# PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

**Date and Time:** Tuesday 12 March 2013 7.00 pm

**Venue:** Room 8, Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton Hill, SW2 1RW

**Contact for enquiries:**
Nigel Harvey
Democratic Services Officer
Tel/Voicemail: 020 7926 3136
Fax: 020 7926 2361
Email: nharvey1@lambeth.gov.uk

Governance and Democracy
Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton Hill, London, SW2 1RW

Despatched: Friday 1 March 2013

**Website:**
www.lambeth.gov.uk/committee

Lambeth Council – Democracy Live on Facebook
http://www.facebook.com/

@LBLdemocracy on Twitter
http://twitter.com/LBLdemocracy

To tweet about Council agendas, minutes or meetings use #Lambeth

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:** Councillors BRADLEY, BRATHWAITE, EDBROOKE, LING (Vice-Chair), MEMERY, MORRIS (Chair) and PALMER

**SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS:** Councillors AMINU, CLYNE, GIESS, HASELDEN, MALLEY, NOSEGBE, PICKARD and J.WHELAN
AGENDA

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA MAY BE CHANGED AT THE MEETING

1. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests

   Under Standing Order 4.4, where any councillor has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (as defined in the Members’ Code of Conduct (para. 4)) in any matter to be considered at a meeting of the Council, a committee, sub-committee or joint committee, they must withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Monitoring Officer.

2. Minutes

   To agree minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2013. (To follow).


   For information on documents used in the preparation of the reports contact the Planning Advice Desk, Tel: 020 7926 1180.

3. Peabody Estate, Rosendale Road, London SE24 9EQ (Thurlow Park Ward) (12/02630/FUL & 12/02658/CON) 1 - 64

   Recommendation:

   12/02630/FUL
   Grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

   12/02658/CON
   Grant Conservation Area Consent

4. 368 - 372 Coldharbour Lane, London SW9 (Coldharbour Ward) (12/03393/S106) 65 - 76

   Recommendation: Amend the Section 106 Agreement pertaining to
06/04037/FUL and incorporate the alterations as outlined in the report.

5. **168 And 170 Vauxhall St And 17 And 19 Oval Way And Disused Rd To Rear Of Morris, Isis-& Matilda House, London SE11 5RR** (Oval Ward) (12/04623/FUL) 77 - 98

Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to conditions and Section 106 Agreement.

6. **129 Valley Road, London SW16 2XT** (Streatham Wells Ward) (12/04546/FUL) 99 - 154

Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

7. **378-382 Wandsworth Road, SW8 4TE** (Larkhall Ward) (12/04774/FUL) 155 - 178

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.


Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the report and the signing of a Section 106 agreement for developer contributions and GLA stage 2 referral.
Dates of future meetings, the agenda management timetable and details of past meetings can be found on the Council’s website, if you are viewing this online [http://tinyurl.com/pacdates](http://tinyurl.com/pacdates).

**Access Information:**
- Lambeth Town Hall is on the corner of Acre Lane and Brixton Hill, 200 metres south of Brixton tube station (Victoria Line) – turn left on leaving the station and look for the clock tower.
- If you are viewing this online, [http://tinyurl.com/lambethtownhallmap](http://tinyurl.com/lambethtownhallmap)

**Facilities for disabled people:**
- Access for people with mobility difficulties, please ring the bell (marked with the disabled access symbol) on the right-hand side of the Acre Lane entrance.
- Sound enhancement system available in meeting room. Please contact the officer shown on the front page of this agenda to discuss your needs.
- Adapted toilets on the premises.
- Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request.

For further assistance please contact the officer listed on the front page.

**Audio/Visual Recording of meetings**

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press please contact the Press Office). Please note that the Chair of the meeting has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons including disruption caused by the filming or the nature of the business being conducted.

Anyone filming a meeting is asked to only focus on those actively participating but please also be aware that you may be filmed whilst attending a council meeting and that attendance at the meeting signifies your agreement to this.

Persons making recordings are requested not to put undue restrictions on
the material produced so that it can be reused and edited by all local people and organisations on a non-commercial basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queries on reports:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please contact report authors prior to the meeting if you have questions on the reports or wish to inspect the background documents used. The name, email address and telephone number of the report author is shown on the front page of each report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other enquiries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please contact the officer shown on the front page to obtain any other information concerning the agenda or meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessing Agendas, Reports and Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All public committee papers are available for inspection at Lambeth libraries, and also on the internet from the day of publication in the following manner which you can access by logging onto <a href="http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/committee">www.lambeth.gov.uk/committee</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Or</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Log on to <a href="http://www.lambeth.gov.uk">www.lambeth.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Click on Council and Democracy in the menu on the left hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Then click on the third main item in the body of the page—Committee reports, minutes and agendas, and then Council meetings and decisions pages. Click on the relevant committee in the list and then the meeting you require.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are unable to locate the document you require, please contact the officer shown on the front page above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councillors (details via the website <a href="http://www.lambeth.gov.uk">www.lambeth.gov.uk</a> or phone 020 7926 2131) may be contacted at their surgeries or through Party Group offices to represent your views to the Council: (Liberal Democrats 020 7926 2028) (Conservatives 020 7926 2213) (Labour 020 7926 1166).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE (PAC)

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

1  Who sits on the PAC?

The Council has established a Planning Applications Committees, which consists of seven Councillors (elected members).

2  Where and when do PAC meetings take place?

Meetings are usually held in Room 8 at Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton Hill, SW2 1RW. The meetings are normally held on a Tuesday evening and are held 1 or 2 times a month and are listed on the Council’s calendar of meetings at: http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov/mgCalendarMonthView.asp?GL=1&bcr=1

3  Can I attend PAC meetings?

Yes. All PAC meetings are open to the press and public although on rare occasions the Committee may discuss a matter in private.

4  How can I get a copy of any reports to be considered by PAC?

The officer reports on applications to be considered are circulated to PAC Members and published on the Council’s website a week before the meeting. Papers for meetings can be viewed at: http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov/uuCoverPage.asp?bcr=1. Hard copies are also available from Democratic Services at the meeting.

5  Can I make written representations to the PAC meeting?

Yes. Written representations, including any letters, petitions or photos should be:
- Sent to the relevant case officer listed on the front page of the officer report preferably by email.
- Sent by 12 noon 2 clear working days before the meeting.

The meetings are normally on a Tuesday, so the deadline would be 12 noon by the Thursday before the meeting.

6  Can I speak at PAC meetings?

Yes. Up to three supporters (including applicants), three objectors and Ward Members can address the meeting at the Committee’s discretion for a maximum of 3 minutes each.

You must register your wish to speak on any application by telephoning Democratic Services on 020 7926 2170 or emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk by 12 noon on the last working day before the meeting.

7  Does the PAC consider applications in the order listed on the agenda?

Not necessarily. The order of business is determined at the meeting taking into consideration:

(a) Whether an application has been withdrawn or officers are recommending deferral
(b) Whether an application has been deferred from a previous meeting or has been the subject of a site visit.

(c) The level of interest on an application.

(d) Whether applicants/supporters/objectors/Ward Members have any special requirements

8 What is the process for considering an application at the meeting?

Officers will introduce each application with a brief Powerpoint presentation which will usually include drawings and photographs of the application site. The Committee will then hear from and question all interested parties. The merits of the application are considered taking into account the views of the interested parties and planning officers before the committee reaches a decision.

9 What time does the meeting come to an end?

The meeting will be conducted in a business like fashion and the Committee will endeavour to deal with reports as quickly as possible.

However if there is a lot of outstanding business at 9.00 pm the Chair will advise the meeting if and how the timetable for the meeting has to be revised, in order to deal with remaining business and finish the meeting at 10.00 pm. At 10.00 pm the meeting will decide which business can be completed by 10.45 pm and any business not reached by that time will be deferred to the next meeting.

10 What are site visits?

Site visits are arranged by Planning Officers to allow the Committee and Ward Members to view the site and its surroundings and to seek clarification. However, the merits of the application are not discussed.

11 When do site visits take place?

Site visits usually take place on the Saturday morning immediately preceding the committee at which the application is to be considered. If you have already made written representations to the Planning Service about the application, you will be notified of the date and time of the site visit. The site visit is a good opportunity for any interested parties to explain the impact on the ground of the development in a more satisfactory way than through written and second hand visual material.

12 If I am unable to attend the PAC meeting, how can I find out the decision?

You can find out the decision by contacting Democratic Services the day after the meeting. The minutes from the meeting will also be available on the Council’s website 5 clear working days after the meeting. Planning officers will send the applicant and any interested parties who have made written representations formal notification of the Committee decision.

13 Where can I get further information or advice?

If you would like further information or advice, please contact:
(a) Town Planning Advice Desk: Tel: 020 7926 1180, Email: lambethplanning@lambeth.gov.uk
(b) Town Planning Webpage: http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/Services/HousingPlanning/Planning/
(c) Democratic Services: Tel: 020 7926 2170, Email: democracy@lambeth.gov.uk
This page is intentionally left blank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>12/02630/FUL &amp; 12/02658/CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Address</td>
<td>Peabody Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosendale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site address</td>
<td>Peabody Estate, Rosendale Road, London SE24 9EQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Thurlow Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Demolition of existing community hall, estate office and garages and redevelopment of 5 sites within Peabody Estate to provide a community centre together with the erection of 8 self-contained houses and 4 flats as follows:- Site A:- Demolition of existing community hall and garage and the erection of 2 storey building to provide 4 single dwelling houses to the south-western corner of the estate. Provision of refuse and cycle storage. Site B:- Demolition of existing estate office and garage and erection of a 4 storey extension to Block F to provide 4 self contained flats with the provision of refuse and cycle storage. Site C:- Demolition of existing garages and the erection of 2 two storey cottages. Provision of refuse and cycle storage. Site D:- Erection of 2 two storey cottages with the provision of refuse and cycle storage. Site E:- Erection of a single storey community hall with associated landscaping and provision of refuse and cycle storage (Town Planning and Conservation Area Consent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application type</td>
<td>Full Planning Application Conservation Area Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ref(s)</td>
<td>12/02630/FUL &amp; 12/02658/CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation date</td>
<td>10th July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case officer details</td>
<td>Name: Robert O’Sullivan Tel: 020 7926 1427 Email: <a href="mailto:rosullivan@lambeth.gov.uk">rosullivan@lambeth.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Peabody Trust (Mr James Hawton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Ms Sarah Hare: c/o Haworth Tompkins Architects 9 Holyrood Street London, SE1 2EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations/constraints</td>
<td>Peabody Estate - Rosendale Road Conservation Area (CA53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0937.3 (0)001 Rev 02; 0937.3 (0)100 Rev 04; 0937.3 (0)010 Rev 02; 0937.3 (0)020 Rev 02; 0937.3 (0)030; 0937.3 (0)040; 0937.3 (0)050;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site A</strong> - 0937.3 (0)110 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)111 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)112 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)310 Rev 01; 0937.3 (0)210 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)211 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)212 Rev P3;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site B</strong> - 0937.3 (0)120 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)121 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)122 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)220 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)225 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)320 Rev P2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site C</strong> - 0937.3 (0)130 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)131 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)160 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)240 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)340 Rev P2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site D</strong> - 0937.3 (0)140 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)141 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)132 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)231 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)230 Rev P2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site E</strong> - 0937.3 (0)150 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)0151 Rev P2; 0937.3 (0)0250 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)0251 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)0252 Rev P3; 0937.3 (0)0350 Rev 02;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202-01; 1202-02 Rev A; 1202-03 Rev A; 1202-04; 1202-05; 1202-06 Rev B; 1202-07; 1202-08; 1202-02 Rev A;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design and Access Statement by Haworth Tompkins (June 2012); Heritage Statement by Haworth Tompkins; Letter from Peabody dated 13 November 2012; Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing report by BVP (June 2012); Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy by Conisbee (June 2012); Arboricultural Implications Report by PJC Consultancy Ltd (May 2012); Noise Assessment by Max Fordham (June 2012); Sustainability and Energy Statement by Max Fordham (July 2012); Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment by Pre-Construct Archaeology (May 2012); Ecology and CF SH Assessment by The Ecology Consultancy (June 2012);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Conservation Area Consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>22.02.2013</td>
<td>25.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/09/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Multiple dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/02/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Unit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21/12/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Green Spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>09/08/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboricultural Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/02/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services (Noise Pollution)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health (Asbestos)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14/02/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Team (S106)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17/12/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>22/01/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich Residents Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage (Archaeology)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18/01/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31/12/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>04/01/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>31/08/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Multiple dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Background Documents

Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)

---

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website [www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy)
1.0 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The main issues pertaining to this application are:

- The acceptability of the proposal in land use terms;
- The standard of proposed residential accommodation;
- The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The design of the proposal and its impact upon surrounding townscape and the character, appearance and setting of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area;
- The acceptability of the demolition of the existing community hall, estate office building and garages in heritage terms (Conservation Area Consent);
- Whether the proposed dwelling mix and affordable housing provision is acceptable;
- The highways and parking implications of the proposal;
- Sustainability and renewable energy issues;
- Whether the development would incorporate sufficient measures to reduce the opportunity for crime;
- Waste storage and collection; and
- Planning obligations/CIL.

2.0 Site Description

2.1 The Peabody Estate on Rosendale Road comprises nearly twenty acres and is located on a sloping site between two railway embankments, backing onto Knights Hill and garden allotments. Norwood Road (A215) which runs along the nearby Brockwell Park is to the west of the estate.

2.2 George Peabody was an American philanthropist, born in 1795, who spent most of his later life in London. The Peabody Trust was set up in 1862 when he donated £500,000 ‘to ameliorate the condition of the poor and needy of this great metropolis and to promote their comfort and happiness’. The original housing type chosen by the Trust was of large blocks of flats, five storeys high. These characteristic blocks were the first to be built on the Rosendale Road site. In the north west of the estate there are twelve blocks in rows of three with one block facing onto Rosendale Road. These blocks were designed by William Cubitt and Co., and were erected circa 1901. The blocks of flats are generally four storeys high but with a fifth storey over the centre of each, which was originally the laundry and drying area but are now converted to flats. Built in red brick, pale gault bricks have been used for window arches and restrained decoration to relieve the massing of the blocks.

2.3 The remainder of the estate comprises terraces of small two storey cottages of varying designs each with its own garden and facing onto wide estate roads. In 1905 eighty-two cottages were added to the estate, and a further sixty-four designed by W.E. Wallis were built in 1907-08. The cottages are good examples of early twentieth century garden suburb design, with yellow stock or red brick ground floors and roughcast rendering at first floor level, often incorporating half timber detailing. The roofs are of slate or clay tiles and the houses still have
their chimney stacks and pots. Some of the cottages have canted bays on the ground floor and the windows of the cottages throughout the estate have small paned sashes or casements constructed of timber. Gable ends incorporate various design features, including decorative half-timbering and arched window recesses. There are dressed brick arches over windows and entrances while the terrace ends have pronounced chimney stacks used as a pleasing architectural device. Each home has a small front garden usually enclosed with a picket fence or pivet hedging.

2.4 On the south side of the estate there is a war memorial built in a simple Arts and Crafts style of darkened timber and red brick in the form of a lych gate. Next to the memorial is the original estate office and greenhouse. A replacement estate office was built on the western side of the estate in 1994.

2.5 Vehicular and pedestrian access to the estate is from Rosendale Road. Two further pedestrian routes into the estate are provided along the southern boundary, which link with Knight’s Hill Wood and the Peabody Hill Estate further to the south. The site has good access to public transport, with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 4. Herne Hill Station is located approximately 800m to the north-west. There are bus services on Knight’s Hill and Herne Hill, which are within easy reach of the site via Rosendale Road.

2.6 The estate was designated a conservation area in 1999; although none of the buildings on the site are listed. The site is bordered to the west, south and east by the Peabody Hill Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SINC).

3.0 Planning History

3.1 09/02785/FUL – Planning permission GRANTED on 12/11/2009 for ‘Estate wide environmental improvements involving resurfacing of roads and pavements, installation/upgrading of street/external lighting, provision of bin stores, revision of parking layout, provision of cycle parking, planting of trees and shrubs, boundary improvements/alterations, alterations to the main entrance on Rosendale Road including the erection of brick piers and metal arches, and hard and soft landscaping of communal areas’.

3.2 08/04276/RG4 – Planning permission REFUSED on 27/02/2009 for ‘Estate wide environmental improvements involving resurfacing of roads and pavements, installation/upgrading of street lighting, revision of car parking layout, planting of trees and shrubs, boundary improvements and hard and soft landscaping of communal areas, erection of a bulk storage cage adjacent to substation to the rear of blocks D, E and F, enlargement and repositioning of vehicular entrance onto Rosendale Road and erection of brick columns to Rosendale Road entrance’.

3.3 February 1999 – Designation of the estate as a Conservation Area.

4.0 Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of 5 infill sites within the Peabody Estate to provide a replacement community centre together with the
construction of 8 self-contained houses and 4 self-contained flats (12 additional residential units). Each of the site proposals are expanded on below.

4.2 Conservation Area Consent is also sought for the demolition of existing structures within the estate comprising the derelict community hall and the estate office with adjoining outbuildings.

Site A

4.3 Site A is located in the south-west corner of the estate, and currently houses a vacant community hall originally used for playgroups and a local tenants association. The existing single storey timber structure was constructed in 1913 and has an internal floorspace of approximately 160m$^2$. The building has fallen into a state of disrepair and there is evidence of vandalism. A railway line runs to the west and north-west of the site with wooded banks separating the two. To the north-east and east are the gable walls and back gardens to cottages No. 115 and 116 respectively. There is an access path and public right of way to Knights Hill Wood immediately adjoining the eastern boundary of the site.

4.4 Conservation Area Consent is sought for demolition of this structure, which is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey terrace of four no. 3-bedroom family homes. The design approach is a contemporary reworking of the adjoining Cubitt designed cottages, which references the use of brick as a finishing material and gables to the roof structure. Roof materials would be slate to match the adjoining cottages. Each house would have a rear garden and a front garden with boundary treatment to provide defensible space from the public right of way.

4.5 There is a noticeable change in land level adjacent to the site on the route into Knight's Hill and Peabody Hill Wood to the south. This access pathway would be maintained as a public right of way.

Site B

4.6 Site B is located along the western boundary of the estate between a 4/5 storey block of flats (Block F) and a two storey cottage (No. 99). This site currently contains a vacant 2-storey estate office (110m$^2$), a 13.5m$^2$ garage and 11.2m$^2$ outbuilding to the rear of the site. Conservation Area Consent is sought for demolition of these structures. The estate office was constructed in 1994 and is finished in red brick with sash windows and is lacking in fine detail. It is considered only to make a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The estate office facilities would be rehoused in the proposed community centre (Site E).

4.7 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a four storey extension to Block F to provide 4 self-contained flats, with one on each floor. A 1-bedroom wheelchair accessible unit would be provided on ground floor, with a 2-bedroom unit provided on each of the upper three floors. All flats would be dual aspect, with the ground floor flat having a private back garden and the upper flats having 7.3m$^2$ balconies to the rear.

4.8 The proposal has been designed as a four storey extension with a recess at the
junction with Block F to allow architraves and other projections on the existing block to return comfortably, and also to delineate the old from the new. The ground floor (base) would be modulated through small projections of alternating bricks to relate to the highly articulated base of the existing block of flats. In contrast the upper floors would be finished in plain brickwork rising to the ‘shoulder’ of the adjoining block of flats. The materials have been chosen to work with the existing, a brick which ties in with the orange of the Cubitt designed block of flats to the north.

**Site C**

4.9 Site C is located in the centre on the estate on the site of cottages No. 49 and 50, which were destroyed in WWII. This infill site is at the end of a terrace of cottages and is currently occupied by a garage and an enlarged garden to the adjoining property at No. 51.

4.10 The proposal seeks the replacement of the two lost cottages, one which mirrors the pair of cottages (Nos. 63 & 64) at the far end of the terrace. These existing cottages were designed by W.E. Wallis and built in 1907-08. The Wallis designed cottages are good examples of early twentieth century garden suburb design, with yellow stock bricks at ground floor and roughcast rendering at first floor level. The roofs are of slate and the houses still have their chimney stacks and pots. Each home has a small front garden enclosed with a picket fence of privet hedging.

**Site D**

4.11 Site D is located on an existing hard-surfaced roadway adjoining the eastern boundary of the site. It is bordered by the railway line to the east and by No.28 Peabody Cottages to the west. There are no existing buildings on this site, with the exception of a small garage proposed for demolition. There is a change of land level across the site with a rise in land level towards the south.

4.12 The proposal seeks the construction of a pair of semi-detached 2-storey cottages (1 x 3-bed and 1 x 2-bed). The principle elevation would sit in the same frontage as the adjoining row of Art and Crafts cottages. It would be of a similar bulk and mass but would be detached from the end of terrace property, turning the corner and facing onto the railway embankment. The proposed dwellings would have a south-facing garden with a boundary fence with Nos. 62-64, with a back to back distance similar to existing adjoining properties. Brick has been chosen as the principle finishing material to tie in with the base of the adjoining Cubitt designed cottages.

**Site E**

4.13 Site E is a vacant plot in the south-eastern corner of the estate currently used as a roadway for vehicular traffic and pedestrians. Vehicular access is only from the northern point of the road due to changes in land level. The site occupies a prominent position within the estate as it terminates at the end of the principle east-west axial route through the site.

4.14 The proposal seeks the construction of a single storey replacement community centre housing community facilities which would be used and run by residents of the Rosendale Estate and Peabody Hill Estate, both of which are managed by Peabody Trust. Although a single storey building, it would have the scale of the
surrounding 2-storey domestic buildings due to the rear profile. The proposed building would be integrated into the existing slope, and a pathway to Knights Hill Wood maintained as this is a public right of way.

4.15 This proposed community centre would provide 261m² of floorspace as compensatory provision for the floorspace to be lost through the proposed demolition of the existing community hall (Site A) and estate office (Site B). The proposed building would provide a multi-functional hall, learning/IT/Board meeting space, ‘well-being’ room and an office hub. A community kitchen/café would also be available for hall users to provide refreshments. The hours of operation would be from 9:00am to 9:00pm seven days a week.

4.16 The application proposes 6 affordable dwellings of affordable rent tenure, with the remaining 6 dwellings scheduled for market sale. The affordable rent units would be based on no higher than 60% of market rents on the 3 bedroom units and 70% of market rent on the 1 bedroom unit. Lambeth would receive 100% nomination rights to these units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Housing</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-bed flat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bed flat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bed house</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bed house</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17 Additional parking demand generated by the proposed development would be provided within the current estate layout, which comprises of 183 car parking spaces. This is inclusive of 21 blue badge holder parking bays. Cycle parking would be provided at each of the 5 infill sites.

5.0 Consultations and Responses

5.1 Consultation letters were sent to 312 addresses in the Peabody Estate.

5.2 Site notices (x5) were displayed in the vicinity of the site on the 9th March 2012 and a Press Notice was published in the Weekender Press on 9th March 2012.

5.3 A re-consultation was carried out in November 2012 following receipt of design amendments to Sites A, B, C, D and E at the request of Council officers.

5.4 Internal consultation

The Council’s Policy officer has provided verbal comments and raises no in principle objections subject to securing adequate compensatory provision for the loss of the community facility.

5.5 The Council’s Conservation and Design officer has provided detailed comments relating to both the full planning and conservation area consent applications. The principle of demolition of existing buildings on Sites A and B is supported when considered against the wider public benefit of the proposal to the Peabody Estate and the local community. The design proposals for the 5 infill sites have been amended in response to feedback and continued dialogue with the Conservation Officer and no objection is now raised subject to securing
additional details through planning conditions. This is further expanded on in Section 7.2 of this officer report.

5.6 **The Council’s Highways and Transportation officer** has advised that the proposed development is acceptable in policy terms.

5.7 **The Council’s Regulatory Services (Noise Pollution) team** has not responded to consultations to date. Notwithstanding, officers consider that the introduction of residential dwellings to Sites A, B, C and D would be conforming land uses within the residential estate. The operation of the community centre could be adequately controlled by conditions restricting hours of operation and amplified noise to ensure that there isn’t an undue noise impact on adjoining properties.

5.8 **The Council’s Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) team** has been consulted due to the presence of asbestos within the vacant community centre on Site A. No response has been received to date. Works to remove asbestos is controlled by the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012. This is further detailed in Section 7.10 of this report.

5.9 **The Council’s Parks Projects officer** with responsibility for ecological/biodiversity matters has raised no objections to the proposal. A number of conditions are recommended to protect the biodiversity position in the event that planning permission is granted.

5.10 **The Council’s Tree Officer** considers the proposed works to trees within the estate, including the removal of a number of trees, to be acceptable. This is further detailed in Section 7.9 of this report.

5.11 **The Council’s Streetcare Team** has not responded to consultations to date. Provisions have been made for recycling and refuse storage for each of the five development sites. Refuse collection would be made from the street and would be required to comply with the Council’s adopted Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers (May 2006). It is also recommended to secure by condition, details of a waste management plan.

5.12 **The Implementation team** has advised on the s106 requirements as reported within Section 7.8 of this report.

5.13 **The Council’s Housing officer** has reviewed the proposed affordable mix and tenure and raised no objection to the proposal.

5.14 **The Council’s Design out Crime officer** has recommended that the development should be completed in accordance with the physical protection measures of the Secured by Design guidelines. A condition to this effect is attached.

5.15 **The Council’s legal officer** has been consulted and offered no comments on this report.
External consultation

5.16 **English Heritage (Archaeology)** has reviewed the submitted archaeological report and has raised no objection to the proposal.

5.17 **The Environment Agency** has advised that the area is of low flood risk and therefore offered no comments on this application.

5.18 **Thames Water** has raised no objection to this application in relation to the sewerage infrastructure and the water infrastructure and, recommends informatives in relation to surface water drainage, discharge of groundwater into the public sewer and water pressure requirements.

5.19 **The London Wildlife Trust** has advised that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the integrity of the adjacent Peabody Hill woodland subject to the range of mitigation measures detailed in the submitted Ecology Report and requested by the Council’s Ecological adviser.

5.20 **Network Rail** was consulted but at the time of writing had not responded.

5.21 **The Dulwich Residents Association and Dulwich Society** were notified of the application but at the time of writing had not responded.

5.22 10 responses were received from local residents following the initial consultation process, all of which objected to the proposal. No new objections were received following the re-consultation in November 2012.

5.23 A petition has also been received containing 53 signatories, all of which are from residents within the Peabody Estate. The petition specifically raises objection to the proposed development of a new Community Centre on Site E, with no objection raised to the other 4 infill sites.

5.24 The objections received from the public consultation are summarised in the following section, with an officer response to those comments contained within the right hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>10 (not including petition with 53 signatories)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objections:</th>
<th>Council’s Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed buildings on a number of the sites are not of sufficient design quality/merit and would</td>
<td>The design proposals for each of the 5 infill sites have evolved from pre-application discussions with officers and a continued dialogue following submission of the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

<p>| Loss of value to existing residential properties. | This is not a material planning consideration. |
| Loss of green space to Site C (i.e. ‘garden grabbing’). Potential loss of a habitat for birds, insects and amphibians. | Site C is a vacant plot of land that previously contained cottages No. 49 and 50, which were destroyed in WWII. It is noted that the site is currently occupied by a garage and an enlarged garden to the adjoining property at No. 51. Section 17 [Core Planning Principles] of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development of the site would result in the loss of existing garden land, the site has previously been developed upon and it therefore considered acceptable for redevelopment. The Council’s Ecology advisor considers the proposal to be an appropriate and sustainable use of the present site, and no objection is raised on biodiversity/ecological grounds. This is subject to securing a range of mitigation measures detailed in the Ecology Report and requested by the Council’s Ecological adviser. This is discussed in more detail in Section 7.9 of this report. |
| Unacceptable loss of sunlight/daylight to adjoining properties. | A daylight and sunlight study assessing potential impact upon adjoining residential properties has been submitted with the application. The report concludes that there would be limited impacts upon adjoining properties, which is further detailed in Section 7.3 of this report. Officers consider the sunlight/daylighting impacts to be acceptable and in compliance with the intentions of the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BRE guidance given the site’s existing layout with back to back cottages being a prevailing characteristic.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of privacy and unacceptable overlooking to adjoining residential properties.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7.3 of this officer report provides an assessment of privacy issues to adjoining residential properties. It concludes that the proposal would not adversely impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining residential properties given the existing layout and building relationships that exist between cottages in the estate. A planning condition has been recommended to require obscure glazing to the balconies of Site B to mitigate against overlooking of the rear gardens of adjoining properties to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of visual amenity to Nos. 45-48 due to the loss of trees and the introduction of a blank flank elevation to the new properties in Site C.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The proposal for Site C seeks to reinstate the existing cottages that were lost during WWII. The proposed brick flank elevation would replicate an existing relationship found elsewhere within the Estate, and no objection is raised.  

The proposal would require the loss of 5 existing trees on the site, including a silver birch, Leyland cypress and apple. Whilst any loss of trees is regrettable, the Council’s Tree Officer has advised that these particular specimens offer limited value to the character of the Conservation Area. No objection is raised subject to securing replacement planting elsewhere in the site through a planning condition. |
| **Adjoining properties at Nos. 46 and 51 have access to the existing garden area within Site C through a rear gate, which would be lost in the event of planning approval being granted.** |
| The applicant has been asked to provide a response to this objection. Peabody advises that the title deeds for these adjoining properties have been reviewed. There is no mention of a rear gate and there are no rights granted to the leaseholders to use the land at Site C.  

Any claims for legal rights of way (easements) over Site C is a legal matter and not a material planning consideration. |
| **Proposed development would put pressure on drainage, increase water run-off and pose a flood risk.** |
| The site lies within an area that is deemed by the Environment Agency as having a low environmental risk from flooding. It follows that the site and development does not pose an unacceptable risk in terms of flooding.  

The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment, which details the incorporation of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) into the development proposal. The Environment Agency welcomes these measures, and officers recommend that they be secured through a |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damage to adjoining properties during construction works.</td>
<td>This is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and disturbance to adjoining residents during construction works.</td>
<td>Construction works by their very nature can have the potential to unduly impact upon the amenity of existing residential occupiers. Officers agree that any development proposal should have appropriate safeguards in place to balance the need for future development with the amenity of future residents. For this reason it is recommended that a Construction Management Plan be secured by condition in the event that planning approval is granted. Hours of building works are also recommended as a condition of planning consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic and parking pressures within the Estate</td>
<td>Section 7.4 of this officer report provides an assessment of the highways and transport impacts of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council’s Transport Planner concludes that on balance the proposal is acceptable in policy terms and would not result in an unacceptable impact on the free flow of traffic or parking levels within the estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk to residents if the applicant (Peabody Estate) passes the costs of development onto them.</td>
<td>The applicant has stated that the development would be cross-subsidised through the development of 6 additional private market houses on the Estate. Notwithstanding, the potential financial risk to existing tenants is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that proposed development will benefit the current residents of the Estate.</td>
<td>The proposal seeks to provide a new, fit for purpose Community Centre to replace the vacant community hall. It is envisaged that the flexible spaces in the new facility will be made available for all local residents, with details to be secured through a Community Use Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of terrace of dwellings on Sites A and E would encroach onto valuable open space, impacting upon wildlife habitats, trees and the adjoining woodland.</td>
<td>Development sites A and E are located in close proximity to the southern boundary of the site, adjoining the Peabody Hill SINC. The building footprints would not encroach into the adjoining woodland. A public right of way into the woodland would be retained as part of the development proposal. The Council’s Ecological adviser and the London Wildlife Trust have raised no objections on Ecology/Biodiversity grounds subject to the use of appropriately worded planning conditions to safeguard the adjoining woodland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and wildlife habitat. This is discussed in more detail in Section 7.9 of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of sufficient and adequate services (e.g. drainage, water, sewage) to accommodate the additional development works.</th>
<th>Policy 5.14 (Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure) of The London Plan requires that infrastructure of adequate capacity (particularly water supply and sewerage) should be available in time to serve new development (following consultation with the utility companies). It is important that development does not proceed ahead of the ability of sewerage facilities and receiving sewerage treatment works to be able to deal with increased flows. Thames Water has been consulted and has not raised any objection to the proposal. A number of informatives are requested which would be added to the decision notice in the event that planning approval is granted. Officers consider that the existing services can adequately accommodate the additional development on the site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objection to development to the rear of the war memorial</td>
<td>No development is proposed for the war memorial site. This was removed by the applicant at pre-application stage in response to comments received from local residents and the Council’s Planning Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No details have been provided for the operation of the proposed Community Centre.</td>
<td>The submitted Design and Access statement provides an overview of the proposed community centre, including the nature of the flexible spaces. The applicant has also provided a draft community use plan which indicates that the community centre would be managed in conjunction with local residents. The application form advises that the Community Centre would operate from 09:00–21:00, seven days a week. These hours are considered to be acceptable and would balance the requirements of the operators of the facility with the amenity concerns of local residents. Planning conditions are recommended to restrict the hours of operation and to ensure that no amplified sound or music can be heard at the nearest noise sensitive property. A community use management plan could be secured by condition to provide a more detailed overview of the proposed operation of the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objections raised in petition to community centre at Site E**

<p>| Siting and layout fails to respect the local context and street pattern and would be out of character. Proposal represents 'town | The proposed community centre would be sited on an existing hard surfaced roadway within the south-eastern corner of the site. Section 17 [Core Planning Principles] of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cramming’ onto a low density road thereby significantly altering the fabric of the area.</th>
<th>Environmental value. This includes fixed surface infrastructure such as surfaced roadways. The development of this parcel of land is an appropriate use of this underutilised part of the site and is considered acceptable subject to an appropriate design response. The Council’s Conservation and Design Officer has raised no objection to the design proposal, and considered it to be an appropriate response to the local context, street pattern and the character of the Conservation Area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental impact on amenity of adjoining neighbours by reason of loss of privacy to adjoining gardens, overbearing impact, noise and community safety concerns. This would be contrary to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.</td>
<td>Section 7.3 of this officer report provides an assessment of amenity issues to adjoining residential properties. It concludes that the proposal would not adversely impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining residential properties. The proposed development would not be contrary to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate parking provision and access arrangements for future users of the Community Centre.</td>
<td>The proposal would provide replacement provision for an existing community hall and estate office on the site, rather than the introduction of a new use into the Estate. In addition, the facilities provided within the proposed community centre would be principally for local residents, thereby reducing the requirement for car journeys. Some third party usage is proposed, but it is considered that this is unlikely to generate excessive levels of parking demand due to the limited size of the facilities. The Council’s Transport Planner has raised no objection to the proposed community centre on parking and access grounds. Section 7.4 of this officer report provides a detailed assessment of the highways and transport impacts of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate access and parking arrangements for construction vehicles and site operatives.</td>
<td>The site has been the subject of recent estate wide improvement works, which were accommodated within the estate, thereby demonstrating the capacity to accommodate construction vehicles. The Council’s Transport Planning officer has reviewed the proposal and has not raised any in principle objection to access and parking during construction. Further details of these arrangements could be secured through the submission and approval of a Method of Demolition and Construction Statement in advance of works commencing on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed café and use of community centre by third parties would unduly impact on neighbours residential amenity</td>
<td>The cafe (dining) space would be located in the entrance foyer/hallway. Peabody envisages that the primary focus would be health, training and food awareness initiatives as well as being made available to provide refreshment for users of the hall and the other multi-purpose meeting rooms. This is intended to be used as an ancillary café area for the community centre rather than a standalone Class A3 café/restaurant. A condition could be attached to any future planning consent to restrict its use for purposes ancillary to the community centre. Due to its limited size and ancillary nature, officers do not consider that it would result in an undue impact on neighbouring residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.0 Planning Policy Considerations

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 The development plan in Lambeth is:

- The London Plan (adopted July 2011)
- Lambeth’s Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011); and
- The remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’.

6.3 It should be noted that given the recent adoption of the Council’s Core Strategy, the policies contained therein and those remaining in the UDP are in general conformity with the recently adopted London Plan. For the purposes of this recommendation report therefore the assessment will concentrate upon the development’s compliance, or not, with Core Strategy and UDP policies. Reference will only be made to London Plan policies where there is conflict or where it is necessary and/or appropriate to do so.

6.4 Material considerations include national, regional and local planning policy document and guidance.

6.5 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

6.5.1 Central Government guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was published on the 27th March 2012. This sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and replaces all existing Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs).

6.5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It reinforces
the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of
the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF
must now be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood
plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Of significance, it
sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, Local
Planning Authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable
development.

6.6 London Plan

6.6.1 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaces the previous
versions, which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008.
The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London and, it sets out a fully
integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the
development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. It forms part of the
development plan for Greater London. All Borough plan policies are required to
be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

6.6.2 The key policies of the London Plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
- Policy 2.9 Inner London
- Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
- Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
- Policy 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
- Policy 3.6 Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation
  Facilities
- Policy 3.8 Housing Choice
- Policy 3.9 Mixed and Balanced Communities
- Policy 3.10 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 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
- Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- Policy 5.14 Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure
- Policy 5.21 Contaminated Land
- Policy 6.3 Assessing Effect of Development on Transport Capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- 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 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
• Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations

6.6.3 The Mayor of London’s Supplementary Planning Guidance – Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (March 2008) is of relevance to the consideration of amenity space provision.


6.7.1 The following saved UDP policies (whole or part thereof) are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

• Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
• Policy 9 Transport Impact
• Policy 14 Parking and Traffic Restraint
• Policy 16 Affordable Housing
• Policy 31 Streets, Character and Layout
• Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime
• Policy 33 Building Scale and Design
• Policy 36 Alterations and Extensions
• Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction
• Policy 38 Design in Existing Residential/Mixed Use Areas
• Policy 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
• Policy 47 Conservation Areas

6.8 Lambeth’s Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)

6.8.1 The following policies of the Core Strategy are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

• Policy S1 Delivering the Vision and Objectives
• Policy S2 Housing
• Policy S4 Transport
• Policy S5 Open Space
• Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction
• Policy S8 Sustainable Waste Management
• Policy S9 Quality of the Built Environment
• Policy S10 Planning Obligations

6.9 Local Guidance

6.9.1 The Council has adopted the following Supplementary Planning Documents, which are relevant:

• SPD: Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions
• SPD: Safer Built Environments
• SPD: Sustainable Design and Construction
• SPD: S106 Planning Obligations
6.9.2 The Council’s ‘Waste & Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (2006) is also relevant to this application.

7.0 Assessment

7.1 Land Use

(a) The principle of redevelopment for residential use (Sites A, B, C and D)

7.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework actively promotes housing developments in suitable locations and, requires local planning authorities to manage the supply of housing land in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land. Policy 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply) of the London Plan seeks to ensure a minimum provision of 32,210 new additional homes across London with Lambeth allocated a target of 11,950 for the period 2011-20. Lambeth Core Strategy Policy S2 envisages the provision of at least 7,700 net additional dwellings for the period 2010/11 to 2016/17.

7.1.2 The Peabody Estate is currently used for residential purposes and the proposed dwellings would be compatible with this land use and the prevailing character of the surrounding area. Therefore in land use terms the provision of 12 additional dwellings would be in accordance with policy objectives for the delivery of additional housing in the borough, subject to compliance with other development plan policies and other material considerations.

7.1.3 As each of the proposed residential development sites are standalone infill sites, it is considered appropriate to individually assess their suitability for redevelopment for residential purposes.

Site A:
This site currently houses the vacant community hall. The principle of redevelopment of this site for residential purposes is considered acceptable, subject to adequate compensatory provision for the lost community facilities and the acceptability of the demolition of the heritage asset, both of which are discussed further on in this officer report.

Site B:
This site currently houses the Peabody Estate Office. The principle of redevelopment of this site for residential purposes is considered acceptable, subject to adequate compensatory provision of the community facilities and the acceptability of the demolition of the existing building, both of which are discussed further on in this officer report.

Site C:
This is a vacant plot of land that previously contained cottages No. 49 and 50, which were destroyed in WWII. It is noted that the site is currently occupied by a garage and an enlarged garden to the adjoining property at No. 51. Section 17 [Core Planning Principles] of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development of the site would result in the loss of existing garden land, the site
has previously been developed upon and it therefore considered acceptable for redevelopment. Officers consider that a reason for refusal could not be sustained relating to the loss of green space.

Site D:
This site comprises of an existing garage and a hard-surfaced roadway adjoining the eastern boundary of the site. The garage is classified as previously developed land and is not of high environmental value. No objection is raised to its redevelopment. The erection of two cottages on the roadway is also considered acceptable in principle. An assessment of the development proposal for this site against a range of planning considerations is provided further on in this report.

In summary, there are no in principle land use objections to the development of the four identified sites for residential purposes (Class C3).

(b) The principle of development of a replacement Community Centre (Site E)

7.1.4 Site E is a vacant plot in the south-eastern corner of the estate currently used as a roadway for vehicular traffic and pedestrians. The proposal seeks the construction of a single storey replacement community centre housing community facilities which would be used and run by residents of the Rosendale Estate and Peabody Hill Estate, both of which are managed by Peabody Trust.

7.1.5 Saved Policy 26 of the UDP promotes the development and improvement of community facilities. Policy 26 deals with the protection of community facilities and is of particular relevance to this proposal. It states that the loss of a community use will be resisted unless a facility of equivalent functionality is replaced locally. This would require securing or improving facilities of equivalent functionality in the area and ensuring their long-term viability.

7.1.6 This proposed community centre would provide 261m$^2$ of floorspace as compensatory provision for the floorspace to be lost through the demolition of the existing 160m$^2$ Community Hall (Site A) and the 110m$^2$ Estate Office (Site B). This is considered to broadly comply with the policy requirements to ensure that equivalent functionality is replaced locally. The new facilities would be housed in a modern, fit for purpose building that would be accessible by all sections of the local community.

7.1.7 The proposed community centre would be sited on an existing hard surfaced roadway within the south-eastern corner of the site. Section 17 [Core Planning Principles] of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. This includes fixed surface infrastructure such as surfaced roadways. The development of this parcel of land is an appropriate use of this underutilised part of the site and is considered acceptable subject to an appropriate design response.

7.1.8 The applicant has advised that the community centre would comprise of a number of flexible spaces that offer a range and versatility of services needed for it to be a viable and sustainable community resource. These include:
Hall Area: An 87m² open plan community hall with ancillary storage facilities.

Community café/kitchen: The cafe (dining) space would be located in the entrance foyer/hallway. Peabody envisages that the primary focus would be health, training and food awareness initiatives as well as being made available to provide refreshment for users of the hall and the other multi-purpose meeting rooms. This is intended to be used as an ancillary café area for the community centre rather than a standalone Class A3 café/restaurant. A condition could be attached to any future planning consent to restrict its use for purposes ancillary to the community centre.

Board Room/Third Sector Room: Two multi-functional rooms (17.3m² and 11.3m²) have been set aside that could attract third party organisations to hire the facilities and desk space to help cross subsidise the cost of providing this community centre. It is also envisaged that the space could be utilised to provide sessions for residents to help access employment initiatives, IT access and training. Peabody advises that the letting to third parties is required to address the long-term viability of the community facility as required by Policy 26.

Hub/Residents Association Room: This space would be used by Peabody staff (e.g. caretaking services) as an ‘estate hub’ and would replace the existing estate office on Site B proposed for demolition. This space would also be used to provide meeting space for the Residents Association and other community groups.

Wellbeing Room: This room would be equipped so that it could be hired out to therapists and health outreach professionals so that services can be accessed by local residents.

The applicant has advised that the proposed Community Centre would go beyond the traditional remit of a community hall. The supporting information states that for these new centres to thrive, be attractive and remain financially sustainable in the long term, they need to be able to offer a number of adaptable spaces which can be used simultaneously by different groups and where appropriate attract third party organisations to increase income generation through the renting of these spaces.

7.1.9 The current proposals are for the hall to be managed by a Management Committee. This Management Committee would be appointed by the Residents Association and the members of the committee would include local residents. The broad principle of providing a multi-functional centre is welcomed by officers subject to ensuring that it principally remains a resource for the community, whilst acknowledging the requirement for some third party usage to fund the development. Further details regarding the management and operation of the facility to ensure that it is safeguarded for use by the local community could be secured through a Community Use Management Plan in the event that planning permission is granted.

7.1.10 In summary, it is considered that the proposal would make effective use of
previously developed or underutilised sites within the Peabody Estate, in an accessible location, in accordance with current national and local development planning policies. This viewpoint is shared by the Council’s Planning Policy Officer.

(c) Density of development

7.1.11 Policy 3.4 of the London Plan states that development should optimise housing output taking into account local context and character, the design principles in Chapter 7 of the London Plan and public transport capacity. Policy S2(g) of the Core strategy seeks levels of residential density consistent with London Plan guidelines, having regard to the provision of other uses on the site, availability of local services, access to and capacity of public transport, urban design context, quality of design and impact on existing and future residents. Saved UDP Policy 33 states that the primary consideration in determining the density and scale of new residential development will be achieving the appropriate urban design which makes efficient use of land and meets the amenity needs of existing and potential residents.

7.1.12 The site lies within an urban location and has a PTAL level of 4. The surrounding area is characterised by terraced houses or apartments blocks of four to five storeys in height. The density of the existing development is 94 units per hectare, which would increase to 97 units per hectare with the addition of the proposed dwelling units. This falls within the recommended London Plan density range for this type of location and no objection is raised by officers to the resultant density level.

(d) Dwelling Mix and Affordable Housing

7.1.13 Policy S2(d) requires the provision of a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures in new residential schemes to meet the needs of different sections of the community. The policy does not prescribe a mix of units; rather it is informed by the priority and strategic housing market needs identified in regular housing assessments undertaken by the Council. The provision also has to have regard to the particular location and nature of the individual development site(s).

7.1.14 In this case the proposed dwelling mix of 1 x 1-bedroom flat, 3 x 2-bedroom flats, 3 x 2-bed cottages, and 5 x 3-bedroom cottages, would provide a predominance of family sized units suited to 3-5 person households, for which there is a continuing demand in the borough.

7.1.15 Officers consider the proposed dwelling mix acceptable and consistent with the objectives of Policy S2 of the Core Strategy and the strategic market housing needs identified in annual housing assessments undertaken by the Council.

7.1.16 Saved Policy 16 of the UDP states that a range of unit sizes of affordable housing should be provided, having regard to local circumstances, site characteristics and the borough’s annual Housing Strategy. Core Strategy Policy S2 seeks affordable housing on all sites over 0.1 of a hectare of capable of providing 10 or more units, and as such affordable housing is required on this application site. The policy requirements are for at least 50% (40% without public subsidy) of units to be affordable with a tenure split of 70% social rented
and 30% intermediate housing tenures.

7.1.17 The application proposes to offer 6 affordable dwellings of affordable rent tenure, with the remaining 6 dwellings scheduled for market sale. The affordable rent units would be based on no higher than 60% of market rents on the 3 bedroom units and 70% of rents on the 1 bedroom unit. Lambeth would receive 100% nomination rights to these units. The Council’s Housing officer welcomes this provision and has raised no objections to the proposal.

7.1.18 In summary, the dwelling mix complies with the wider objectives of policy to create sustainable and mixed communities. The level of affordable housing is considered acceptable and consistent with the development plan policies above given that the proportion of affordable housing currently on offer complies with the planning policy requirement of 50% where public subsidy is available.

7.2 Design
7.2.1 Officers have assessed the proposals in relation to national, strategic and local policy guidance contained within the NPPF, London Plan policies, Saved UDP policies and the Adopted Core Strategy. A high quality of design is an integral requirement for all new build schemes. The policy objectives to achieve this are set out in saved Policies 31, 33, 36 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S9 of the Core Strategy. Saved Policy 47 of the UDP requires developments to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

7.2.2 The current design proposals for each of the 5 infill sites have evolved from pre-application discussions with officers and a continued dialogue following submission of the application. The design proposal for each infill site is assessed in turn having regard to scale, massing, layout, detailed design & materials, impact upon the surrounding townscape and Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area. The principle of demolition of existing building/structures through the conservation area consent procedure is also assessed where applicable.

Site A
7.2.3 This is the site of the existing single storey community hall which it is proposed to demolish and replace with a terrace of four dwelling houses. The existing building is tucked into the south-western corner of the estate and within the conservation area is only visible to the public from a gap between two terraces.

Principle of Demolition (Conservation Area Consent)
7.2.4 The existing Community Hall was constructed in 1913 and has been vacant for more than two years following the discovery of asbestos. The Council’s Conservation Officer considers that it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area by reason of its historic interest (evidential value) and its architectural interest. The NPPF places a strong emphasis on the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of designated heritage assets. Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that “where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse
consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss”.

This guidance requires Local Planning Authorities to take account of a range of factors including:

- Whether the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;
- Whether any viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term that will enable its conservation; and
- Whether the loss is outweighed by the (public) benefit of bringing the site back into use.

7.2.5 The Conservation Area Consent application has been accompanied by a Heritage Statement which includes a heritage assessment of the existing building and supporting evidence to justify its demolition in light of NPPF requirements. The document includes a Condition Survey by the Philip Pank Partnership (Chartered Surveyors), a Type 2 Asbestos Survey by WPS and a site valuation report by Savills which discusses a range of possible uses for the site.

7.2.6 The Condition Survey advises that the existing building has been closed for use due to major concerns in relation to extensive water ingress, questions over the structural integrity of the building, lack of provision for access by disabled persons, outdated internal layout and facilities and principally the extensive presence of asbestos panelling/components which form the structure and fabric of the building. Savills advise that the costs of asbestos safe removal alone has been estimated at £100,000. Basic refurbishment works have been estimated at £370,000 due to the level of intervention required to the existing structure.

7.2.7 In line with NPPF guidance, the supporting information has explored the option of refurbishing the existing building, in this particular case either for re-use as a community centre or for a range of alternative use (nursery, commercial premises or residential). It concludes that the refurbishment of the existing building would neither be a cost effective proposal giving value for money, nor provide residents with a building which would allow the diversity of activities, necessary for it to be a sustainable and viable community centre.

7.2.8 The NPPF also requires the Local Planning Authority to consider the potential benefits that would accrue from bringing the site back into use. The proposal seeks to provide a terrace of four dwellings on the site, which would be secured as affordable housing and would also part subsidise the provision of a purpose built, modern community centre on Site E for use by residents of the Peabody Estate and the adjoining Peabody Hill Estate. Officers consider that this is a key public benefit that provides strong justification for demolition of the existing building and bringing the site back into use. Officers have also considered the current building condition and the likelihood of continued vacancy due to the cited basic refurbishment costs including asbestos removal. In summary, it is officer recommendation that Conservation Area Consent be granted in this instance for the demolition of the vacant community
centre on the basis of the wider public benefit to local residents and the surrounding community. This is considered to comply with the spirit and intentions of the heritage guidance detailed within Paragraphs 126-141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.2.9 Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that “Local Planning Authorities should not permit loss of whole of part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred”. The acceptability of the loss of the existing building is principally based on the public benefit that would result from the delivery of a new purpose built, modern community centre on Site E and the delivery of additional affordable housing on the site of the existing community centre. For this reasons officers consider it reasonable to require that steps are taken to ensure that the new development would proceed after the demolition of the heritage asset has occurred. This could be achieved through a S106 planning obligation requiring that a contract of works for the construction of the new community facility is presented to the Local Planning Authority in advance of the demolition of the existing heritage asset. Affordable housing provision could also be secured through the S106 legal agreement.

Assessment of replacement scheme

7.2.10 The proposed residential block is two storeys and in brick with a slate roof finish which generally accords with the scale, height, character and appearance of the area. The front elevation incorporates a double fronted gable feature and the use of similar spaced front gardens to the adjoining terrace of Cubitt designed cottages. The layout follows the north/south orientation of the existing building with the public footpath to Peabody Hill retained.

7.2.11 The building form is asymmetrical and the fenestration is contemporary in design. A different coloured brick at the base of each house has been introduced to break up earlier officer concerns with large areas of unrelieved brickwork. The asymmetrical roof form is at odds with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, given the unobtrusive location of this site in relation to the wider conservation area it is the Conservation Officer’s opinion that the proposed building cannot be read as part of the larger Estate and as such its presence is unlikely to cause sufficient harm to warrant refusal.

Site B

7.2.12 This is the existing estate office which sits on the north-western side of the estate between a 2-storey terrace of houses and a 4-storey block of flats. It essentially takes the gabled form of the adjoining terrace house but is in plain red brick with sash windows. The Conservation Officer considers it to be austere and lacking in fine detailing. As a bland modern structure it can be considered only to make a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. No objection is raised to the granting of Conservation Area Consent for its demolition.

Assessment of replacement scheme

7.2.13 The proposal is a four storey block of flats in plain brickwork rising to the
parapet of the adjoining block of flats. Further to submission of the planning application the massing of the building has been remodelled on the advice of the Council’s Conservation Officer to help it respond more harmoniously with the adjoining flatted block. A small set back has been introduced on the first and second floor to allow the mouldings on the existing building to return comfortably. A more pronounced setback has been introduced to the top floor. The windows to the front are generally aligned with the adjoining block and have a more symmetrical arrangement. Texture and relief has been added to the ground floor through the introduction of alternating projecting bricks, with a contrasting lighter coloured brick.

7.2.14 Objections have been received from local residents relating to the principle of providing a 4 storey extension to the existing Block D/E/F. It is argued that the extension would ruin the integrity of the blocks and layout of the estate, would fail to be subordinate in height, would fail to provide a setback from the front building line of Block F, would provide unacceptable detailing and fenestration pattern, and would not be of sufficient design quality to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

7.2.15 Although there are currently no extensions to the existing blocks on the estate, being in a conservation area does not rule out the possibility to extend where there is space to do so and it is done sensitively. In response to these objections officers have sought amendments to the design proposal to amend the detailing and fenestration pattern and to increase the setback with Block F.

7.2.16 The bulk, mass and height is now considered to be acceptable and would not overly dominate the adjoining terrace. The use of a recess at first, second and third floor levels is considered a suitable architectural device to provide an acceptable degree of physical detachment from the adjoining block of flats to ensure that the extension presents as a visually subordinate extension that doesn’t seek to complete or detract from the character and fine architectural detailing of the adjoining block. No objection is raised to the proposed material palette or detailing, which is considered to respect and complement the adjoining block.

**Site C**

7.2.17 This is the site of two original cottages that were destroyed by bomb damage during WWII. The Conservation Officer has advised that the gap site has limited historical significance given the history but not enough to warrant retention as a gap site.

7.2.18 The proposal seeks the replacement of the two lost cottages, one which mirrors the pair of cottages (Nos. 63 & 64) at the far end of the terrace. These existing cottages were designed by W.E. Wallis and built in 1907-08. The cottages would be of yellow stock bricks at ground floor and roughcast rendering at first floor level. The roofs would be of slate with chimney stacks and pots provided to mirror the properties at the far end of the terrace. Each home would have a small front garden enclosed with a picket fence and pivet hedging.

7.2.19 In conservation terms the principle of a scholarly reproduction of the original
houses can be justified as it would reinstate the original architect’s design intention and restore the terrace to its original appearance. The proposed plan form, and in particular the rear returns, have been reduced in scale on the advice of the Conservation Officer in order to retain the sold-void rhythm of adjoining properties. No objection is raised to the proposal for Site C in design and heritage terms.

**Site D**

7.2.20 Site D is located on an existing hard-surfaced roadway adjoining the eastern boundary of the site. There are no existing buildings on this site, with the exception of a small garage proposed for demolition for which no objection is raised.

7.2.21 The proposal seeks the construction of a pair of semi-detached 2-storey cottages (1 x 3-bed and 1 x 2-bed). The principle elevation would sit in the same frontage as the adjoining row of Art and Crafts cottages. It would be of a similar bulk and mass but would be detached from the end of terrace property, turning the corner and facing onto the railway embankment. Brick has been chosen as the principle finishing material to tie in with the base of the adjoining Cubitt designed cottages.

7.2.22 The principle of a building here is acceptable as is the bulk and massing. The architectural aesthetic is contemporary but not considered to be jarring. As such no objection is raised by officers in design and heritage terms.

**Site E**

7.2.23 Site E is a vacant plot in the south-eastern corner of the Estate currently used as a roadway for vehicular traffic and pedestrians. Vehicular access is only from the northern point of the road due to changes in land level. The site occupies a prominent position within the estate as it terminates at the end of the principle east-west axial route through the site between Nos. 64 and 164.

7.2.24 The proposal seeks the construction of a single storey replacement community centre. Although a single storey building, it would have the scale of the surrounding 2-storey domestic buildings. The proposed building would be integrated into the existing slope, and the pathway to Knights Hill maintained as this is a public right of way.

7.2.25 The building would be contemporary in appearance, whilst utilising a palette of materials (brick, roof slates) found elsewhere in the estate. It is proposed that security shutters would be concealed within the ceiling soffit over the front entrance to minimise their visual appearance. All other blinds and security shutters would be located on the inside of the windows of the building. This approach to the siting of security shutters has been developed in consultation with the Council’s Conservation and Designing out Crime Officers.

7.2.26 The Council’s Conservation Officer raises no objection to the proposal and does not consider that it would unduly impact on the local context, the street pattern or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

**Design Conclusions**

7.2.27 A high quality of design is an integral requirement for all development. Much of
the success of the scheme will rely heavily on the quality of materials and detailing which can be controlled by condition. Overall, it is considered that the development presents an acceptable quality of design, that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with the relevant design and heritage related policies of the Development Plan; those being London Plan policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.8; Saved UDP policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 and Core Strategy policy S9.

Archaeological Issues

7.2.28 The application site is not located within an archaeological priority area, and doesn’t have any archaeological designation. Notwithstanding, the applicant has submitted an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment by Pre-Construct Archaeology dated May 2012. This study concludes that there is a low potential for prehistoric, Roman Saxon and medieval remains, and a low to moderate potential for post-medieval remains.

7.2.29 English Heritage (Archaeology) has been consulted, has reviewed the submitted archaeological report and raised no objections. Officers accept the advice of English Heritage. In this regard the development need not fail against London Plan Policy 7.8 and Core Strategy Policy S9.

7.3 Amenity

7.3.1 Saved Policies 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy require all development to be of a high design quality that makes efficient use of land and meets the amenity needs of future residents. The Council’s Adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ expands on these policies and advises on requirements such as minimum room sizes and space standards, external amenity space requirements, daylight/sunlight requirements, privacy, spacing between buildings in relation to outlook, sense of enclosure and lifetimes homes standards.

7.3.2 Under Saved Policies 7, 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy, development should not unacceptably harm residential amenity. The policies seek to ensure that due consideration is given to protecting neighbouring residents in terms of visual intrusion, overbearing impact, loss of natural light, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance during the assessment of a development proposal.

Standard of Proposed Accommodation

7.3.3 The quality of accommodation of the residential units proposed has been assessed having regard to the size of individual rooms, the floor-to-ceiling height and the overall size of each dwelling. The requirement for each unit to have storage space and sufficient circulation space and layout to allow unimpeded access between habitable rooms has also been taken into account.

7.3.4 Against these prescribed standards, the overall floor area of each dwelling within the scheme, including the dwellinghouses and flats exceeds the minimum overall unit size requirements. The dwellings would also meet or exceed the individual minimum room sizes prescribed by the SPD in all cases.
The layout of each dwelling would provide appropriately apportioned living space with adequate light, circulation and storage space. In addition each of the units would achieve a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m.

7.3.5 The internal floorspace of each dwelling would also meet the standards contained in the draft London Housing Design Guide (2010), which exceed the Council’s SPD floorspace standards. This is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LHDG requirement</th>
<th>Proposed floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1bed 2person</td>
<td>50m²</td>
<td>68m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bed 4person (Flat)</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>73m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bed 4person Cottage</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>74m² &amp; 83m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3bed 5person (Cottages)</td>
<td>86m²</td>
<td>99m² &amp; 110m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Design standards apply to housing schemes, which require funding from the London Homes and Communities Agency.

Amenity Space

7.3.6 Guidance on the appropriate level of amenity space and play space in relation to new residential development is contained within Policy S2(h) of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 33 and 50 of the UDP and the Council’s SPD on standards for housing development and conversions.

7.3.7 For new houses the minimum requirement is 30sqm. For new flatted developments, shared amenity space of at least 50sqm is required plus a further 10sqm per flat provided either as a balcony/terrace/private garden or consolidated within the shared amenity space.

7.3.8 The 8 proposed dwellinghouses (Sites A, C and D) would all be provided with the requisite 30m² of private amenity space, and would be compliant with the SPD in this regard. The 4 flats in Site B would fail to provide the 50m² of communal amenity space required by the SPD. The 1-bed ground floor unit (Flat B1) would have a generous private amenity space of 59m². The upper floor flats would each have a 7.3m² private balcony.

7.3.9 This shortfall is considered acceptable in the context of the constrained nature of this infill site and the proximity of a community garden space between Blocks GHJ and KLM to the east of Site B. This community garden space, comprising of a pedestrianised area and a succession of different spaces using natural elements such as poles, mounds and boulders, was recently constructed as part of the scheme of estate wide environmental improvements granted planning approval in 2009. This community garden space is to be used by all residents of the Peabody Estate, and can therefore be considered as amenity space provision (including Children’s Play Space). It is also noted that the proposed flats in Site B would be in close proximity to Knight’s Hill Wood to the South and Brockwell Park to the west.

7.3.10 A financial contribution of £17,207 towards improvements to Parks and Open space provision would be required in accordance with Policy S10 (Planning Obligations) of the Core Strategy and the Lambeth Section 106 Planning
Obligations SPD.

**Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Accessible Housing & Community Centre**

7.3.11 Core Strategy Policy S2(d) and the Council’s SPD on standards for housing development and house conversions provide guidance on Lifetime Homes and wheelchair accessible housing. There is a requirement that all new housing is built to Lifetime Homes Standards. In addition, within a development, 10% of all new homes should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

7.3.12 The proposed development is designed so that all the proposed dwellings would achieve Lifetime Homes Standards. This will ensure that the homes are flexible and able to meet the future needs of the residents. A condition of consent is recommended to secure compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards.

7.3.13 One wheelchair unit would be provided at ground floor level in the block of flats (Site B). This would be a 62m² 1-bed unit with a generous sized private garden to the rear. A condition is recommended to secure this provision.

7.3.14 The proposed community centre would be fully wheelchair accessible.

**Sunlight, Daylight and Overshadowing**

7.3.15 Saved Policies 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy require new development to provide a high quality living environment for future residents in terms of daylight and sunlight levels. These policies also require that new buildings should be of a scale and design that protects residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties by not adversely affecting existing daylight and sunlight levels.

7.3.16 A daylight and sunlight assessment, undertaken by consultants Brooke Vincent + Partners (BVP) has been submitted with the application to provide an overview of potential lighting levels to be received within each dwelling. The report also contains a detailed assessment of the potential effect of the development on natural light received at neighbouring properties. Overshadowing implications of the development have also been assessed. The report is based on the British Research Establishment (BRE) publication “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, a guide to good practice”.

7.3.17 The study, which included survey-based modelling and technical assessment of the site, analysed the potential impact of the development on daylight levels to a number of residential properties adjoining each of the 5 infill sites. Sunlight assessments were also taken on neighbouring properties with windows which have a view of the proposed development and face with 90° of south i.e. south of the east-west axis. Finally, an overshadowing assessment of neighbouring gardens to each of the infill sites was carried out.

7.3.18 The study found that daylight to habitable rooms serving neighbouring buildings would satisfy BRE recommendations in all locations, except for the ground floor windows to the rear of No 51 (adjoining Site C). The study found that vertical sky component (VSC) would be reduced below the recommended
threshold level of 0.8 times the existing VSC value for three ground floor windows, serving a living room (Window 1) and kitchen (Windows 2 and 3). A further analysis of these rooms was carried out to estimate the size of the living space and to review daylight distribution (which indicates daylight penetration into the room). This showed daylight distribution to the living room to be 0.9 of the current value, which is BRE compliant and indicates that there would be no adverse effect.

7.3.1 In order to address the shortfall to the adjoining kitchen windows 2 and 3, the applicant has reduced the overall width of the proposed rear extension from 4.0m to 2.9m, thereby increasing the separation distance to the adjoining windows in No. 51 by 1.1m. The increased separation distance is now in keeping with the existing layout pattern and separation distance found within this terrace of properties (Nos. 51-64). In this regard the amended proposal is considered to address the earlier cited daylight concerns to windows 1 and 2. No objections are raised by officers with regards to daylighting to adjoining residential properties.

7.3.20 The study found that sunlight availability to neighbouring buildings would remain very similar to existing in almost every location and would satisfy BRE criteria in all but two locations. In these locations the loss is very small and is only relevant to winter sunlight.

7.3.21 The affected windows would be ground floor windows at Nos. 38 and 47, which adjoin Site C. At No. 38 the winter sunlight level received would reduce from 4% to 2% and at No. 47 from 3% to 2%. However consideration should be given to the fact that each property currently receives very little winter sunlight and this would continue with the development of Site C. It is also noted that the proposed buildings on Site C are replacements for previous bomb damaged buildings, and that the resultant relationship with adjoining properties would be similar to that which exists with terraced properties elsewhere in the estate. In light of these considerations, officers conclude that the proposed developments are acceptable in terms of sunlight impact to neighbouring properties.

7.3.22 The overshadowing study concludes that the overshadowing created by many of the proposed buildings, at various times of the day, coincides with existing overshadowing from buildings or fencing. Taken overall, proposed conditions would be little different from that existing on 21 March and thereby satisfy BRE requirements.

7.3.23 The results of the BRE tests for internal daylight and sunlight show that all rooms within the development would enjoy levels of daylight and sunlight that is in compliance with those recommended by the BRE guidelines. The overshadowing study also shows that each amenity space should be able to receive good levels of sunlight.

7.3.24 Officers have reviewed the report and are satisfied that there would be no material adverse impacts resulting from the proposal on the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties in terms of sunlight and daylight. Internal natural light levels within the development would also meet the BRE standards.
whilst the external amenity spaces would not be overshadowed. In these respects, the proposal complies with relevant planning policies.

Privacy for existing and future residents

7.3.25 The proposed buildings have been designed to ensure that there would be no direct overlooking into windows within the development that would compromise the amenity of future residents. Where there is potential for overlooking between dwellings, it occurs at oblique angles. There would be some overlooking from the 3 upper floor balconies to the ground level private garden serving the 1-bedroom unit within the flat block at Site B; this form of mutual overlooking is to be expected within flat blocks. It is noted that the gardens, terrace and balconies to the eastern boundary would be semi-private areas as they would be overlooked by passing commuters trains on the adjacent railway line.

7.3.26 The potential for overlooking of neighbouring residential properties within the estate is now assessed for each of the development sites in turn:

Site A:
The proposed terrace of houses would have two double bedrooms with windows facing eastwards toward the rear garden of No.116 and beyond. It is considered that the privacy of existing residents would not be compromised as similar relationships between bedroom windows and rear gardens is a common feature of the back-to-back terraced arrangement found elsewhere in the estate. This level of overlooking occurs in many residential development located within urban settings.

It is also noted that there is a south facing ground floor window in the flank elevation of No. 115, which appears to serve a non-habitable utility room. The proposed dwelling closest to No. 115 would have a window serving a first floor level bedroom, which would be sited directly over the utility room. Officers consider this relationship to be acceptable and an obscure glazed solution is not required in this instance.

Site B:
The proposed flat block would have upper floor balconies on the south-west elevation, which may give rise to unacceptable overlooking to No. 99. Officers consider that this could be satisfactorily mitigated through the imposition of a condition requiring the installation of obscure glazed privacy screens to this elevation. The balconies would retain an open westerly aspect thereby not compromising their amenity value to an unacceptable degree.

Site C:
The proposed dwellings would replicate the existing layout and window arrangements found elsewhere in the adjoining terrace. In this regard it is not considered to raise any overlooking issues over and above those found elsewhere in the estate.

Site D:
The proposal would introduce a pair of semi-detached houses to the eastern end of an existing terrace of cottages. These new dwellings would have
bedroom windows facing into the rear gardens and habitable rooms of cottages directly to the south-west (Nos. 61-64). The resultant separation distances between habitable rooms (approximately 14.0m) would be broadly similar to those currently found elsewhere in the Estate, and in this regard no objection is raised. This level of overlooking occurs in many residential development located within urban settings and is not considered sufficient grounds to warrant refusal of planning permission.

Site E:
No overlooking or loss of privacy issues are raised.

Sense of enclosure for existing residents

7.3.27 The design, siting and massing of the proposed infill buildings have been carefully considered to take account of existing building lines, spatial relationships and separation distances within the estate. It is considered that the proposed infill developments would not appear overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties.

Noise and disturbance to existing and future residents

7.3.28 In assessing development proposals, local planning authorities must ensure that development does not cause an unacceptable degree of disturbance to existing residents. They should also bear in mind that a subsequent intensification or change of use may result in greater intrusion and they may wish to consider the use of appropriate conditions. Development proposals should also be assessed to ensure that they provide a suitable residential environment for future occupiers.

Noise environment for future residents

7.3.29 The principle of redevelopment of Sites A, B, C and D for residential purposes is considered acceptable. Noise and disturbance generated from future residents would be compatible with the residential and urban nature of the surrounding area and as such would not unduly harm the living conditions of existing residents.

7.3.30 There is however, potential for residents of the proposed development within Sites A, C and D to be subject to noise and disturbance associated with the location of the site in proximity to the railway line to the east and west. The applicant commissioned an environmental noise assessment survey carried out by Max Fordham LLP to measure prevailing background noise and vibration levels and assess whether these infill sites are suited for residential development.

7.3.31 The report concludes that the noise environment for the Peabody Estate is relatively benign although the facades overlooking the railways lying to the east and west sides, experience relatively high short term noise levels when trains pass by. The report suggests a variety of mitigation measures including the treatment of glazed and non-glazed elements of the development to ensure good internal noise levels. A condition to secure compliance with all recommendations of the report would limit internal noise levels into living rooms and bedrooms associated with environmental noise impact from the railway lines.
In summary, the standard of the proposed residential accommodation and the living environment within the scheme is considered acceptable and meets the objectives of the relevant policies of the development plan as well as the Council’s housing standards as set out in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ (2008). The proposal is also of a design and scale, which would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents and is compliant with the relevant policies of the development plan.

The proposed community centre would be located to the south-east corner of the estate, adjoining residential properties at Nos. 64 and 146. It would house a range of flexible meeting spaces as detailed earlier in this report. The proposed 261m$^2$ building would be a replacement facility for an existing vacant community centre on the estate. Given the existing precedent for such facilities within the estate, officers consider that the principle of such a use would conform with the adjoining residential properties.

The application documentation advises that the Community Centre would operate from 09:00–21:00, seven days a week. These hours are considered to be acceptable and would balance the requirements of the operators of the facility with the amenity concerns of local residents. Planning conditions are recommended to restrict the hours of operation and to ensure that no amplified sound or music can be heard at the nearest noise sensitive property. In addition, a Community Use Management Plan could be sought to provide further clarification regarding the type of proposed uses of the facility. Officers consider that these suggested conditions would provide adequate safeguard to minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents to an acceptable level.

In summary, the standard of the proposed residential accommodation and the living environment within the scheme is considered acceptable and meets the objectives of the relevant policies of the development plan as well as the Council’s housing standards as set out in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ (2008). The proposal is also of a design and scale, which would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents and is compliant with the relevant policies of the development plan.

### Traffic and Parking

Saved Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy are relevant with respect to transport and highway matters. These policies seek to ensure that proposals for development have a limited impact on the performance and safety of the highway network and that sufficient and appropriate car parking and cycle storage is provided whilst meeting objectives to encourage sustainable transport and to reduce reliance on the private car.

The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 4, which is considered ‘Good’. This means that residents of the estate need not be as car
reliant as they would be in areas of the borough less well served by public transport. Saved Policy 14(g) of the UDP encourages reduced car parking provision in areas of good, very good or excellent public transport accessibility.

7.4.3 The current parking arrangements on the Peabody Estate were approved as part of the package of estate wide environmental improvements granted on 12/11/2009 (See paragraph 3.1). This included a revision of the parking layout to provide a total of 183 car parking bays within the estate for the 312 homes. This was inclusive of the provision of 21 blue badge holder parking bays.

Trip Generation

7.4.4 Transport Planning officers have reviewed the submitted details and have concluded that the proposed 12 additional dwellings and community centre are unlikely to generate a significant number of trips and would not result in an unacceptable impact on the highway network. It is recommended that the applicant be required to provide Travel Packs to all new households to encourage a modal shift away from car based journeys to more sustainable modes of transport. This could be secured through the S106 legal agreement.

Parking Provision

7.4.5 With respect to the additional dwellings, the Transport Planning officer has advised that potential demand for parking spaces generated by the new residential units could be accommodated within the existing estate.

7.4.6 The supporting information indicates that the proposed community centre would be primarily used by residents within the Peabody Estate along with residents of the adjoining Peabody Hill Estate. It is envisaged that this would reduce reliance on car journeys. Cycle parking provision is also provided to encourage the take up of more sustainable modes of transport. It is also noted that the proposed community centre would be a replacement for the floorspace to be lost following demolition of the existing community hall and estate office, rather than the introduction of additional community floorspace. Whilst these buildings are currently vacant, it must be taken into account that these buildings could be refurbished and brought back into use without requiring planning approval.

7.4.7 The application submission advises that there may be usage by third parties to cross-subsidise the provision of the community centre. However, the meeting rooms available are limited in size and the supporting information indicates that the primary usage of the facility will be by local residents. When this is considered in tandem with the site’s PTAL rating of 4, there is no objection raised on parking grounds to the community centre.

7.4.8 The proposal is considered to comply with a key objective of National, Regional and Local policy to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys.

Accessibility

7.4.9 The submitted information indicates that the estate has provision for 21 blue badge holders. 16 residents are blue badge holders and have been allocated spaces on the estate. A further 5 spaces remain free, 2 of which are adjacent
to site B. The proposed development includes the provision of a ground floor wheelchair accessible unit to Site B. Officers consider it appropriate that a dedicated disabled parking bay is provided adjoining Site B for ease of access for future occupiers of this unit. This could be secured through a planning condition.

**Cycle Parking Provision**

7.4.10 Cycle parking enclosures would be provided in the rear garden areas of each of the four residential development sites. All dwelling houses would be provided with 2 cycle parking spaces and the 4 flats at Site B would have 7 cycle parking spaces in a purpose built enclosure. The community centre would have cycle parking provided at two locations, with 6 spaces provided in front of the principle entrance and a further 4 spaces located within the gated amenity space.

7.4.11 This level of provision is considered sufficient and consistent with the minimum standards set out in Transport for London (TFL’s) cycle parking guidelines. Further details of this aspect of the development, including details of the storage enclosures and manufacturer’s specification of the stands are reserved by condition.

**Transport conclusion**

7.4.12 Officers are satisfied that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the development would not have an adverse impact on the safe operation of the highway or the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The proposal therefore complies with the objectives of Saved Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy.

7.5 **Sustainability and Renewable Technologies**

7.5.1 Policy S7(a) of the Core Strategy requires all major developments to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in line with London Plan targets. The London Plan Policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) sets a target of at least 25% reduction in carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions during the period 2010-2013 for both residential and non-residential buildings.

7.5.2 There is also a presumption that all major development will seek to reduce CO2 emissions by at least 20% through the use of on-site renewable energy generation, where it is technically and financially feasible to do so (London Plan Policy 5.7 – Renewable Energy). An application for a major development is required to demonstrate, through a detailed energy assessment, how these targets are to be met within the framework of the Mayor’s energy hierarchy (Be Lean, Be Clean and Be Green).

7.5.3 The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement drafted by Max Fordham LLP, which outlines the measures that will be employed in the construction of the development in order to minimise its lifetime energy consumption and associated production of carbon dioxide. The application proposes to install a Solar Photovoltaic (PV) array on the roofs of a number of the proposed buildings to generate renewable electricity. In addition it is proposed to install high efficiency condensing gas boilers as the heating source for each dwelling
The applicant’s energy consultants have explored a range of available on-site renewable technology options, which could be employed to achieve the requisite energy savings for the size, scale and type of development proposed. The assessment included the following technologies: solar thermal hot water; solar photovoltaic electricity; combined heat and power (CHP) including Biomass CHP; biomass boilers; wind turbines and ground and air source heat pumps.

The technical and site assessment discounted several technologies on viability and suitability grounds including the land required for installation of ground or air source heat pump system; insufficient seasonal heat demand for a CHP system; the lack of demand and absence of a centralised hot water distribution system for solar thermal hot water; the lack of local sources for fuel supply and on-site storage space for a biomass plant and; inadequate wind speed and noise and appearance associated with the installation of wind turbines. The consultants recommend that the solar PV system is the most technically feasible low or zero carbon technology to use on the site.

Each dwelling would be fitted with a rooftop PV array of approximately 13m². This would be a combination of panels integrated into the roofslope to Sites A and D, an integrated ‘tile’ solution to Site C and the installation of an angled array to the flat roof of Site B (to be obscured behind the parapet wall). The community centre would have 41m² of integrated PV panels within the roofslope.

The proposed energy strategy comprising a combination of passive and active energy efficiency measures and the installation of the PV array, has been estimated to achieve an overall 30.6% annual carbon dioxide emissions reduction for the residential element and 27.5% annual carbon dioxide emissions reduction for the community centre element. The majority of the savings is attributable to the solar PV alone. The energy strategy therefore exceeds both the target of at least 20% of carbon emission reduction through the use of on-site renewable energy generation required under London Plan Policy 5.7 (Renewable Energy) and the target of at least 25% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions overall required under London Plan Policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions).

In the event of approval it is recommended to require the applicant to submit for approval details of the size and number of the proposed solar PV array including elevational and sectional drawings and, manufacturer’s specifications demonstrating compliance with the details contained in the Energy Statement. This would allow the Local Planning Authority to address any potential design or amenity issues arising from the implementation of this technology.

Saved Policy 35 of the UDP states that all development proposals should show how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles. The Council’s SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction states that all
residential developments should achieve a minimum 3 star rating for the Code for Sustainable Homes, albeit that the Council aspires to 4 stars or more in the majority of developments. The Code for Sustainable Homes is an environmental assessment method for rating and certifying the performance of new homes. It is a national standard which seeks to encourage continuous improvement in sustainable home construction.

7.5.10 A Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment has been carried out as part of the Sustainability and Energy Statement by Max Fordham LLP submitted with the application. The pre-assessment is an evaluation of the potential rating that could be achieved under a formal Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment. To obtain Code Level 4 certification, stringent energy and water standards apply. Once these minimum mandatory standards have been met, the additional credits required to reach the 68% score pass for Level 4 can be gained in categories of choice.

7.5.11 The pre-assessment indicates that a score of 69.05 points can be achieved for the proposed dwellings, thereby meeting Code Level 4. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition is attached stating that no dwelling shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that Code Level 4 has been achieved.

7.5.12 A initial sustainability assessment for the proposed Community Centre has been carried out using the BREEAM New Construction 2011 assessment. This initial pre-assessment achieves a score of 59.49%, which equates to a Very Good rating as required by the Council. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition is attached requiring a final assessment upon practical completion of the community centre (Post Construction Review) to confirm that the building achieves a Very Good rating.

7.6 Refuse and Recycling Considerations

7.6.1 Policy S8 of the Core Strategy places a requirement on developments to contribute to the sustainable management of waste. Specific guidance is set out within the Council’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ guidance (2006). In addition, Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy (January 2011) seek to ensure that proposals for waste collection and servicing strategies have a minimal impact on the performance and safety of the highway network.

7.6.2 The following provision is proposed:

Site A: Purpose built enclosures within the front garden containing 1 no. 140 litre wheelie bin. This is not considered to provide sufficient capacity for a 4-bedroom dwelling house. Further details to ensure compliance with the Council’s adopted standards could be secured by condition to ensure that sufficient refuse and recycling storage provision is provided.

Site B: A purpose built enclosure with the rear garden area, adjoining an existing refuse storage facility for the blocks of flats. Further clarification is required regarding the level of storage capacity to be provided. Access
arrangements are considered acceptable.

Site C: Purpose built enclosures within the front garden containing 1 no. 140 litre wheelie bin. This is not considered to provide sufficient capacity for the dwelling houses.

Site D: Purpose built enclosures within the front garden containing 1 no. 140 litre wheelie bin. This is not considered to provide sufficient capacity for the dwelling houses.

Site E: Purpose built enclosure within the proposed outdoor space, with access provided from the retained pathway. Further clarification is required regarding the level of storage capacity to be provided. The applicant has advised that bins would be brought from the storage area to the street frontage on collection day(s) by the Estate’s caretaker. Further details could be secured through a waste management plan.

7.6.3 The provision for refuse and recycling does not comply with the Council’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ guidance (2006) and with the objectives of Saved Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policies S4 and S8 of the Core Strategy. Notwithstanding, officers consider that the proposed siting and access arrangements for the waste storage is acceptable. Further details are required to confirm that the Council’s minimum storage requirement would be met, which could be secured by planning condition.

7.7 Designing out Crime

7.7.1 Saved Policy 32 of the UDP requires that development should enhance community safety. Development will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder. This requirement is contained within Section 17 of The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which imposes an obligation on the Local Planning Authority to consider crime and disorder reduction in the assessment of planning applications. Policy S9(f) of the Core Strategy requires the Council to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and its liveability by creating safe and secure environments that reduce the opportunities for crime, the fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, having regard to Secured by Design standards.

7.7.2 The Council’s Designing Out Crime Officer was consulted during the consideration of the proposal. Whilst concerned over potential crime opportunities consequent upon the detailed layout of the development, the officer has confirmed that a requirement for all of the proposed residential units and the community centre to comply with ‘Secure by Design’ would be capable of addressing these issues. It has also been recommended that further details of external communal lighting and public realm lighting should be secured to ensure adherence with SBD requirements. Conditions to this effect are recommended.

7.8 S106 Obligations & Mayoral CIL

7.8.1 Policy S10 of the Core Strategy aims to secure planning obligations which will
be sought to mitigate the direct impact of the development within the locality. The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document for S106 Planning Obligations was used to facilitate the calculation of contributions for this application.

7.8.2 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 explicitly set out that planning permissions should only be granted subject to completion of a planning obligation where the obligation meets all of the following tests. A planning obligation should be (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

7.8.3 The development would deliver the following s.106 obligations:

- Education contribution of £38,251
- Parks and Open Spaces contribution of £19,256
- Local labour in construction contribution of £5,397
- Local labour in construction commitments: Promotion of opportunities for local residents to be secured through a Training and Employment Skills Plan.
- Public Realm revenue contribution of £1,926
- S106 monitoring fee of £3,242
- Secure 6 residential units as affordable rent tenure with Lambeth to receive 100% nomination rights to the 6 affordable housing units.
- Safeguard to require that contract for works for new Community Hall is provided in advance of demolition of current vacant community hall on Site A.
- Provision of travel packs for new residential units.

7.8.4 The total financial contribution for the proposed scheme would be £68,072

7.8.5 It is advised that the scheme may also be liable to a Mayoral CIL payment towards Crossrail implementation. The final amount will need to be discussed with the Council's CIL team due to the possibility of charitable exemption for some of the development. This contribution does form part of the Lambeth development plan policy obligations and, is to be secured and monitored by the Council on behalf of the Mayor.

7.8.6 In summary, it is considered that the above provisions, once secured under s106 agreement of the 1990 Act, would appropriately mitigate against any potentially harmful impacts of the development upon local infrastructure, in accordance with Policies 9, 14, and 16 of the UDP, Policies S4 and S10 of the Core Strategy and with the Council’s associated SPD on S106 obligations.

7.9 Trees, Landscaping & Ecology/Biodiversity

7.9.1 All the trees on site are protected by virtue of the site’s designation as a Conservation Area. Saved Policy 39(d) of the UDP states that “trees of high amenity value will be protected, including during construction, through the use of planning conditions and Tree Preservation Orders”.
7.9.2 The proposal seeks permission for the removal of a number of trees that have been identified in the submitted Arboricultural report dated May 2012. Appendix 2 of the report includes a tree survey schedule detailing the trees that have been identified for removal in order to facilitate construction, whilst Appendix 1 contains tree constraints plans. The survey indicates that the tree species on the site include birch, sycamore, ash and pedunculate oak. A total of forty four individual and groups of trees were surveyed across the five infill sites and included in the tree survey schedule.

7.9.3 The finding and recommendations of the report are as follows:

Site A: Three lime pollards are situated north of the existing community centre, and would need to be removed during the proposed development. In addition, an early mature sycamore tree would require removal to facilitate construction. A total of four trees would therefore require removal.

Site B: Two silver birch street trees are located outside the existing estate office. The proposed development would encroach upon the roof protection areas of both of these trees and would occur within their canopy spreads. Both trees would therefore require removal.

Site C: This infill site contains several unmanaged shrubs and small trees including apple and Leyland cypress. A mature silver birch is also located at the eastern end of the garden. The proposed development would require removal of all existing plants and shrubs from within the garden area.

Site D/E: The majority of the trees located at these two adjoining sites are situated on an adjacent railway embankment. Species on the embankment include English oak, sycamore, ash and hawthorn. The proposed construction at these sites would not require removal of any trees, although crown reductions would be required to avoid conflict with the proposed houses at Site D.

7.9.4 The report has been reviewed by the Council’s Arboricultural officer, who has advised that no trees of outstanding merit would be lost as part of the proposal. Most of the tree would have limited visual amenity value due to their positioning within the infill sites rather than prominent positions in the public realm. It is only trees T21 & T22 (Silver Birch) to the front of Site B that are prominent within the public realm. The Arboricultural officer suggests that as these trees are not compatible with the re-development of the site, they are replaced as part of the landscape scheme submission. Measures to protect the retained tree are to be undertaken in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan, contained in the submitted Arboricultural report. A condition to secure compliance is attached.

Landscaping

7.9.5 Saved Policy 39 of the UDP states that development should include landscape design that enhances the area. Details of the proposed landscaping treatment have been provided within the submitted Design and Access statement and the accompanying application drawings. The intention is to provide a
comprehensive proposal for landscaping for each of the infill sites.

7.9.6 The Council’s Arboricultural Officer has raised no objection to the indicative layout but has requested that further details of a final scheme of soft and hard landscaping as well as a planting schedule of replacement tree planting be reserved by condition in the event of a planning approval.

7.9.7 In light of these comments, it is officer consideration that an acceptable landscaping strategy and management plan could be secured in the event of planning approval that would comply with the intentions of Saved Policy 39 of the UDP.

Ecological/Biodiversity issues

7.9.8 Policy 5.3 of the London Plan seeks to protect and promote biodiversity and nature conservation. New developments are required to provide opportunity to incorporate features for wildlife and local biodiversity. Policy S5 of the Core Strategy seeks to improve the quality of, and access to, existing open space within the borough, including the range of facilities available and its biodiversity and nature conservation value and heritage value.

7.9.9 The application site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designation. However, the site is immediately adjacent to and surrounded by an existing Borough Grade Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), SINC 11 ‘Peabody Hill’. This SINC includes extensive operational railway land as well as a mixture of deciduous woodland and open grassland known as ‘Peabody Hill’.

7.9.10 The applicant has submitted an Ecology Report by The Ecology Consultancy dated 11th June 2012. The following are the key findings of this desk and field based ecological assessment of the site:

- Several buildings and trees on the estate exhibited potential to support roosting, foraging and commuting bats;
- The buildings, trees, shrubbery and scrub on the estate exhibit high potential to support breeding bird species;
- The surveyed area exhibit low potential to support widespread reptile and amphibian species;
- Japanese knotweed was observed on Site A during the field based assessment. Under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, it is an offence to plant or otherwise cause this species to grow in the wild. Appropriate site management and a control programme will be necessary to preclude the possibility of Japanese knotweed being disturbed and spread during the course of works.

The report concludes that a further protected species survey and appropriate mitigation measures should be secured by planning condition should planning approval be granted.

7.9.11 The Ecology report has been reviewed by the Council’s adviser on ecological matters. The officer notes and supports the findings and recommendations of the submitted Ecology report. The officer considers the proposal to be an
appropriate and sustainable use of the present site, and no objection is raised on biodiversity/ecological grounds. This is subject to the applicant being required by condition of any consent to submit for further consideration the following details:

(i) a further field assessment of the application site (Sites A, B, C, D and E) immediately prior to demolition or clearance works to ensure no features have been occupied by protected species or habitats in the intervening period between the original ecological survey, planning application and eventual site clearance;

(ii) a condition restricting works to demolish buildings, carry out earthworks and clear vegetation to outside the bird breeding season (March to July inclusive). If any works are necessary in the bird breeding season, the works shall only occur under the supervision of a suitability qualified ecologist;

(iii) details of appropriate mitigation measures relating to the impact of proposed works to Sites A and E on the adjoining Peabody Hill SINC;

(iv) details of removal of Japanese knotweed from Site A; and

(v) a scheme of soft landscaping for the application site, including selection of species, planting plans and programmes and schedules for management and maintenance of landscaped features, whether formal or natural.

7.9.12 The London Wildlife Trust has advised that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the integrity of the adjacent Peabody Hill woodland subject to the range of mitigation measures detailed in the Ecology Report and requested by the Council’s Ecological adviser.

7.10 Other Matters

Flood Risk

7.10.1 Policy S6 of the Core Strategy advises that the Council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency in order to manage and mitigate flood risk. National Planning Guidance requires that Local Planning Authorities consult the Environment Agency for any development on land exceeding 1 hectare in size in order to establish the risk of flood potentially arising from the development. In acknowledgement of this requirement the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment with states that the site falls within flood zone 1 (Areas with little or no potential risk of flooding which are already developed).

7.10.2 The site lies within an area that is deemed by the Environment Agency as having a low environmental risk from flooding. It follows that the site and development does not pose an unacceptable risk in terms of flooding. The site is suitable for the proposed end use, provided that there is adequate surface water drainage that will not increase the flood risk on site and the surrounding area.

7.10.3 Policy 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) of the London Plan states that development should utilise sustainable urban design drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons not to do so. In this case surface water will drain to the
public sewers and sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) will be used to accommodate excess water from the site. Details of SUDS measures are provided in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment which can be secured through a planning condition.

7.10.4 Thames Water has been consulted and has advised that no objection is raised with regards to the impact of the proposed development upon either the sewerage infrastructure or the water infrastructure. An informative is recommended to remind the applicant of their responsibility to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer; the need to ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on-site or off-site storage in accordance with the London Plan drainage hierarchy and; water pressure requirements.

Infrastructure and Utilities

7.10.5 Policy 5.14 (Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure) of The London Plan requires that infrastructure of adequate capacity (particularly water supply and sewerage) should be available in time to serve new development (following consultation with the utility companies). It is important that development does not proceed ahead of the ability of sewerage facilities and receiving sewerage treatment works to be able to deal with increased flows.

7.10.6 Thames Water has been consulted and has not raised any objection to the proposal.

Asbestos Removal

7.10.7 The application submission includes a Type II Asbestos Survey, which advises of the presence of asbestos within the vacant community hall. The removal and safe disposal of asbestos is controlled by the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012. Policy 5.21 of the London Plan requires that appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that development on previously contaminated land does not activate or spread contamination.

7.10.8 Officers consider it appropriate to require the submission of further details of the mitigation measures to control the release of asbestos fibres in the event that conservation area consent is granted for the demolition of the community hall. These details would need to be agreed in writing by the Council’s Environmental Health team in advance of demolition works commencing.

8.0 Conclusions

8.1 In conclusion, the proposal is acceptable in land use terms as it has been satisfactorily demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority that the development would optimise the redevelopment potential of the site by providing new housing and an enhanced and fit for purpose community facility within an area of good public transport accessibility.

8.2 The proposal is acceptable on all other material planning consideration as it would be of an appropriate design that would preserve identified heritage assets and their setting; it would provide an acceptable living environment for future occupiers; it would not prejudice the amenity of the occupiers of
neighbouring residential properties; it would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety and; it would not unacceptably impact upon local infrastructure.

8.3 Furthermore, provisions are to be secured under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure the delivery of employment and training opportunities for local residents and, to mitigate the impact of the development on the local environment.

8.4 It is therefore considered that the development is compliant with the relevant policies of the development plan and, there are no other material planning considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should nevertheless be refused.

9.0 Recommendations

Recommendation A

9.1 Application Ref: 12/02630/FUL

Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed below and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to deliver the obligations listed above.

Application ref: 12/02638/CON

Grant conservation area consent subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommendation B

9.2 In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers, having regard to the Heads of Terms set out in the report, to negotiate and complete a Section 106 agreement with the appellants in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector.

10.0 Summary of the Reasons

10.1 In deciding to grant planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions listed below. In reaching this decision the following policies were relevant:

10.2 Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)

- Policy S1 Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S3 Economic Development
- Policy S4 Transport
- Policy S5 Open Space
- Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S8 Sustainable Waste Management
• Policy S9 Quality of the Built Environment
• Policy S10 Planning Obligations


• Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
• Policy 9 Transport Impact
• Policy 14 Parking and Traffic Restraint
• Policy 16 Affordable Housing
• Policy 31 Streets, Character and Layout
• Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime
• Policy 33 Building Scale and Design
• Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction
• Policy 36 Alterations and Extensions
• Policy 38 Design in Existing Residential/Mixed Use Areas
• Policy 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
• Policy 47 Conservation Areas

11.0 Application 12/02630/FUL: Conditions

STANDARD CONDITIONS

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

DESIGN & HERITAGE

3 No development shall commence until detailed drawings, samples, and a schedule of all external materials (where applicable) to be used in the elevations and roofs within the scheme hereby permitted are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of design, to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).
No development shall commence until drawings to a scale of not less than 1:20 and samples and/or manufacturer’s specifications of the design and construction details listed below have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and, this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

i) metal, glass and/or wood work including railings, balustrades and balconies,
ii) window and door systems (including technical details, elevations, reveal depths, plans and cross sections),
iii) front door entrances (including surrounds),
iv) roof construction,
v) opaque glazing panels to balcony area of Site B;
vi) security shutter detailing to the Community Centre (Site E),
vii) solar photovoltaic arrays to roofs (including sections),
viii) provision of public art installation within the curtilage of the Community Centre; and
ix) rain water pipes (including locations, fixings, material and colour).

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of design, to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

Notwithstanding the approved drawings, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the siting and design of all walls, fencing, gates and railings for each of the five infill sites hereby approved (including details of those existing which are to be retained). The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details and such walls, fencing, gates and railings as may be approved shall be erected before the initial occupation of the development and be permanently retained as such unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained for any variation.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development, to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality, to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area and to ensure a satisfactory and continuing standard of amenity is provided (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1, S2 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

No plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed to the external faces of the buildings, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of design, to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

SUSTAINABILITY

7 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme showing the siting, size, number and design of the Solar Photovoltaic (PV) array including elevational and sectional drawings of the roof with the panels in situ and, manufacturer’s specifications demonstrating compliance with the details contained in the approved Sustainability and Energy Statement by Max Fordham LLP (dated 9th July 2012) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment shall be sited so as to minimise its visual impact upon the external appearance of the buildings and the wider conservation area. The development shall thereafter be completed in strict accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such for the duration of use.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development and in order to control the overall design standard of the development and preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 33, 35 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1, S7 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

8 The recommended renewable energy technology detailed in the approved Sustainability and Energy Statement by Max Fordham LLP (dated 9th July 2012) shall be incorporated into the development and implemented prior to the first occupation of any part of the buildings hereby permitted. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such unless the prior written approval is obtained from the Local Planning Authority for any variation.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

9 The dwellings hereby permitted shall achieve at least Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) (or such equivalent national measure of sustainability which replaces that scheme). No dwelling shall be occupied until a Final Code for Sustainable Homes Certificate has been issued certifying that at least Code Level 4 has been achieved. The development shall be carried
out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and achieve the agreed rating. The development shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

The Community Centre (Site E) hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve a minimum criterion of ‘Very Good’ for the BREEAM New Construction 2011 standard (or subsequent superseding equivalent scheme). A post construction review shall be undertaken and a BREEAM certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved minimum ‘Very Good’ standard (or above) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority no later than 3 months from the substantial completion of the development. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with measures set out in the approved estimator assessment.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

**LANDSCAPING/TREES**

No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailed schemes of soft and hard landscaping showing the treatment of all parts of the 5 development sites not covered by building. The proposals shall include the planting of replacement trees, as well as hedges, grass, shrubs, ground flora or climbers, and shall cover areas of communal and private open space within the development, including roofs, walls and boundary features. The landscaping scheme shall include an indication of how the planting would integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to anticipated routine maintenance and protection. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above specification shall accord with BS3936:1992, BS4043:1989 and BS4428:1989 and current Arboricultural best practice.

Reasons: In order to introduce high quality soft landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policy 39 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011)).

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season
following the occupation of the development hereby permitted or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from the occupation or substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and continuing standard of amenities are provided and maintained in connection with the development (Policies 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011)).

13 No trees other than those shown to be removed on the approved Arboricultural Implications Assessment by PJC Consultancy Ltd dated 25 May 2012 (ref no: PJC/2028/11) and shown on the Tree Protection Plans (Appendix 1) shall be felled, pruned, uprooted, damaged or otherwise disturbed without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality and the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

14 All tree protection measures as set out on the Approved Drwg Tree Protection Plan prepared by PJC Consultants (Document ref: PJC/2028/11) dated 25 May 2012 shall be strictly adhered to and implemented before the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved. The tree protection measures shall remain in place for the duration of the construction of the development, and only be dismantled or removed following the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality and the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

15 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of all proposed Access Facilitation Pruning (BS5837:2012) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved works shall be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010. The development shall thereafter be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality and the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

ECOLOGY/BIODIVERSITY

16 No development, including demolition or site clearance shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a detailed statement including final field assessment of the development’s impact upon any legally protected species or habitats which might be present on the application site or adjacent to it, with particular reference to bats (Chiroptera), reptiles (herpetofauna) and birds (Aves), and any mitigation measures to be implemented should any protected habitats or species be found on the application site or where the development will have an adverse impact upon the adjacent Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The details of mitigation as are approved shall thereafter be implemented as part of the development and, if appropriate, shall be retained thereafter for the duration of the permitted use of the site.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development minimises its impact with respect to protected wildlife species and habitats that may be present on site or on adjacent properties in accordance with Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy S5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

17 Works to demolish buildings, tree management and clearance of vegetation shall be undertaken outside the annual bird nesting season (March to July inclusive) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If works are necessary in the bird breeding season and agreed by the Local Planning Authority, the works shall only occur under the supervision of an appropriately qualified ecologist.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development minimises its impact with respect to protected wildlife species and habitats that may be present on site or on adjacent properties in accordance with Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy S5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

18 Prior to commencement of works on Site A, details of appropriate site management and a control programme to treat and eradicate Japanese knotweed from the site and to preclude the possibility of Japanese knotweed being spread during the course of works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Council’s Ecological Adviser).

Reason: In order to ensure that the development minimises its impact with respect to protected wildlife species and habitats that may be present on site
or on adjacent properties in accordance with Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy S5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

**TRANSPORT**

19. No development shall commence until full details of the proposed construction methodology, in the form of a Method of Demolition and Construction Statement, has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Transport for London). The Method of Demolition and Construction Statement shall include but not be limited to details of notification of neighbours with regard to specific works, details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway, and other measures including details of the phasing of construction, and details of parking, deliveries and storage to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and the safe operation of the public highway. The details of the approved Method of Demolition and Construction Statement must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the demolition and construction process.

Reason: To ensure minimal nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers and of the area generally, and avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway. (Policies 7, 9, 31, and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policy S4 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

20. Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans, detailed drawings of the cycle storage areas including the layout, elevational treatment and manufacturer’s specification of the proposed cycle stands shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before first occupation of any parts of the development. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site, to promote sustainable modes of transport and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area (Policies 9, 14, 33, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S4 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

21. Prior to first occupation of the ground floor unit in Site B, a detailed drawing showing the provision of one disabled car parking space in front of or immediately adjoining the wheelchair accessible unit in Site B shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The car parking space shall thereafter be designated, laid out and permanently used solely for this purpose and no other.

Reason: To ensure that parking provision is available for people with disabilities in accordance with the provisions of Policy S4 of the Local

**RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

22 The Community Centre (Site E) hereby approved shall only operate between the hours of 09:00-21:00, seven days a week.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding area (Policies 7 and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

23 No mechanical ventilation, filtration or air conditioning system shall be installed or operated on the Community Centre until details of the installation and operation of the system, including details of all external plant equipment and trunking, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The system shall thereafter only be installed and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers and the surrounding area, the visual amenity of the area in general, and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Hill Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 7, 31, 33, 38, and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

24 The areas of flat roof as shown on the drawings hereby approved, shall only be accessed for maintenance purposes, and shall not be used as a sitting out area or be used for any other recreational purposes whatsoever unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding area (Policies 7 and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

25 Prior to first occupation of any of the residential units within Site B, the opaque privacy screening panels (to be approved under Condition 4) shall be installed in accordance with the drawings to be approved as part of Condition 4. These privacy screening panels shall thereafter be permanently retained for the duration of the residential use hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding area (Policies 7 and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January

26 There shall be no amplified sound, speech, or music generated from the community centre which is audible when measured from any window within the nearest noise sensitive residential property


27 Prior to first occupation of the community centre hereby approved, a Community Use Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ‘Community Use’ of the site shall thereafter only occur in accordance with the approved Community Use Management Plan, unless the written approval is obtained from the Local Planning Authority for any variations.


**NOISE**

28 The recommended environmental noise mitigation measures outlined in the applicant’s Noise Assessment Report by Max Fordham LLP dated 7th June 2012 shall be incorporated into the development and implemented prior to the first occupation of any part of the building hereby permitted. Noise levels within habitable rooms of the development hereby permitted shall not exceed the following levels:

- Living rooms 35dB(A) Leq 18 hour 07:00hrs to 23:00hrs;
- Bedrooms 30dB(A) Leq 8 hours + no individual noise event to exceed 45dB(A) max (measured with F time weighting) – 23:00hrs to 07:00hrs.


29 The Building works required to carry out the use/development allowed by this permission must only be carried out within the following times:-

- 08:00 Hours to 18:00 Hours, Monday to Friday
- 09:00 Hours to 13:00 Hours on Saturdays
- You must not carry out the required building works on Sundays, Bank or
Public Holidays.

- Noisy operations shall not take place outside these hours unless the Council has agreed in writing that there are exceptional circumstances, for example to meet police traffic restrictions, in an emergency or in the interests of public safety.


REFUSE/WASTE MANAGEMENT

30 Notwithstanding any indication given on the approved drawings, full details of the refuse and recycling storage facilities for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development hereby approved. The details shall include a description and storage capacity of the facilities to be provided including, where appropriate, lockable containers. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 9, 33, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S8 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

31 No development shall commence until a Waste Management Strategy outlining the operation and management of waste storage and collection has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate arrangements are put in place for the storage of refuse on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area and the safe operation of the adjacent public highway (Policies 9, 33, 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S4, S8 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

COMMUNITY SAFETY/DESIGNING OUT CRIME

32 The development shall be constructed and operated thereafter to ‘Secured by Design’ standards. A certificate of accreditation to Secured by Design standards shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to first occupation of any part of the development.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory attention is given to security and community safety (Policy 32 of the Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development

33 No development works above ground shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a strategy for the exterior lighting of the sites including the lighting of all public/communal areas. The details approved shall be implemented prior to the commencement of use of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained for the duration of the permitted use, unless the written approval is received from the Local Planning Authority for any variation.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the security of the site. (Policies 7, 32 and 33 of the Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 refer, Policies S7 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Safer Built Environments).

**OTHER**

34 The management of surface water drainage for the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) detailed in the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by Conisbee (dated 20 June 2012) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

35 All the residential units hereby approved shall be constructed to Lifetime Homes Standards in accordance with details contained in the approved Design and Access Statement by Haworth Tompkins Architects dated June 2012, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development is made more accessible to all (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policy S2 (d) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the related Supplementary Planning Document: Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008)).

36 The proposed buildings shall be built to the ground levels and heights as shown on the approved drawings or lower and if the indicated existing heights and levels of the neighbouring properties should prove to be erroneous, then the heights of the proposed buildings shall be no higher than the relative height difference(s) between the heights of the neighbouring properties and proposed buildings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development is built to the heights relative to adjoining properties as shown on the approved drawings in the interests of visual and residential amenity (Policies 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

37 The café/kitchen use within the community centre (Site E) shall only be used for purposes ancillary to and in conjunction with the community use hereby approved within Use Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005 (as amended) and for no other purpose.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to allow the Local Planning Authority to monitor land use and to protect the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers (Policies 7 and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

38 The residential accommodation hereby approved shall be constructed to include at least 1 of the units as wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users and permanently retained as such for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate proportion of units are wheelchair accessible or adaptable for wheelchair use (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policy S2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011), and the Council’s Adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ (2008)).

39 No development shall commence on Site A until a Type III Asbestos Survey detailing the mitigation measures to control the release of asbestos fibres and to ensure the safe removal of asbestos from the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Council’s Environmental Health Team). The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: In order to control the potential threat to health and the environment posed by contaminates present on the application site, with particular reference to the potential release of asbestos fibres during demolition works, in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan (2011).

40 Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B, C, D, E & F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of, or to, any dwellinghouse
the subject of this permission shall be carried out without planning permission having first been obtained via the submission of a planning application to the Local Planning Authority; nor shall any building or enclosure required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of any said dwellinghouse as such be constructed or placed on any part of the land covered by this permission without such planning permission having been obtained.

Reason: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, strict control is required over the form of any additional development which may be proposed in the interests of maintaining a satisfactory residential environment, to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the Peabody Estate Rosendale Road Conservation Area (Policies 7, 31, 33, 38 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

41 No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water or sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the relevant water or sewerage undertaker. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: In order to mitigate the potential impact of the development on local underground water and sewerage utility infrastructure (Policy 5.14 of the London Plan (2011)).

Application 12/02638/CON: Conditions

1 The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1991.

2 No demolition of any (or part) of the buildings within Site A or B shall commence until a contract(s) for construction of the replacement structures in accordance with planning permission ref: 12/02630/FUL has been presented to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid premature demolition and the creation of a undesirable gap in the townscape and to maintain the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with the provisions of saved Policy 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.
12.0 Informatives

1 This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 You are advised that this consent is without prejudice to any rights which may be enjoyed by any tenants/occupiers of the premises.

3 Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council's Building Control Officer.

4 You are advised that this permission does not authorise the display of advertisements at the community centre and separate consent may be required from the Local Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

5 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements for the Control of Pollution Act 1974 concerning construction site noise and in this respect you are advised to contact the Council's Environmental Health Division.

6 You are advised all conditions which require further details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority need to be accompanied by an application form and a fee. The application form and fee schedule can be viewed at www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning.

7 It is current Council policy for the Council’s contractor to construct new vehicular accesses and to reinstate the footway across redundant accesses. The developer is to contact the Council’s Highways team on 020 7926 9000, prior to the commencement of construction, to arrange for any such work to be done. If the developer wishes to undertake this work the Council will require a deposit and the developer will need to cover all the Council’s costs (including supervision of the works). If the works are of a significant nature, a Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) will be required and the works must be carried out to the Council’s specification.

8 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Principal Highway Engineer of the Highways Team on 020 7926 2620 or 079 0411 9517 in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffolding, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections, Hoarding, Excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licences etc.

9 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Streetcare team within the Public Protection Division with regard to the provision of refuse

10 As soon as building work starts on the development, you must contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer if you need to do the following:
- name a new street
- name a new or existing building
- apply new street numbers to a new or existing building

This will ensure that any changes are agreed with Lambeth Council before use, in accordance with the London Buildings Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 and the Local Government Act 1985. Although it is not essential, we also advise you to contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer before applying new names or numbers to internal flats or units. Contact details are listed below.

Street Naming and Numbering Officer
e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283

11 The evaluation of any risks to human health arising from the site should be discussed with the Local Planning Authority’s Environmental Health department.

12 Thames Water recommended that the following informatives be added to this planning decision.

(a) With regards to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required on 0845 80 2777.

(b) Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water’s Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 85074890 or by e-mailing wwqrismanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.

(c) Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of
10m head (Approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres per minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water’s pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

With regards to Condition 41 (Piling Method Statement), the applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 8502777 to discuss the contents of the statement.

With respect to internal noise standards detailed within Condition 28 the Council’s Environmental Health (Noise Pollution) team has provided the following advice:

BS8233:1000 gives guidance for internal noise levels in rooms for residential purposes for environmental noise to maintain appropriate resting and sleeping conditions. The publication provides noise levels for ‘good’ and ‘reasonable’ standards to be aimed for within dwellings. The ‘good’ standard being in compliance with the latest World Health Organisation (WHO) standards on Community Noise. WHO advises that as well as considering average noise levels (LaEQ metric) the individual single event LaMax level should be considered as well as the LaEQ where there are distinctive events.

Both WHO and BS8233:1999 also recommends that any individual noise event at night should not normally exceed 45dB (A) max. This standard is designed to minimise sleep disturbance and, by necessity, precludes ventilation through open windows. These schemes often require some form of forced ventilation to allow for rapid ventilation.

It is highly important that a sound insulation scheme with noise attenuated ventilation provision is incorporated.

With respect to Condition 18 it is noted that there is a presence of Japanese Knotwood on Site A. Under Schedule 0 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, it is an offence to plant or otherwise cause this species to grow in the wild. This invasive plant must be treated and eradicated, using suitable chemical and physical methods, prior to any site clearance or demolition works commencing, and appropriate monitoring and response procedures should be included in the landscape strategy not only during site redevelopment but also after works are completed and the initial site maintenance phase is in operation.

In relation to condition 11 of this consent it is advised that landscaping schedules should endeavour to include reasonable measures to promote biodiversity including use of native species typical of locality and ground conditions or any naturalised areas. The applicant should act on good practice to maximise the site’s landscape, visual and horticultural quality, ease of maintenance and to provide long-term environmental benefit. The applicant should also endeavour to include measures to encourage protected species to occupy the application site, such as installation of bat and bird boxes on buildings, or bat bricks within buildings, or creation of naturalised areas within communal areas.
In relation to Condition 30, the refuse and recycling storage facilities for the development hereby permitted shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the London Borough of Lambeth’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (May 2006).
Case Number: 12/03393/S106

Application Address:
368 - 372 Coldharbour Lane
London

---

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site address</strong></th>
<th>368 - 372 Coldharbour Lane, London SW9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward</strong></td>
<td>Coldharbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td>Variation of S106 to allow the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. To substitute the previously included definitions for Social Rented Housing Units with Affordable Housing Units and to fix the rent figures at 60% OMR for a 2 bed, 55% OMR for a 3 bed and 49% OMR for a 4 bed unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application type</strong></td>
<td>Full Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application ref(s)</strong></td>
<td>12/03393/S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation date</strong></td>
<td>06.09.2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Case officer details** | Carl Griffiths  
Tel: 020 7926 5020  
Email: cgriffiths2@lambeth.gov.uk |
| **Applicant** | Barratt Homes (East London Ltd)  
C/O Agent |
| **Agent** | Mr Phillip Joyce  
BPTW Partnership  
Hiltons Wharf  
Norman Road  
Greenwich  
London  
SE10 9QX |
| **Considerations/constraints** | Conservation Area  
Major Centre Boundary |
| **Approved plans** | Deed of Variation |
| **Recommendation(s)** | Amend the Section 106 Agreement pertaining to 06/04037/FUL and incorporate the alterations as outlined in the report. |

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
Report Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>21/02/2013</td>
<td>25/02/2013</td>
<td>Comments incorporated throughout report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21/09/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/10/2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Documents
Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
1 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 Whether the proposed Deed of Variation to change the affordable housing to the affordable rent model would allow the development to deliver adequate affordable housing.

2 Site Description

2.1 The application site is located on the north side of Coldharbour Lane, to the east of its junction with Atlantic Road. The site was previously divided into two separate sites that accommodated two buildings; No 368-370 was a former factory/warehouse known as the Voice Building and No. 372 Coldharbour Lane previously housed an Employment Exchange. Both of these buildings have now been demolished and the site is currently undergoing development. The application site is virtually square in shape, and totals approximately 4200 square metres in area (65m wide x 65m deep).

2.2 The application site is located within the Loughborough Park Conservation Area, and immediately adjacent to the Brixton Road Conservation Area. The site sits within the fringe/edge of the Brixton Town Centre, the core being located to the west. The site is also located within MDO6 (East Brixton Regeneration Arc) under the UDP proposals map which identifies this part of Coldharbour Lane as offering potential for mixed uses, and extending the town centre north-eastwards.

2.3 The site is bounded to the north by an elevated railway line which serves Brixton Station. The 4 storey Granville Arcade and a commercial laundry are located to the west of the site. No. 360-366 Coldharbour Lane to the east is currently being re-developed with a mixed use development containing 60 residential units and B1 office units. Beyond that is a pair of 4 storey villas and a smaller house, which adjoins Valentia Place. The Angel Public House is on the opposite corner of Valentia Place and Coldharbour Lane.

2.4 To the south of the site, on the opposite side of Coldharbour Lane, are Somerleyton Place and Southwyck House.

3 Relevant Planning History

3.1 Planning permission was refused in June 2005 for the redevelopment the site involving the demolition of the existing buildings (Class B1/B2/B8) and erection of a part-single, part-five, part-seven, part-twelve-storey mixed-use development arranged around a central courtyard, providing 165 residential units and 930 sqm of commercial / community floorspace (Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1/D1), together with amenity space and three car parking spaces (application ref: 05/01015/FUL).

This application was subsequently appealed with the appeal being dismissed on conservation and design grounds. The level of affordable housing in the scheme was deemed to be acceptable by the inspector in making their decision.

3.2 Planning permission was granted in February 2007 for the redevelopment of the
site involving demolition of the existing buildings and erection of part-five and part-seven storey building with a lower ground floor to provide 155 residential units comprising 54 x 1 bed, 90 x 2 bed, 6 x 3 bed and 5 x 4 bed and 923 sqm of commercial floorspace (Class A1, A2, and B1), together with provision of internal courtyard, with 2 disabled car parking spaces, cycle stores, refuse store, a roof garden at first floor level, landscaping and boundary treatment (application ref: 06/04037/FUL).

This application was granted permission subject to conditions and subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the provision of 48 affordable housing units.

3.3 Planning permission was granted in February 2011 for the redevelopment of the site involving the erection of a part 5 and a part 7 storey building with lower ground floor to provide 141 residential units and 923 SQM of commercial floorspace (Use Classes B1,A1 and A2) together with amenity space, provision of 2 disabled car parking spaces and cycle and refuse storage (application ref: 10/02516/FUL).

3.4 In addition to the planning history on the application site itself there is applications elsewhere in the borough which are relevant to the consideration of the current application. This is set out below.

3.5 Planning permission was granted in April 2012 for a variation to the S106 agreement in relation to planning permission 07/03115/FUL (Redevelopment of site involving the demolition of buildings at 31-33 Macaulay Road, non-original extensions to 29 Maucalay Road, 2 storey building adjacent to the existing warehouse, the single storey building at the rear of Nattrass House, part of the former LETS site, side garden wall between 23 and 29 Macaulay Road and rear garden wall of 23 Macaulay Road with existing wall and gate posts to 23 Macaulay Road) (application ref: 12/00526/S106).

The result of the application to amend the Section 106 agreement was to amend the agreed rent levels of the affordable housing on the scheme. The rents amended rents were based on the new Affordable Rent model without the use of HCA funding.

4 Proposed Development

4.1 Permission is sought for a variation of the existing Section 106 Agreement pertaining to application no.06/04037/FUL in respect of the definition of the consented Social Rented Units.

4.2 The application seeks to amend the Section 106 Agreement to the Social Rented units to be let as Affordable Rented units and to limit the maximum rent which can be charged.

4.3 The Affordable Rented terms would be defined in the following way.

“Affordable Rented Unit” means rented housing let by an RSL to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable rented housing is not subject to the national rent regime but is subject to other rent controls that
require a rent of no more than 80 per cent of the local market rent (which for the purpose of this Deed shall be defined as the Maximum Percentage) and the phrase “Affordable Rented” shall be construed accordingly such that:

(a) 2 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 60% of local market rents including service charges

(b) 3 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 55% of local market rents including service charges

(c) 4 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 49% of local market rents including service charges

PROVIDED THAT such rents may be adjusted by the RSL in accordance with the Homes and Communities Agency and Greater London Authority guidance relating to affordable rents provided that the rent charged shall not exceed the Maximum Percentage

4.4 The result of the proposal to amend the Section 106 agreement would be to amend the agreed rent levels of the affordable rented housing on the scheme without amending the actual mix of the consented affordable housing. The rents would be based on the new Affordable Rent model without the use of Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) funding.

5 Consultations and Responses

5.1 A press notice was published in the Weekender Press on 5th October 2012.

5.2 Site notices were displayed adjacent to the application site on 5th October 2012.

5.3 Letters were also sent to neighbouring residents and local amenity groups.

5.4 Internal consultation

The Council’s Housing team were consulted on the application and had no objection to the proposed variation. These observations are incorporated into the assessment of the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material planning objections

The proposed variation will diminish the affordability of the residential units.

Officer Response

The Council has carried out an assessment of the affordability of the Affordable Rent Model, comparing different proportions of market rent for different postcodes within Lambeth; identifying incomes which would be required to afford different rents; and considering the impact of the benefit cap
when it is introduced. This information is contained within the Council’s Tenancy Strategy which also sets out that Affordable Rent levels should not be above the Local Housing Allowance level.

The Affordable Rent levels on the scheme, including service charges, are within the weekly Local Housing Allowance rates for the area and produce a rate of less than 65% of the cost of renting on the open market. This complies with the Council’s Tenancy Strategy and as such officers consider that the affordability of the units would be acceptable in the context of local circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The change from RSL to ‘Affordable Housing Provider’ is not acceptable.</th>
<th>This element of the proposed variation has been removed from the application and permission is only sought for the change to the new Affordable Rent model.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed variation would reduce the level of affordable housing for local people. The borough suffers from a shortage of housing for people on low incomes.</td>
<td>The affordability of the proposed Affordable Rent product is considered to be acceptable in terms of local circumstances and the proposed number of units defined as affordable within the development scheme will not be reduced and as such consider that level of affordable housing in the borough as a whole would not be diminished as a result of the variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed variation would harm the diversity of Brixton.</td>
<td>The affordable rent product is targeted to meet the same housing need as the social rent product. The diverse mix of the borough would therefore not be irrevocably altered by the proposed variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed variation would set a dangerous precedent allowing further future dilution of affordable housing.</td>
<td>In making this recommendation, officers are mindful of national and regional policy which has identified and facilitates the affordable rent model. This procedure is stated within the NPPF, the London Plan and its SPG and is being adopted in affordable housing provision being delivered in new qualifying residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Planning Policy Considerations

National Guidance

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (‘consolidated with Alterations since 2004’ published in February 2008), the Lambeth Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’. Material considerations include national planning policy statements and planning policy guidance.

6.2 On 27th March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework. This document had the immediate effect of replacing various documents including, amongst other documents, PPS1, PPS3, PPS4, PPS5, PPS12, PPG13, PPG17 and Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations.

6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It reinforces the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Moreover, it sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following parts of the NPPF are considered to be particularly relevant in the consideration of the current application:

Annexe 2:

“Affordable housing: social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.”

“Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges where applicable).”

The London Plan 2011

6.4 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaces the previous versions which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008.
The London Plan is the Mayor’s development strategy for Greater London and provides strategic planning guidance for development and use of land and buildings within the London region.

6.5 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

6.6 GLA Supplementary Planning Guidance on Housing (2012)

The Supplementary Planning Guidance on Housing (2012) sets out guidance to supplement the housing policies in the 2011 London Plan. The following parts of the document are considered to be of most relevance to the consideration of the application:

Chapter 4.2.13:

In April 2011 government introduced a new affordable rent product, intended to meet the same housing need as social rent. It is intended to “allow a more diverse offer for the range of people accessing social housing. Affordable homes will be made available to tenants at up to a maximum of 80% of the gross market rent (which will take account of the service charge for that property, where applicable) and allocated in the same way as social housing is at present.

Chapter 4.2.14:

Rents for the new product will be set by Registered Providers on a scheme by scheme basis. The gross market rent benchmark will reflect the property size, location and other characteristics of the property. According to the affordable rent investment framework, nationally “it is expected that providers [will] utilise the flexibility to charge rents of up to 80% of market rents to maximise financial capacity. The HCA would need to understand how any proposal to charge lower rents would help to meet particular housing needs, deliver value for money for the taxpayer and generate the capacity required to deliver new supply aspirations….. There may be specific circumstances where it is appropriate to set rents at less than 80% of market rents.

6.7 Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011)

6.8 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy S1 – Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S2 – Housing
- Policy S10 – Planning Obligations

6.10 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy 15 – Additional Housing
- Policy 16 – Affordable Housing

7 Affordable Housing Provision

7.1 The original consented scheme on this site consisted of the provision of 431 habitable rooms of which 151 would be affordable. Of these 151 habitable rooms, 59 were designated as ‘Affordable Rent’ to give a figure of 14% of habitable rooms within the overall scheme and 39% of the total affordable housing provision. The mix of the units would not change as a result of the variation sought in the current application.

7.2 Within the Section 106 Agreement secured as part of application 06/04037/FUL the definition of ‘Rented Housing Unit’ states the following:

Means a dwelling within the development which is to be let on an assured tenancy at an affordable rent on the basis of housing need and where the rents are no greater than target rents set by the government for Housing Association and local authority and co-operative rents and service charges are such as to meet the affordability criteria for households as set by the Mayor’s SPG on affordable housing.

7.3 This definition will be deleted and replaced by the following:

“Affordable Rented Unit” means rented housing let by an RSL to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable rented housing is not subject to the national rent regime but is subject to other rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80 per cent of the local market rent (which for the purpose of this Deed shall be defined as the Maximum Percentage) and the phrase “Affordable Rented” shall be construed accordingly such that:

(d) 2 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 60% of local market rents including service charges

(e) 3 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 55% of local market rents including service charges

(f) 4 bedroom Residential Units shall be available for rent up to 49% of local market rents including service charges

PROVIDED THAT such rents may be adjusted by the RSL in accordance with the Homes and Communities Agency and Greater London Authority guidance relating to affordable rents provided that the rent charged shall not exceed the Maximum Percentage
7.4 The result of the proposal to amend the Section 106 agreement would be to amend the agreed rent levels of the affordable housing on the scheme.

7.5 The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) no longer directly funds Social Rent housing and a new Affordable Rent product has now been introduced. The affordable housing element of the scheme is therefore proposed to be delivered using the Affordable Rent product and without recourse to direct HCA funding. The new Affordable Rent product, introduced in April 2011, is intended to meet the same housing need as social rent. Affordable homes will be made available to tenants at up to a maximum of 80% of the gross market rent (which will take account of the service charge for that property, where applicable) and allocated in the same way as social housing is at present.

7.6 The Affordable Rent product is included within the definition of affordable housing contained within both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the London Plan. In this regard, the principle of the provision of Affordable Rented units is acceptable given its compliance with the definition as set out within the NPPF.

7.7 In terms of affordability, the Council has carried out an assessment of the affordability of the Affordable Rent Model, comparing different proportions of market rent for different postcodes within Lambeth; identifying incomes which would be required to afford different rents; and considering the impact of the benefit cap when it is introduced. This information is contained within the Council’s Tenancy Strategy which also sets out that Affordable Rent levels should not be above the Local Housing Allowance level. The blended rate is one which takes account of the both the service charge and the rent payable. The Affordable Rent levels on the scheme, including service charges, are within the weekly Local Housing Allowance rates for the area and produce a blended rate of less than 65% of the cost of renting on the open market. This complies with the Council’s Tenancy Strategy and as such officers consider that the affordability of the units would be acceptable in the context of local circumstances.

7.8 Furthermore, the Mayor of London’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (Nov 2012) supports the use of Affordable Rent products whilst the Localism Bill and HCA Affordable Homes Programme Framework also sets out the requirements in terms of both rent levels and length of tenure. The proposed Affordable Rent product in this case is compliant with the Mayor’s SPG, the Localism Bill and the HCA framework.

7.9 The proposed variation to provide Affordable Rent will not affect the shared ownership units proposed on site and will not alter the actual mix of units. Previous proposals to widen the definition of ‘Registered State Landlords’ within the S106 to include ‘Affordable Housing Providers’ has been removed from the scheme on the advice of officers.

7.10 Given the clear national definition of affordable rent, guidance from Government and the HCA, and NPPF and London Plan policy supporting the use of Affordable Rent, officers recommend that the current application is approved.
8 Conclusion

8.1 It is recommended that the application for a Deed of Variation to the s106 Agreement be granted to substitute the previously included definitions for Social Rented Housing Units with Affordable Rented Units and to fix the rent figures as set out in this report.

9 Recommendation

9.1 Amend the Section 106 Agreement pertaining to 06/04037/FUL and incorporate the alterations as outlined in the report.

10 Summary of the Reasons

10.1 In deciding to grant approval for the Deed of Variation to the s106 legal agreement, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the development plan and all other relevant material considerations. The development plan in Lambeth is the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy adopted in January 2011’ and the London Plan (adopted July 2011). Having weighed the merits of the proposed variation in the context of these issues, it is considered that the Deed of Variation be granted. In reaching this decision the following Policies were relevant:

London Plan (July 2011)

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 in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes

Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

Policy S2: Housing
Policy S10: Planning Obligations

Unitary Development Plan (Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011)

Policy 15 Additional Housing;
Policy 16 Affordable Housing.
For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
Site address: 168 And 170 Vauxhall St And 17 And 19 Oval Way And Disused Rd To Rear Of Morris, Isis & Matilda House, London SE11 5RR

Ward: Oval

Proposal: Refurbishment of existing 3 storey building on 142-170 Vauxhall Way, demolition of single storey existing buildings on 17-19 Oval Way, and the erection of a 3-4 storey extension to west of existing building facing 17-19 Oval Way for B1 and ancillary facilities. Addition of 2 storey addition to northern corner of existing building.

Application type: Full Planning Permission

Application ref(s): 12/04623/FUL

Validation date: 04.12.2012

Case officer details: Carl Griffiths
Tel: 020 7926 5020
Email: cgriffiths2@lambeth.gov.uk

Applicant: Mr Peter Allen
Social Justice & Human Rights Centre Limited
c/o The Ethical Property Company Limited
The Old Music Hall
106-108 Cowley Road
Oxford
Oxfordshire
OX4 1JE

Agent: Mr Lynton Pepper
Hub Westminster
First Floor, New Zealand House
80 Haymarket
London
SW1Y 4TE

Considerations/constraints: Environment Agency Flood Zone
HSE Consultation Zone
Key Industrial and Business Area
Protected Vista

Approved plans

Recommendation(s): Grant planning permission subject to conditions and Section 106 Agreement.

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
Report Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>11.02.2013</td>
<td>12.02.2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>08.01.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services – Health and Safety</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Highways</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services - Noise Pollution</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Design Advisors</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Cross Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Oval &amp; Vauxhall Forum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Bridge Gardens Ltd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Neighbourhood Housing Forum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vauxhall Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision For Vauxhall</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>05.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Documents
Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)
1 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The proposed land uses in the context of the KIBA location of the application site.

1.2 The impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

1.3 The impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

1.4 The transport impact of the scheme including parking provision and the impact on the operation of the adjacent highways.

1.5 The Planning Obligations required to mitigate the impact of the development.

1.6 The risk involved with the development in the context of the adjacent Kennington Gas Holders

2 Site Description

2.1 The application site is located on the west side of Vauxhall Street and to the east of Oval Way. The application site currently comprises a large complex of late Victorian industrial buildings used for B1 (office / light industrial) and B8 (storage and warehousing) use class purposes which has a frontage on both Vauxhall Street and Oval Way. The main building of the complex adjoining Vauxhall Road rises to three storeys in height and is of a brick construction. Adjoining the large building to the west is a single storey structure with a pitched roof fronting onto Oval Way.

2.2 To the east of the site is one of the Oval Gas Holders, to the south of the site is Brockwell House which comprises residential units, to the west of the site is Lilian Baylis School and to the north of the site is a large self storage unit facility (Use Class B8). The site has an approximate area of 2142 sq.m and is situated within close proximity to public transport routes.

2.3 The site is situated in a protected view corridor, is located within the Environment Agency Flood Zone and is also located within the Health and Safety Executive Consultation Zone by virtue of its proximity to the Oval Gas Holders. The site is also identified as being within a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA). None of the buildings on site are listed and the site is not located within a conservation area.

3 Relevant Planning History

3.1 Permission was granted in May 2007 for the refurbishment of the existing building occupied for office / light industrial and storage and warehousing purposes (B1 and B8 classes), including demolition of part of existing single storey infill building to create new courtyard, erection of a 3-storey staircase tower and 2-storey building for office use (B1 class) on north-west corner of site, installation of new roof to retained single storey building on west side of site, and associated alterations. Together with erection of a single storey work/live unit on derelict land at the rear of Brockwell House (application ref: 05/01063/FUL).
This permission was not implemented.

3.2 An application was made in July 2012 for the refurbishment of existing 3 storey building on 142-170 Vauxhall Way, demolition of single storey existing buildings on 17-19 Oval Way, and the erection of a 3-4 storey extension to west of existing building facing 17-19 Oval Way for B1 and auxiliary facilities. Addition of 2 storey addition to northern corner of existing building (application ref: 12/02758/FUL).

This application was withdrawn on the advice of officers due to the proposal incorporating timber cladding to the fourth floor structure.

4 Proposed Development

4.1 Permission is sought for the refurbishment of the existing 3 storey building on 142-170 Vauxhall Way, the demolition of single storey existing buildings on 17-19 Oval Way, the erection of a part 2, part 3, part 4 storey extension to the west of the existing building facing 17-19 Oval Way for B1 and ancillary facilities along with the addition of a 2 storey addition to the northern corner of the existing building.

4.2 The proposed development will provide B1 office space for organisations from the social justice and human rights sector. To facilitate the provision of the B1 office space, the existing large building standing on site will be retained in its current form and will be renovated with the chimneys reinstated. The chimneys would be reinstated using matching brickwork to the existing building along with a zinc clad ventilation cowl. The existing glazing of the building will be replaced by visually matching new window units with higher thermal efficiency.

4.3 To the west of the retained large building, a new part 3 part 4 storey extension will be erected. The prominent west elevation of the extension facing Oval Way will have three exposed horizontal concrete planes delineating the three floors to the front. The external faces of the building between the concrete planes will consist of glazed walling intersected at by solid vertical panels. Above the three storey element of the extension would be a fourth floor, set back 5.8 metres from the north elevation of the building and 15.5 metres from the south of the building. The fourth floor element of the extension will have three pitched roof sections laid out in a linear form and finished in zinc cladding. The area to the south of the fourth storey element atop the three storey flat roof section would be turned into a roof top garden accessed from a stairwell leading from a further roof top garden at second floor level of the two storey element of the extension.

4.4 It is proposed that the development will provide employment for 330 people and will offer a total of 3145 square metres of B1 floorspace. At ground floor level the development will provide an exhibition/conference centre and a café.

4.5 In order to facilitate the development, various highway works are proposed including the removal of the existing crossover on Oval Way, the setting back of the building line along Oval Way in order to provide a widened footway and the removal of 2 crossovers on Vauxhall Street. The development will be car free with the exception of the provision of 6no. on street disabled parking spaces on
5 Consultations and Responses

5.1 External Consultation

5.1 A total of 123 letters were sent to neighbouring occupants.

5.2 A site notice was displayed on 11th December 2012.

5.3 A press notice was published on 15th February 2013.

5.4 The Health and Safety Executive were consulted on the application and referred the application to be assessed against their Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI) methodology.

5.5 The Environment Agency were consulted on the application and had no objection.

5.6 The following local amenity groups were consulted on the application and did not respond:

Kennington Cross Neighbourhood Association;
Kennington Association;
Kennington Oval & Vauxhall Forum;
Regents Bridge Gardens Ltd;
Vauxhall Neighbourhood Housing Forum;
The Vauxhall Society;
Vision For Vauxhall

Internal Consultation

5.7 Transport and Highways officers have no objection to the application subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to secure contributions for highways works.

5.8 Conservation and Urban Design officers have no objection subject to conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Planning Policy Considerations

National Guidance

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (‘consolidated with Alterations since 2004’ published in
February 2008), the Lambeth Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’. Material considerations include national planning policy statements and planning policy guidance.

6.2 On 27th March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework. This document had the immediate effect of replacing various documents including, amongst other documents, PPS1, PPS3, PPS4, PPS5, PPS12, PPG13, PPG17 and Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations.

6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It reinforces the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Moreover, it sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The London Plan 2011

6.4 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaces the previous versions which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008. The London Plan is the Mayor’s development strategy for Greater London and provides strategic planning guidance for development and use of land and buildings within the London region.

6.5 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

6.6 Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011)

6.7 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy S1 – Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S3 – Economic Development
- Policy S4 – Transport
- Policy S6 – Flood Risk
- Policy S7 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S8 – Sustainable Waste Management
- Policy S9 – Quality of the Built Environment
- Policy S10 – Planning Obligations

The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy 7 – Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 – Transport Impact
- Policy 14 – Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 21 – Location and Loss of Offices
- Policy 23 – Protection and Location of other Employment Uses
- Policy 31 – Streets, Character and Layout
- Policy 32 – Community Safety/Designing out Crime
- Policy 33 – Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 36 – Alterations and Extensions
- Policy 39 – Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design

Supplementary Planning Documents

- S106 Planning Obligations (2009)
- Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)

Land Use

The site is located within a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA) and the current lawful use is a mix of B1/B8 use classes. Core Strategy Policy S3 safeguards land in KIBAs for “business, industrial, storage and waste management uses, including green industries, and other compatible commercial uses, excluding large scale retail”.

The proposed development will involve the demolition of one building on site that is currently in B1/B8 use resulting in a loss of 530 square metres however this would be more than compensated through the erection of the extension which would provide an additional 1845 square metres of B1 employment floorspace. In all the development would provide 4715 square metres of employment floorspace resulting in a gain approximately 1315 square metres of additional employment floorspace.

The provision of additional employment floorspace within a KIBA will be compliant with the objectives of Policy S3 of the Core Strategy. The development would also create an additional 30 jobs over and above the 300 jobs already in place on the site. The provision of B1 office space on this site and creation of additional jobs will contribute towards achieving the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy to “support the growth of key economic sectors through the development of new shops, offices and visitor accommodation, by maintaining a varied supply of business premises”.

The proposed conference facility and café at ground floor level are proposed to be predominantly used by the occupiers of the building however the applicant has indicated that they will not be precluded from use for members of public with an interest in social justice visiting the occupiers of the development. The
entrances for both the café and the conference facility will be via the main Social Justice Centre entrance and as such they could not operate independently of the main building and would be located within the same planning unit.

7.5 In terms of the conference facility, this will be primarily used by building-based organisations to host meetings and events both for their own organisation. The applicant has indicated that at the facilities may be used at times by external businesses interested in issues of Social Justice and Human Rights however the operation of these facilities will be centrally managed by the building managers, the Ethical Property Company. In order to ensure that the conference room remains ancillary to the B1 use and does not develop into a D1 facility in itself, a condition is attached requiring the submission of a management plan to demonstrate how the facility will be managed.

7.5 The applicant has indicated that the café would primarily serve the needs of the employees of the building however would incorporate informational literature relating to the Social Justice Centre which may be of interest to the general public and as such the café may occasionally be used by in an extramural manner. Nevertheless, given the fact that the café could only be accessed through the main entrance of the Social Justice Centre and that there would be no external signage advertising the cafe, it is likely that any external customers would be visitors to the main building. Officers consider that this would constitute an ancillary use and would not generate any land use conflict in relation to the protection of KIBA land for employment uses. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that the café operates in such a manner, a condition is attached requiring the submission of a management plan to demonstrate how the facility will be managed alongside the conference facility by the building managers.

7.6 The proposed development would increase the amount of employment floorspace on the site and would upgrade and improve the quality of the existing employment accommodation and it is therefore considered that the application is in full accordance with Policy S3 of the Core Strategy and Policy 23 of the UDP.

8 Design

8.1 Policy S9 of the Council’s Core Strategy (2011) states that the Council will improve and maintain the quality of the building environment by seeking the highest quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions.

8.2 Policy 33 of the UDP states that all development should be of a high quality design and contribute positively to its surrounding area.

8.3 The existing large industrial building which forms part of the application site is a fine example of a late 19th century industrial building and is considered to make a positive contribution to the area. Officers therefore welcome its retention and renovation. Officers also consider that the reintroduction of 2 chimneys at roof level of the retained building will contribute to preserving the industrial heritage of the application site.

8.4 It is considered that the proposed extension, despite being a contemporary
structure in modern materials, will be congruent in the context of its surroundings and would not diminish the established character of the area. The height, scale and bulk of the buildings surrounding the site are largely similar to that of the proposed extension and the aesthetic of the extension would also be of a similar style to that of the Lilian Baylis school site adjacent to the site to the west.

8.5 The proposed part 2, part 3, part 4 storey extension will be of a scale that would sit well within the context of the retained large building on site. Whilst the height of the extension would be similar to that of the retained building, its lightweight contemporary aesthetic would result in it appearing as a subordinate addition that would not overwhelm its parent building. The extension is well designed and would be constructed in such a way as to appear to be physically separate from the parent building and connected by internal walkways across a void. The built fabric of the rear elevation of the existing building will be protected and retained which will help to lend the extension a greater sense of subordination.

8.6 The extension would introduce a contemporary aesthetic with a largely glazed elevation delineated by horizontal exposed concrete platforms. The front elevation would provide a coherent and well ordered façade. The contemporary nature of the structure would stand in contrast to the solid industrial aesthetic of the large industrial building retained on site. Nevertheless, officers consider that the lightweight nature of the extension would offer a visual contrast which would complement the original building and would not visually imbalance the overall development.

8.7 Conservation and Urban Design officers are supportive of the extension subject to conditions requiring the submission of all external materials and construction details for approval. A previous scheme envisaged timber cladding to be installed on the fourth floor of the extension which, on the advice of officers, has been removed in favour of zinc cladding. Zinc cladding would also be installed on the cowls of the reinstated chimneys to the roof of the main building to create a consistent aesthetic at roof level. The use of the zinc cladding in this context is considered to be appropriate.

8.8 The proposed development will, subject to conditions, be acceptable in design terms and would preserve the character of the surrounding area. The application is therefore in accordance in Policy S9 of the Core Strategy and Policy 33 of the UDP.

9  Amenity Impact

9.1 Policy 33 (d) of the UDP states that development should not unacceptably harm the amenities of adjoining residents with regard to overlooking, loss of sunlight, daylight or the creation of a sense of enclosure

9.2 Policy 7 of the UDP protects the right of people to the quiet enjoyment of their homes.

9.3 Brockwell House
In respect of the impact on the living conditions of the occupants of Brockwell House, the side elevation windows of this residential block lie directly opposite the south elevation of the existing building to be retained as part of the development. There would be no change to the height of the retained building and as such there would be no additional impact over and above that which already exists in terms of daylight, sunlight or outlook.

9.4 A roof terrace will be created to the south west corner of the site at second and third floor levels approximately 15 metres of the front elevations of the properties of Brockwell House. Given the separation distance and subject to a condition requiring the submission of details pertaining to a privacy screen, it is not considered that there would be any unacceptable degree of overlooking from either roof terrace.

9.5 Nevertheless, the number of employees at the site and the lack of information within the submitted application in relation to the use of these roof terraces could result in potentially unacceptable levels of noise for neighbouring residents from employees utilising the roof terrace, especially during the summer months. In order to mitigate any harm and ensure that the levels of noise do not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, a condition is attached restricting the use of the roof terrace from 10am-7pm Monday to Friday and not at weekends. In addition, a condition is attached stating that amplified music shall not be played on the terrace.

9.6 Morris House

The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment as part of the application documents. Whilst the assessment is in no way comprehensive in quantifying the daylight and sunlight impact on the neighbouring properties, officers consider that in respect of the properties to the south west of the application site, Morris House, the orientation of the rear elevation windows of these residential properties is such that they lie directly opposite Brockwell House and there are no habitable windows in the flank elevation facing the application site. The proposed extension will taper down to a two storey height (7 metres) adjacent to the south boundary of the site. Given its location at an oblique angle to the windows of the rear elevation of the Morris House, officers consider that there would be no additional impact on the outlook over and above that which already exists. In terms of sunlight, the extension will be located to the north of the rear elevation of the Morris House and as such there would not be a demonstrable impact. The levels of daylight in the rooms served by the rear windows of Morris House would not be unacceptably harmed by the extension given the angle at which it would stand in relation to the windows and the limited 7 metre height adjacent to the boundary. Any demonstrable impact would not be over and above that which already exists with the dominant height and location of Brockwell House to the east of Morris House. This is similarly the case with the garden that is located to the rear of Morris House, Isis House and Matilda House and any impact in terms of sense of enclosure, daylight and sunlight would not be significantly over and above that which exists already with the dominant height and location of Brockwell House to the east.

9.7 The proposed development envisages the creation of a roof terrace at second
floor level adjacent to the south boundary of the application site and the rear
elevation of Morris House. The location of the roof terrace would mean that
overlooking of the rear elevation of Morris House would be possible by users of
the terrace. The submitted plans indicate that a balustrade would be erected
however officers consider that a privacy screen erected on the southern edge of
the roof terrace would be necessary in order to prevent overlooking of Morris
House and protect the privacy of the occupants. To this end, a condition is
recommended requiring the submission of details of a privacy screen for
approval. Noise disturbance from this terrace is also addressed by a condition
limiting the use of the terrace to 10am-7pm Monday to Friday and not at
weekends along with stating amplified music shall not be played on the terrace.

9.8 In addition, a first floor roof garden will be created at first floor level on the north
side of the proposed extension. Whilst the roof garden would not be located in
close proximity of any residential properties it is considered prudent to apply the
same conditions as with the other roof terrace limiting the hours of use of the
terrace and stating that amplified music shall not be played.

9.9 The proposed development would intensify the B1 use currently on site with
additional floorspace and an additional 30 employees. Nevertheless, the
application site is located within a KIBA and as such it is a designated
employment site with an established history of operating as such. The additional
employment provision at the site is considered to outweigh any additional harm
in terms of the resultant impact of noise and disturbance to the adjacent
residential properties. However, the roof terrace adjacent to the south site
boundary will be located in close proximity of Morris House and there is
potential for this to be used as an external amenity space for employees. In
order to mitigate any potential noise and disturbance, a condition is
recommended requiring the submission of a management plan to set out how
access to the roof terrace will be managed so as to minimise any potential harm
to neighbouring residents.

10 Transport

10.1 Policy 9 of the UDP states that planning applications will be assessed for their
transport impact, including cumulative impacts on highway safety, on the
environment and road network and on all transport modes.

10.2 The development does not propose any car parking and with the application site
enjoying a PTAL of 6b a Car Free development is considered to be appropriate.

10.3 However, the applicant has also identified that, given the nature of the proposed
operation; it is likely that there would be a higher number of disabled visitors to
the site than would typically be found at a B1 premises of this size. To
accommodate this it is proposed to provide 6 disabled on-street bays on Oval
Way in the vicinity of the main entrance with a further 'parking/loading' bay
indicated on Vauxhall Street adjacent to a proposed secondary access. These
works would be carried out through a Section 278 Agreement. Given the
presence of a contra-flow cycle lane along Vauxhall Street, this element of the
scheme is not supported by Transport officers due to concerns over conflicts
between cyclists and vehicles.
10.4 Nevertheless, the 6 disabled bays on Oval Way may be acceptable subject to further detailed design and in this regard a condition is recommended requiring the applicant to submit full details for approval of all proposed works to the highway prior to commencement of the development and subsequently to complete these works prior to occupation.

10.5 To facilitate the development, various works to the highway would be undertaken including the removal of the existing bellmouth vehicular crossover on Oval Way, the setting back of the building line along Oval Way in order to provide a widened footway and the removal of 2 crossovers on Vauxhall Street. Conditions are recommended which require the submission of full details of this work to be undertaken for approval prior to commencement of the development and completed prior to its occupation. Contributions towards the cost of the works to the cycle route on Vauxhall Street have also been secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement.

10.6 The level of cycle parking proposed at the site is considered to be acceptable by Transport officers and the provision of changing and shower facilities is welcomed. However, officers consider it pertinent to place a condition on the permission requiring the applicant to provide further details such as manufacturer’s specifications and access arrangements.

10.7 The applicant has undertaken an analysis of the likely trip generation of the site following the proposed development. Transport officers are satisfied that this demonstrates that there would not be any unacceptable impact on the operation of the surrounding public highway network. A total of 136 and 114 trips are predicted in the AM and PM peaks respectively with the majority of these made on foot which is considered to be acceptable.

10.8 In respect of servicing the applicant has stated that the building will be a managed property with a full time dedicated building manager. Deliveries will be made at prearranged times outside of, what would be considered to be normal working hours, and therefore use of the disabled spaces on Oval Way will be available for use as a loading bay which would therefore negate the necessity of the Vauxhall Street loading bay and subsequent traversing of the cycle route. Transport officers are of the view that this approach is acceptable.

11 Crime Prevention / Community Safety

11.1 Policy 32 of the UDP requires that development should enhance community safety. These policies state that development will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder.

11.2 The applicant entered into pre-application discussions and concerns raised by community safety officers have been addressed within the current application including the following measures:

- The provision of street furniture to prevent ram raiding;
- The installation of secure fire exits;
- The installation of active CCTV;
- The installation of toughened safety glass to all ground and first floor windows;
- Locating reception area so as to provide surveillance of entrance and communal areas;
- The provision of locked, non visible bin stores;
- Internal drainage on extension to prevent climbing of external fixtures;
- The provision of cycle storage with surveillance and
- The installation of a security gate to the base of the external fire escape stairs.

11.3 Subject to all of these measures being implemented, officers consider that the proposed development would not create any additional opportunities for crime to be committed and would not diminish public safety. In order to ensure all of these measures are implemented as set out within section 6.3 of the Design and Access Statement, a condition is attached. A condition is also attached requiring the submission of ongoing Crime Management & Maintenance plan in order to demonstrate how the development will continue to address Policy 32 of the UDP.

12 Safety Concerns related to Kennington Gas Holders

12.1 The application site lies in close proximity to the Kennington Gas Holders and as such this necessitates the consultation of the Health and Safety Executive. The HSE were consulted on the application and the application has been assessed against their statutory consultation methodology Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI).

12.2 HSE advice on development within the inner zone adjacent to a hazardous installation is dictated by their PADHI system (Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations). The PADHI methodology indicates either AA (advise against) or DAA (don’t advise against) through a matrix based on the type of development and the zone in which it is located. In this case the type of building being proposed represents a workplace providing for 100 or more occupants and with 3 or more occupied storeys in height (DT1.1 x1) which indicates a risk level of 2 whilst the location of the application site is defined as being within the inner zone. Using the matrix set out within the PADHI methodology, this indicates that the HSE would advise against development.

12.3 However, there is exemption for extensions to existing buildings where that building would stay in the same use class and would not increase the number of employees by more than 10% (Rule 4). In this case the applicant has agreed to limit the number of additional employees to be employed on site so as to meet the requirements of the PADHI system and address any concerns in relation to health and safety of future occupiers of the building. The number of proposed employees has been revised to 330 (down from 350) and as a result the relative increase in employment on site would meet the exemptions set out within Rule 4 of the PADHI and the result would be the reduction in one level of the risk level attached to the matrix. The result of this would be that the matrix would change to produce a DAA indicating that the HSE would not advise against development.
12.4 Even with the reduction in employment offered by the site, the scheme is still considered to be fully policy compliant by officers.

12.5 The proposed café and conference facilities at ground floor level would operate as ancillary to facilities within the development. HSE PADHI guidelines identify the Social Justice Centre as development type 1.1, ‘workplaces’. In identifying development type 1.1, the guidelines are set out on the premise that members of the public will not be present or will be present in small numbers and for a short time at the building. Due to the ancillary nature of the café and conference facilities it is considered that they would not generate any stand alone trip generation and it is likely, given the scale of both facilities, that the number of visitors using them would not be so significant as to materially alter the definition of the development as identified within HSE guidelines. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that the number of visitors and the nature of their visits does not fundamentally alter the function of the building in the context of the HSE guidelines, a condition is attached requiring the submission of a visitor management plan.

13 Planning Obligations

13.1 The development proposed has been assessed using the Section 106 toolkit and contributions are sought for the following:

- Parks / Open spaces / Trees - £3768
- Highways improvements (Cycle Route) - £5000
- Libraries - £553
- Sports and Leisure - £2062
- Local training in Construction - £6500
- General Employment & Training Contributions - £6619
- Revenue Contributions - £377
- S106 monitoring and programme costs - £344
- Travel Plan Monitoring - £1000

13.2 In all the development will secure a total of £28223 in contributions. In addition to the contributions set out above, one construction nominee trainee placement per 10 construction workers will be employed on site during the building of the scheme as part of the Section 106 Agreement.

13.3 Whilst financial contributions were originally sought towards public art, the applicant has agreed to provide an on-site public art installation which would reflect the ethos of the Social Justice Centre. Officers are of the view that the provision of such an installation, subject to approval of the scale and location, would mitigate the need for a financial contribution. A condition is recommended which requires the submission of details for a public art installation to be installed prior to the first occupation of the building.

13.4 The application is also liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at a rate of £35 per square metre of additional floorspace. Due to the 1845 square metres of additional floorspace created, the development would be liable to pay a contribution of £64575.
14 Flood Risk

14.1 The application site lies within a designated Environment Agency Flood Zone. The applicant has therefore submitted Flood Risk Assessment which has been viewed by the Environment Agency who have no objections to the proposed development.

15 Sustainability

15.1 The applicant has submitted a sustainability assessment in support of the application. The document states that the retained building on site will be fitted with new thermally efficient windows and roof glazing. Two heat pumps with a twin circuit configuration will also be installed within the development to provide four independent energy sources. In order to ensure that this achieves a level of 20% for renewable energy sources, a condition is attached requiring the submission of full details to demonstrate how this will be achieved.

15.2 A condition is attached requiring details of the renewable energy technologies to be used to ensure an appropriate level energy can be provided by renewable and that any associated external changes required for these technologies would have an appropriate impact on the appearance of the building and the amenity of the surrounding area.

15.3 A condition is also attached requiring the development to achieve a minimum standard of BREEAM ‘very good’.

16 Waste, Refuse and Recycling

16.1 Whilst a waste management strategy has been submitted, this does not explicitly set out the location and amount of facilities to be provided. With this in mind, a condition is attached requiring the submission of details to show the amount and location of these facilities.

17 Conclusion

17.1 Upon full assessment of the submitted material supporting the application, officers consider that the objectives of relevant policies of the Council’s Core Strategy (2011) and Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011 have been met.

18 Recommendation

18.1 Grant conditional planning permission subject to Section 106 Agreement

19 Summary of the Reasons

19.1 In deciding to grant planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of
these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions listed below. In reaching this decision the following policies were relevant:

Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011):

- Policy S1 – Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S3 – Economic Development
- Policy S4 – Transport
- Policy S6 – Flood Risk
- Policy S7 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S8 – Sustainable Waste Management
- Policy S9 – Quality of the Built Environment
- Policy S10 – Planning Obligations


- Policy 7 – Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 – Transport Impact
- Policy 14 – Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 21 – Location and Loss of Offices
- Policy 23 – Protection and Location of other Employment Uses
- Policy 31 – Streets, Character and Layout
- Policy 32 – Community Safety/Designing out Crime
- Policy 33 – Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 36 – Alterations and Extensions
- Policy 39 – Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design

20 Conditions

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, further details, of all external materials, including samples where appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In order to ensure that the building has an acceptable external appearance (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

4 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, detailed external construction drawings at a scale of 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the building has an acceptable external appearance (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

5 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, a privacy screen shall be installed on the southern edge of the roof terrace at first floor level to the south of the building. The privacy screen shall be of a height of at least 1.8 metres and details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the building has an acceptable external appearance (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

6 No development shall take place until details of the following works to the highway have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Proposed on-street disabled parking bays on Oval Way;
- Removal of bellmouth on Oval Way and reinstatement of footway;
- Removal of redundant crossovers on Vauxhall Street;
- Widened footway along Oval Way frontage.

The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation (Policy 9 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

7 Prior to the occupation of the building, hereby approved, details of the provision to be made for cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use.
8 A travel plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the building, hereby approved, and shall be so maintained for the duration of its use, unless the prior written approval of the local planning authority is obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that the travel arrangements to the (a) are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements (Policy 9 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

9 A detailed management plan demonstrating how the ongoing operation of the building will minimise opportunities for crime shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the building, hereby approved, and shall be so maintained for the duration of its use.

Reason: To ensure that the day to day operation of the building does not create opportunities for crime (Policy 32 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

10 All of the measures set out within Section 6.3 of the Design and Access Statement received on 04/12/2012 shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the building hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the day to day operation of the building does not create opportunities for crime (Policy 32 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

11 The development, hereby permitted, shall operate in compliance with the construction management plan (received 04/12/12).

Reason: To ensure the construction of the development does not harm the operation of the highway (Policy 9 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

12 The development hereby approved shall be built to a minimum standard of BREEAM 'very good'. Prior to the occupation of the approved building, a copy of the Post Construction Certificate verifying that BREEAM 'very good' has been achieved shall be submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development in accordance with Council Policy S7 of the Core Strategy (2011)
13 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, an operational management plan to demonstrate the day to day operation of the premises including opening hours of all facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the building. The building shall thereafter operate in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the day to day use of the building does not conflict with any surrounding land uses or harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents (Policy 7 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

14 All roof terraces on the building shall not be used outside the hours of 10am – 7pm Monday to Friday and not at weekends. There shall also be no amplified music on the terraces at any time.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents (Policy 7 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

15 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, full details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the building. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with approved details.


16 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, full details of all a CCTV scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the building. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with approved details.


17 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, details of a public art installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing, the installation shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and prior to the first occupation of the building.

Reason: To ensure that the location and scale of the public art installation is acceptable (Policy 33 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

18 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, a management plan to demonstrate how the operation of both the café and conference facility will be managed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local
Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the building.

Reason: To ensure that the operation of the café and conference facility remains ancillary to the main building and does not create any land use conflicts (Policy 7 and 23 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Core Strategy: January 2011).

19 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, full details to demonstrate how 20% of energy demand will be satisfied by renewable energy sources shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development in accordance with Council Policy S7 of the Core Strategy (2011)

20 Notwithstanding the details of the application, hereby approved, a visitor management plan to demonstrate the number, regularity and the organisation of visitors to the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the building. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the function of the building does not conflict with the requirements of the HSE PADHI methodology.

17 Informatives

1 This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Highways team prior to the commencement of construction on 020 7926 9000 in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffolding, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections, Hoarding, Excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licences etc.

3 Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council's Building Control Officer.

4 The applicant is advised that in order to satisfy HSE guidelines regarding the adjacent hazardous installation, no more than 330 people shall be employed on the site.
For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
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Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>22.02.2013</td>
<td>25.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.01.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services (Noise &amp; Pollution)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>08.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>05.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Green Spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>05.01.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBL Crime Prevention Unit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.01.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboricultural Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>08.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Consulting (Sustainability )</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>09.01.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>07.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Team (s106)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14.02.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage –Archaeology</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18.12.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.12.2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Transport Buses</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Carr Gardens Tenants Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Common Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehill Mansions Residents Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanthorpe Triangle Residents Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Village Community Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Unigate Wood (FuW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.12.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Documents
Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)
1.0 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The main issues arising from this proposal are:

- The principle of change of use from warehousing and distribution with ancillary offices (Use Class B8) and the redevelopment of the site to provide new housing (Use Class C3);
- The quantum of development in terms of density;
- The dwelling mix and level of affordable housing proposed;
- The standard of proposed residential accommodation;
- The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The design of the proposal and its impact upon surrounding townscape and heritage assets;
- The impact on local ecological assets;
- Sustainability and renewable energy issues;
- The highways and parking implications of the proposal;
- Whether the development would incorporate sufficient measures to reduce the opportunity for crime;
- Waste storage and collection and;
- Planning obligations/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

2.0 Site Description

2.1 The application site is located on the east side of Valley Road, between its junctions with Namba Roy Close to the south and South Oak Road to the north. Immediately to the north of the site is the Valley Road Playing Field and a purpose-equipped play area and, a terrace of semi-detached two storey residential properties fronting onto Valley Road; to the east and south are terraces of two and three storey residential properties that comprise Namba Roy Close and Samuel Johnson Close; and to west on the opposite side of Valley Road, is Sunnyhill Primary School and a further terrace of semi-detached two storey residential properties.

2.2 The area surrounding the site is predominantly residential in nature with the exception of Sunnyhill Road Primary School. There is also a convenience store near the site, at the junction of Valley Road with Well Close and a Doctor's Surgery in Namba Roy Close. The primary commercial area is on Streatham High Road, which is located some 700-800m away to the west of the site. The majority of residential properties in the area are period semi-detached or terraced dwellings of varied architectural style although there are contemporary flat blocks including the Barratt Homes development to the north on Curtis Field Road, opposite the Playing Fields and the Council owned housing stock in South Oak Road and Namba Roy Close.

2.3 The site, which covers an area of approximately 0.7ha, is situated on rising ground with land levels rising significantly from west to east to the extent that the adjoining land along the eastern boundary of the site is approximately a storey above ground levels within the site. South Oak Road and Namba Roy Close gradually rise eastwards and, as the buildings within the site are on levelled ground they are enclosed by retaining walls on the eastern and
2.4 The site contains a series of single storey industrial buildings together with extensive hard-surfaced areas of car parking and/or loading. The buildings sit hard against the boundaries of the site to the north, east and west with the car parking/loading areas located in the northwest corner of the site, at the junction of South Oak Road and Valley Road and to the south adjacent to the boundary of the site with Namba Roy Close. A line of trees frame the Valley Road boundary of the site, behind Weld mesh fencing.

2.5 Access onto the site is obtained from both Valley Road and South Oak Road via gated entrances. The site has poor access to public transport, with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 1b. There is one bus route operating on Valley Road although other bus routes operate within walking distance of the site on Streatham Common North, Leigham Court Road and Streatham High Road. Streatham Hill Railway Station is located approximately 1.4km to the northwest of the site and Streatham Railway Station is some 1.2km to the southwest. The application site and surrounding streets in the area are not included within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) with parking restriction limited to yellow lines at road junctions.

2.6 The site lies within the vicinity of Unigate Wood, located to the east and southeast of Namba Roy Close and north of Well Close. Unigate Wood is a designated Borough Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC 20) under the adopted Local Development Framework Proposals Map. The site is also identified as a Major Development Opportunity area (MDO 74 - Unigate Depot 129 Valley Road) under the site specific policies of the Unitary Development Plan (2007). The MDO designation seeks redevelopment of the site that would create street frontage to Valley Road and make improvements to the Unigate Open Space.

2.7 The site does not lie within a designated Conservation Area but is located within the setting of the main Sunnyhill Primary School building, which is Grade II Listed.

2.8 The site has a historic use as a depot providing warehousing, cold storage and ancillary offices for the storage and distribution of milk products by Dairy Crest (Use Class B8). The premises ceased trading in September 2011 and have remained vacant since then.

3.0 Planning History

3.1 The site was subject of two planning applications in 2004/2005 proposing change of use of part of the site from storage (Class B8) to carwash (Class Sui Generis) and MOT service station [Class B2] (Refs. 04/00110/FUL and 05/01348/FUL). Both of these applications were withdrawn by the applicant.

3.2 In May 2008 the Council refused planning permission for “demolition of existing stores and erection of single storey office and storage buildings in the north eastern corner of the site, rearrangement of the on-site car parking, including use of part of car parking area for open air storage, new vehicular crossover on to South Oak Road and alterations to existing boundary treatment” (ref
08/00876/FUL). The application was refused on the following grounds:

- Intensification of the storage/distribution use of the site on a part of the site previously used for car parking, resulting in unacceptable impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties in terms of increased noise, nuisance, pollution and disturbance.
- Loss of existing employment generating floorspace without evidence being provided demonstrating that no effective demand exists, or is likely to exist in the future for the continued use site for employment generating purposes.
- Failure to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the safety and function of the highway.
- Adverse impact on the streetscene as a result of the open storage nature of the proposal.

3.3 In December 2009 an application for the sub-division and change of use of north western corner of the site to provide vehicle hire premises involving the erection of a single storey building, the installation of a wash-bay canopy and palisade fencing with gates around the site was refused planning permission (ref. 09/03052/FUL). Officers considered the proposed single-storey prefabricated building and valet canopy as well as the palisade fencing to be visually discordant in the streetscene by virtue of their siting, design and size. An associated advertisement consent application for the display of illuminated signage was withdrawn (10/03793/ADV).

4.0 Current Proposal

4.1 This application seeks planning permission for demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 58 residential units comprising 18 dwellinghouses and 40 flats with provision for 65 off-street car parking spaces as well as private and communal amenity space.

4.2 The houses would consist of terraces of two storey buildings with roof level accommodation, fronting onto both Valley Road and South Oak Road. The flats would be contained in two blocks: a four storey block with the third floor contained within a pitched roof, located along the southern perimeter of the site and fronting onto Valley Road (Block B); and a four storey block with a pitched roof, located in the north-eastern corner of the site and fronting onto South Oak Road (Block A).

4.3 The buildings within the development would be laid out in a perimeter block, with the terraced houses handed and paired in plan, taking up most of the street frontages on Valley Road and South Oak Road and the Flat blocks bookending the development on the northeast and south perimeters of the site. The development would be set back from the street frontages with short front gardens behind low brick walls, providing a break between the private and public realm.

4.4 The terraced housing would address the street with recessed door entrances and two storey paired bays containing window openings, which terminate in triangular gable roof dormers within high pitched roofs. The flat blocks would also address the street with Flat block A presenting its short elevation to South
Oak Road and Flat block B presenting its short elevation to Valley Road. The front elevations to the flat blocks would contain communal entrances, vertically accentuated windows with inset balconies to Flat block B and projecting balconies to block A.

4.5 Flat block B would terminate in a high pitched roof containing habitable space with the triangular gable roof dormer of the terraced houses continued whilst Flat block A would terminate in an unadorned pitched roof. The buildings within the development would be of a predominantly red brick finish with lighter colour brickwork and opaque panels. The roof slopes and flat roof areas within the development, except those facing onto the street in Valley Road and South Oak Road, would host photovoltaic panels for renewable energy capture.

4.6 All the houses would be 4 bedroom dwellings, laid out with kitchens and living rooms at ground floor level and bedrooms/bathrooms on the upper floors. Each dwellinghouse would have a sizeable lawn rear garden and a short front garden. Storage provision for refuse and recycling is proposed in the front garden, in wheelie bins set behind the front boundary wall and adjacent to the street door entrances.

4.7 The flat blocks would contain a range of 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom dwellings with open plan kitchen/living areas. Flat block A would have a total of 16 residential units comprising 3 x1bed units; 1 x2bed unit and 12 x3bed units and Flat block B would have 24 residential units, all being 2 bedroom dwellings. Each of the flats on the upper floors would have private amenity space in the form of balconies. Storage for refuse and recycling would be in Euro bins contained within the fabric of the building at ground level. The flats would be accessed via a communal street entrance to each block with access to the upper floor flats gained via lift/staircase cores.

4.8 In addition to the private gardens and balconies noted above, the development would have a communal amenity space of over 480sqm, located to the rear of the terraces and adjacent to flat block A. The communal amenity area would be landscaped and, would incorporate play features and/or equipment for children. The amenity space provision would be part of a landscaping scheme that would include perimeter defensible planting and tree planting, lawn private gardens with terraced sections and boundary treatment to the play areas, parking areas and between the individual dwellinghouses.

4.9 The development would be gated and accessible to residents only. It would be accessible to pedestrians from both Valley Road and South Oak Road via front door entrances to the dwellinghouses and via communal entrances to the Flat blocks with paved footpaths to communal areas. Vehicular access into the site would only be from South Oak Road via two gated entrances, one leading to the under-croft car parking spaces underneath Flat block A and the other to the surface car parking adjacent to the communal play area as well as under-croft car parking located underneath Flat block B.

4.10 The car parking proposal includes 65 parking bays, 6 of which would be designated as disabled/wheelchair parking spaces. The applicant also proposes to pay membership for all residents to a City Car Club (Zipcar), which operates
vehicles from bays located within close proximity to the site. A total of 88 cycle parking spaces is proposed with each of the 18 houses having two spaces within secure stores in their rear gardens, and the remaining 52 spaces being provided in a mixture of Sheffield stands and wall hung racks situated in storage rooms within each flat blocks at ground floor level.

4.11 The application proposes to offer 23 affordable dwellings of which 16 would be for affordable rent tenure and 7 for intermediate housing tenure, with the remaining 35 dwellings scheduled for market sale. This equates to 40% of the proposed dwellings being affordable housing with 70:30 ratio of affordable rent to intermediate housing. All the 18 x4 bedroom townhouses and 17x2 bedroom flats are proposed to be for market housing (a total of 35 dwellings) with 12 x3 bedroom, 1x2 bedroom and 3 x1 bedroom for affordable rent (a total of 16 dwellings) and the rest comprising 7 x2 bedroom dwelling being offered for intermediate housing. The tenure split is illustrated in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>1Bed</th>
<th>2Bed</th>
<th>3Bed</th>
<th>4Bed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ownership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Consultations and Responses

5.1 Consultation letters were sent to 1019 adjacent addresses in Valley Road, South Oak Road, Namba Roy Close, Spa Court - Well Close, Samuel Jackson Close, James Boswell Close, Well Close, Francis Barber Close, Curtis Field Road, Wellfield Road, Sunnyhill Road, Gleneldon Road and Harborough Road. A comprehensive list of the neighbouring properties consulted is held on the planning file.

5.2 Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site on the 7th December 2012 and a Press Notice was published in the Weekender Press on 28th December 2012.

Internal consultation

5.3 The Council’s Policy officer has not made comment on the application but advised during pre-application consultations on the relevant policy considerations including the marketing evidence required to justify the loss of existing employment floorspace outside Key Industrial and Business Areas (KIBA) and the density of proposed development. These matters are discussed in detail in the Land Use section of this report.

5.4 The Council’s Urban Design officer has been involved in all pre-application discussions and considers the design approach to respond well to constraints and context of the site in terms of the layout, scale, massing and appearance of the scheme. The four storey block on Valley Road including roof level accommodation would be in keeping with the scale and massing of the adjacent 3-4 storey building at Nos. 1-9 Namba Close; the four storey block on South
Oak Road takes advantage of the rising gradient of the land from west to east and as such would not be out of scale with the adjacent housing development in South Oak Road and; the two storey terrace with roof level accommodation fronting Valley Road constitutes an acceptable contemporary interpretation of the existing Victorian terraced housing in the area. Conditions are recommended to secure further details on materials, boundary treatment, soft and hard landscaping, windows, balconies, canopies terraces and doors.

5.5 The Council’s Social Housing Liaison Officer has held pre-submission discussions with the applicant and has advised that affordable housing tenure and dwelling mix meet the requirements of relevant housing and planning policies.

5.6 The Council’s Highways and Transportation officer has advised that the level of traffic generation associated with the development would not have a detrimental impact on the safe operation of the surrounding local highway network. Proposed improvements to South Oak Road including kerb build outs at the junction with Valley Road to improve visibility and, additional waiting restrictions on Valley Road in the vicinity of the site would be necessary, to prevent parking on the eastern side of Valley Road adjacent to the site. These measures will be secured by condition and/or S278 or S106 agreements. Following discussions with officers, the number of car parking spaces proposed has been reduced from 75 to 65, which is welcomed. However, Transport officers still consider the level of off-street parking proposed excessive. A detailed assessment of the transport implications of the scheme is contained in the traffic and parking section of the report.

5.7 The Council’s Regulatory Services (Noise & Pollution) team has no objection to the proposal and recommends conditions to secure compliance with internal noise standards for residential properties (BS 8233:1999). In relation to potential contamination of the site, the officers have reviewed the submitted Geo-Environment Site Assessment and consider it competent. Conditions requiring site remediation investigations are attached.

5.8 The Council’s Design out Crime officer has recommended that the development should be constructed in accordance with the physical protection measures of the Secure by Design/New Homes 2010 guidelines in relation to cycle and bin storage provision, any external lighting and to all doors and windows. Conditions to secure these provisions are attached.

5.9 The Council’s Streetcare Team has not responded to consultations to date. Provisions have been made for recycling and refuse storage within the fabric of the flat blocks and in individual bins for the terraced houses. Refuse collection would be required by condition of consent to comply with the Council’s adopted Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (May 2006). Details of a waste management plan are also reserved by condition.

5.10 The Council’s Parks Projects officer has reviewed the applicant’s Ecological Report and concurs with its findings but recommends further site investigations to ensure that no protected wildlife specifies, which might be present on the site.
would be adversely affected by the development as well as the submission of
details of measures to improve the ecological and landscape value of the site.
These are to be secured by condition. It is also recommended that part of the
s106 financial contributions for “Parks and Open Space” and “Sports and
Leisure” are ring-fenced and used for improvements to the adjacent Valley
Road Playing Field and Unigate Wood. The requisite improvement works are
detailed in the Landscaping and Biodiversity section of this report.

5.11 The Council’s Arboricultural officer considers the removal of the existing
trees on the site to make way for the development acceptable. New trees are to
be planted in accordance with details to be submitted and approved prior to
commencement of development or otherwise as required by other conditions of
consent.

5.12 The Council’s Sustainability consultant is satisfied with the application’s
proposed measures for minimising carbon dioxide emissions and energy
demand including sustainable design and construction measures and renewable
technologies. Compliance is to be secured by way of conditions.

5.13 The Implementation team has advised on planning obligations to be secured in
order to comply with the requirements of the development planning policies and
the Council’s SPD on Planning Obligations and to mitigate the potential impact
of the development on the environment and local infrastructure.

5.14 The Council’s legal officer has been consulted and has raised no concerns
over the proposal

External consultation

5.15 Natural England has advised that the proposal does not appear to affect any
statutorily protected sites or landscapes or have significant impacts on
conservation of soils but advises that bats might be present on the site. The
applicant’s Ecological Assessment found no presence of bats on the site; it is
recommended that measures to improve foraging opportunities for bats in the
area are included within a landscaping scheme.

5.16 Thames Water has raised no objection to the application in relation to the
sewerage and the water infrastructure and, recommends informatives in relation
to surface water drainage and water pressure requirements.

5.17 The Environment Agency has offered no formal comment on this proposal; the
site is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 and as such poses no risk of flooding.

5.18 English Heritage do not consider that the proposal would adversely affect the
setting of the adjacent Grade II listed Sunnyhill Primary School building. However,
they have expressed regret for the proposed loss of the existing
buildings on the site and, encourage the Council to consider the dairy as a non-
designated heritage asset. To this end it is recommended that an
archaeological/historic recording of the existing buildings is undertaken prior to
demolition of the buildings and the findings deposited with the Council’s local
history archive and the Greater London Historic Environment Record.
5.19 **Sport England** were consulted but declined to comment on this application.

5.20 **London Transport Buses** were consulted but at the time of writing had not responded.

Local Amenity Groups

5.21 **The Friends of Unigate Wood (FuW)** Vice-chair wrote in support of the proposal and requests that the developer contributions under the S106 obligations be allocated for improvements to the Valley Road Playing Field and the Unigate Wood. It is suggested that the former pavilion building on the playing field, which burnt down some 20 years ago, should be replaced with a new pavilion building to serve local sports groups and provide a venue for local meetings. A financial contribution should also be sought towards funding the provision of dog-waste bins at the entrances as well as signage illustrating existing wildlife in Unigate Wood.

5.22 **Streatham Wells Safer Neighbourhood Panel chair** has written in support of local residents’ concern over the lack of and need for sports and community facilities for young people in the area. Local residents requested that the applicant provides or makes a contribution towards the provision of a community hall and children’s outdoor play area for use by the local community via section 106 Obligations. In addition, it is proposed that any contributions towards public realm works should include improvements to footways to and from the site.

5.23 The following Amenity Groups, who are formally registered with the Local Planning Authority as local interest groups, were notified of the application but at the time of writing had not responded: The Albert Carr Gardens Tenants Association, the Streatham Common Advisory Committee, the Stanthorpe Road Proprietors and Residents Association, the Stanthorpe Triangle Association and the Streatham Village Community Association.

5.24 All the Streatham Wells Ward Councillors were notified of the application. Councillor Alex Davies met with officers and made representations for local residents in respect of the s106 contributions to community facilities including a community hall and outdoor play facilities that could be secured from the development proposal.

5.25 11 letters of objection from local residents were received during the consultation process. The objections raised and officers’ response to them, are set out in the table below.

5.26 Further consultations were undertaken on 15 February 2013 following Transport officers’ recommendation to reduce the level of car parking provision on site. Any new issues of concern raised by the revised proposal will be reported by way of an addendum to this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objections:**

Proposed high density of development would exacerbate existing traffic problems on Valley Road.

**Officers’ Response:**

It is acknowledged that the proposed density of development is high having regard to the poor public transport accessibility of the site and that Valley Road suffers a high volume of extraneous traffic. However, whereas the local development plan suggests that high density residential schemes should be located in areas of good or very good public transport accessibility, the primary consideration in determining the appropriate density and scale of new residential development is whether a proposal achieves an appropriate urban design that makes efficient use land. The proposed density of development meets these policy requirements, which are weighted against the broader regeneration of the scheme including the provision of new housing. A detailed analysis of the proposed quantum of development is set out in paragraphs 7.16-7.23 of this report.

With regard to traffic problems in Valley Road, Transport officers have reviewed the applicant’s Transport Statement (TS) and are satisfied that the level of traffic generated as a result of this development would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding highway network. Paragraphs 10.14-10.20 of this report contain a reasoned justification for this conclusion.

The proposed 75 car parking spaces are not adequate for a development of 58 dwellings and would lead to overspill parking on Valley Road.

The level of car parking proposed has been reduced to 65 because transport officers considered the original proposal of 75 spaces excessive. Transport officers have calculated that the proposed development would generate around 33 vehicles whilst the applicant’s TS suggests that the scheme could generate around 50 vehicles. This would suggest that a large number of the proposed car parking spaces would be left unused. The Council’s development plan positively encourages the use of alternative and more sustainable means of transport and has a presumption against development that would encourage a reliance on the private car. A high level of car parking provision would be contrary to these policy provisions. The proposed level of car parking is considered to strike a reasonable balance between the need to provide sufficient off-street car parking so that the development does not cause additional parking stress on surrounding roads, having regard to the poor public transport accessibility of the site and the requirement to uphold stated Council policy that seeks to encourage a choice of alternative
means of travel rather than a reliance on the use of the private car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposed location of the vehicular access on South Oak Road and ‘build out’s at the junction with Valley Road would lead to loss of existing car parking spaces on this road.</th>
<th>South Oak Road is a private housing estate road and is not part of the Local Highway Authority road network. The existing parking is informal and will be displaced by the proposed road works with the consent of the owner of the road. The proposed removal of existing access points onto the site from Valley Road together with the implementation of new waiting restrictions, which would prevent car parking on the eastern side of Valley Road, would improve traffic flows and safety on Valley Road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal would place additional pressure on school places in the local area and on other facilities.</td>
<td>In order to mitigate the environmental and social impacts of the development on the local area, the Council would secure financial contributions towards primary and secondary school provision in the borough as well as contributions to health, libraries, sport and leisure and parks and open spaces. The details of the planning obligations arising out of the proposed development are outlined in section 13 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed buildings are not in keeping with the existing large Victorian houses in the area and appear ultramodern and cramped, and as such would devalue existing properties.</td>
<td>As noted at paragraph 5.4 of this report, the design and scale of the development has evolved out of detailed discussions with the Council’s Design and Conservation Officers. The proposal takes its design cue from the varied architectural styles in the area including the Victorian terraces in Valley Road and the flat blocks in the surrounding area. The proposed terraces houses are a contemporary interpretation of the Victorian properties that characterise this part of Valley Road and the flat blocks are well articulated and respond to their immediate context. The perimeter block layout with street frontages to both Valley Road and South Oak Road and private and communal amenity space to the rear contains sufficient gaps and spaces between buildings and as such would not appear cramped. Overall, it is considered that the development presents an acceptable quality of design that would enhance the appearance of the area. A detailed assessment of the design for each site is provided in Section 9 of this report. The impact of the development on the value of neighbouring properties is not a material planning consideration in this case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A potentially lengthy construction process would cause noise and dirt and pollution and disruption and as such would devalue existing properties. No provision</td>
<td>Construction of the development should not endanger conditions of the highway or cause inconvenience to drivers and/or pedestrian using the highway. In order therefore to ensure minimum disturbance or nuisance to local residents and to avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway it is recommended that a condition of this consent be the submission of a Construction Management Plan. The Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been made for the parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles. Residents would not be able to park outside their properties.</td>
<td>would include details regarding the hours of construction; parking, deliveries and storage (including details of the routing if delivery vehicles to and from the site and the accommodation of all site operatives’, visitors’ and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site during the construction period); dust mitigation measures and; measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the development on the value of neighbouring properties is not a material planning consideration in this case.</td>
<td>The proposal would bring no benefit to the local community. The scheme should include local shops and should be used to improve the existing playing field on South Oak Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The details of the planning obligations arising out of the proposed development are outlined in section 13 of this report. In particular It is proposed to secure financial contributions towards improvement works to the adjacent Valley Road Playing field and Unigate Wood as well the erection of bespoke railings as a form of public art to the Valley Road boundary of Sunnyhill Primary School and on Unigate Wood. It is also recommended that part of the S106 Obligations funds should be ring-fenced to fund the construction of a pavilion building on the playing field or the provision of a new or the refurbishment of an existing community facility in the area.</td>
<td>The construction process would be likely to cause damage to neighbouring properties as a result of excavation and demolition works and the movement of construction vehicles. The developer should undertake to survey the condition of neighbouring building to ensure damage caused during construction is made good at cost to the developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.0 Planning Policy Considerations

#### National Guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is
the London Plan (July 2011), the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy (January 2011)’.

6.2 Other material considerations include national, regional and local planning policy documents and guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6.3 Central Government guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was published on the 27th March 2012. This replaced all Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) that preceded it and, sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

6.4 The NPPF reinforces the Development Plan led system and, does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF must now be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and, is a material consideration in planning decisions.

6.5 It should be noted that the NPPF requires local planning authorities to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development when assessing and determining development proposals.

The London Plan 2011

6.6 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaced the previous versions, which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008. The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London; it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years and, forms part of the development plan for Greater London.

6.7 All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies. Given the recent adoption of the Council’s Core Strategy, the policies contained therein and those remaining in the UDP are in general conformity with the London Plan. Therefore, for the purposes of this report, reference to the London Plan policies will only be made where there is conflict or where it is necessary and/or appropriate to do so.

6.8 The key policies of the London Plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
- Policy 2.9 Inner London
- Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
- Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
- Policy 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
- Policy 3.6 Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation Facilities
- Policy 3.8 Housing Choice
• Policy 3.9 Mixed and Balanced Communities
• Policy 3.10 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 4.4 Managing Industrial Land and Premises
• Policy 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
• Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
• Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
• Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy
• Policy 5.11 Green Roofs and Development Site Environs
• Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
• Policy 5.14 Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure
• Policy 5.21 Contaminated Land
• Policy 6.3 Assessing Effect of Development on Transport Capacity
• Policy 6.9 Cycling
• 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 7.6 Architecture
• Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
• Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations
• Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

6.9 The Mayor of London’s Supplementary Planning Guidance – Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (March 2008) is of relevance to the consideration of amenity space provision.


6.10 The following saved UDP policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

• Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity;
• Policy 9 Transport Impact;
• Policy 14 Parking and Traffic Restraint;
• Policy 16 Affordable Housing;
• Policy 23 Protection and Location of Other Employment Uses;
• Policy 31 Streets, Character and Layout;
• Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime;
• Policy 33 Building Scale and Design;
• Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction;
• Policy 38 Design in Existing Residential/Mixed Use Areas;
• Policy 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design;
• Policy 45  Listed Buildings and;
• MDO 74  Unigate Depot 129 Valley Road

Lambeth’s Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)

6.11 The following policies in the Core Strategy are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

  • Policy S1  Delivering the Vision and Objectives
  • Policy S2  Housing
  • Policy S3  Economic Development
  • Policy S4  Transport
  • Policy S5  Open Spaces
  • Policy S7  Sustainable Design and Construction
  • Policy S8  Sustainable Waste Management
  • Policy S9  Quality of the Built Environment
  • Policy S10 Planning Obligations

Local Guidance

6.12 The Council has adopted the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), which are relevant:

  • SPD: Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions
  • SPD: Safer Built Environments
  • SPD: Sustainable Design and Construction
  • SPD: S106 Planning Obligations

6.13 The Council’s ‘Waste & Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (2006) is also relevant to this application.

7.0 Land Use and Principle of Change of Use

7.1 The application relates to a Major Development Opportunity (MDO) site. MDOs are defined as “Site specific proposals for important sites in the Borough where a land use is not normally defined”. Where the land use is not specified the development of the site will be determined having regard to borough-wide considerations including housing development, mixed-use development as well as the need to protect existing uses such as employment or community facilities. MDO policies may nevertheless list key urban design objectives to be achieved on the site.

7.2 In this location, under Saved Unitary Development Plan Policy MDO 74: Unigate Depot 127 Valley Road, the Council seeks the “creation of street frontage to Valley Road” and improvements to Unigate Open Space”. The site is not safeguarded for any specified land use. The application proposes the change of use of the land and buildings on the site from warehousing and storage with ancillary offices (Use Class B8) by redevelopment to provide new housing (Use Class C3).
Loss of Employment Floorspace.

The application site is approximately 0.7ha in size and is occupied by vacant warehousing/storage buildings and an ancillary office building with a total gross internal floor area of 3741sqm. The buildings on site have, until recently, been used for the storage and distribution of milk products by Dairy Crest (Use Class B8). Saved Policy 23 of the UDP (Protection and Location of other Employment Uses) defines employment uses to include all "B Class" uses as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987, comprising Class B1 [Business]; Class B2 [General Industrial] and; Class B8 [Storage and Distribution]. As such the proposal would result in the loss of employment floorspace.

Whereas the Council has a presumption against loss of employment floor space, the existing use of the site for employment purposes is not protected as the site is not situated in a designated Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA). Nevertheless, in order to manage the release of existing employment sites located outside KIBA to non-employment use, Saved Policy 23 (b) of the UDP requires that where land is or has last been in employment use, loss of floorspace (in particular B1 business use floorspace for small businesses) to non-employment use will not be permitted unless the proposal accords with at least one of five cited criteria.

In this case criterion (ii) is particularly relevant as it relates to vacant building/sites. It requires an application for a change of use of a vacant site outside a KIBA to be accompanied by marketing evidence demonstrating that there is no reasonable prospect in the medium term of re-use or redevelopment to modern standards for an environmentally acceptable employment use. Paragraphs 4.11.18 – 4.11.20 within Saved Policy 23 set out the requirements for marketing evidence.

The marketing evidence submitted in support of the application is contained in a report by commercial property agents HB Surveyors and Valuers, dated 26th November 2012. The report states that Dairy Crest ceased using the site in September 2011 as the facilities were surplus to their requirements for the area. Since then the site has remained vacant. The agents have actively marketed the site in its current condition as well as its redevelopment potential to provide new industrial or warehousing development for period of one year, without success. The property was offered for sale through various marketing avenues including on-site marketing boards and the use of a range of web-based marketing resources including the South London Business website and via the EGI Property Link. It was also advertised in commercial property publications including the Estates gazette and the South London Business Press. Direct marketing to agents and industrial/warehousing operators was also undertaken.

The agents received a total of 161 enquiries in response to the marketing of the site with almost all the potential clients seeking to purchase the site for residential redevelopment. Only LofnStore and Big Yellow Storage expressed interest in its storage re-use but discounted it as they considered it unsuitable for their businesses due to the poor condition of the buildings and the location of the site in a residential area with poor access and lack of prominence to
potential customers.

7.8 Consideration was also given to the redevelopment of the site to modern standards for an environmentally acceptable employment use. The applicant instructed chartered surveyors Stiles Harold Williams to review the potential for redevelopment or conversion of the site to provide office accommodation (Use Class B1 (a)). The report analysed the demand for office space in Streatham and the surrounding area, the take up of office space in the area and the potential for refurbishment or redevelopment of the premises for office accommodation.

7.9 The report noted that Streatham is not an established office location and is considered a secondary location in relation to other town centres such as Croydon, which have better location characteristics. The report advises that whilst there has been recent office take up and demand for office accommodation in primary office locations such as Croydon, this has not spilled over into secondary locations such as Streatham. The premises are not considered suited for refurbishment and conversion to offices and as such would require redevelopment. However, the location of the site away from Streatham town centre and in a predominantly residential area with a poor public transport accessibly level, renders the site unattractive and unviable as an office location.

7.10 It should also be noted that the extension or intensification of existing (Class B2/B8) premises in residential areas would not be permitted by the Council where it would exacerbate or create unacceptable servicing problems or harm residential amenity (Saved Policy 23 (a) of the UDP). For these reasons, the Council refused an application for planning permission in May 2008 to extend the premises, which would have resulted in the intensification of the use of the site for storage and distribution purposes to the detriment of residential amenity (ref 08/00876/FUL). As such any redevelopment proposal for Class B2/B8 purposes, which would intensify the established use of the site within this predominantly residential area, would not be permitted. It is unlikely that redevelopment without intensification would be a viable proposal.

7.11 Officers consider the marketing evidence submitted in support of the proposal involving loss of employment floorspace on a site located outside a KIBA to be consistent with the requirements of Saved Policy 23 of the UDP and the Council’s Planning Guidance Note: Marketing of Employment Sites and Premises (September 2008). The premises have been vacant for well over the requisite 12 months marketing period and the evidence submitted shows that an active marketing campaign for continued employment generation use of the premises was undertaken.

7.12 The loss of the site for employment generating purposes must also be weighed against the benefits of the proposed change of use and redevelopment of the site to provide new housing, having regard to the MDO status of the site and the location of the site in a predominantly residential area.

The Principle of Redevelopment for Housing

7.13 The Council’s development plan policies have a presumption in favour of housing development on any site unless it is protected by other land use
policies. Policy MDO 74, which applies to this site, does not specify a land use proposal for it and, given the location of the site in a predominantly residential area, the redevelopment of the site to provide new housing is considered acceptable in land use terms subject to compliance with other development plan policies.

7.14 Core Strategy Policy S2(a) seeks the provision of at least 7,700 net additional dwellings across the borough between 2010/11 and 2016/17 in line with London Plan targets, and a further 8,800 more homes by 2024/25 subject to London Plan targets for that period. Core Strategy Policy S2(c) seeks to secure affordable housing on all sites over 0.1 of a hectare or capable of providing 10 or more units. The proposal would include the requisite level affordable housing and, would contain a mix of dwellings sizes and types to meet the needs of the different sections of the community in accordance with Policy S2 (d) of the Core Strategy.

7.15 The proposal would therefore positively contribute to the annual target for housing delivery within the Borough, as identified by the London Plan and the Lambeth Core Strategy.

The Proposed Density of Development

7.16 Policy 3.4 of the London Plan states that development should optimise housing output taking into account the local context and character, the design principles in Chapter 7 of the London Plan and public transport capacity. Reference is also made to indicative density ranges for different types of locations, which are set out in Table 3.2 of the London Plan.

7.17 Saved UDP Policy 33 states that the primary consideration in determining the appropriate density and scale of new residential development will be achieving an appropriate urban design, which makes efficient use of land and meets the amenity needs of existing and future residents. Proposals for higher densities than that prevalent in the surrounding area will be encouraged in appropriate locations, which include areas of good, very good or exceptional public transport accessibility. Schemes that under-develop a site will be refused. Indicative density ranges for different types of locations in the borough are set out in Table 10 of the UDP.

7.18 Policy S2(g) of the Core Strategy seeks levels of residential density consistent with London Plan guidelines, having regard to the provision of other uses on the site, availability of local services, access to and capacity of public transport, urban design context, quality of design and impact on existing and future residents.

7.19 In all cases, however, development should not unacceptably overbear on surrounding development or harm residential amenity. Residential amenity considerations include whether a development would result in a loss of privacy; whether it would have an acceptable impact on sunlight and daylight; whether it would create overlooking problems; whether it would create an undue sense of enclosure for neighbouring residents and; the whether the development includes a sufficient level of outdoor space.
7.20 In this case, given the poor accessibility of the site to public transport (PTAL rating 1b) and its suburban location, Table 10 of the UDP suggests that densities of 200-250 Habitable Rooms per Hectare (hrh) can be achieved on this site if a design based approach is employed. Table 3.2 of the London Plan is based on dwelling units per hectare and suggests that density range of 35-75 dwelling units per hectare (u/ha). The application proposes a density of 339 habitable rooms per hectare, which exceeds the suggested range in the UDP Table 10 or 79 dwelling units per hectare, which exceeds the range of densities in Table 3.2 of the London Plan.

7.21 However, it must be recognised that the density ranges given in both the London Plan and the UDP are for indicative purposes only and accompanying text in both the London Plan and the UDP is very clear that the existing site context must be considered in applying these ranges. The ranges are based on a design-led approach, which recognises that different densities are appropriate to different contexts and that density for a site should be informed by urban design criteria. Therefore the density standards contained in London Plan and the UDP should be applied with some flexibility.

7.22 The proposal meets the design-led policy constraints to density including the need to optimise housing on a site having regard to local context and character, the quality of design and the impact on existing and future residents. (Policy 3.4 of the London Plan and Policies 33 (c) and (d) of the UDP and S2 (g) of the Core Strategy). The capacity of the existing road network would be able to accommodate the additional operational demand placed upon it by the proposed developed. These matters are outlined in more detail in the sections below relating to the design of the scheme and the transport implications of the development proposal.

7.23 Officers are satisfied that whilst the proposed density exceeds the target density range, the resulting quantum of development, in terms of scale and density, would make optimal use of the site without compromising the residential amenity of existing neighbouring properties or detracting from the character and appearance of the surrounding area, which contains terraced houses and flat blocks in buildings of typically two to three storey and four storey height. It is noted that a larger scale development in buildings of up to 6 storeys in height with a density of 140 dwelling units per hectare (53 self contained flats and 6 houses) was permitted in December 2003 for the nearby Barratt Homes development on Curtis Field Road.

Dwelling Mix and Affordable Housing

7.24 Policy S2 (d) requires the provision of a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures in new residential schemes to meet the needs of different sections of the community. The policy does not prescribe a mix of units; rather it is informed by the priority and strategic housing market needs identified in regular housing assessments undertaken by the Council. The provision also has to have regard to the particular location and nature of the individual development site.

7.25 In this case the proposed dwelling mix of 18 x4 bedroom townhouses; 12 x3 bedroom apartments; 25 x 2 bedroom apartments and, 3 x1 bedroom
apartments would provide an acceptable proportion of family sized units (approximately 52% of proposed total dwellings) on the site suited to 3-5 person households for which there is a continuing demand in the borough.

7.26 Officers consider the proposed dwelling mix acceptable and consistent with the objectives of Policy S2 of the Core Strategy and identified strategic housing needs in the borough.

7.27 Saved Policy 16 of the UDP states that a range of unit sizes of affordable housing should be provided, having regard to local circumstances, site characteristics and the borough's annual Housing Strategy. Core Strategy Policy S2(c) seeks affordable housing on all sites over 0.1 of a hectare or capable of providing 10 or more units, and as such affordable housing is required on this site. The policy requirements are for at least 50% (40% without public subsidy) of units to be affordable with a tenure split of 70% social (affordable) rented and 30% intermediate (shared ownership) housing tenures.

7.28 The application proposes to offer 23 affordable dwellings of which 7 (7 x2bed) would be for intermediate housing tenure and 16 (3 x1bed; 1 x2bed; 12 x3bed) for affordable rent, with the remaining 35 dwellings (17 x2bed; 18 x4bed) scheduled for market sale. This level of provision equates to approximately 40% of the total dwelling units being offered for affordable housing with the tenure split between social (affordable) rent and intermediate(shared ownership) housing equating to a ratio of 70:30 in terms of dwelling units. The proposed affordable housing provision and tenure mix is shown in Table 1 above.

7.29 The Council’s Social Housing Liaison Officer has advised that given the location of the site, the proposed development is well suited for households with young children including those on the housing register. In addition it is noted that although the affordable housing units are provided within the Flat block housing and not the terraced housing, the scheme would provide a good mix of affordable dwelling sizes, particularly those for rent. Family Mosaic who are working in partnership with the Developer on this scheme, consider the amount of family units proposed to be at the optimum level and have no objection to the design or layout of the affordable units.

7.30 In summary, the dwelling mix complies with the wider objectives of policy to create sustainable and mixed communities. The level of affordable housing and the proportion of affordable rent to intermediate housing are consistent with the development plan policy requirements and the objectives of the NPPF. These provisions would need to be secured by way of a Section 106 legal agreement.

8.0 Residential Amenity

8.1 Saved Policies 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy require all development to be of a high design quality that makes efficient use of land and meets the amenity needs of future residents. The Council’s Adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ expands on these policies and advises on requirements such as minimum room sizes and space standards, external amenity space requirements, daylight/sunlight requirements, privacy, spacing
between buildings in relation to outlook, sense of enclosure and lifetimes homes standards.

8.2 Under Saved Policies 7, 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy, development should not unacceptably harm residential amenity. The policies seek to ensure that due consideration is given to protecting neighbouring residents in terms of visual intrusion, overbearing impact, loss of natural light, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance during the assessment of a development proposal.

**Standard of Proposed Accommodation**

8.3 The quality of accommodation of the residential units proposed has been assessed having regard to the size of individual rooms, the floor-to-ceiling height and the overall size of each dwelling. The requirement for each unit to have storage space and sufficient circulation space and layout to allow unimpeded access between habitable rooms has also been taken into account.

8.4 Against these prescribed standards, the overall floor area of each dwelling within the scheme, including the dwellinghouses exceeds the minimum overall unit size requirements (measured as gross internal area- GIA). The dwellings would also meet or exceed the individual minimum room sizes prescribed by the SPD in all cases. The layout of each dwelling would provide appropriately apportioned living space with adequate light, circulation and storage space. In addition each of the units including those with loft level accommodation would achieve a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m.

8.5 The internal floorspace of each dwelling would also meet the standards contained in the draft London Housing Design Guide (2010), which exceed the Council’s SPD floorspace standards. Each typical 1 bedroom/2 person dwelling would have a minimum internal gross floor area of 50sqm in size; a typical 2 bedroom/3 person dwelling: 70sqm; a typical 3 bedroom/5 person dwelling: 86 sqm and; a typical 4 bedroom/5 or more person dwelling: 150sqm. The London Design standards apply to housing schemes, which require funding from the London Homes and Communities Agency.

**Amenity Space/Children’s Play Space**

8.6 Guidance on the appropriate level of amenity space and play space in relation to new residential development is contained within Policy S2 (h) of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 33 and 50 of the UDP and the Council’s SPD on standards for housing development and conversions.

8.7 For new houses the minimum requirement is 30sqm. For new flatted developments, shared amenity space of at least 50sqm is required plus a further 10sqm per flat provided either as a balcony/terrace/private garden or consolidated within the shared amenity space.

8.8 Communal gardens including children’s play space are required to comply with the following standards: (i) receive natural light; (ii) be screened from parking areas; (iii) be easily accessible to all occupants; (iv)be overlooked by habitable rooms to ensure safety and surveillance; and (v) have a landscape, management and maintenance plan. In addition play areas for pre-school and
junior school children should be enclosed either through fencing, railings or other safety features. Appropriate play equipment that complies with current safety standards should be installed.

8.9 Further guidance on the requisite provision is provided in the GLA’s Supplementary Planning Guidance Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (adopted March 2008). This indicates that new residential development generating more than 10 children (as determined by the application of child occupancy assessments) should provide suitable play space as part of the development scheme. It states that provision should be based on 10sqm per child and that the provision should be considered as part of the overall open space provision rather than ‘over and above’ the requirements for private or shared amenity space as set out above.

8.10 The development would provide at least 50sqm of private garden space for each of the townhouses, which exceed the SPD minimum requirement of 30sqm. A front courtyard to each house, measuring 3m x 6m would also be included as defensible space. The flats would have balcony space of between 6sqm and 12sqm, where the SPD seeks a minimum of 10sqm each. However, they would all have access to a communal amenity space located in the centre of the development to the rear, measuring over 480sqm. This exceeds the SPD minimum requirement of 450sqm (50sqm plus a further 10sqm per flat). This amenity space would incorporate Children’s play area and, meets the Mayor’s SPD requirement of 190sqm (based 10sqm x child yield of 19).

8.11 The proposal therefore meets and/or exceeds the Council’s amenity space standards. The communal children’s play space is generously sized and would: (i) receive natural light; (ii) be screened from the street; (iii) be easily accessible to all occupants; and (iv) be overlooked by side windows the facing flats and dwellinghouses within the development and, as such would be safe to use.

8.12 In summary the level and nature of amenity space is considered acceptable and would not prejudice the aims of the SPD. In the event of planning permission being granted it is recommended that a landscape management and maintenance plan for the communal amenity space and children’s’ play space as well as details of its enclosure together with play equipment to be installed in it be secured by condition.

8.13 It should be noted that no financial contribution is to be sought towards further provision for children play space as the proposal contains the requisite amount of on-site children play space. However, a financial contribution towards improvements to Parks and Open space would be required in accordance with Policy S10 (Planning Obligations) of the Core Strategy and the Lambeth Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD. It is recommended that this financial obligation should go towards funding improvements to the nearby Valley Road Playing Field and Unigate Wood in accordance with the identified projects outlined in the Ecology and Biodiversity section of this report.

Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Accessible Housing

8.14 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan, Core Strategy Policy S2 (d) and Saved Policy 33 of the UDP together with the Council’s SPD on standards for housing
development and house conversions provide guidance on Lifetime Homes and wheelchair accessible housing. There is a requirement that all new housing is built to Lifetime Homes Standards. In addition, within a development, 10% of all new homes should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

8.15 The proposed development is designed so that all the flats and the townhouses will achieve Lifetime Homes Standards. All townhouses and ground floor flats would have level threshold access to Valley Road and South Oak Road. A wheelchair accessible lift is proposed, which would serve all floors within each flat block. All units would have level threshold to the balconies. These measures would ensure that the homes are flexible and able to meet the future needs of the residents. A condition of consent is recommended to secure compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards.

8.16 It is noted that 4 of the dwellinghouses and the two ground floor flats in Block A and B (a total of 6 units) have been designed to be wheelchair accessible. This equates to 10% of all the units in the scheme and as such the proposal complies with the above policy requirements. It is also proposed to provide 6 parking bays as part of the wheelchair accessible housing offer. A condition is recommended to secure these provisions.

Sunlight and Daylight

8.17 Saved Policies 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy require new development to provide a high quality living environment for future residents in terms of daylight and sunlight levels. These policies also require that new buildings should be of a scale and design that protects residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties by not adversely affecting existing daylight and sunlight levels.

8.18 A daylight and sunlight assessment, undertaken by Savills Commercial Ltd, has been submitted with the application to provide an overview of potential impact of the development on lighting levels currently received at neighbouring properties. The report is based on the British Research Establishment (BRE) publication “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, a guide to good practice (2011)”. The BRE provides the technical basis for determining what level of loss of sunlight or daylight following development can be considered material. The guidelines advise that the greatest need for sunlight and daylight is within “habitable” rooms of residential buildings.

8.19 In this case the BRE assessment, which included survey-based 3D modelling and technical assessment of the site, analysed the potential impact of the development on daylight and sunlight levels to the residential properties on Valley Road (Nos. 81 and 83 and 120 -180), South Oak Road (Nos. 23 and 27 and 58-62) and Namba Roy Close (Nos. 18-25 and 1-9). These are the neighbouring properties considered mostly likely to be affected by the proposed development. The impact of the development on daylight levels on Sunnyhill Primary School was also assessed given its education use. Sunlight assessments were not undertaken on any of these neighbouring properties where they had no south facing windows (Nos. 58-62 South Oak Road) or where the windows are north facing (Nos.18-25 Namba Roy Close).
The study found that none of the identified neighbouring residential properties would suffer a noticeable reduction in the levels of sunlight or daylight, in all cases levels of both sunlight and daylight received following development would remain well within acceptable BRE guidelines. In addition the study found that the impact on daylight and sunlight levels for Sunnyhill primary School would be limited and, would fall within BRE recommendations.

Officers have reviewed the assessment report and are satisfied that there would be no material adverse impacts resulting from the proposal on the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties or the school in terms of sunlight and daylight.

In relation to the sunlight and daylight within the proposed developed, officers consider that the dwellings that would likely suffer a reduction daylight and sunlight levels, are the flats in Flat block A, which have windows near an off-site Ash tree located on the neighbouring Council Estate land, (northeast boundary of site). The applicant proposes to prune the tree back to improve the amenity of the occupiers of the affected flats, although officers would prefer its removal altogether. Any of these measures is considered acceptable. Elsewhere the proposed dwellings would receive unimpeded levels of sunlight and daylight, consistent with BRE guideline.

Privacy for existing and future residents

The proposed buildings would not give rise to direct overlooking of windows within the development; windows and balconies in the front elevations of the proposed buildings would face onto Valley Road and South Oak Road and those to the rear would overlook the communal amenity space and parking courtyard. Where there is potential for overlooking between dwellings at the rear of the site, this would only occur at oblique angles or at distances of 19m from the closest balcony in Flat block B. However, it is noted that the rear gardens of the 3 proposed terraced houses in South Oak Road would be overlooked by windows and balconies within the flank/courtyard elevation of Flat block A. The overlooking in this case would be mitigated by the proposed application of obscure glazing to the subject windows including the installation of opening restrictors to each of these windows, which in all instances service bedrooms. A condition to ensure these measures are implemented is recommended.

The proposal would not give rise to overlooking of nearby residential properties in South Oak Road, Samuel Jackson Close, Valley Road and Namba Roy Close. In South Oak Road and Samuel Jackson Close, the dwellings in Flat block A would directly overlook the adjacent play area and playing fields with views towards the adjacent terraced houses in Valley Road and Samuel Jackson Close being oblique and/or sufficiently remote. In Valley Road, the separation distance between the proposed development and the existing houses - across the pavements, the carriageway and front gardens, would ensure that the privacy of those residents would not be unduly compromised.

The separation distance across a carriageway of over 17m between the window openings and balconies in Flat block B and the properties in Namba Roy Close (Nos. 1-9, 18 and 20), would also ensure that the privacy of existing residents is
not unduly affected. And whilst the rear gardens of Nos. 21-25 Namba Roy Close would be overlooked by the window openings in the rear elevation of Flat block A, the development would maintain a window-to-window separation distance of between 20m and 23m with these properties. This spatial relationship between the rear elevations of neighbouring properties is typical within many suburban locations in the borough.

Sense of enclosure for existing residents

8.26 The proposed buildings would be sited to the same building line in relation to the street as the existing terraces in Valley Road and would be of similar height, scale and massing. The flat blocks, although 4 storeys in height, would present as three storeys when viewed from the neighbouring properties in Namba Roy Close and Samuel Jackson Close due to the rising gradient of the land across the site from west to east. Given this and the separation distances identified above between the existing properties and the proposed development, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring properties or create undue sense of enclosure.

Noise and disturbance to existing and future residents

8.27 In assessing development proposals, local planning authorities are required to ensure that development does not cause unacceptable noise nuisance and/or general disturbance to existing residents. Where subsequent intensification or change of use may result in greater noise and/or general disturbance, planning policy recommends the use of appropriate conditions to mitigate the impact of a development proposal.

8.28 The area surrounding the site is predominantly residential in nature and therefore the residential development proposed would be a compatible land use. It is considered that the living conditions of existing resident in terms of noise and any disturbance would be significantly improved by the proposal when compared with the lawful operational use of the application site. The Council’s Noise and Pollution officer has raised no objection to the proposal and recommends a condition to safeguard the amenity of future occupiers from environmental, including traffic/road noise pollution.

Conclusion on Residential Amenity

8.29 In summary, the standard of the proposed residential accommodation and the living environment within the scheme is considered acceptable and would meet the objectives of the relevant policies of the development plan as well as the Council’s housing standards as set out in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ (2008). The proposal is also considered to be of design, scale and layout that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents and is compliant with the relevant policies of the Council’s development plan.

9 Design Considerations

9.1 A high quality of design is an integral requirement for all new build schemes. The policy objectives to achieve this are set out in saved Policies, 31 33 and 38 of the UDP and Policy S9 of the Core Strategy. The design has evolved from pre-application discussions with officers; the scheme proposes a development
of a contemporary appearance and, is a modern interpretation of traditional vernacular that officers consider appropriate in the context of the surrounding area.

Massing and Scale

9.2 Saved Policy 33(b) states that all development should be of an appropriate scale, massing and height suited to the site characteristics. The majority of the residential properties in the area are period semi-detached or terraced dwellings of varied architectural style although there are contemporary flat blocks including the Barratt Homes development on Curtis Field Road and the Council owned housing stock in South Oak Road and Namba Roy Close.

9.3 The proposal takes its design cue from the existing building heights in the area. The proposed terraced houses in both Valley Road and South Oak Road would be 2-3 storeys with the second floor contained within pitched roofs. The gable features, which typify the Victorian terraces in Valley Road, are recreated in contemporary light and glazed triangular dormers set within a pitched roof, with two-storey paired projecting bays below. The proposed bulk, scale and massing of the terraced houses would therefore be in keeping with the immediate surrounding area and in particular, would create a desirable street frontage on Valley Road as required under Policy MDO74 of the UDP.

9.4 The scale of development in Valley Road rises to 4 storeys (three storeys with roof level accommodation) at the southern end of the terraced houses- at the junction with Namba Roy Close. This increased scale responds well to the scale of the adjacent buildings; the imposing 3 storey high main Sunnyhill Primary School building and the elevated 3 -4 storey building at No.1-9 Namba Roy Close. The incorporation of the 4th storey within a pitched roof, the low ridge height, the topography of the land and the change in character and scale of Valley Road at this junction would ensure that the scale, massing and 4 storey height of the building comprising Flat block B, is in keeping with its immediate context.

9.5 Flat block A, which bookends the site in South Oak Road, is to be 4 storeys in height. This scale of development is considered appropriate in this location given the topography of the site whereby the gradient of the land rises across the site from west to east. Along the eastern perimeter of the site, the land is almost a storey higher than the adjacent ground level within the site so that the building would be present a three storey height to the properties in South Oak Road and Samuel Jackson Close. The front elevation of this block would face onto the open ground of the Playing Field and in the context of the 4-6 blocks in Curtis Field Road beyond the playing field, would not appear out of place.

Layout

9.6 Saved Policy 31 of the UDP requires that new developments should, where possible, retain or contribute to a clear urban grain and follow appropriate block widths, gaps and spaces between buildings thereby helping to add to the connectivity of street blocks. Individual buildings should address the street with frontages and entrances and should create or enhance views and vistas. Saved UDP Policy MDO74 requires the creation of a street frontage to Valley Road when redeveloping this site.
9.7 The scheme proposes a perimeter block layout with regular entrances along Valley Road and South Oak Road - creating street frontages with a regular rhythm of street level entrance doors, short front gardens and bay windows to the townhouses. The perimeter block layout would result in continuous street frontages, which would help to reinforce the street and would successfully integrate the development into the streetscene, particularly in Valley Road. The proposed layout also makes a clear distinction between the public front of the buildings in Valley Road and South Oak Road and the private rear aspect of the site.

9.8 The buildings to Valley Road and South Oak Road would address the street with clearly delineated front gardens defined by boundary treatments and entrance gates. The proposed layout would animate and provide natural surveillance to the streets instead of the dead street frontages presented by the existing buildings. This is the character of the Victorian streets in the surrounding area and is particularly important for South Oak Road, which currently does not benefit from any natural surveillance.

Appearance and Materials

9.9 Saved Policy 33 of the UDP states that all development should be of high quality design, which positively contributes to its surroundings. It also states that developments should be compatible with the colour, type, source and texture of local materials. Policy S9 of the Core Strategy supports and encourages innovation in design where it would contribute to local distinctiveness, enhance the existing built environment and create high quality of the public realm.

9.10 The proposed buildings are contemporary in appearance, boasting clean lines, simple detailing and good use of materials. The houses are well articulated with paired two storey bays incorporating metal windows to principal rooms with triangular glazed dormers above - set within a steep slate pitched roof. The paired bays create a strong rhythm within the street elevation, which is typical of the existing Victorian houses in Valley Road. In addition, the use of different materials including stock red brick and lighter brickwork and opaque panels applied beneath bay windows, would help to break up the massing of the terrace, thereby enhancing its appearance within the streetscene.

9.11 The flat blocks are articulated with tall metal windows and balconies in Flat block A - on South Oak Road frontage and recessed balconies with metal balustrades and the triangular glazed dormers set within steep pitched roof to Flat B - on the Valley Road frontage. The elevations to the flat blocks would also be finished in predominantly stock red brick and would terminate in slate roof to Flat block A and a pitched roof with flat sections to Flat block B. The east and south facing roof slopes to the terraced houses and flat blocks as well as the flat roof section to Flat block B would be used to host photovoltaic tiles for renewable energy capture.

9.12 The proposed material palette draws reference from the local context; the surrounding Victorian residential properties are constructed from red brick, London stock brick and are accentuated with stucco rendering. The selection of materials comprises: stock red brick and lighter brickwork to elevations, slate
roofs, grey metal framed windows and doors, grey painted metal balconies and balustrades, brick boundary walls, timber fences and grey painted steel gates. It is recommended that details of the materials including a brick sample panel and slate tiles as well as detailed drawings of the balconies, typical windows, triangular glazed roof dormer and all boundary treatments are reserved by condition.

**Impact upon Heritage Assets**

9.13 Saved Policy 45 of the UDP advises that development, which adversely affects the setting of a listed building, or significant views of a listed building, will be refused. The site is located within the setting of the main Sunnyhill Primary School building, which is Grade II Listed.

9.14 Following consultation, English Heritage advised that the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of the listed school but expressed regret for the loss of the existing dairy buildings and associated railings on the site. EH consider the site to be of historic and aesthetic interest and as such urged the council to consider the former dairy as a non-designated heritage asset. EH's archaeological department also advised that the buildings are considered to be of intrinsic archaeological interest and recommended that the historic buildings on the site should be recorded before any demolition works are undertaken.

9.15 Whilst officers acknowledge that some of the buildings on the site may be of some architectural interest they are not considered to constitute a non-designated heritage asset. It should be noted that the buildings were designed with a specific use in site and do not lend themselves to successful conversion.

9.16 It is advised that even if the council were to consider the site a non-designated heritage asset, regard must be paid to guidance within the NPPF, which states that in weighing up applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset (Para. 135).

9.17 In assessing the potential impact of a development proposal on a non-designated heritage asset, a local planning authority is required to have regard for the positive attributes of the proposed scheme. In this case, it is considered that the positive aspects of the proposed development including the creation of a street frontage to Valley Road in compliance with Saved Policy MDO74, the provision of 58 residential units, 40% of which would be for affordable housing and the design merits of the scheme as outlined above, outweigh the loss of any heritage that may be present within the existing buildings.

9.18 Nevertheless, in accordance with English Heritage recommendation, should planning permission be granted for the redevelopment of the site, the applicant would be required to undertake a Level 3 archaeological recording of the existing buildings (as defined in the English Heritage publication “Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Practice ,2006”) prior to their demolition with the findings deposited with the Council’s local history archive and the Greater London Historic Environment Record.

**Conclusion on Design Considerations**
In summary, the proposal is considered to respond well to the site constraints and its immediate context in terms of the layout, scale, mass and appearance of the proposed buildings and as such would enhance the appearance of this part of Valley Road without causing harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed school building. As such, the proposal complies with the objectives of Saved Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 45 of the UDP and Policy S9 of the Core Strategy.

Trees, Landscaping and Biodiversity

There are no trees on site, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or which are considered to be of significant amenity value. Nevertheless Saved Policy 39 (c) of the UDP, requires developments to include landscape design that enhance the area including landscaped frontages incorporating new tree planting of appropriate specification, boundary treatments such as fencing and railings to complement the development and enhance the streetscene and the protection of valuable existing habits as well as maximising opportunity to create or add to wildlife habits.

The application was accompanied by an Arboricultural Implications report dated November 2012. Appendix 1 of the report includes a tree survey schedule whilst Appendix 2 and 3 contain tree locations and tree plans, respectively. The survey identifies the row of broad leaved trees growing along Valley Road, between the existing buildings and the pavement and those along the eastern boundary of the site. The quality of these trees is considered poor with some species unlikely to be suitable for long term retention.

The proposal would involve the removal of all trees on the site either because they are too close to the existing buildings and/or structures that are to be demolished and as such would be likely to suffer significant damage or they are located within the footprint of the proposed development. No part of the proposed buildings or associated hard surfaces would fall within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the off-site trees, located along the north-eastern boundary of the site and as such they are unlikely to suffer unacceptable damage to their roots or rooting environment. One of the off-site trees (Ash tree T3), located along the eastern boundary of the site would be pruned back to provide adequate working space for construction.

The report has been reviewed by the Council’s Arboricultural officer, who has advised that the trees on site are generally poor specimens and therefore are of limited landscaping value and as such there is no objection to their removal. Measures to protect the retained on or off-site trees are to be undertaken in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan, contained in the submitted Arboricultural report. It is however recommended that the off-site Ash tree, which is a poor specimen, should be removed (with the owners agreement) to prevent potential conflict between it and the proposed nearest units (flat block A) as it is likely to restrict sunlight and daylight reaching these properties.

Details of soft and hard landscaping including all works to be carried out within the children’s play space and the boundary treatment along the perimeter of the site and within the site and, between plots are also reserved by condition.
In relation to the potential for the presence of flora or fauna of ecological value on the site, reference is made to Policy 5.3 of the London Plan, which seeks to protect and promote biodiversity and nature conservation. New developments are required to provide opportunity to incorporate features for wildlife and local biodiversity.

The applicant has submitted an Ecological Assessment report, drafted by Ecological Solutions Ltd dated November 2012, which assesses the potential ecological impacts of the proposal and where necessary proposes mitigation measures. The report indicates that there are no statutory designated sites of nature conservation interests on or around the site. However Unigate Wood Nature Reserve, which lies behind the site to the south east, is a non-statutory designated site. It is secondary deciduous woodland, which is managed by the Council’s Parks and Green Spaces team and is a designated Borough Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). To prevent an adverse impact on it, the report recommends the use of dust suppression techniques during both the demolition and construction phases of the redevelopment of the site.

The assessment found no habitats within the site of any significant ecological value and recommended new tree planting, hedgerows and landscaping planting in order to improve the ecological value of the site. A bat survey, which was conducted as part of the assessment, found no foraging or roosting bats within the site and, it is considered that the site is not suited to supporting protected breeding birds. It is recommended that the removal of vegetation should take place outside the bird nesting season or that the vegetation be checked for nesting birds prior to its removal. A condition to secure this requirement is recommended.

The report has been reviewed by the Council’s adviser on ecological matters. The officer supports the proposed mitigation strategies outlined in the Ecological Assessment and confirms that there is a low or minimal risk that the development would adversely affect any existing site based ecology or the adjacent nature conservation site. The wildlife value of the current site is low and there are no measurable risks to protected habitats or protected species such as bats or nesting birds. The recommendations contained in the submitted Ecological Assessment in relation to the provision of new planting in order to improve foraging opportunities for any bats or prevention of disturbance of nesting birds are supported.

In addition it is recommended that any scheme of landscaping should include measures to encourage protected species to occupy the application site by the installation of bat and bird boxes on trees and buildings, bat bricks within the new buildings, the creation of stag beetle loggeries or wood piles, and the creation of naturalised areas within communal areas. Where such mitigation measures cannot be provided within the site, it is recommended off-site biodiversity enhancements within Unigate Wood or Valley Road Playing Field should be sought via a section 106 agreement. Conditions to secure these measures are attached. The applicant would also be advised of the need to operate a ‘watching brief’ on the application site in relation to any protected species including appropriate reporting procedures, should findings of protected species be made.
With respect to Valley Road Playing Field, it is recommended that funding should be secured to provide new or improve its boundary treatment and thereby improve its safety. In addition, the playing surfaces on the playing field should be made suitable for use in all weather including drainage works and new goalposts should be provided. For Unigate Wood it is advised that a financial contribution should be secured towards providing dog-waste bins and additional signage, especially street directional or main entrance signs. The Council’s adviser on Ecology also recommends that the type and density of tree cover within Unigate Wood should be reduced to improve the open character of the woodland and invasive species should be removed. In addition, access to both main entrances to Unigate Wood should be improved by providing steps and/or new gates together with the installation of new railings. The new railings would be funded from the financial contributions towards Public Art. Part of the financial contributions towards Parks and Open Spaces and for Sport and Leisure should be ring-fenced for the rest of the recommended works.

Friends of Unigate Wood (FuW) as well as several local residents have sought to secure the provision of a community hall on the application site or a pavilion building on the playing field out of the s106 financial contributions arising from the development. Whilst a pavilion building with changing rooms, shower facilities and a meeting room, erected on the site of a former pavilion on the playing field, would be of significant benefit to the local community, the funding available from this development is unlikely to be sufficient to cover its construction.

It is also advised that the Council’s Parks section would not be able to co-finance its construction if there was a shortfall in funding, and could have problems securing and maintaining it for the long term. It is nevertheless recommended that part of the S106 Obligations for Parks and Open Spaces and for Sport and Leisure should be ring-fenced as a contribution towards the provision of a new or the refurbishment of an existing community facility in the area, should the pavilion option prove undeliverable.

It is further advised that no direct encroachment into or onto either Unigate Wood or Valley Road Playing Field without the prior consent of Lambeth Council should occur during the demolition or construction phases of the development. Any encroachment must be under agreement or licence, and must be temporary to allow for site access, boundary treatment or safety reasons, and any damage or disturbance to either open space must be rectified and the land returned to its original condition or improved accordingly. Any damage to any tree, habitat or boundary feature of Unigate Wood must be adequately compensated for at cost to the applicant or their agents. An informative to this effect is recommended.

### Traffic and Parking

Saved Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy are relevant with respect to transport and highway matters. These policies seek to ensure that proposals for development have a limited impact on the performance and safety of the highway network and that sufficient and appropriate car parking and cycle storage is provided whilst meeting objectives.
to encourage sustainable transport and to reduce dependence on the private car.

10.2 Saved Policy 9 of the UDP states that planning applications will be assessed for their transport impact, including cumulative impact on highway safety, on the environment and road network and all transport modes including public transport. Any increase in traffic generated by development should not increase levels of traffic congestion, lead to a situation where the condition of highway safety is reduced, cause material harm to the speed and/or reliability of bus and other public transport services. If development would have an unacceptable transport impact transport, it should be refused in the absence of mitigation measures to make the development acceptable.

10.3 With regard to traffic generation, car parking provision and its impact on the highway, Policy S4 (f) of the Core Strategy requires development to comply with the maximum car parking standards in the London Plan and, to reflect the public transport accessibility of the development. New development is also required to make provision for improvements to the public realm and transport and highway infrastructure.

Location and Accessibility

10.4 Valley Road is a London Distributor Road, running north-south between Leigham Court Road and Streatham Common. This road is known to be a ‘rat-run’ used to avoid a large section of Streatham High Road. It is located within a 20mph zone and traffic calming measures are in place along its length including speed cushions, kerb build outs and pedestrian refuge islands. Immediately to the south-west of the site is the Sunnyhill Primary School, and there is a Zebra crossing located on Valley Road near the junction with Sunnyhill Road.

10.5 The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 1b, which is considered ‘poor’. Having a low PTAL means that residents are likely to be relatively car-dependent. In this case too, the local topography, with land rising away from Valley Roof, might make walking and cycling less attractive/feasible than is the case at other locations in the borough.

10.6 In order to estimate what impact the proposed development could have on traffic and parking levels in the area, the applicant has submitted a Transport Statement (TS) report dated November 2012. The report includes a description of the existing site conditions and surrounding area including the local highway network and existing levels of public transport provision together with an overnight parking survey conducted in mid January 2013.

Car Parking Provision

10.7 A total of 65 car parking spaces are proposed for the 58 dwellings, which equates to a ratio of 1.1 car parking spaces per dwelling. The site is not located within a CPZ, and parking pressure is known to be an issue on surrounding streets. The submitted overnight parking survey found levels of parking stress to be between 83% and 93% on surrounding streets. It is therefore considered necessary that sufficient on-site parking is provided to meet the demand for parking generated by the proposed development and in order to avoid overspill
parking thereby exacerbating on-street parking pressure in the area.

10.8 The applicant had originally proposed a total of 75 car parking spaces, which equates to a ratio of 1.3 car parking spaces per dwelling with the large 4 bedroom units being allocated 2 spaces each and the smaller units 1 space each. The applicant contends that the level of car parking as originally proposed is justified by the high number of family size units in the scheme (18 x 4bed houses and 12 x 3bed flats) and the need to prevent overspill parking on surrounding streets. That level of car parking provision would also be consistent with the London Plan Maximum residential standards as set out in the table below.

**London Plan: Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum residential parking standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1.5 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.9 Whilst welcoming the reduction in the number of car parking spaces, officers still consider the proposed 65 car parking spaces excessive. Using the 2001 Census data for Streatham Wells Ward (broken down by tenure and unit size) to calculate car ownership associated with the proposed development, officers advise that the development could generate around 33 vehicles. By contrast the analysis contained within the applicant’s TS suggested that the scheme would generate 50 vehicles. This was based on the 2001 ward average household car ownership level of 0.68, uplifted by a 28% growth in car ownership between 2001 and 2012. However, the 2011 Census findings indicate that car ownership within the borough has actually fallen by an average of 16% over the previous ten years.

10.10 In the circumstances, assuming the development could generate somewhere between 33 and 50 vehicles, a large number of the proposed car parking spaces could be left empty, which could otherwise be used as additional amenity space. In addition it is considered the provision of excessive parking could positively encourage private car dependence by future residents of the development. This contradicts the Council’s Core Strategy Policy S4, which seeks to encourage sustainable means of travel. However, a balance must be struck to ensure that the proposed development does not result in undue parking pressure on surrounding streets. The applicant has reduced the number of car parking spaces to meet the sustainable development requirements of the development plan whilst providing an acceptable quantum of off-street car parking. It is considered given the location of the site in an area of poor public transport accessibility, a refusal of planning permission on grounds of the level of proposed parking alone, could be difficult to justify at appeal.

10.11 The spaces originally occupied by 10 car parking spaces are to be landscaped to prevent drivers parking in these spaces. The detail of how this is done would be secured by condition as part of the landscaping and/or parking layout scheme for approval by the council. This could be designed to improve the cycle parking on site to ensure that high quality provision is made and enough
stands are provided to cater for the family sized dwellings.

10.12 Six (6) of the proposed car parking bays would be designated for disabled/wheelchair users in connection with the proposed wheelchair accessible units. The London Plan also requires that 20% of all spaces must be set aside for electric vehicles with an additional 20% identified for future electric vehicle provision. These requirements will be secured as conditions of consent.

10.13 In order to mitigate the impact of the development on car parking in Valley Road and surrounding roads, the applicant has agreed to fund membership to the Zipcar car club, which operates in the vicinity of the site, for all prospective residents of the development for a period of 2 years. This obligation will be included in the S106 agreement. Furthermore, the applicant proposes to provide Travel Packs for each dwelling. Officers consider this an acceptable alternative to the implementation of a Travel Plan in this case. The provision of the travel packs will be secured as a contribution in lieu and included in the S106 agreement.

**Trip Generation and Traffic Impacts**

10.14 The TS includes an assessment of expected trip generation associated with the proposed development. Typical levels of traffic generated by the previous use as a dairy (Use Class B8) have been analysed, indicating that most vehicle movements were made overnight and between 09:00-12:00 and averaged at 10-13 vehicle trips per hour. As a comparison TRAVL (a traffic database) has been used to estimate the number of vehicular movements that could be generated by another B8 use on the site. TRAVL has also been used to estimate the number of vehicular trips, which would be generated by the proposed residential development, by using suitable proxy sites. A comparison of the peak hour vehicular trip generation is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive</td>
<td>Depart</td>
<td>Arrive</td>
<td>Depart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Dairy Crest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing B8 Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed C3 Use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.15 The proposed residential development is expected to generate an increase in the number of vehicles entering and exiting the site during the morning and afternoon peak. The largest increase is expected to be during the AM peak when an additional 14 vehicle movements are predicted, which equates to 1 extra vehicle every 4mins. This level of traffic generation is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding local highway network.

**Access and Local Highway Improvements**

10.16 However, given that the level of traffic using South Oak Road will increase, improvements to the road involving widening the footway on the south side of South Oak Road and kerb build outs at the junction with Valley Road to improve
visibility are required to make the development acceptable in transport terms. It is also proposed to rationalise the existing access arrangements into the site by removing all existing vehicular access points from Valley Road, and providing two new vehicular access points from South Oak Road. South Oak Road is a private Housing Estate road, which is managed by Lambeth Living. The applicant’s TS contains an indicative plan of the proposed improvements, which include kerb build outs at the junction with Valley Road, widened footways and traffic calming measures incorporating the removal of some informal parking, and giving priority to vehicles approaching from Valley Road. The details of these works and their implementation will be secured by Grampian condition. The works will be implemented at cost to the applicant.

10.17 In addition, due to the limited width of Valley Road, additional waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the site are considered necessary, to prevent parking on the eastern side of Valley Road adjacent to the site which could affect traffic flow and safety. This would not affect the ability of residents to park on the western side of the road. The changes to waiting restrictions as well as associated amendments to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in Valley Road would be implemented at cost to the applicant via a Section 278 agreement and would be included in the S106 Heads of Terms.

10.19 The TS includes swept path analyses of cars entering and exiting the site in forward gear. No larger vehicles are shown entering and exiting the site but it is understood that refuse collection and emergency vehicles will not require access into the site. All the proposed buildings on the site are located within 45m of either Valley Road or South Oak Road, and as such there would be adequate emergency access onto the site. Pedestrian access will be available via a pedestrian gate next to the first vehicular access on South Oak Road, and for the properties fronting Valley Road alternative direct access routes are proposed from the street.

10.20 Construction of the development should not endanger conditions of the highway or cause inconvenience to drivers and/or pedestrian using the highway. In order therefore to ensure minimum disturbance or nuisance to local residents and to avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway it is recommended that a condition of this consent be the submission of Construction Management Plan.

Cycle Parking Provision

10.21 88 cycle parking spaces are proposed, which meets London Plan standards. The 4 bedroom houses will each have two spaces within secure stores in the rear gardens, and the remaining 52 spaces will be provided through a mixture of Sheffield stands and wall hung racks split across two stores on the site.

Conclusion on Transport Considerations

10.22 Officers are satisfied that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and mitigation measures to be secured through s.106 and s278 Agreements, the development would not have an adverse impact on the safe operation of the highway or the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The proposed level of parking is considered acceptable on balance, and would ensure that surrounding roads to not suffer additional car parking demand. The proposal therefore complies with the objectives of Saved Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the UDP.
11 Refuse and Recycling Provision

11.1 Policy S8 of the Core Strategy places a requirement on developments to contribute to the sustainable management of waste. Specific guidance is set out within the Council’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ guidance (2006). Saved Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy (January 2011) seek to ensure that proposals for waste collection and servicing strategies have a minimal impact on the performance and safety of the highway network.

11.2 Storage provision for refuse and recycling is proposed in the front gardens of the houses, in wheelie bins set behind the front boundary wall and adjacent to the street door entrances. Storage for refuse and recycling for the Flat blocks would be in Euro-bins contained within the fabric of each block at ground level. All refuse collection and servicing would be undertaken from Valley Road and South Oak Road.

11.3 The provision for refuse and recycling complies with the Council’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ guidance (2006) and with the objectives of Saved Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policies S4 and S8 of the Core Strategy. Nevertheless, if planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition be imposed to provide a waste management plan including detailed drawings of the refuse/recycling receptacles to ensure that secure and adequate provision is made for the management of waste litter and refuse of the premises, in the interests of security within the development and the residential amenities of the area.

12 Designing out Crime

12.1 Saved Policy 32 of the UDP requires that development should enhance community safety. Development will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder. Policy S9(f) of the Core Strategy requires the Council to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and its liveability by creating safe and secure environments that reduce the opportunities for crime, the fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, having regard to Secured by Design standards.

12.2 The applicant's Design and Access Statement contains an outline of how the site has been laid out to create a safe environment for future residents including passive surveillance within the development as well as various physical protection measures to deter or reduce opportunities for crime such as controlled entrance systems.

12.3 The Council’s Design Out Crime officer was consulted during consideration of the proposal. The officer considers that if Secure By Design minimum standards for all entrance doors, windows, refuse and cycle storage facilities and communal entrances gates and boundary treatment as well as the external/communal lighting of the car parking areas and the communal amenity space are incorporated into the scheme, most of the crime risks should be
mitigated. Conditions, requiring the development to incorporate the relevant Secured by Design – Part 2, Physical Protection Measures and provide a certificate of accreditation to SBD standards.

13 Infrastructure Implications/S.106 Obligations

13.1 Policy 16 of the UDP and Policy S10 of the Core Strategy, supplemented by other local development plan policies and the Council’s SPD on s106 planning obligations, set out the circumstances in which the Council will seek planning obligations from a developer to mitigate the potential social and environmental impacts of a scheme. Obligations under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010) will also be sought.

13.2 The application proposes to offer 23 affordable dwellings of which 7 would be for intermediate housing tenure and 16 for affordable rent. This level of provision equates to approximately 40% of the total dwelling units being offered for affordable housing with the tenure split between social (affordable) rent and intermediate(shared ownership) housing equating to a ratio of 70:30 in terms of dwelling units. The affordable housing provision is comply compliant and would be secure by S106 agreement.

13.3 The proposed changes to waiting restrictions (Signing and Lining Works) and associated amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would be required to prevent parking on the eastern side of Valley Road. The cost of changes to waiting restrictions in Valley Road and associated TROs has been estimated by the Council’s transport and highway officers to be £7,500. These works would be implemented via a Section 278 agreement and are to be included in the Heads of Terms of the s106 agreement.

13.4 The applicant has agreed to fund a two year membership for all future residents of the development to the Zipcar car club, which operates in the local area. In addition it is proposed to provide Travel Packs to all households within the development. These provisions are to be secured as a contribution in lieu and included in the s106 agreement.

13.5 It is recommended that part of S106 financial contributions for Sport and Leisure should be ring-fenced for improvement works to the Valley Road Playing Field including boundary treatments, safety improvement measures, works to playing surfaces to make them suitable for use in all weather conditions including drainage, new access arrangements and the provision of new goalposts.

13.6 With regards to Unigate Wood, it is recommended that part of the S106 financial contributions for Parks and Open Spaces should be ring-fenced to fund the provision of dog waste bins, new/additional signage including information on existing flora and fauna and directional street and entrance signage, landscaping at the main entrances and access improvement works to access steps and/or gate as well as tree works to improve the open character of Unigate Wood.

13.7 It is further recommended that the remaining funds from the Parks and Open Space and Sport and Leisure contributions identified above may be used
towards funding the provision of a pavilion building within the Valley Road Playing field, which would contain changing rooms, shower facilities and a meeting room for use by the local community. Should the proposition to erect a new pavilion building within the Valley Road Playing Field become unviable the remaining ring-fenced funds should be used, in consultation with Friends of Unigate Wood and Valley Road Playing Field and local residents, for an alternative community use.

13.8 The applicant has also agreed to provide new bespoke railings to Unigate Wood and along the Valley Road frontage of Sunnyhill Primary School. The railings on the Sunnyhill Road frontage of the school have recently been replaced. The cost of the railings to Unigate Wood has been estimated by the applicant at £5000 and that to the Valley Road frontage at £15,000. These financial obligations are to be secured as part of the Public Art contribution.

13.9 The following financial contributions, or direct works to the value of, will be secured by way of s.106 to mitigate against the environmental and social impacts of the development in accordance with the requirements of Policy S10 of the Core Strategy and the Council’s SPD on s106 planning obligations:

- Education (Primary) £193,485.00
- Education (Secondary) £139,005.00
- Health £47,025.50
- Libraries £10,175.62
- Sport & Leisure £37,950.62
- Parks & Open Spaces (General) £94,702.40
- Public Art £20,000.00
- Traffic and Highways £7,500.00
- Revenue Contributions £10,220.24
- Local Labour in Construction £11,411.15
- S106 Monitoring Fee £28,573.77

13.10 The above contributions come to a total of £600,049.09

13.11 In addition, the applicant will also make a financial contribution under the Mayor’s CIL scheme. This contribution does form part of the Lambeth development plan policy obligations and, is to be secured and monitored by the Council on behalf of the Mayor.

13.12 In summary, it is considered that the above provisions, once secured under s278 agreement of the Highways Act 1980 and s106 agreement of the 1990 Act, would appropriately mitigate against any potentially harmful impacts of the development, in accordance with Policies 9, 14, and 16 of the UDP, Policies S4 and S10 of the Core Strategy and with the Council’s associated SPD on S106 obligations.

14 Other Material Considerations

Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

14.1 Policy S6 of the Core Strategy advises that the Council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency in order to manage and mitigate flood risk. The
site lies within an area that is deemed by the Environment Agency as having a low environmental risk from flooding. It follows that the site and development does not pose an unacceptable risk in terms of flooding.

14.2 Policy 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) of the London Plan states that development should utilise sustainable urban design drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons not to do so. In this regard Thames Water has advised that it is the responsibility of the applicant to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. The applicant would also need to ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on-site or off-site storage in accordance with the London Plan drainage hierarchy. Thames Water has also advised on the minimum water pressure requirements for the development. Thames Water has no objection to the scheme with regards to its impact on the water or sewerage infrastructure.

Sustainability and Renewable Technologies

14.3 Policy S7(a) of the Core Strategy requires all major developments to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in line with London Plan targets. The London Plan requires developments to make the fullest contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions, adopting sustainable design and construction measures and prioritising decentralised energy, including renewable technologies. Policy 5.2 sets out a minimum carbon reduction requirement in buildings of 25% below the Target Emissions Rate outlined in the national Building Regulations Part L. The London Plan states that that a development proposal should contribute to this by minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor’s energy hierarchy (‘Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green’).

14.4 An application for a major development is required to demonstrate, through a detailed energy assessment, how these targets are to be met within the framework of the Mayor’s energy hierarchy. The concept of the energy hierarchy proposes that in the first instance passive energy efficiency measures such as building layout and orientation and certain active measures such as the use plant with higher efficiency or the use of heat recovery ventilation systems, should be employed to reduce energy demand as far as is feasible. If it is not possible to achieve the regulatory requirements through these measures, the hierarchy then requires that the use of decentralised energy systems and Combined heat and Power (CHP) should be compared. Finally there a requirement to evaluate the possible application of renewable technologies such as solar panels or heat pumps.

14.5 The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement drafted by Bespoke Builder Services (BBS) Environmental consultancy, which outlines the measures that will be employed in the construction of the development in order to minimise its lifetime energy consumption and associated production of carbon dioxide. The statement indicates that using a range of energy efficiency measures such as enhanced insulation through walls, floors, roofs and windows, efficient lighting and natural ventilation (Be Lean) and the use of efficient condensing gas boilers for space and water heating (Be Clean), the development would achieve a 3.75% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions.

14.6 The applicant’s energy consultants have explored all possible on-site renewable
technology options, which could be employed to achieve the requisite energy savings for the size, scale and type of development proposed. The assessment included the following technologies: solar thermal hot water; solar photovoltaic electricity, combined heat and power (CHP) including Biomass CHP; biomass boilers; wind turbines and ground and air source heat pumps.

14.7 The technical and site assessment discounted several technologies on viability and suitability grounds; the consultants recommended solar Photovoltaic (PV) systems as the most technically feasible low or zero carbon technology for use on this site (Be Green). The application proposes to install 454sqm of roof mounted PV panels on appropriate roofs of the terraced houses and flat blocks to capture renewable energy for generation of electricity. The statement indicates the array would achieve a 24.3% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emission.

14.8 The proposed energy strategy comprising a combination of passive and active energy efficiency measures and the installation of the PV array is predicted to achieve an site-wide annual reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 25.5% below the Target Emission Rate (TER) outlined in the national Building Regulations Part L, thus exceeding the London Plan (Policy 5.2) requirement for a 25% reduction.

14.9 In the event of approval it is recommended to require the applicant to submit for approval details of the size and number of the proposed solar PV array including elevational and sectional drawings and, manufactures specifications demonstrating compliance with the details contained in the Energy Statement. This would also allow the Local Planning Authority to address any potential design or amenity issues arising from the implementation of this technology.

Sustainable Design and Construction

14.10 Saved Policy 35 of the UDP states that all development proposals should show how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles. The Council’s SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction states that all residential developments should achieve a minimum Level 3 rating for the Code for Sustainable Homes, albeit that the Council aspires to Level 4 or more in the majority of developments. The Code for Sustainable Homes is an environmental assessment method for rating and certifying the performance of new homes. It is a national standard which seeks to encourage continuous improvement in sustainable home construction.

14.11 A Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment carried out by BBS Environmental consultancy has been submitted with the application. The pre-assessment is an evaluation of the potential rating that could be achieved under a formal Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment. To meet Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 3, developments are required to achieve a total percentage points score of (equal to or greater than) 57 points. A level 4 Code is equivalent to a percentage score of 68 points or above.

14.12 The pre-assessment indicates that a score of 59.77 points can be achieved for the proposed townhouses and a score of 57.86 points for the proposed flats. This equates to CSH Level 3. An addendum CSH report submitted during
consideration of the application has indicated that a CSH Level 4, equivalent to a score of 68 points could not be achieved within this development but a higher CSH Level 3 score with houses able to secure a score of 64% and flats 62% is possible. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition is attached stating that no dwelling shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that Code Level 3 has been achieved.

Land Contamination

14.13 The application was accompanied by a Geo-Environmental Site Assessment report, drafted by RSK Environment Limited in relation to potential contamination of the site and its history and environmental setting. The report advises that no records of contamination or enforcement under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 are held by the Council. The report suggests that petrol tank identified as being on the site until the mid-1990s, a garage identified as being present in the vicinity of the site in the 1960s, made ground from site development works and site activities associated with the historic use of the site as a dairy depot could all be a potential source of contamination. The site could therefore pose a risk to human health and to plants and animals as a result of the presence of contaminants on or in close proximity to it.

14.14 Following Phase II intrusive investigations of the ground conditions including soil sampling, the report concluded that there is low to moderate risk to human health from soil contamination. However there remains the possibility of contamination on site not identified by the level of investigation so far undertaken. There is a possibility that the existing buildings on site have asbestos containing materials and that the soil on site has asbestos fibres or asbestos containing materials. It is therefore recommended that a Phase III Site Investigation is undertaken to ensure that contaminants in the ground including any asbestos fibres do not pose a significant risk to the future occupiers of the site. A condition to secure this investigation is recommended.

15 Conclusions

15.1 In conclusion, the proposal is acceptable in land use terms as it has been satisfactorily demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority that the development would optimise the redevelopment potential of the site by providing new housing on previously developed land (Brownfield), located within a predominantly residential area.

15.2 The proposal is acceptable on all other material planning consideration as it would be of an appropriate design; it would provide an acceptable living environment for future occupiers; it would not prejudice the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties; it would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety and; it would not unacceptably impact upon local infrastructure.

15.3 Furthermore, provisions are to be secured under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure the delivery of an appropriate quantum of affordable housing in accordance with policy requirements and, to mitigate the impact of the development on the local environment.
15.4 It is therefore considered that the development is compliant with the relevant policies of the development plan and, there are no other material planning considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should nevertheless be refused.

16 Recommendations

16.1 Grant planning permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Obligation and the attached conditions.

16.2 In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers, having regard to the Heads of Terms set out in the report, to negotiate and complete a Section 106 agreement with the appellants in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector.

17 Summary of the Reasons

17.1 In deciding to grant planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions listed below.

17.2 In reaching this decision Policies 7, 9, 14, 16, 23, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39 and 45 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): ‘Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’ and Policies S1, S2, S3 S4, S5, S7, S8, S9 and S10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) were considered relevant.

18 Conditions

STANDARD CONDITIONS

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

DESIGN & HERITAGE

3 No development shall commence until detailed drawings, samples, and a schedule of all external materials (where applicable) to be used in the elevations
and roofs within the scheme hereby permitted are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

4 Prior to construction works starting on site, drawings to a scale of not less than 1:20 and samples and/or manufacturer’s specifications of the design and construction details listed below have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and, this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

i) metal, glass and/or wood work including railings, balustrades and balconies showing opaque glazing panels to balconies and windows where applicable
ii) window and door systems (including technical details, elevations, reveal depths, plans and cross sections),
iii) canopies and front door entrances (including surrounds),
iv) glazed triangular roof dormers,
v) roof construction;
v) Solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays to roofs (including elevational and sectional) and;
vii) rain water pipes (including locations, fixings, material and colour).

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

5 Notwithstanding the approved drawings, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the siting and design of all walls, fencing, gates and railings for the whole site (including fencing between gardens and within and/or around the communal amenity space). The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details and such walls, fencing, gates and railings as may be approved shall be erected before the initial occupation of the development and be permanently retained as such unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained for any variation.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development, to safeguard and
enhance the visual amenities of the locality and to ensure a satisfactory and continuing standard of amenity is provided (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1, S2 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

6 No plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed to the external faces of the buildings, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

SUSTAINABILITY

7 Prior to first occupation of any of the buildings hereby approved, evidence (e.g. photographs, installation contracts and as-built certificates under the Standard Assessment Procedure) showing that the development has been constructed in accordance with Bespoke Builder Services Ltd’s Energy Statement dated November 2012, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

8 Within six months of work starting on site, a Design Stage certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment (or equivalent authorising body) and summary score sheet under the Code for Sustainable Homes (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) showing that a Level 3 rating will be achieved, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and achieve the agreed rating. The development shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

9 Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, a Post
Construction Review certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment (or equivalent authorising body) and summary score sheet under the Code for Sustainable Homes (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) showing that a Level 3 rating has been achieved, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

10 All the residential units hereby approved shall be constructed to Lifetime Homes Standards in accordance with details contained in the approved Design and Access Statement by RMA Architects dated November 2012, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development is made more accessible to all (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policy S2 (d) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the related Supplementary Planning Document: Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008)).

LANDSCAPING AND BIODIVERSITY

11 No trees other than those shown to be removed on the Approved Drawing Tree Protection Plan (Ref: SJA TPP 12085 - 01) prepared by Simon Jones Associates Ltd dated November 2012, shall be felled, uprooted, damaged or otherwise disturbed without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

12 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailed schemes of soft and hard landscaping showing the treatment of all parts of the site not covered by buildings. The proposals shall include the planting of specified trees, hedges, grass, shrubs, ground flora or climbers, and cover areas of communal and private open space within the development, including boundary features. The landscaping scheme shall include an indication of how the planting would integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to anticipated routine maintenance and protection. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above specification shall accord with BS3936:1992, BS4043:1989 and BS4428:1989 and current Arboricultural best practice. The landscaping scheme
shall include full details of the proposed communal amenity space incorporating a designated Children’s Play space showing its layout, boundary and surface treatment and specifications for any play equipment.

Reasons: In order to introduce high quality soft and hard landscaping in and around the site, in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers, particularly with regard to families and children (Policies 39 and 50(i) of the Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies S2 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011).

13 The new landscaping scheme shall include measures to promote biodiversity with the use of native species typical of the locality and ground conditions or naturalised areas as well as measures to improve foraging opportunities for any bats or to prevent disturbance to nesting birds in accordance with the recommendations contained in the approved Ecological Assessment report dated November 2012. The on-site biodiversity improvement measures to encourage protected species to occupy the application site shall, where possible, include the installation of bat and bird boxes on trees and buildings, bat bricks within the new buildings, the creation of stag beetle loggeries or wood piles, and the creation of naturalised areas within communal areas.

Reason: In order to promote biodiversity on the site in accordance with Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy S5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

14 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the development hereby permitted or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from the occupation or substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and continuing standard of amenities are provided and maintained in connection with the development (Policy 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

TRANSPORT

15 No development shall commence until full details of the proposed construction methodology, in the form of a Method of Demolition and Construction Statement, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method of Demolition and Construction Statement shall
include details and arrangements regarding:

- the notification of neighbours with regard to specific works; advance notification of road closures;
- details regarding parking, deliveries and storage (including details of the routing if delivery vehicles to and from the site and the accommodation of all site operatives’, visitors’ and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site during the construction period);
- details regarding dust mitigation;
- details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway; and
- other measures to mitigate the impact of construction upon the operation of the highway and the amenity of the area.

The details of the approved Method of Demolition and Construction Statement must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the demolition and construction process.

Reason: To ensure minimal nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers and of the area generally, and to avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway (Policies 7 and 9 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

16 Notwithstanding the approved plans, detailed drawings of the cycle storage areas including the layout and manufacturer’s specification of the proposed cycle stands shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before first occupation of the development. Secure provision shall be provided for a minimum of 88 cycles. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site, to promote sustainable modes of transport and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area (Policies 9, 14, 33 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S4 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)).

17 The occupation of the development authorised by this permission shall not begin until:

(a) the local planning authority has approved in writing a full scheme of works of improvement to South Oak Road and at the junction of South Oak Road with Valley Road

(b) the approved works have been completed in accordance with the local planning authority’s written approval and have been certified in writing as complete on behalf of the local planning authority; unless alternative arrangements to secure the specified works have been approved in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure that appropriate and adequate access arrangements are made to serve the approved development and the neighbouring housing estate and, to avoid hazard and obstruction to the adjoining highway network (Policies 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

18 There shall be no permanent means of vehicular access to the development other than from South Oak Road as shown on the approved drawings.

Reason: To minimise danger and inconvenience to highway users (Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

19 Within one month of the new/altered access points being brought into use all other existing access points not incorporated in the development hereby permitted shall be stopped up by raising the existing dropped kerb and reinstating the footway verge and highway boundary to the same line, level and detail as the adjoining footway verge and highway boundary.

Reason: To limit the number of access points along the site boundary for the safety and convenience of the highway users (Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

20 The scheme for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles shown on the submitted plans and supporting Transport Statement shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and the parking areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose, or obstructed in any way.

Reason: To ensure that there an acceptable quantum of off-street car parking provision and to enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn within the site and clear of the highway so as to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway (Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

21 At least 13 of the car parking spaces hereby approved shall be provided with electrical charging points for electric vehicles.


REFUSE/WASTE MANAGEMENT

22 Notwithstanding any indication given on the approved drawings, full details including plan and elevational drawings of the refuse and recycling storage facilities for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The details shall include a description and
storage capacity of the facilities to be provided. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area (Policies 9, 33, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S8 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

23 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until a Waste Management Strategy outlining the operation and management of waste storage and collection has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate arrangements are put in place for the storage of refuse on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area and the safe operation of the adjacent public highway (Policies 9, 33, 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S4, S8 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

24 Prior to first occupation of any of the residential units within Flat blocks A and B, the opaque privacy screening panels to balconies and the proposed obscure glazed windows incorporating ‘Opening Restrictors’ on the upper floors of Flat block A, situated within its west elevation, shall be installed in accordance with detailed drawings to be approved as part of Condition 4 of this consent. The privacy screening panels and obscured glazed window with opening restrictors shall thereafter be permanently retained for the duration of the residential use hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy of occupiers within the development and of the adjoining residential properties (Policies 7 and 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

25 The proposed buildings shall be constructed to prevent environmental noise impacts from the adjacent highway. Noise levels within habitable rooms of the development hereby permitted shall not exceed the following levels:

(a) Living rooms  35dB(A) Leq  18 hour 07:00hrs to 23:00hrs;
(b) Bedrooms  30dB(A) Leq  8 hours + no individual noise event to exceed 45dB(A) max (measured with F time weighting) – 23:00hrs to 07:00hrs.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of future occupiers of the
The residential accommodation hereby approved shall be constructed to include at least 6 of the units as wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users and permanently retained as such for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate proportion of units are wheelchair accessible or adaptable for wheelchair use (Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policy S2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011), and the Council’s Adopted Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions’ (2008)).

COMMUNITY SAFETY/DESIGNING OUT CRIME

27 The development hereby permitted shall meet Physical Protection Measures (Section 2) of Secured by Design/New Homes 2010. A certificate of accreditation to Secured by Design standards shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to first occupation of any part of the development.


28 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a strategy for the exterior lighting of the site including the lighting of the car parking areas and all communal areas. The details shall include a specification of the lighting, location, lux, hours of operation, details of light spillage and details of shielding to neighbouring properties. The details approved shall be implemented prior to the commencement of use of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained for the duration of the permitted use, unless the written approval is received from the Local Planning Authority for any variation.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the security of the site. (Policies 7, 32 and 33 of the Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 refer, Policies S7 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Safer Built Environments).

OTHER

29 The further site contamination investigations recommended in the Geo-
Environmental Site Assessment report submitted with the application including a Phase III Site Investigation and a Refurbishment & Demolition Asbestos Survey shall be undertaken prior to the commencement development works including demolitions on any part of the site. The finding of the investigations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the residential occupation of the development, together with evidence that where the investigations demonstrated inappropriate levels of contamination, suitable mitigation measures have been undertaken to alleviate these matters. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure that the site is not hazardous to human health and the environment with particular reference to the potential release of asbestos fibres during demolition works and to address the risk of pollution in the interest of the amenity of future residents and the wider environment in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan (2011).

30 No development including demolition works shall commence within the site until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological recording of the standing historic buildings in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The historic buildings on the site are of historic and/or archaeological interest and as such the historic structures should be recorded before they are destroyed by the development hereby permitted (Policy S2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011), and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2011).

31 No works of development to any dwellinghouse the subject of this permission comprised within Classes B, C & D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out without planning permission having first been obtained via the submission of a planning application to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the nature and density of the layout requires strict control over the form of any additional development which may be proposed in the interests of maintaining a satisfactory residential environment having regard to Policies 7, 33 and 38 of the Unitary Development Plan Policies Saved Beyond 5th August 2010, Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policy S2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

17 Informatives

1 This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related
legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council’s Building Control Officer.

3 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements for the Control of Pollution Act 1974 concerning construction site noise and in this respect you are advised to contact the Council’s Environmental Health Division.

4 You are advised all conditions which require further details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority need to be accompanied by an application form and a fee. The application form and fee schedule can be viewed at www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning.

5 In relation to condition 4 of this consent the applicant is advised that in order to ensure a high quality standard of development all window reveals on the external faces of the approved buildings should be set within 115mm (minimum) reveals from the face of the building.

6 It is current Council policy for the Council’s contractor to construct new vehicular accesses and to reinstate the footway across redundant accesses. The developer is to contact the Council’s Highways team on 020 7926 9000, prior to the commencement of construction, to arrange for any such work to be done. If the developer wishes to undertake this work the Council will require a deposit and the developer will need to cover all the Council’s costs (including supervision of the works). If the works are of a significant nature, a Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) will be required and the works must be carried out to the Council’s specification.

7 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Highways team prior to the commencement of construction on 020 7926 9000 in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffolding, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections, Hoarding, Excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licences etc.

8 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Streetcare team within the Public Protection Division with regard to the provision of refuse storage and collection facilities. The London Borough of Lambeth’s Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (May 2006) is available on the planning pages of the Council’s website: www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning.

9 As soon as building work starts on the development, you must contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer if you need to do the following:
- name a new street
- name a new or existing building
- apply new street numbers to a new or existing building

This will ensure that any changes are agreed with Lambeth Council before use, in accordance with the London Buildings Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 and the Local Government Act 1985. Although it is not essential, we also advise you to
contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer before applying new names or numbers to internal flats or units. Contact details are listed below.
Street Naming and Numbering Officer
e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283

10 Thames Water has advised the developer to take note of the following matters regarding the water and/or sewerage infrastructure:

(a) With regards to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required on 0845 80 2777.

(b) Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (Approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres per minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water’s pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

11 With respect to internal noise standards detailed within Condition 25 the Council’s Environmental Health (Noise Pollution) team has provided the following advice:

BS8233:1000 gives guidance for internal noise levels in rooms for residential purposes for environmental noise to maintain appropriate resting and sleeping conditions. The publication provides noise levels for ‘good’ and ‘reasonable’ standards to be aimed for within dwellings. The ‘good’ standard being in compliance with the latest World Health Organisation (WHO) standards on Community Noise. WHO advises that as well as considering average noise levels (LaEQ metric) the individual single event LaMax level should be considered as well as the LaEQ where there are distinctive events.

Both WHO and BS8233:1999 also recommends that any individual noise event at night should not normally exceed 45dB (A) max. This standard is designed to minimise sleep disturbance and, by necessity, precludes ventilation through open windows. These schemes often require some form of forced ventilation to allow for rapid ventilation.

It is highly important that a sound insulation scheme with noise attenuated ventilation provision is incorporated.

12 With respect to Conditions 27 and 28 (Secured by Design) the Design Out Crime officer offers the following additional advice:

(i) A targeted external communal lighting scheme should cover the frontage,
communal / amenity spaces and car parking area. This should achieve a minimum of 25% uniformity and a minimum colour rendition of 60.

(ii) A CCTV system risk assessment may be appropriate for the communal entrances, vulnerable points in car parking areas. This is only effective if it is constantly monitored and clearly defined objectives are set for the system. Internal & external CCTV cameras should compliment each other to provide “defined” cover subject to any risks identified. It may be more effective to do this in one overall system rather than piece-meal.

(iii) All new major developments in Lambeth should actively mitigate issues of crime and particularly the lack of amenity/activity for youth – youth orientated crime is increasing and youngsters with nothing to do may become either involved in or vulnerable to crime.

13 With respect to boundary treatment and any landscaping works in proximity to Unigate Woods, the applicant is advised that it is imperative that no direct encroachment onto either Unigate Wood or Valley Road Playing Field should occur without the prior consent of the Council; any encroachment would have to be via agreement or licence, by the appropriate Council Authority and, would only be for a temporary period of time to allow for site access, boundary treatment or for safety reasons. Any damage or disturbance to either open space would have to be rectified and the land returned to its original condition or improved accordingly at cost to the applicant.

14 It is also advised that all site demolition, clearance and building works must not adversely affect any part of Unigate Wood or any features within it, and no trees or habitats must be removed or reduced without the prior consent of the Council. Any damage to any tree, habitat or boundary feature of Unigate Wood must be adequately compensated for and the cost of replacement/rectification must be covered by the applicant or their agents.

15 The applicant should also be mindful of the need to operate a ‘watching brief’ on the application site as to protected species – particularly bats and birds - during demolition/clearance and building phases. Appropriate reporting procedures should be in place to alert staff as to findings of protected species or their roosts/nests, and enable them to report these findings to the Local Planning Authority, qualified ecological advisors or a statutory nature conservation agency so that effective mitigation or compensatory measures can be put in place to prevent destruction or loss of protected species.

16 In relation to condition 30 of this consent English Heritage has advised that the recording should be undertaken to a Level 3 standards as defined in the English Heritage publication “Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Practice -2006”) and copies of the results should be deposited with the Council’s local history archive and the Greater London Historic Environment Record.
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Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>21/02/13</td>
<td>25/02/13</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/12/12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Control Enforcement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>07/02/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27/02/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/Highways</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>03/01/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Unit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30/01/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services - Noise</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28/11/12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboricultural Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>04/02/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and Community Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>03/01/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support &amp; Child Protection Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28/12/12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People’s Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>07/01/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration and Enterprise</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28/02/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water Development Control</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31/12/12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>22/01/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>06/02/13</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Clapham Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Larkhall Park</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall Triangle Residents Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Stockwell Street Residents and Tenants Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background documents

Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)

---

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
1 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The main issues involved in this application are:

- Introduction of a residential use; supported care housing (Use Class C2) in a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA);
- Location of supported care housing without safe and convenient access to local services and in an area with a poor level of public transport accessibility.

2 Site Description

2.1 The site is located on the northern side of the intersection of Wandsworth Road and Pensbury Street. Wandsworth Road serves part of the Transport for London (TfL) Road Network (TFLRN) and is a classified London Distributor Road. Pensbury Street is a local road serving business and industrial land to the north of the site.

2.2 The site is generally rectangular in shape. A low brick wall with metal fencing above is located along the northern, southern and western boundaries. There are two gates in the fencing on the Pensbury Street frontage (western side) with existing vehicle crossovers. The north-western corner of the boundary of the rear of the site is splayed to the adjoining vehicle laneway. The site is currently vacant and is mostly covered in overgrown weeds and shrubs. A small shed is located adjacent to the eastern boundary and towards the centre of the site.

2.3 The site is located within the Wandsworth Road Conservation Area (CA 59) which features a mostly 19th Century development in three separate sub-areas along Wandsworth Road. The area is linear in character and contains a range of building types from housing to commercial and industrial (the former Plough brewery). The buildings are typically two or three storeys with narrow frontages in the traditional manner. The site is also located in the London Plan (2011) Vauxhall, Nine Elms and Battersea Opportunity Area, a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA) under Council’s Core Strategy (2011) and is in an Environment Agency Flood Zone.

2.4 The adjoining property to the north-east (376 Wandsworth Road) of the site accommodates a three storey with basement building occupied in the form of self-contained flats. The building is a Grade II Listed Building constructed in the early-mid 19th Century and features stucco with boxed cornice (altered) and blocking course, recessed sash windows with glazing bars, prostyle Tuscan porch and further internal features of interest. In addition, 372-374 Wandsworth Road also accommodates two three storey with basement Grade II Listed Buildings of similar style, design and appearance. At the rear of these Grade II Listed Buildings and between 372 and 374 Wandsworth Road are commercial and industrial buildings.

2.5 Across Wandsworth Road to the south of the site are four storey buildings with ground floor retail and commercial businesses and upper level residential flats. Similar development exists to the south-west of the site on both sides of
Wandsworth Road. The northern boundary of the site adjoins a vehicle access lane from Pensbury Street to the premises located at the rear of 376 Wandsworth Road. The Pensbury Arms Public House is located on the other side of the access lane. Beyond this are industrial and warehousing buildings leading to the Stewarts Road Industrial Estate in the London Borough of Wandsworth.

2.6 The surrounding area contains a variety of uses. The adjoining property to the north of the site is occupied in the form of four self-contained flats with further residential development and a McDonald’s drive-thru restaurant along Wandsworth Road. On the southern side of Wandsworth Road, the built environment is characterised by residential flat estates and four storey residential flat buildings with ground floor retail and commercial uses. Some of the buildings present a high quality aesthetic appearance whilst others appear to be in need of upgrade and refurbishment. Commercial and industrial uses predominate further along Pensbury Street within the KIBA. Overall, there is no definite character to the area with a variety of uses present in the surrounding built environment.

3 Planning History

3.1 14 October 1976 – Planning permission was refused for the construction of a single storey building plus basement at 378-382 Wandsworth Road for use as a vehicle exhaust fitting centre. The single reason for refusal was due to the unsatisfactory relationship of the proposal to the adjoining building of architectural and historical interest.

3.2 13 October 2005 – Planning permission was granted for the removal of an existing mono-pitch roof of single storey storage building and the construction of a new flat roof, together with the installation of an additional window to the front elevation and associated alterations at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. The officer’s report noted that the buildings on the site were in a dilapidated state, building materials were strewn across the site and parked taxi cabs. Furthermore, there was previously a single storey building along the Wandsworth Road frontage however this had already been demolished.

3.3 3 March 2006 – An application for planning permission for the erection of a four storey building to provide an office (Use Class B1) unit at ground floor level and 12 self-contained flats above with associated car parking at 378-382 Wandsworth Road was withdrawn.

3.4 3 May 2006 – An application for planning permission for the erection of a four storey office block (Use Class B1) with associated works at 378-382 Wandsworth Road was withdrawn.

3.5 4 May 2007 – Planning permission was refused for the redevelopment of the site to include excavation of a basement level car park accessed from Pensbury Street and the erection of a part-single and part-three storey building for use as a retail and hot food takeaway unit (Use Class A1 and A5) at ground floor level and office use (Use Class B1) on first and second floor levels at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. The reasons for refusal were that the proposal would fail to
preserve or enhance the conservation area and setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings, the A1 and A5 uses were contrary to the KIBA land use designation and that the A5 use would cause a traffic safety conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

3.6 10 January 2008 – Planning permission was refused for the redevelopment of the site involving excavation of a basement level car park accessed from Pensbury Street and the erection of a part single, part three storey building for use as offices (Use Class B1) with associated landscaping, roof top plant and green roof to the single storey element at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. The reasons for refusal were that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area and setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings, exceed the maximum car parking standards and result in damage to a protected tree.

3.7 11 May 2010 – Planning permission was refused for the redevelopment of the site involving the erection of a part four storey building including lower ground floor level to provide shops (Use Class A1) and offices (Use Class B1) involving underground car parking for 4 cars (incl. 1 disabled space), refuse and cycle storage at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. The reasons for refusal were that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area and setting of nearby listed buildings, A1 use contrary to KIBA designation, undue sense of enclosure on neighbouring residents and damage to protected tree.

3.8 28 July 2010 – Planning permission was refused for the change in use to a hand car wash (Sui Generis) involving the erection of 2 canopies and 1 steel storage container and installation of 2 new windows to existing building for a temporary period of 3 years at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. The reasons for refusal were that the proposal would result in an unacceptable visual impact on the streetscene and fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area and setting of nearby listed buildings, adverse vehicle increase in surrounding street network and unacceptable noise impact on surrounding residential amenity.

3.9 15 October 2012 – Receipt of request for pre-application advice for the erection of a four storey building for social care housing at 378-382 Wandsworth Road. It is noted that prior to this request for pre-application advice, the agent had been in contact with Conservation officers regarding the design of the proposal.

3.10 28 October 2012 – Application for planning permission (ref: 12/04002/FUL) for the construction of a four storey building for social care housing at 378-38 Wandsworth Road was validated.

3.11 15 November 2012 – Pre-application advice issued raising land use planning objections to the proposed social care housing on land designated as a KIBA (amongst other issues) and locational objections (Policy 18 of the UDP (2007)). Subsequent to the issue of pre-application advice, planning application (ref: 12/04002/FUL) was withdrawn.

3.12 The subject application has been made and seeks to overcome the objections raised in the pre-application advice.

4 Proposal
4.1 The proposed development consists of the construction of a four storey building comprising office (Use Class B1) on part of the ground floor and training facilities and support areas together with nine self-contained studio flats (Use Class C2) on the upper three floors. Associated landscaping, cycle parking, refuse store and boundary treatment is proposed.

4.2 The ground floor plan is arranged into two zones; office and administration (Use Class B1) and supported care housing training facility (Use Class C2). A secure public lobby and reception separates the two zones. The training facility is located on the eastern side with stair access to the upper floors containing the supported care flats whilst the western side contains the office/administration component in the form of two large open plan office areas with accessible toilet and shower and counselling/night room.

4.3 The three upper floors accommodate nine self-contained training flats with three on each floor. Each studio has a bedroom, bathroom and limited kitchenette. Communal laundries are located on the western side of the second and third floors. Each level has three studios accessed by a communal corridor and stair. The studios are 17.5m² in area with the exception of one studio on the first floor which has an equal access bathroom and area of 20.5m².

4.4 The applicant and operator, Young Futures is a provider of supported housing to young people leaving care. They currently provide accommodation with support to four Local Authorities in London. The proposed development by Young Futures is a new facility to support their operations which includes administration and office, training facilities, specialist 24 hr office and self-contained training studios for vulnerable female care leavers aged 16+. Young Futures have secured significant grant and loan funding from the Department of Health’s Social Enterprise Investment Fund (SEIF) to fund the project.

4.5 A detailed description of the use is as follows;

**Offices and administration for an emerging social enterprise business**

- Administration and field workers: 13 (9 full time and 4 part time) with up to 8 of these employees spending 50% of their time at the site.
- Most staff are field workers and will attend the office for limited periods including weekly team meetings, monthly supervisions and training/continued professional development (CPD). The facility staff will manage the centre 24 hrs per day with a minimum of 2 team members on-shift at any one time.

**Training Centre for professionals/consultants**

- Young Futures actively engages in training and up skilling emerging professionals. The proposal will provide facilities to carry out training and continued professional development for a broader range of staffing levels.
- The office at the rear of the centre will be equipped with multi-media equipment to facilitate team meetings, team training, CPD. The room will also be used for drop in hot desking, group key working sessions (including functional skills). The ground floor kitchen will also be used for individual and group key working classes.
Studio accommodation for care leavers

- The studios will provide up to nine female care leavers aged 16+ with high levels of need, training flat experience with intensive key working support and protection. Each young person will receive up to 20 hours per week of support to best prepare them for the next step in the transition to adulthood and living independently.
- Facility staff: 11 (5 full time and 6 part time) involving shift work operating the 24 hr supported care housing (Use Class C2) function on the site.

5 Consultations and Responses

5.1 A total of 44 neighbours were consulted and relevant amenity/interest groups.

5.2 A site notice was displayed on 24 December 2012 and a press notice was published on 11 January 2013.

5.3 The application was called in by Councillor Neeraj Patil on 28 February 2013.

Internal consultation

5.4 Conservation Officer commented that the bulk and massing is sympathetic to the locality. The part that adjoins the Listed Building is subordinate as it is setback and comprises alternate materials. The landscaped front garden is welcomed. Recommended conditions requiring details of boundary and landscape treatment, external materials and external construction detail drawings (scale of 1:20) to be imposed in the event that permission is to be granted.

5.5 Transport/Highways Officer commented that although the site has a poor level of public transport accessibility (PTAL rating of 2), car use is likely to be low and the impact on parking stress is expected to be negligible in light of the proposed use. Cycle parking and refuse storage is acceptable subject to the imposition of recommended conditions relating to closure of existing crossovers, cycle parking details, control of mud deposit and method of construction statement in the event that permission is granted.

5.6 Crime Prevention Officer raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions securing the development in accordance with Secure by Design principles.

5.7 Aboricultural Officer commented that there is an existing Lime tree situated at the rear of the neighbouring property at 376 Wandsworth Road and is of moderate landscape value. The tree will require protection during construction to protect the root system and can be dealt with through the imposition of recommended conditions in the event that permission is to be granted.

5.8 Regulatory Services – Noise commented that a scheme for sound insulation should be secured through the imposition of a condition to protect the residential use from the commercial use in terms of noise transmission.

5.9 Adult and Community Services commented that although not directly relevant,
the location of such development should ensure future occupants are not put at risk due to the presence of other services and/or community safety issues in the area.

5.10 Family Support and Child Protection Services Officer advised of no objections to the proposal.

5.11 Children and Young People’s Services Officer commented that Young Futures is known and approached the Council in 2010 regarding service delivery. Due to tendered service framework, they were not able to utilise their services and there is no current contract with Young Futures as a service provider in Lambeth. It is noted that Young Futures Lewisham contract review demonstrated that they delivered highly rated services. The service proposed in this instance would be available to all authorities interested. Lambeth is due to re-tender services in 2014 and it will be up to Young Futures to decide to place a bid for service provision in Lambeth. The development is welcome; however, for the reasons stated, Lambeth youth may not be able to access the provision. The cost of the service offered is also unknown and the development may see the introduction of young people from other authorities who may then gain access to Lambeth’s general resources.

5.12 Planning Policy Officer was originally consulted in the preparation of pre-application advice issued 15 November 2012 and objected to the introduction of residential use in any form in a KIBA as it was contrary to Policy S3 of the Lambeth Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (2011). This position has been reconfirmed in the assessment of the subject application.

5.13 Streetcare officer advised that subject to sufficient refuse and recycling storage being provided the proposal is generally acceptable.

5.14 Employment and Skills Manager was commented that Lambeth does not suffer from a shortage of training providers and the proposal is therefore not meeting an identified need. Furthermore, the proposal will not result in significant job creation if these are being relocated from an existing site. Overall the proposal does not appear to justify the use within the KIBA designation.

External consultation

5.15 Thames Water Development Control commented and advised of no objections having regard to water infrastructure and recommended the inclusive of informatives in the decision notice.

5.16 The Environment Agency advised of no objections to the proposed development following review of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that accompanied the application.

5.17 English Heritage advised that they did not wish to comment on the application and recommended the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and Council’s own specialist conservation advice.

5.18 No comments were received from Transport for London (TfL).
5.19 Four letters of objection have been received following the conclusion of the consultation process. No letters of support have been received; however the applicant has forwarded ‘testimonials’ from other authorities involved with Young Futures service provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objections:**

- **No daylight/sunlight assessment has been undertaken.**
  - **Council’s Response:** A daylight and sunlight assessment has been undertaken by Eco Design Consultants (Architects and Environmental Consultants) dated 12 November 2012 and considers the impact of the proposed development on existing levels of daylight and sunlight to adjoining properties.

- **Adverse daylight/sunlight impact on residential properties and gardens to the adjoining property at 376 Wandsworth Road**
  - **Council’s Response:** The abovementioned daylight and sunlight assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines and indicates that although there will be a small increase in overshadowing to part of the rear garden on the neighbouring property at 376 Wandsworth Road, this is insignificant in relation to the overshadowing caused by the existing building. The impact is not unacceptable having regard to existing development and orientation of the site.

- **No acknowledgment of a listed (protected) tree located at the rear of 376 Wandsworth Road**
  - **Council’s Response:** Council’s Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that the Lime tree situated in the rear of the adjoining property at 376 Wandsworth Road is not covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) however is of moderate landscape value in the area. An assessment has been made and recommendations for the imposition of conditions to protect the tree in the event that permission is granted made. Subject to these conditions, there is no adverse impact on the existing tree.

- **The proposal does not accord and is unsympathetic to the Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Buildings nearby.**
  - **Council’s Response:** English Heritage have been consulted and advised of having no comments. Council’s Conservation Officer considers the design to be subordinate and appropriate in terms of bulk and mass having regard to the existing Grade II Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. Subject to the submission of design details, the proposal will not result in harm to the special significance of the nearby Listed Buildings or the Conservation Area.

- **Planning Statement incorrectly refers to 376 Wandsworth Road as a guest house however is**
  - **Council’s Response:** The agent amended the Planning Statement so that it accurately reflected adjoining development and occupation in the form of four self-contained residential flats.
occupied in the form of self-contained flats.

Adverse noise impact on nearby residential properties. Although the proposed development will operate 24 hrs per day, the use is for supported care housing, a residential use class that is unlikely to be conducive to noise impact beyond what would normally be expected from a residential use.

Adverse privacy and safety impact. The proposal has been assessed to preserve the privacy of adjoining and nearby residents and is unlikely to result in an unacceptable safety impact.

6 Planning Policy Considerations

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 On 27th March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This document had the immediate effect of replacing various documents including, amongst other documents, PPS1, PPS3, PPS4, PPS5, PPS12, PPG13, PPG17 and Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations.

6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Full weight should be given to the NPPF as a material consideration in taking planning decisions. It reinforces the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Moreover, it sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

6.4 The development plan in Lambeth is:

- The London Plan (adopted July 2011);
- Lambeth’s Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011); and
- The remaining saved policies in the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011.

The London Plan 2011

6.5 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaces the previous versions which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008. The London Plan is the Mayor’s development strategy for Greater London and provides strategic planning guidance for development and use of land and buildings within the London region.
The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy 3.17 – Health and Social Care Facilities
- Policy 4.4 – Managing Industrial Land and Premises
- Policy 5.3 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 5.12 – Flood Risk Management
- Policy 6.3 – Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
- Policy 6.9 – Cycling
- 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 7.6 – Architecture
- Policy 7.8 – Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy S1 – Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S2 - Housing
- Policy S3 – Economic Development
- Policy S4 – Transport
- Policy S6 – Flood Risk
- Policy S7 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S9 – Quality of the Built Environment


The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy 7 – Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 – Transport Impact
- Policy 14 – Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 18 – Shared Housing and Supported Housing
- Policy 19 – Active Frontage Uses
- Policy 31 – Streets, Character and Layout
- Policy 32 – Community Safety/Designing Out Crime
- Policy 33 – Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
6.10 The following Supplementary Planning Documents are relevant:

- Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008)
- Safer Built Environments (2008)

7 Land Use

7.1 The site is situated within the Wandsworth Road Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA). Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) designates land in KIBA for business, industrial, storage and waste management uses, including green industries and other compatible commercial uses excluding large scale retail. KIBAs are the Borough’s strategic reservoir of land for industrial and business use.

7.2 The London Plan (2011) identifies these sites as ‘Locally Significant Industrial Sites’ under Policy 4.4 and confirms the strategic direction for London Borough Council’s to preserve and protect industrial land where justified. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) is a material consideration in the assessment and determination of applications for planning permission. The NPPF (2012) at paragraph 22 emphasizes the need for Council’s to provide an up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites to meet local needs and to justify their long term protection. This has been undertaken most recently in the form of a survey of all KIBAs in the Borough in August 2012. This survey revealed that KIBAs were generally performing well and vacancy levels have remained the same from previous survey in 2008 and 2010.

7.3 The applicant’s planning statement has sought to demonstrate that although the proposal will not provide a wholly industrial or business use, other planning benefits outweigh these policies including:

(a) Economic Role: The ground floor will generate a total of 14 full time and 10 part time staff members contributing to the local economy. In light of the 2012 KIBA survey revealing 8% vacancy in floor space of which 4% related to B class premises, there is capacity to accommodate the development without harm to the KIBA.

(b) Environmental Role: The proposal is compatible to the mixed use character of the development fronting Wandsworth Road and on the cusp of the KIBA. It will achieve a better integration with its environment than a wholly industrial building.

(c) Social Benefits: The proposal will establish new support care housing for vulnerable young women aged 16+.

It is therefore concluded by the applicant that the proposed mix of uses will provide the optimum use for the site having regard to the site constraints and
sustainable development as sought by the NPPF.

7.4 The application therefore seeks to argue that the proposal presents substantial other planning benefits that should override the land use designation of the site as a KIBA. Although it is recognised that the proposal has sought to satisfy some of the planning issues relating to the site (e.g. Conservation Area, Listed Buildings, residential amenity, flooding, land contamination etc), and seeks to establish a social care housing facility, this does not overcome the land use designation of the site as a KIBA. Furthermore, Council’s Employment and Skills Manager has advised that the proposal does not meet an identified training need and is unlikely to result in a significant contribution to jobs where these are relocated from an existing site.

7.5 The introduction of supported care housing (Use Class C2) into a KIBA is contrary to Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) which specifically seeks to preserve this land for business and industrial uses only. The KIBA survey undertaken in August 2012 does indicate that four of the fifty-one (8%) premises in the Wandsworth Road KIBA were vacant however this vacancy rate is consistent across the Borough’s KIBAs when compared to the 2010 survey results. Therefore, there is no evidence that the preservation of land in existing KIBAs should not be sought in accordance with The London Plan (2011) and the NPPF (2012).

7.6 The introduction of incompatible uses within existing KIBAs may undermine Council’s policy and lead to compatible business and industrial uses having to seek alternate locations elsewhere in the Borough or outside the Borough. This may in turn reduce local employment opportunities contrary to the overall aims of Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011).

7.7 Accordingly, despite the office/administration function proposed as part of the development and the ability of the scheme to resolve other planning issues relating to the site, the introduction of supported care housing (Use Class C2), a residential use on a site designated for business and industrial uses only is contrary to Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011).

8 Location of Supported Housing

8.1 Supported housing refers to housing with care for those who are unable to live independently in their own homes. The level of care can vary from 24-hour residential care to an officer calling in on a regular basis. As long as there are more than six occupants and care is provided, this type of housing falls within Use Class C2 (residential institution) along with hospitals, residential schools and colleges. The proposed development is 24hr care provided to nine supported care housing flats for vulnerable females aged 16+ and therefore falls within this category and is subject to Policy 18 of the UDP (2007).

8.2 Proximity and safe convenient access to local facilities and public transport are important in the location of supported care housing. Policy 18 of the UDP (2007) establishes the location and suitability standards for determining whether a location for supported housing is appropriate (amongst other considerations). In relation to the subject application, the proposal is required to be located in or
adjoining town centres, or in residential areas with easy access to local services and good or better public transport accessibility and not result in:

- Over-intensive development (levels of local parking stress and parking provision will be taken into consideration);
- Over-concentration of facilities or accommodation;
- Excessive numbers of those in care such as to harm residential amenity; or
- Unacceptable pressure on local health and/or social services.

8.3 The proposal does not result in an over-intensive development having regard to levels of parking stress and parking provision (discussed in greater detail under ‘Transport and Highways’). The design of the proposal to accommodate nine studio ‘training flats’ as supported housing is not an over-concentration of facilities or accommodation and similarly there is not an excessive number of those in care proposed. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposal will result in unacceptable pressure on local health and/or social services.

8.4 However, the proposal fails to satisfy the locational requirements for supported housing in or adjoining a town centre or a residential area with easy access to local services and good or better levels of public transport. Although there are some existing commercial and retail uses in the vicinity of the site, this is not a recognised town centre. Instead, the site is situated within a KIBA and has a ‘Poor’ Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2.

8.5 Reliance can not be made on the existing commercial and retail uses in the vicinity of the site as there is minimal policy protection afforded to the retention of these uses outside of a recognised centre. Furthermore, Policy 26 of the UDP (2007) requires community facilities to be generally located in local, major or district centres. Where there are no suitable sites in these areas, small-scale community facilities should be located on a site with moderate or better public transport accessibility which is easily and safely accessible by cycling and walking. This means that not only is the proposed supported housing development located in an inappropriate location, but that there is a policy emphasis for community facilities and other services to be located away from the site, in and around identified centres.

8.6 The proposal therefore fails to achieve safe and convenient access to local services, facilities and public transport having regard to the locational standards of Policy 18 of the UDP (2007) as it is not located in or near a recognised local, major or district centre.

9 Conservation

9.1 The site is located in the Wandsworth Road Conservation Area (CA 59) and adjacent to a site accommodating a Grade II Listed Building (376 Wandsworth Road). There are two further Grade II Listed Buildings at 374 and 372 Wandsworth Road to the north of the site.

9.2 The design of the proposed development has been subject to early discussions with Council's Conservation and Design team in acknowledgment of adjoining and nearby listed buildings. The design has been refined to achieve a
sympathetic bulk and massing having regard to the locality and being no greater than the adjoining listed building. The stairwell proposed to adjoin the southern blank façade of the adjoining listed building has been designed to be subordinate through the introduction of a setback and use of alternate materials. This will see the proposed building achieve similar proportions to the adjoining listed building.

9.3 Policy 7.8 of The London Plan (2011) calls for development to conserve the significance of heritage assets and their settings by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. This is mirrored in Policy S9 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) which seeks to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and its liveability in pursuit of stable communities by safeguarding and promoting improvements to the Borough’s heritage assets. Policy 45 of the UDP (2007) calls for Council to preserve listed buildings for their special architectural or historic interest and refuse development which may adversely affect the setting of a listed building. Policy 47 of the UDP (2007) requires development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

9.4 The three adjoining listed buildings will remain the dominant architectural element in the composition of the street scene. The contemporary architectural aesthetic is tempered by the use of stock brick as the framing material on the flank and to the edges of the façade. The use of this characteristic material in the locality responds well to local distinctiveness. The combination of full-height glazing and green coloured cladding has the potential to be very successful. The use of the colour green is welcome as it will contribute to a softening of the urban landscape. The construction detailing provided shows the combination of glazing, cladding panels and fascias is carefully considered.

9.5 Overall, the proposed development has been appropriately designed having regard to the nearby listed buildings and characteristic features of the Wandsworth Road Conservation Area. The proposal will therefore preserve the special significance of the adjoining and nearby listed buildings and preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies 45 and 47 of the UDP (2007) and Policy S9 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011).

10 Design

10.1 The design of new buildings is regulated by both The London Plan (2011), Policy S9 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) and relevant policies of the UDP (2007). These policies generally seek to achieve a high quality design in new development that responds to the existing pattern and grain of spaces and streets, scale, proportion and mass in development. New buildings should contribute a positive relationship between the urban structure and natural landscape features, be human in scale and ensure people feel comfortable in their surroundings. In addition, new building design should be informed by the surrounding historic environment.

10.2 The proposed development is generally consistent with the established pattern of development on the western side of Wandsworth Road. The building design
maintains a continuous building line that respects the historic environment and addresses Wandsworth Road with a clearly identifiable frontage and entrance. Access for cycle parking and refuse storage and collection is conveniently located on the Pensbury Road secondary street frontage.

10.3 The proposed building design responds well to the architectural character of the local area. The proportions, bulk and mass of the building respect the significance of the adjoining Grade II Listed Buildings whilst presenting a contemporary design of interest. This design is integrated into the existing architectural character of the area and local distinctiveness of Lambeth through the use of stock brick on part of the building.

10.4 Landscaping proposed in the front setback of the building will complement the contemporary design and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area. Final design details would be requested for further review and approval by the Local Planning Authority through the imposition of a condition in the event that permission was granted.

10.5 Overall, the design of the proposed development is a high quality contemporary design that would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance in the local area and respond well to local distinctiveness.

11 Residential Amenity

11.1 The amenity of adjoining and nearby residents is a primary consideration in the assessment of applications for planning permission for new buildings and uses. The proposed development is located adjoining to 376 Wandsworth Road which is currently occupied in the form of four self-contained flats. This property is the immediate adjoining residential property. Other residential properties in the vicinity of the site are located across Pensbury or Wandsworth Roads and therefore have sufficient distance of separation to alleviate any potential amenity impacts such as overlooking, daylight/sunlight, sense of enclosure etc.

11.2 Turning to the most affected residential property, 376 Wandsworth Road, Council's planning policies, in particular, Policies 7 and 33 of the UDP (2007) seek to preserve the existing amenity afforded to residents. Policy 7 recognises the right of people to the quiet enjoyment of their homes. The Policy sets out two grounds for consideration depending on the context of the site. In this instance, the site is situated in an area with a variety of uses (i.e. is not in a predominantly residential area). Therefore, the scale, design, layout, hours-of-use, intensity, concentration and location of non-residential uses may need to be controlled to protect residential amenity. Furthermore, Policy 33 requires development to have an acceptable standard of privacy, acceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight, not create unacceptable overlooking or an undue sense of enclosure and where appropriate, have sufficient outdoor amenity space.

11.3 The proposed development is generally satisfactory having regard to these considerations and is likely to preserve the existing amenity afforded to adjoining residents in accordance with the above provisions. The privacy of adjoining residents will not be unacceptably impacted by way of overlooking as a result of the proposal. The windows in the rear elevation are to corridors and
the stairwall (not habitable rooms). This, in conjunction with the positioning of
the windows and layout of the building means that only an obscure view into
part of the neighbouring rear gardens would occur. As this view is limited to part
of the rear gardens, and is available from non-habitable rooms, the likely impact
is minimal and privacy will be satisfactorily maintained. It is noted that this
impact is no different to the existing situation from neighbouring properties.

11.4 A daylight and sunlight assessment has been undertaken by EcoDesign
Consultants. The assessment has analysed the implications of the proposed
development on the existing levels of daylight and sunlight to the rear garden of
376 Wandsworth Road and the nearby Pensbury Arms public house located a
the rear of the site. Policy 33 of the UDP (2007) requires development to protect
the residential amenity of existing and future residents by having an acceptable
impact on levels of daylight and sunlight. Whilst Council’s policy does not
prescribe numerical standards for assessment, reference can be made to the
Building Research Establishment (BRE) guideline for Site Layout Planning for
Daylight and Sunlight. The assessment carried out in accordance with the BRE
guideline indicates that there is no impact to the nearby Pensbury Arms Public
House however there is a minor increase in overshadowing to the neighbouring
rear gardens at 376 Wandsworth Road. This overshadowing however is minimal
compared to the impact of the existing building at 376 Wandsworth Road which
contributes to substantial overshadowing of the rear gardens. Accordingly, the
implications of the proposed development on sunlight to the rear garden of the
adjoining property at 376 Wandsworth Road are acceptable in accordance with
Policy 33 and having regard to existing development and site orientation.

11.5 Overall, the existing amenity afforded to neighbouring residents is likely to be
substantially preserved in accordance with Policies 7 and 33 of the UDP (2007).

12 Transport and Highways

12.1 The proposed development is located on a site that has a relatively poor public
transport accessibility rating (PTAL) of 2. The site is also situated within the
Stockwell Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and close to the boundary of Clapham
CPZ. The car use associated with the proposal is expected to be low and the
impact on parking stress negligible in light of the use.

12.2 Policy 6.9 of The London Plan (2011) requires 1 cycle space per 250m² gross
floor space for office (Use Class B1) and 1 cycle space per 3 staff for the
supported care housing component (Use Class C2). This generates a minimum
required cycle parking of 4.6 spaces (i.e. 5 spaces). The proposed development
exceeds this minimum standard and provides 12 cycle parking spaces at the
rear of the site and therefore satisfies the abovementioned policy.

12.3 Overall, the proposal is not expected to result in an adverse increase in vehicle
trip generation or demand for on-street parking. In the event that planning
permission is granted, conditions requiring the closure of existing driveway
accesses, details of cycle parking, control mud deposit on highway during
construction and preparation of a construction statement in the event that
planning permission is granted. Subject to the above assessment and
recommended conditions, the proposal satisfy Policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13 of The

13 Flood Risk Zone

13.1 The site is situated within Flood Zone 3 within the River Thames flood plain. In accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policy 5.12 of The London Plan (2011) and Policy S6 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) outline the assessment process to manage and mitigate flood risk in new development.

13.2 This planning policy context calls for a considered approach supported by flood risk assessment (FRA) and the application of a sequential approach where necessary. In addition, the Environment Agency is consulted on the application and FRA.

13.3 A FRA has been carried out by the applicant’s consultants and reviewed by the Environment Agency who advised of having no objections to the application on flood risk planning grounds. The Environment Agency has recommended that flood resistant and resilient measures are incorporated in the design of the development at the ground floor level, where practical, and in accordance with the guidance contained within Approved Document C of the Building Regulations and the document entitled ‘Improving the flood performance of new buildings: flood resilient construction’ published by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) 2007. This recommendation could be dealt with through the imposition of a condition in the event that planning permission was granted. The proposal is therefore satisfactory having regard to the relevant policies regulating development in Flood Risk Zones.

14 Sustainable Design and Construction

14.1 Sustainable development is an objective of the NPPF and reflected in the various policies of The London Plan (2011), the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) and UDP (2007). Furthermore, Council has an established Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which outlines local expectations for development to achieve sustainable design and construction outcomes.

14.2 The SPD requires new development to aspire to a BREEAM ‘Excellent’ and seeks a ‘Very Good’ as a minimum standard. The application has been accompanied by a BREEAM assessment that confirms the proposal will achieve the minimum ‘Very Good’ standard and therefore satisfies the SPD.

14.3 In addition, a statement has been submitted addressing Policy 35 of the UDP (2007) in relation to the development incorporating sustainable design and construction principles including for example; utilising environmentally friendly specifications and materials, specifying the reuse of sustainable sources of timber (FSC) and installation of low water use garden amongst others.

14.4 Overall, the proposed development is generally satisfactory having regard to the sustainable design and construction planning policy context.

15 Crime Prevention
15.1 Policy 7.3 of The London Plan (2011), Policy 32 of the UDP (2007) and supporting Supplementary Planning Document for Safer Built Environments requires development to be safe, secure and accessible whilst contributing to a reduction in crime prevention. The applicant outlines the crime prevention measures in the development to include a defined and enclosed front garden visible from the street and within the building, secure rear garden, CCTV facility, secure site entry points, 24hr site supervision, external lighting and secure door and window specification.

15.2 Council’s Crime Prevention have recommended that the new building complies with Safer By Design minimum standards for physical protection and maximise surveillance where possible. Conditions have been recommended to be imposed along with the submission of boundary treatment details to the front and rear of the site for further approval of the Local Planning Authority in the event that permission is to be granted. Subject to the above conditions and submission of further details, the proposal is satisfactory having regard to Policy 32 of the UDP (2007) and SPD for Safer Built Environments.

16 Land Contamination

16.1 The site is located in a KIBA and appears to have been used for various uses in the past. Policy 5.21 of The London Plan (2011) requires a consideration of whether the land on which the development is proposed to be located is suitable having regard to past uses and potential contamination. A preliminary Site Check review has been undertaken which involves a desktop review of past uses on and in the vicinity of the site. Although this does not provide an authoritative statement as to whether contaminated land may be encountered on the site, it does give an indication of potential sources and/or past land uses that may result in land contamination. Notwithstanding, in the event that permission were to be granted, conditions could be imposed to require a site investigation scheme and further action, if necessary, to ensure that any potential land contamination was remediated.

17 Landscaping and Trees

17.1 The appearance of good quality and well designed landscaping can make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene and Conservation Area. In addition, landscaping can contribute to a pleasant aesthetic setting for new buildings. The proposal will involve the landscaping of the front setback area to Wandsworth Road. In the event that permission was granted, a condition would be imposed requiring the final details of a landscape design and treatment to the front setback area to be submitted for further approval. Subject to this condition, the proposal would be consistent with Policy 39 of the UDP (2007).

17.2 In addition to the landscaped appearance of the site, Policy 39 identifies the high amenity value of trees and seeks to protect them. Although there are no trees on the site, there is an existing Lime tree located in the rear of the adjoining property at 376 Wandsworth Road. Council’s Arboricultural Officer has identified this tree to be of moderate landscape value and require protection
during construction works. Conditions have been recommended to be imposed in the event of planning permission being granted and subject to these conditions, the Lime tree is likely to be protected from construction works on the site.

18 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

18.1 The Mayor of London’s Community Infrastructure Levy is applicable to applications for planning permission in the London Borough of Lambeth at a rate of £35/m². Most new buildings that people normally use will be liable to pay the levy and the proposal has a residential floor area of 160m². Although the recommendation presented in this report is to refuse planning permission it should be noted that the proposal may be liable to pay a contribution towards the CIL in the event that permission is granted.

19 **Conclusion**

19.1 Although the proposal has been designed to satisfy many of the planning policies that apply, the development has not been able to demonstrate that it is appropriately located within a KIBA. The site is unsuitable for the introduction of residential use (Use Class C2) on land that is specifically designated for business and industrial use. The incorporation of a part office (Use Class B1) on the ground floor, stated training and employment opportunities fails to overcome the land use designation of the site as a KIBA for the reasons stated above.

19.2 In addition to the above, the location of supported care housing (Use Class C2) on the site does not achieve safe and convenient access for future occupants to public transport and local services contrary to Policy 18 of the UDP (2007). Supported care housing is required to be located in or near recognised local, major or district centre in order to achieve this. As stated above, the site is designated as a KIBA and reserved for business and industrial land uses. Whilst there are some commercial and retail uses in the vicinity of the site, there is minimal policy protection to preserve these uses in support of the proposed supported care housing. Overall, the location of the proposed supported care housing (Use Class C2) on the site is contrary to the land use designation of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) and locational requirements of Policy 18 of the UDP (2007) for supported care housing.

20 **Recommendation**

20.1 It is recommended that planning permission is refused for the reasons stated below.

21 **Summary of the Reasons**

21.1 In deciding to refuse planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be refused subject to the reasons below. In reaching this decision the following policies were relevant:

21.3 The London Plan (2011):

- Policy 3.17 – Health and Social Care Facilities
- Policy 4.4 – Managing Industrial Land and Premises
- Policy 5.3 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 5.12 – Flood Risk Management
- Policy 6.3 – Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
- Policy 6.9 – Cycling
- 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 7.6 – Architecture

21.4 The Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011):

- Policy S1 – Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S2 - Housing
- Policy S3 – Economic Development
- Policy S4 – Transport
- Policy S6 – Flood Risk
- Policy S7 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S9 – Quality of the Built Environment


- Policy 7 – Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 – Transport Impact
- Policy 14 – Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 18 – Shared Housing and Supported Housing
- Policy 19 – Active Frontage Uses
- Policy 31 – Streets, Character and Layout
- Policy 32 – Community Safety/Designing Out Crime
- Policy 33 – Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 39 – Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
- Policy 45 – Listed Buildings
- Policy 47 – Conservation Areas

21.6 Supplementary Planning Documents:

- Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008)
22 Reasons

22.1 Despite the office/administration (Use Class B1) component, the introduction of a residential use; supported care housing (Use Class C2) on a site designated as a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA) is contrary to Policy S3 of the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

22.2 The location of supported care housing (Use Class C2) on the site does not provide safe and convenient access to local services in a recognised local, major or district centre or to an acceptable level of public transport accessibility contrary to Policy 18 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): ‘Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’.

23 Informatives

23.1 It is recommended that a site located in or near a local, major or district centre is sought in accordance with Policy 18 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011 in order to ensure that safe and convenient access to local services and good public transport accessibility is achieved. Land designated for Key Industrial and Business Areas (KIBAs) should be avoided.
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Site address

Hampton House, 20 Albert Embankment, London, SE1 7TJ

Ward

Prince’s

Proposal

Demolition and redevelopment of the existing building and the erection of a part 15, part 16-24, part 19-27 storey building to provide a residential led mixed use development comprising ground floor cafe/restaurant uses (A3); office (B1); residents gym and members lounge; and 248 residential units, together with ancillary residential facilities, associated amenity space, car, motorcycle and cycle parking, access and servicing, refuse storage and collection facilities and landscaped public piazza.

Application type

Major

Application ref(s)

12/04422/FUL

Validation date

19/11/2012

Case officer details

Name: Kevin Tohill
Tel: 020 7926 5021
Email: ktohill@lambeth.gov.uk

Applicant

St James Group

Agent

Ms Hayley Ellison: Boyer Planning

Considerations/constraints

Environment Agency Flood Zone
VNEB Opportunity Area
London Plan Thames Policy Area
CAZ
Archaeology Priority Area
Strategic Viewing Corridor - Parliament Hill to Palace of Westminster

Approved plans

2080 PA002 rev.1; PA003 rev.1; PA004 rev.1; PA005 rev.1; PA006 rev.1; PA007 rev.1; PA008 rev.1; PA009 rev.1; PA010 rev.1; PA011 rev.1; PA021 rev.1; PA022 rev.1; PA024 rev.1; PA025 rev.1; PA050 and PA051

Recommendation(s)

Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the report and the signing of a Section106 agreement for developer contributions and GLA stage 2 referral.
## Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>27.02.2013</td>
<td>28.02.2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.12.2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>02.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01.03.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation s106</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>05.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26.02.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>08.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.02.2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise &amp; Pollution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Equalities &amp; Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Waterloo Groups</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Society</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Community Development Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Cross Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Albert Embankment Residents Association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Vauxhall Spring Gardens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQBA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Terrorism Unit - Met Police</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See C.P comments for details</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.12.2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage (Archaeology)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.10.2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.12.2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Camden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09.01.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.02.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Westminster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>06.02.2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See consultation responses for details</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, all ward councillors for the Prince’s ward have been consulted.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
Background documents
Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)
1 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The main issues involved in this application are:

The principle of the loss of office accommodation and redevelopment of the site with a mixed use development;

The visual impact of the proposed building on the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area, streetscape, nearby listed buildings, listed Albert Embankment walkway and Westminster World Heritage site;

The impact of the proposal upon surrounding residential amenity in terms of visual intrusion, overbearing impact, a sense of enclosure, loss of light, privacy, noise and disturbance;

The acceptability of a residential use in this location;

The quality of the residential accommodation proposed;

The quantum and type of affordable housing provided;

The impact of the development upon the highway network, conditions of highway safety and levels of parking provision;

The ability of the proposal to reduce its energy demands through the use of renewable energy technologies and increased energy efficiency;

The measures taken to mitigate the effects of the proposal through contributions secured by s.106 planning obligations, and;

The effect of the proposal on water resources and its ability to resist flooding.

2 Site Description

2.1 The application site is 0.4 hectare in size and contains a 10 storey office block (16,400sqm), erected in the late 1950s. The building is currently empty and has been boarded up at ground floor level; a bank (A2 use) previously occupied the ground floor. Located on Albert Embankment, the site is approximately equi-distance between Lambeth Bridge and Vauxhall Bridge. It is a rectangular site, sitting between the east bank of the River Thames and a railway viaduct with train lines running to and from London Waterloo.

2.2 Directly to the north of the site is the recently completed 12 storey Riverside Park Plaza Hotel, whilst to the south there are similar office blocks to that on the application site. To the east, on the other side of the railway viaduct is Pedlars Park and an office complex, and beyond that, residential properties made up largely of Lambeth flats on estates. Access to the largest open space nearby, Spring Gardens, to the southeast, is via Tinworth Street, under the railway viaduct. On the opposite side of the River Thames, on Millbank, is Millbank Tower.
2.3 The site lies immediately adjacent to the Albert Embankment Conservation Area, which extends to the north and south along the riverside. The nearest listed buildings are some 150 metres to the north - London Fire Brigade Headquarters and Southbank House. On the opposite side of the river in the City of Westminster, is the listed Millbank Tower, Tate Britain, the Houses of Parliament and the Westminster World Heritage Site.

2.4 The site is located within the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea opportunity area (VNEB) as set out in the London Plan policy 2.13 and shown on Map 2.4 (London Plan 2011). The site also falls within the boundary of the Central Activity Zone (CAZ) as shown on Map 2.3 of the London Plan. The site lies adjacent to the Lambeth Embankment and the listed Albert Embankment walkway adjacent to the River Thames. The site falls within Flood Risk Zone 2.

2.5 In terms of Development Plan designations, the London Plan (2011) shows the site as falling within the South West London Sub Region, the Central Activities Zone and the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity Area. In the UDP the application site is identified as falling within the Central Activities Zone, within the Thames Policy Area, within an Archaeological Priority Area. The application site also lies within the background consultation area for the strategic view from Parliament Hill to Westminster.

3 Planning History

3.1 27th March 2008 - Ref: 07/04264/FUL - Council issued planning permission, subject to conditions and a s.106 agreement, for:

Redevelopment of the site involving the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three buildings of between 13 and 27 storeys to provide a mixed use development comprising ground floor commercial units (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D2), a 167 room apart-hotel, 242 self contained residential units comprising 93 x 1 bed, 77 x 2 bed, 65 x 3 bed and 7 x 4 bed, along with associated parking and landscaping including first floor podium and roof gardens.

3.2 There have been a number of subsequent planning applications to discharge the conditions attached to the above planning permission.

In April 2012 the applicant entered into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the council with a view to working with officers of the council in order to bring forward an acceptable redevelopment scheme for the site. This is a public document which set out an agreement between the developer and the council on how the pre-application process would be managed. The PPA has culminated in the submission of this current planning application for the local planning authority’s full consideration.

Whilst entering into a PPA by no way means that a subsequent application will be rubber stamped, PPAs are increasingly being used by Lambeth on schemes of this nature to proactively and positively engage with developers to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions
of the area; in accordance with the expectations conferred upon LPAs by the NPPF. It is advised that in this instance the applicant has responded positively and openly to all advice given. It must therefore be borne in mind that whilst this officer recommendation of approval is being presented having regard to the merits of the scheme currently before the LPA for consideration, those ‘merits’ have been largely and positively influenced by the extensive pre-application negotiations and discussions that preceded the application submission.

3.2 The proposal was presented to the Council Strategic Sites Panel on 12 June 2012. The Panel was largely supportive of the scheme in terms of the mix of uses on the Albert Embankment, design, scale and massing.

Concern was raised regarding the proposed level of parking provision within the development. The Councils standards would seek parking provision to be no greater than 0.25 per unit in an area PTAL 6 location and levels proposed where closer to 0.75 per unit which was unacceptable. Parking levels have been reduced down to 0.41 however this is still considered excessively high within the Vauxhall area. Considerable discussions have taken place between St James and officers to reach agreement on this matter which is set out in detail within the transport section.

3.3 The proposal was also presented to the Planning Applications Committee at a Planning Technical Briefing on 21 January 2013 and a number of concerns were raised:

Parking Provision was considered to be excessively high and contrary to policy, in light of the high PTAL level of 6a.

Parking provision remains high for the location however the needs of the extra care RP and the desire of the developer to provide sufficient levels of parking have been worked through with the Councils transport department. To ensure that the Councils aspirations are met to reduce vehicle trips in the area, most noticeably on the gyratory, a strict parking penalty clause is being drawn up to accommodate the developers requirements while heavily limiting trips made. Further details can be found in the transport section of this report.

Design and the colour of the development could be enhanced.

This has also been raised by the Councils Conservation and Design team and a substantial amount of work has been undertaken by the architects and the Councils conservation and design team to ensure that the development is appropriately colourful while using the native materials of the Southbank, most noticeably Portland stone to achieve a high quality design and appearance while preserving the Southbank’s historic materials.

4 Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing 11 storey Hampton House and the re-development of the site with a part 15, part 16-24, part 19-27 storey building to provide a residential led, mixed use scheme.
4.2 Planning permission is being sought for the demolition of the existing Hampton House building and the redevelopment of the site for a residential-led mixed use development comprising residential apartments and ancillary residential facilities, office (B1) and café/restaurant (A3), uses together with private amenity space, parking, servicing, refuse facilities and public realm at ground floor level. The proposal would comprise:

- 253 residential apartments (which includes 85 affordable senior living apartments) and ancillary residential facilities (33.6% affordable);
- 771sqm café/restaurant (A3) uses;
- 1,272sqm office (B1) use;
- 106 car parking spaces in the basement;
- 11 motorcycle spaces in the basement;
- 318 bicycle spaces in the basement and at grade;
- Public piazza and private communal amenity space, including children’s play space.

4.3 The development proposals are accommodated within three buildings ranging in height from 15 storeys to 27 storeys. Buildings 1 and 2 accommodate the commercial uses at ground and first floor levels with residential apartments above and Building 3 comprises the affordable senior living apartments. The positioning of the buildings across the site allows for the creation of the proposed public piazza at ground floor. The public piazza would follow the high quality design and appearance of the listed Albert Embankment opposite the site, include high quality landscaping and a cultural strategy has been developed to create a sense of place within the development.

4.4 As well as the public piazza, private and communal residential amenity space comprising; balconies and communal gardens are proposed, children’s play spaces and car parking is proposed within the basement and cycle parking spaces are also proposed in the basement and at grade.

5 Consultations and Responses

5.1 In April 2008, the London Borough of Lambeth adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets out policy for involving the community in the preparation, alteration and review of planning policy documents and in deciding planning applications. Paragraph 7.10 of the adopted version sets out the expectation of the Council:

“Consultation and community involvement is not a statutory requirement at the pre-application stage, but the Council strongly encourages developers with proposals for major developments to consult the community and appropriate stakeholders. The Council also encourages applicants to consult planning officers for advice before submitting planning applications. Pre-application discussions can be of considerable help to all parties. They can assist in establishing whether a development is acceptable in principle. In addition they full range of information and supporting information required for the submission of a planning application can be identified. This can include the requirements for planning obligations, for example, thereby giving more certainty and speeding
up the decision making process."

5.2 St James has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement to demonstrate how they engaged with the local community. St James undertook two public consultations with the local community and the following local stakeholders have been included:

- Local residents and businesses
- Friends of Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens
- Vauxhall Gay Business Forum
- Vauxhall Garden Estate Resident and Tenants’ Association
- Vauxhall Gardens Community Centre
- Vauxhall City Farm
- Vauxhall Society
- Viva Vauxhall
- Vision for Vauxhall
- Vauxhall BID
- Kennington Association
- Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum
- St George Wharf Residents’ Association
- Ethelred Tenant Management Organisation
- Vauxhall Neighbourhood Housing Forum
- Manor of Kennington Association
- Association of Waterloo Groups
- Waterloo Action Centre
- Waterloo Community Development Group
- Ward Councillors
- London Borough of Lambeth
- Greater London Authority
- Transport for London
- English Heritage
- Metropolitan Police

5.3 St James also invited local residents and interested parties to view information that illustrated details of the site, the planning framework, and the design evolution of the proposals. Local residents were invited to attend a public exhibition to view the proposals and discuss the scheme. A total of 1,200 invitation ‘flyers’ were delivered in the local area. The flyers provided a brief explanation of the proposals and details of the exhibitions which were held on 14 July and 18 July 2012.

The public consultation was supplemented by a website that contained the exhibition information, so that residents could view the information outside of the formal consultation events.

St James have engaged with officers from the planning authorities and local residents and amenity groups through the design development and application process.

5.4 1082 neighbouring properties have been consulted by the Council. See attached map for details of the consultation addresses.
5.5 Three site notices were displayed on 17 December 2012 and a press notice was also published on 28 December 2012 in the Weekender.

Internal consultation

5.6 The Council’s Highways and Transportation officer have been heavily involved in the design and development of the proposal, striving to reduce the levels of parking provision on site. This has been met with resistance from the developer and therefore a trip levels penalty clause has been proposed by the Council’s transport officers. See transport section of this report for further details.

5.7 The Council’s Noise and Pollution officer raised no objection to the development.

5.8 The Council’s Food Safety officer has mentioned that as the typical flue extraction system running to the roof would not be appropriate on a building of this scale, an extraction system should be designed to suppress and disperse fumes and smells produced by cooking and food preparation from impacting upon neighbouring units/premises. This would be conditioned.

5.9 The Council’s Policy officer raises no objection to the development and supports the mix of uses and provision within the confines of a relatively small site.

5.10 The Council’s Streetcare Team raise no objection.

5.11 The Council’s Design Officer raises no objection and largely supports the development subject to condition relating to the finishing materials and details.

5.12 The Council’s Crime Prevention Officer has met with the applicants throughout the design process and the concerns have largely been addressed.

5.13 The Council’s Employment Officer is largely in support of the development.

5.14 The Council’s Housing Department supports the provision of a mixed Affordable Rent and Shared Ownership Extra Care Older Person’s Scheme provided as the affordable housing at Hampton House on the basis that it is not possible to obtain additional affordable accommodation as BNP Paribas conclude in their assessment of St James Plc’s Financial Appraisal.

External consultation

5.15 Transport for London - No objection raised.

5.16 Environment Agency - No objection has been raised subject to the imposition of a condition that planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by Powell Tolner & Associates, which was submitted with this application.

5.17 English Heritage Archaeology - Have raised no objection subject to the imposition of a condition stating that no works should take place until the
applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme for investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

This condition was on the previous planning permission on the Hampton House site and has been approved. As such any approval of this development would include a condition to insure compliance with the approved documents from this discharge of conditions application ref: 12/04180/DET.

5.18 English Heritage - Raise no objection but have noted that future development within the VNEB OAPF should avoid tall building appearing collectively as a solid wall of development. Concerns have however been raised regarding the strategic views from Parliament Hill. The Councils conservation and design department are satisfied that the proposal would not impact on views of the world heritage site from parliament hill, to ensure this was the case, planning and design officers conducted a site visit, checking the views from all strategic locations.

5.19 London Borough of Camden - Raised objection to the impact on strategic views from Parliament Hill. (See above for officer comments)

5.20 London Borough of Southwark - No objection raised

5.21 London Borough of Wandsworth - Raise no objection.

5.22 City of Westminster - Raise no objection.

5.23 GLA - The applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with the GLA in May 2012 and further meetings in August 2012 and September 2012. At those meetings the design approach and quality of the architecture were endorsed, however concerns have been raised regarding the levels of parking within the development and the nature of the affordable housing provision being restrictive and not general needs housing.

A number of concerns raised by the GLA have been responded to by the developer, we are awaiting a response. The GLA comments will be reported to Members if they are received before the Committee meeting.

5.24 Port of London Authority - Raised no objection. Suggestions were made that the development could make use of the Thames river to deliver construction materials. This was raised with the Councils transport department and TfL and it was considered that crossing/closing the highway to make deliveries would impact significantly on the highway.

5.25 To date 1 objection has been received following the consultation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objections:
The proposed developments dimensions and projected scope of use will have an adverse effect on the environment; the Albert Embankment Gardens and the height of the proposed development will have a negative impact on the view available to the residents of surrounding properties, including those at Peninsula Heights.

### Council’s Response:
The proposal is comparable to other recent planning approvals including the 2010 Hampton House planning approval and Eastbury House in terms of scale and height and is within the VNEB OAPF height guidance for this location. The building will be set back significantly from the Albert Embankment, across the road which gives sufficient separation to avoid any impact on this listed embankment. The development is also approximately 100m away from Peninsula Heights and at this distance would have no impact in planning terms on the residents of this block.

## 6 Planning Policy Considerations

### National Guidance

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (‘consolidated with Alterations since 2004’ published in February 2008), the Lambeth Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’. Material considerations include national planning policy statements and planning policy guidance.

6.2 On 27th March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework. This document had the immediate effect of replacing various documents including, amongst other documents, PPS1, PPS3, PPS4, PPS5, PPS12, PPG13, PPG17 and Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations.

6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It reinforces the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Moreover, it sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

6.4 The applicant’s planning statement sets out how this development meets the aspirations of the NPPF.

The London Plan 2011
6.5 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and replaces the previous versions which were adopted in February 2004 and updated in February 2008. The London Plan is the Mayor’s development strategy for Greater London and provides strategic planning guidance for development and use of land and buildings within the London region.

6.6 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

6.7 The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy 1.1 - Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
- Policy 2.9 - Inner London
- Policy 2.10 - CAZ - Strategic Priorities
- Policy 2.13 - Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas
- Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
- Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 3.6 - Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
- Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
- Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 3.10 - Definition of affordable housing
- Policy 3.11 - Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing on individual private and mixed use schemes
- Policy 3.13 - Affordable housing thresholds
- Policy 4.1 - Developing London’s economy
- Policy 4.2 - Offices
- Policy 4.3 - Mixed use development and offices
- Policy 4.7 - Retail and town centre development
- Policy 4.9 - Small shops
- Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
- 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 wastewater infrastructure
- Policy 5.15 - Water use and supplies
- Policy 5.16 - Waste self-sufficiency
Policy 5.18 - Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 6.1 - Strategic approach
Policy 6.3 - Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.5 - Funding Crossrail and other statically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.7 - Better streets and surface transport
Policy 6.9 - Cycling
Policy 6.10 - Walking
Policy 6.13 - Parking
Policy 7.1 - Building London’s neighbourhoods and communities
Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 - Local character
Policy 7.5 - Public realm
Policy 7.6 - Architecture
Policy 7.7 - Location and design of tall and large buildings
Policy 7.8 - Heritage assets and archaeology
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 7.29 - The river Thames
Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 - Community Infrastructure Levy

Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011)

6.8 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

- Policy S1 - Delivering the Vision and Objectives
- Policy S2 - Housing
- Policy S3 - Economic Development
- Policy S4 - Transport
- Policy S6 - Flood Risk
- Policy S7 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy S8 - Sustainable Waste Management
- Policy S9 - Quality of the Built Environment
- Policy S10 - Planning Obligations
- Policy PN2 - Vauxhall


6.9 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:
- Policy 7 - Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 - Transport Impact
- Policy 14 - Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 16 - Affordable Housing
- Policy 19 - Active Frontage Uses
- Policy 21 - Location and Loss of Offices
- Policy 23 - Protection and Location of other Employment Uses
- Policy 31 - Streets, Character and Layout
- Policy 32 - Community Safety/Designing Out Crime
- Policy 33 - Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 39 - Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
- Policy 40 - Tall Buildings
- Policy 41 - Views
- Policy 43 - The River Thames Policy Area - Urban Design

Local Guidance

6.10 The council has adopted the following Supplementary Planning Documents, which are relevant:
- SPD: Housing Development and House Conversions
- SPD: Safer Built Environments
- SPD: Sustainable Design and Construction
- SPD: S106 Planning Obligations
- SPD: Vauxhall


Regional Guidance

6.12 In March 2012, the Mayor adopted a planning framework for the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity Area. It is Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan. The framework has been produced in collaboration with Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils, as well as TfL and English Heritage.

6.13 The framework sets out an ambition for around 16,000 new homes and a range of 20,000 - 25,000 jobs. It contains proposals for an extension to the Northern Line from Kennington to Battersea via Nine Elms; a new linear park connecting Vauxhall to Battersea Power Station; a tall buildings strategy which supports an emerging cluster at Vauxhall within the parameters of the London Views Management Framework. It promotes the creation of a Combined Cooling and Heat Power network. Additionally, a Development Infrastructure Funding Study has been undertaken which informed the advancement of a Section106 tariff to fund the full range of infrastructure required to support new development in the Opportunity Area.

6.14 The following regional guidance is relevant to the application proposal:

- Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012)
Land Use

7.1 The application site is located within the London Plan Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and the London Plan Vauxhall Nine Elms, Battersea Opportunity Area. The current use of the site is B1 office floor space which is currently partially occupied by DEFRA.

7.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the Lambeth Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011), the remaining saved policies in the 'Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF ‘Core Strategy January 2011’ and the London Plan 2011.

7.3 The Vauxhall, Nine Elms and Battersea Opportunity Area Policy Framework (VNEB OAPF) was adopted in March 2012. The VNEB OAPF anticipates high density, mixed use, housing-led intensification on the application site along with other sites in the immediate vicinity and along the River Thames in Nine Elms. The OAPF represents a change to land use policy in the Vauxhall/Albert Embankment area, which has traditionally consisted predominantly of industrial/employment/office uses. Lambeth’s Core Strategy also supports residential-led mixed use development, identifying that new homes and jobs along Albert Embankment will be provided through redevelopment with active ground floor frontages and an expanded range of employment and residential uses (policy PN2 of the Core Strategy).

7.4 While Core Strategy and the OAPF policy encourages mixed use redevelopment on the Albert Embankment, saved Lambeth UDP policy 23 seeks to protect existing employment floorspace. The development proposals incorporate approximately 1,272sqm of office (B1) floorspace and 771sqm of retail/café (A1/A3) floorspace, which represents re-provision of approximately 25% of the existing floorspace which would provide a similar number of jobs to the current occupation levels along this part of the Albert Embankment as they are all currently under occupied.

Office Provision and Part Change of Use

7.5 The application includes an employment study by Roger Tyms and Partners, which reviews the constraints of the existing building as an office, considers the likelihood of successfully re-letting the existing building, demand for office
accommodation in the area, and the potential demand for the proposed replacement floorspace. The report demonstrates that the existing building is no longer suitable for employment use; in this regard, the design of the building lacks the quality of servicing needed to accommodate modern users. Without refurbishment and modernisation these constraints impact the likely success of letting the building to a single occupier or on a floor by floor basis. Officers have found similar low levels of occupancy along the entirety of this part of the Albert Embankment including Eastbury and Prince Consort House.

7.6 The Roger Tyms report also identifies that there is a surplus of similar 1950/60s buildings in the area, which further hindered the likely success of letting the existing building. The report identifies that there are a range of estimates of demand for office accommodation within the VNEB Opportunity Area; however, in all cases the pipeline supply of office floor space is significantly greater than the estimated demand. As such it is not considered that there is a wider strategic requirement for Hampton House to remain in an office use or for all of the existing floorspace to be re-provided in the development proposals subject to the nature of the redevelopment.

7.7 The overall provision of non-residential floorspace within the proposed scheme has been reduced over the existing and approved development ref: 07/04264/FUL, through with the omission of the apart hotel, however due to the inclusion of this level of modern office floorspace and restaurant, and residential facilities especially within the extra care services, the levels of employment would be comparable to the approved development and as such officers are satisfied with the employment levels of the development.

7.8 Core Strategy Policy PN2 Vauxhall sets out the vision for the regeneration of the wider Vauxhall area including the Albert Embankment in the context of the London Plan CAZ and Opportunity Area designations. The policy supports development in Vauxhall for the full range of central London uses. In particular, section (a) supports active ground floor frontages being provided in development throughout the Vauxhall area, with a mix of uses including Central London Activities with local services and facilities serving the predominantly residential areas to the east of the railway viaduct. Section (b) of the policy seeks the developing of an accessible, legible and permeable pedestrian and cycling environment, including creating public spaces, promoting public art, with key landmarks quality streetscape, strong linkages to the River Thames, between public spaces and connections from east to west between Albert Embankment and the primarily residential areas beyond the railway viaduct and ensuring that a high quality riverside walk is maintained. Section (h) seeks enhancing the appearance and character of Albert Embankment, with active ground floor frontages and an expanded range of employment and residential uses with a greater footfall, ensuring that it is highly accessible and well connected to the surrounding area, maintaining and improving safe access to the River Thames with development avoiding the creation of a wall effect through ensuring variation in the roofline and sufficient gaps between buildings, safeguarding strategic and local views and historic environment.

7.9 This policy for places and neighbourhoods should be read alongside relevant London Plan policies, the Core Strategy strategic policies (particularly S2 and
S3) and the remaining saved detailed policies in the UDP which support them. Core Strategy Policy S3 (b) supports the location of major office developments (over 1,000 sqm) in the CAZ and VNEB Opportunity Area. The policy is also supported by saved UDP Policy 21 which provides more detail about the consideration of large scale office development.

7.10 London Plan Policy 4.3 ‘Mixed use development and offices’ is also relevant in this case. This states that, within the CAZ, wherever increases in office floorspace are proposed they should provide a mix of uses including housing, unless such a mix would demonstrably conflict with other policies in the plan. While the level of office provision would decrease in line with the current levels of the buildings, in this CAZ location, it is appropriate, in principle, that this scheme includes housing alongside the re-provision of office floorspace within a mixed use scheme. The inclusion of housing would help to achieve the wider objectives for Vauxhall and would contribute to meeting the London Plan housing target for the borough (Core Strategy Policy S2(a)), which is to be welcomed.

Ground Floor Use - Active Frontages

7.11 At ground floor level, the scheme proposes 3 individual retail/restaurant (A1/A3) floorspace units. The applicant is seeking a flexible permission to use the space for a range of active uses, comprising retail and restaurant/cafe, due to the fact that the end user has not yet been established. Policy 19 of the saved UDP policies require application sites within the Thames Policy Area, and on the Albert Embankment, to provide active frontage uses at ground floor level. Active frontage uses, as identified within the adopted UDP, are uses that fall within Use Classes A and D. The objectives of the above policies have been achieved, and this element of the proposal is considered acceptable in principle. Officers consider that the wide range of uses and services within the development will significantly increase the footfall along the Albert Embankment creating a much more vibrant location.

Residential Accommodation

7.12 London Plan Policy 3.3 seeks to increase London’s supply of housing and sets for Lambeth a minimum ten year target of 11,950. Policy S2 of the Core Strategy commits the Council to the provision of at least 7,700 net additional dwellings across the borough between 2010/11 and 2016/17 in line with London Plan targets and a further 8,800 more homes by 2024/25, subject to London Plan targets for this period.

7.13 London Plan Policy 3.11 sets out that the Mayor will, and boroughs and other relevant agencies and partners should, seek to maximise affordable housing provision and ensure an average of at least 13,200 more affordable homes per year in London over the term of this Plan. In order to give impetus to a strong and diverse Intermediate housing sector, 60% of the affordable housing provision should be for social rent and 40% for intermediate rent or sale. Priority should be accorded to provision of affordable family housing.

7.14 Policy 16 of the UDP sets out that a range of unit sizes of affordable housing
should be provided, having regard to local circumstances, site characteristics and the aims of the borough’s annual housing strategy. It goes on to set out the presumption that affordable housing should be provided on site.

7.15 London Plan Policy 3.8 encourages a full range of housing choice. This is supported by the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, which seeks to secure mostly family sized accommodation within residential schemes, particularly within the social rented sector. However the policies main aspirations seek to give people a wider choice of housing type, which through the inclusion of extra care and general privat sales units, this development fulfils.

7.16 With regard to the housing element of the scheme, Core Strategy Policy S2 (c) seeks the provision of affordable housing on sites capable of accommodating 10 or more homes and policy 15 of the saved UDP policies seeks to ensure that a range of new housing development is provided to meet the needs and demands of the Borough. At least 50% of housing should be affordable where public subsidy is available, or 40% without public subsidy, subject to housing priorities and, where relevant, to independently validated evidence of viability. The mix of affordable housing should be 70 per cent social rented and 30 per cent intermediate. Following significant discussions with officers and the RP for the extra care block regarding the quantum, type and mix of the proposal, the number of affordable units within Block 3 has been increased from 80 to 85 units with no public subsidy, an increase of 5 affordable units over the originally submitted scheme totalling 33.5% of the development.

Affordable Housing Provision

7.17 The affordable housing provision of the proposal would be located entirely within block 3 adjacent to the Park Plaza Hotel. Through discussions with officers to maximise the provision of affordable housing the height of this block has been increased over the approved development by 3 floors, any greater height would impact on strategic views of the Palace of Westminster, this has been confirmed through direct discussions with English Heritage.

7.18 The affordable housing provision is proposed as ‘senior living’ housing and would consist of one and two bedroom units suitable for single persons or couples who are seeking to down-size from affordable family housing to a modern apartment that meets their needs and potentially free up larger family sized units within the Borough as a result. The proposed senior living affordable housing mix is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One bed</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.19 The extra care provision would be provided on the basis that there is a need within the Council for this type of housing. This has been set out in the Councils
adopted Older persons strategy. In this regard, the proposed affordable housing would be available for ‘senior living’; that is, single persons and couples who are typically 55 years plus and eligible for affordable housing. Similarly to ‘general needs’ affordable housing the units would be owned and managed by a Registered Provider (RP) and the accommodation would be secured as affordable housing in perpetuity through the usual Mortgagee in Possession clauses within the section 106 agreement.

7.20 Senior Living accommodation provides housing choice for people who do not wish to stay in family sized homes or accommodation that no longer suits their needs. Evidence submitted as part of this application by the applicant and verified by the Council’s adult care and housing officers, shows that senior living accommodation can result in the freeing up of family sized accommodation through the creation of accommodation blocks specifically designed for the older person being more attractive than typical housing stock. Unlike general needs housing, senior living accommodation provides additional facilities, including a community lounge, hobby room, communal dining area, and communal kitchen, which are provided within the ground and first floor of the block as such as mobility scooter parking and a private communal garden of this block.

7.21 London Plan Policy 3.8 ‘Housing choice’ states that it is necessary to take into account the changing age structure of London’s population and, in particular, the varied needs of older Londoners, including for supported and affordable provision. At a local level, the Council’s adopted Older People Housing Strategy and associated cabinet reports states that Lambeth Council has been faced with long running challenges around housing for older people, principally centred on a limited choice of housing provision specifically for older people in the borough and the council’s financial constraints. Therefore officers consider the proposal would help to address this identified affordable housing need.

Housing Mix

7.22 The overall provision of accommodation would result in 253 units providing a mix of dwelling sizes and tenure to meet an identified housing need within the borough. The overall provision, including the dwelling mix and tenure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Private Sales Units</th>
<th>Affordable: Intermediate Units</th>
<th>Affordable: Rented Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One beds</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85 (33.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two beds</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three beds</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers consider this mix to be appropriate, providing a good level of family sized units and 33.5% affordable housing provision on site inline with the Council’s adopted Older persons Strategy as such the mix is considered acceptable. The Council’s Housing Department supports the provision of a mixed Affordable Rent and Shared Ownership Extra Care Older Person’s
Scheme provided as the affordable housing at Hampton House on the basis that it is not possible to obtain additional affordable accommodation as BNP Paribas conclude in their assessment of St James Plc's Financial Appraisal.

Standard of Accommodation

7.23 All of the new dwellings have been designed to meet the Mayor’s London Housing Design Guide and the Council’s SPD (Housing Development and House Conversions) in terms of size and layout. In addition, all of the units would be designed and constructed to the Lifetime Homes Standards. The layout of the apartments has been carefully considered in respect of the scheme design. In this regard, the majority of the units are dual aspect and the positions of the windows and walls have been designed to avoid overlooking within the development. The orientation of the apartments seeks to ensure that views of the river are maximised in all three buildings. Most of the units would have access to private amenity space in the form of a balcony.

7.24 The proposed unit sizes exceed the expectation of the London Housing Design Guide and the Lambeth SPD guidance for housing development in terms of space standards. The Design and Access Statement incorporates proposed floor plans that provide detail of the layout of typical proposed units. The overall mix, type, and range of unit sizes provides extensive housing choice and a high quality residential environment which achieves the objectives of Lambeth’s planning policy, the London Plan and the GLA’s Housing Design Guide and Draft Housing SPG.

7.25 The design of the proposed buildings and location of the residential units within the buildings ensures that the proposed units would not be overlooked and would not cause any undue overlooking to nearby occupiers. The orientation of the apartments and the position of the windows ensure that within the development all of the apartments would have adequate privacy without potential overlooking from within the apartments or from the private amenity space.

Daylight/Sunlight

7.26 A daylight and sunlight study has been undertaken by Anstey Horne to review the quality of the light that would be achieved within the proposed development and to determine the quality of the residential environment for future occupiers. The study demonstrates that the majority of rooms (84%) tested (which were a representative selection of habitable rooms in all three buildings) would enjoy daylight in excess of the BRE guidelines. A further 13% would be fairly close to the BRE target value and the remaining nine rooms are all bedrooms, which the BRE guide accepts are less important. In overall terms, the results demonstrate that there would be a very high degree of compliance with the BRE guidance and that levels of daylight enjoyed by occupants in the proposed development would be good.

7.27 The proposed units have been designed so that the vast majority of living rooms would have a southerly or westerly aspect ensuring good levels of sunlight into the living accommodation. The results of the sunlight assessment demonstrate
that around 60% of the living rooms tested would exceed the annual sunlight guidelines for summer and 64% would exceed the winter sunlight guidance. Although the remaining rooms may not achieve the guideline levels it is relevant to note that approximately half of these rooms do not face within 90 degrees of due south, and, therefore would expect to receive less sunlight. The design of the scheme has sought to maximise the number of living rooms with a southerly aspect and reasonable access to sunlight. The proposal would provide a high quality residential environment in the context of an urban location. It is concluded within the daylight and sunlight study that the design of the proposed development has carefully followed the BRE guidelines and will provide good daylight and sunlight conditions.

Amenity Space

7.28 The residential units of the scheme have been designed to comply with the Supplementary Planning Document for Housing Development, which sets out guidance and standards for new build developments such as this. Given the constraints of a high density urban site, the proposed development provides an appropriate design response in terms of its form and massing. In this regard, the envelope of each of the proposed buildings follows the general form of the implemented scheme; the most notable exception is the additional height of building 3 and over hanging amenity space for this block.

7.29 The introduction of balconies to the majority of the apartments, which were not incorporated in the implemented scheme, ensures that residents would have access to private amenity space. The balcony design ensures that the depth is sufficient to provide a useable space for all sized units and exceeds the Mayor’s Housing Design Guide requirements. The Council’s SPD guidance in respect of private amenity space seeks 10sqm per unit either as private amenity space or within private communal amenity area. In total 24 of the residential units have balconies which exceed the SPD requirement and 199 units have balconies which measure 5sqm. A total of 1,644sqm of private amenity space is proposed. The remaining amenity space requirements are accommodated in the landscape private communal spaces at first floor level. The landscaped space between buildings 2 and 3 is 246sqm and has direct access from Building 3. Building 3 also includes a roof terrace comprising 211sqm providing private communal space for the occupants of the senior living accommodation. Along with the ancillary residential facilities in Building 1, the private communal amenity space at the podium south of building 1 provides 250sqm of outdoor amenity space, including children’s play space.

7.30 Overall, the proposals incorporate 707sqm of private communal amenity space, 1,644sqm of private amenity space and significant levels of useable public realm to the front of the development. The quantum of amenity space on-site, therefore accords with Lambeth’s amenity standards. In addition to the landscaped outdoor amenity space created through the considerable set back from the road into the site, the proposals incorporate ancillary residential facilities for occupiers of the site, including a gymnasium and swimming pool for the private residents.

Play Space
7.31 In accordance with the GLA SPG (Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation) and its draft replacement, the provision of children’s play space has been considered throughout the design development. The approved planning permission ref: 07/04264/FUL, provided a quarter of the necessary children’s play space for 0 - 4 year olds on site; the current proposals seek to provide all of the required play space for 0 - 4 year olds on site. The detail of the children’s play space is provided within the Landscape Strategy submitted as part of this application. A payment in lieu of the necessary play space for 5-11 and 12+ year olds is proposed, as it was not considered practical to include play space for these age groups on site. The proposed development would generate a child yield and subsequent expectation for children’s play space as set out in the table below. As agreed with officers the proposal would provide sufficient on-site play space for 0-4 year olds and the section 106 Agreement would include a financial contribution towards enhancing nearby recreational grounds reflecting the anticipated child yield of 5-11 and 12+ year olds as a result of the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total number of children</th>
<th>Playspace requirements</th>
<th>Max walking distance (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 11 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>320sqm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.32 In consultation with officers at the Council it has been agreed that the constraints of the site are such that it is impractical to provide further children’s play space on the development site due to the location and density and the close proximity to the railway. However in line with the emerging strategy for recreation, including children’s plays space in Vauxhall, the Cultural Arts Development Manager has advised that a financial contribution to maintenance and improvements to nearby parks and open space in lieu of on-site play space would be the best way forward. Officers consider that a s106 Agreement including a financial contribution reflecting the child yield anticipated by the development is appropriate in this case. This has been agreed by the developer.

Accessible Housing

7.33 The development would have to meet Part M of the Building Regulations, which deals with aspects of the Disability and Discrimination Act (DDA) including width of doors and corridors, level thresholds, toilet facilities, stairs etc. The Design and Access statement states that all flats have been designed to Lifetime Homes standards to ensure that they are flexible and meet the need of future residents and 10% of the residential units would be capable of adaptation for a wheelchair user. It is considered therefore that, the scheme complies with the aims of the disability and discrimination legislation.

Noise and Disturbance
7.34 The application site is located between the busy A3036 Albert Embankment which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network to the west and national railway lines from Vauxhall to Waterloo to the east and as such the site is subject to the effects of noise from road, rail, as well as nearby entertainment venues. This being the case the developer has undertaken noise surveys to determine the noise environment and likely levels of exposure to inform the design team and mitigate the impact for future occupiers.

7.35 The methodology relating to the acoustic surveys was agreed with the Council’s Noise officer prior to the work commencing and suitable internal acoustic levels were agreed prior to the conclusion of the design. The acoustic report submitted in support of the application demonstrates that these standards would be achieved.

7.36 The Councils Environmental Health noise team have been consulted on the application and following review of the documents, have raised no objection to the levels or the mitigation measures to the facades. Following thorough assessment of the acoustic environment, officers consider that the scheme design would ensure a suitable residential environment is created by the development.

Viability Assessment

7.37 Policy S2 (c) of the Councils adopted Core Strategy seeks the provision of affordable housing on sites of at least 0.1 hectares or on sites capable of accommodating 10 or more homes. At least 50% of housing should be affordable where public subsidy is available, or 40% without public subsidy, subject to housing priorities and where relevant, to independently validated evidence of viability, or where there is a clearly demonstrable benefit in a different mix in the case of housing estate regeneration.

7.38 This scheme proposes to provide 33.5% affordable housing within the third block to the north of the site, providing 85 extra care affordable housing units following detailed discussions with the Council adult care and housing departments. The proposal would include a good mix of affordable rent and intermediate units; the final mix has been worked in with the Councils Older Persons Strategy, providing a balanced development as required for such developments in the CAZ.

7.39 The applicant confirms that to provide the desired quantum of affordable housing would not be economically viable. They have submitted a financial viability assessment in order to demonstrate, that the levels of affordable housing provided is the most that can reasonably be provided whilst maintaining viability. The report has made use of the established Toolkit model and guidance from the GLA. Furthermore detailed discussions have been undertaken with officers to provide the maximum levels of affordable housing. Officers are satisfied the affordable housing building itself is the maximum size as to avoid impacting on views of the world heritage site and that the internal layouts and unit mix would ensure the maximum levels without impacting on the overall viability of the development.
7.40 BNP Paribas have been instructed to independently assess the submitted financial appraisal and confirm that the applicant's model is robust and provides accurate results. The findings of their appraisal concludes that the development cannot support the provision of any further affordable housing than is currently proposed.

7.41 Given that the Development is currently providing the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing as shown in the independent assessment of the viability assessment, but taking into account that this is below the policy aspiration, officers consider it appropriate to include a review mechanism. This has been raised by officers and the applicant has agreed that some form of a review mechanism could be put in place. Discussions with officers are on going and would be dealt with through the s106.

8 Amenity

8.1 Policy 7 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan deals with the protection of residential amenity. It states that the right of people to the quiet enjoyment of their homes will be respected. It also states that in mixed use areas, the scale, design, layout, hours of use, intensity, concentration, and location of non-residential uses will be controlled in relation to residential uses in order to protect residential amenity.

8.2 Policy 7 of the Adopted UDP requires land uses not to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Policy 33 requires new development to protect residential amenity.

8.3 Adopted UDP Policy 36 (c) sets out criteria which new development should not unacceptably affect. These protected criteria are as follows: privacy; outlook and associated unacceptable sense of enclosure; and, sun/daylight. The above mentioned daylight and sunlight assessment confirms that there would be a minimal impact on neighbouring properties.

8.4 As the development is involving changes to building layout, mass and height increases, daylight and sunlight experienced by nearby buildings surrounding the site will be affected to a certain degree. Anstey Horne have been commissioned to undertake a formal technical assessment of the effect of the proposed development scheme upon the existing public amenity space, Albert Embankment Gardens, and the River Thames.

8.5 The site benefits from an existing planning permission ref: 07/04264/FUL for a scheme of comparable bulk and massing, which the applicant could continue to build should this planning application be rejected. The Environmental Impact Assessment submitted in connection with that application considered the impact of the scheme on daylight and sunlight on the surrounding neighbours and amenity spaces to be negligible, officers agreed with these findings.

8.6 A Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report prepared by Anstey Horne is submitted in support of the application. A model based on guidance published by the Building Research Establishment (BRE), was used to assess the likely daylight, sunlight and overshadowing impacts of the development on
surrounding residential dwellings which in terms of sunlight, daylight and overshadowing could potentially be affected by the proposal. The report identifies that all of the rooms of the surrounding dwellings tested would satisfy the BRE guidelines in respect of vertical sky component (VSC), daylight distribution (DD) and annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) and therefore the proposed development would not have any material impact on daylight or sunlight levels.

8.7 In terms of overshadowing, the submitted report outlines that in accordance with the BRE guide the impact on the two main areas of open space at Pedlars Park that receive two hours or more of direct sunlight on 21st March has been calculated. It is identified that the proposed development will not have any effect on the two-hour sunlit area of the park at all. Transient overshadowing was also assessed and whilst the proposed development will cast longer shadows than the existing building, the gaps between and around the proposed buildings ensures that the width of the shadows reduces in the proposed conditions, thereby allowing sunlight to penetrate around the buildings. Overall there is therefore a negligible to minor increase in overshadowing, as was the case with the implemented permission.

8.8 The daylight and overshadowing studies undertaken by Anstey Horne demonstrate that the proposed development would not adversely affect the neighbouring property, nearby open space, or the River Thames. In this regard, relevant guidelines contained in the BRE guidance are met.

8.9 In terms of outlook due to the location of the proposed building fronting the Albert Embankment and within a commercial row of buildings with a hotel adjoining the site. The majority of residential buildings to the east and south at a distance of 150m+, therefore the development should have no impact on outlook for surrounding residents.

8.10 The surrounding residential developments are located to the south east at a distance of approximately 150m. The generally acceptable distance for mutual overlooking within London is 20m+ to avoid the potential for significant loss of privacy and at the abovementioned distances there should be no impact. Furthermore the proposed balconies are located to the front of the building facing the Albert Embankment, this orientation should restrict the potential for overlooking on to future developments due to inclosing design of the space, location and therefore it is considered that the proposal would not prejudice future developments within the area while protecting existing residential amenity in compliance with Council policy.

9 Design

9.1 The local policy context is the Core Strategy (2011) policies S7, S9 and PN2 as well as the UDP (Policies saved beyond 05 August 2010), in particular policies 19, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39, 40, 41, 45 and 47. Without being comprehensive, the wider context is the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity Area Planning Framework (2012), London Plan, Westminster World Heritage site Management Plan, LVMF (2012) and CABE/EH guidance on tall buildings. Please be advised that the Draft Vauxhall SPD is currently being revised.
9.2 The proposal is for two tall buildings along Albert Embankment. The tallest tower (Building 2) is located south of Park Plaza Hotel and steps down from 27 to 19 storeys towards the hotel. The second tower (Building 1) has a slightly lower height stepping down in height to the south from 24 storeys to 16 storeys and is situated close to the boundary with no. 22-26 Albert Embankment. Buildings 1 and 2 are connected by a two storey base. A third building, 15 storeys high, is located behind Building 2 adjacent to the viaduct. The maximum height of the proposal will be 90m and as such complies with guidance set out in the VNEB Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) which supports tall buildings along Albert Embankment in the region of 80-90m (VNEB OAPF p121).

9.3 The height and location of the proposal means it will be highly visible from designated LVMF views particularly river prospects. LVMF management plans should be used in the assessment of scheme and its impact on designated views. The LVMF acknowledges that new clusters of tall buildings may emerge within the Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms Opportunity Area. The OAPF VNEB also offers general advice on tall buildings in this area stating that tall buildings should avoid appearing as a solid wall of development within the setting of the Palace of Westminster from Waterloo, Hungerford and Westminster bridges. The World Heritage Site should be maintained as the main focus within the townscape composition from the river prospects. A Townscape Conservation and Visual Impact Assessment (TCVIA) has been submitted, and provides a thorough evaluation of the impact of the proposal in terms of its height and form on strategic views, the surrounding context, on other tall buildings including the emerging cluster when perceived from all directions and heritage assets.

9.4 It is important to note that whilst the current proposal remains largely unchanged when compared to the implemented scheme, there are slight differences in mass to Building 1 and 2, and there is significant change to the height and mass Building 3 which has increased considerably. The TCVIA View 1a (LVMF 2B.1) shows that the scheme will be located directly behind Victoria Tower and would be low so as not to impact on the silhouette of Victoria Tower. The TCVIA demonstrates that the changes to the scheme will not negatively impact on LVMF London Panorama View 2B.1.

9.5 The London Borough of Camden have raised concerns regarding the ‘height and visual prominence’ of the proposal which would ‘fail to preserve or enhance the ability to recognise and appreciate the Palace of Westminster in London Panorama LVMF View 2A.2’. Please be advised that English Heritage have not raised any objections to the proposed scheme or specifically this view. The Parliament Hill view is a city panorama, where Victoria Tower is a relatively minor element in the wide expanse of cityscape. Indeed it is difficult to identify the tower because of its small size in the jumble of buildings in its foreground and middle ground. Victoria Tower is discernible in silhouette against the greyer background development behind but the middle ground of the view have an assortment of post-war tall buildings of varying heights which diminish its impact and obscure its lower part. There are three post war tall buildings in particular
that are positioned on either side and in front of Victoria Tower in the foreground and middle ground - taking visual prominence from the tower itself.

9.6 Building 2 will be seen in this view to the right of Victoria Tower and its proposed roof level will have a similar height to the Victoria Tower parapet. The TVCIA telephoto images show that the proposals impact will be very similar to the implemented scheme with a slight increase in mass at the top. It is considered that the proposal will not dominate Victoria Tower. Officers consider that the proposal due to its materiality and distance from the viewing point and WWHS would form part of the darker coloured backdrop and in reality the development to the naked eye will be hardly perceptible from this view. In addition to this the proposal will be set away from Victoria Tower and will not be seen to be attached to it or encroach visually on its silhouette. The proposal will also have a flat roof a very different silhouette to Victoria Tower therefore a viewers ability to recognise and appreciate the Palace of Westminster will not be compromised or diminished in any way. Officers agree with Professor Robert Tavenor Consultancy assessment that the proposals impact on view 2A.2 would be negligible and would not harm the setting of the WWHS.

9.7 The combination of the proposal with the approved scheme at Eastbury House along the Albert Embankment will not result in a ‘solid wall’ of development due to the varied roof form and gaps within the development and with Eastbury House. The proposal will have a 'moderate - beneficial' impact from river prospects views and the Westminster WHS maintains the main focus within the townscape composition. Overall it is considered that the proposal will not have a negative impact on strategic and local views and unlikely to adversely affect the outstanding universal value of the Westminster World Heritage Site (WWHS).

Scale, Massing and Layout

9.8 As stated previously the application site has an existing planning permission and therefore the design has been an evolution to enhance the parameters and design of that scheme. The current proposals still comprise three proposed buildings of varying heights which have been designed to open up views through the site and create a public piazza at ground floor to add vibrancy to this locality. The maximum height is 27-storeys and the minimum height is 16-storeys. Therefore, with the exception of Building 3 the building heights have remained the same as the implemented permission. Building 3 has increased to part 15, part 16 storeys in the current proposals to increase the provision of affordable housing within the site and ensure that the current design standards; most notably the interim Housing Design Guide (2010) and the Draft Housing SPD (2012) are met.

9.9 Council UDP Policy 40 states that tall buildings should enhance the skyline through profile and use of materials. The two towers fronting Albert Embankment are formed of slender bays that step up from 16 to 24 storeys (Building 2) and 19 to 27 storeys (Building 1) creating an interesting silhouette against the sky both individually and collectively when viewed from a number of local views and strategic views. While being split across three separate buildings linked at ground floor level creating an interesting and varied roof profile against the sky, ensuring that the development does not create a wall like
affect along the embankment.

9.10 The cluster of slender bays of Building 1 and 2 grouped in sets of two bays at right angles to each other result in a highly modelled façade and refined massing particularly when compared to the larger cylindrical forms of the implemented scheme. As a result the perceived scale and bulk of the building is reduced.

Appearance and Materials

9.11 The current proposal seeks to ensure that the façade treatment reflects a more residential character given the residential lead nature of this current scheme. The desire to provide private amenity space through the inclusion of balconies has served to assist with this objective. It is considered that the residential character of the buildings has successfully been achieved whilst still maintaining and actually enhancing the vertical articulation which was a key feature of the approved planning permission.

9.12 The design evolution has resulted in a proposal that is a carefully considered design response to the opportunities and constraints of the site, providing a high quality mixed use development that would enliven and add vibrancy, whilst also and enhancing the setting of the heritage assets and townscape value of the Albert Embankment.

9.13 Although the proposal was primarily residential led the approved scheme ref: 07/04264/FUL, due to the extensive use of glass with little modelling to elevations gave the appearance of an office development. The introduction of balconies in the proposed scheme provides the opportunity to meet current London space standards giving the opportunity to articulate the building in a way that reinforces the residential use of the building. The slender vertical bays of the towers are formed of stacked balconies which are an integral part of the buildings form rather than architectural add-ons and are considered to be quite successful.

9.14 As stated previously the towers are joined at their base by a two storey podium wrapping around the bays in a continuous sinuous glazed façade which should create an attractive feature. The increased proportion in glazing and double storey height of the ground floor creates an articulated zone (base to the building) and reflects the differing uses within the building. The articulated zone should serve to minimise the impact of the developments height when viewed from the street.

9.15 The applicants design team explored various material and detail options for the buildings façade as seen on page 64 and 65 of the Design and Access Statement. Officers requested the design team to consider using a palette of materials which would respond to the colour palette of buildings along the Riverside which comprise mainly of pale and neutral tones due to the prevalent use of concrete, Portland stone, stone dressing and white tiles. The design team propose a concrete fascia panel to balconies with an aluminium trim. The texture and tone of the concrete resonates strongly with the riverside character whilst the metal accents to balconies reflect light adding another layer of interest.
9.16 The mid grey cladding panels to elevations provide a subtle distinction to the concrete bands which wrap around the building accentuating the horizontal elements of the building, contrasting successfully with the verticality of the tower. The material palette relates successfully to the recently approved Eastbury House scheme that also incorporates concrete and metal subsequently defining and re-enforcing an emerging character along Albert Embankment. Whilst Building 3 differs slightly in its appearance it shares the design language with Building 1 and 2 in terms of the palette of materials and detailing. This results in a collection of buildings that have a strong visual relationship.

Public Realm and Landscaping

9.17 Page 99 of the OAPF supports the creation of periodic small places or points of interest along Albert Embankment in order to humanise the road. The new public space/realm within the site, fronting the Albert Embankment along with the proposed restaurants, office entrances and other activity will serve to support each other in creating a node of activity and interest along the street - a place where people can stop and enjoy the embankment. This should succeed in humanising the road and creating a ‘place’ which this stretch of the Albert Embankment is currently lacking.

9.18 The landscape strategy is integral to the overall design of the proposed development. The submitted strategy undertaken by Townshend Landscape Architects for the applicant, explains the principles of the landscape design, which seek to generate external spaces which not only contribute to the setting and uses of the proposed building, but also add to the enjoyment of the wider community by providing freely accessible public space.

9.19 The current scheme offers a generous amount of public realm by setting Buildings 1 and 2 back from the street, similar to the implemented scheme. The layout is such that it draws the pedestrian from the street and into the proposed piazza. The piazza creates a ‘periodic small place or point of interest’ along Albert Embankment which humanises the road consistent with VNEB OAPF guidance (p.99). The sinuous glazed frontage of the development provides a striking backdrop to the landscaping scheme. The aspiration is to create a space that is protected from the street where people can sit and enjoy. The challenge for the design team was to develop a landscaping strategy that in achieving this aspiration did not create a barrier to the street. The landscaping plan shows a series of planters of differing heights that align with the bays of Building 1. The planters will create a layered effect of texture and colour, adding interest as well as softening this space. The planters are spaced to offer wide pedestrian routes to entrances and more intimate spaces with narrower spaces between planters with integrated seating.

9.20 In terms of materials, the proposal seeks to create a cohesive coordinated palette of hard landscaping materials which would ensure longevity of the landscaping and are easy to maintain and control. This palette of materials would tie into the existing listed Albert Embankment materials opposite the site.
and appearance, as well as the recently approved Eastbury House development to create a unified appearance to the new face of the Albert Embankment. Planting would be carefully selected ensuring a variation in structure and height and adding seasonal interest with colour. All disability requirements would be considered during the selection/design of street furniture.

9.21 Overall, the current scheme is a high quality scheme that responds well to the context and will not impact negatively on heritage assets including WWHS. The current scheme is considered to be an improvement from the approved scheme.

9.22 The elegant composition of slender bays, introduction of balconies and stepped silhouette creates an attractive building with interesting roof profile and improved residential character. The material palette relates well to the character of the Thames whilst the double height curved glass base provides an attractive backdrop to the generous piazza. The Council’s design and conservation team have considered carefully the detailing of the proposal through detailed drawings, models and 1:1 scale mock ups. This meticulous attention to detail should ensure a high quality development.

10 Traffic and Parking

10.1 Policy 9 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan states that development will be assessed for their transport impacts, including cumulative impacts on highway safety, the environment and road network, and on all transport modes.

10.2 Policy S4 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy states that the Council will achieve transport objectives by requiring development to be appropriate to the level of public transport accessibility and capacity in the area.

10.3 A Transport Assessment prepared by Transport Planning Practice is submitted as part of the planning application.

Site and Accessibility

10.4 The site is well located in terms of accessibility to public transport being located close to Vauxhall Rail and Underground stations and Bus Station as well as other frequent bus routes in the area. This is reflected in the site’s PTAL of 6a which is the second highest rating possible on the 1a - 6b scale. This equates to an excellent level of accessibility to public transport.

Parking Provision

10.5 The proposed parking ratio per residential unit is stated as being 0.42, 106 parking spaces, 3 for the commercial uses and 103 for the residential development. Through discussions with Council officers and the registered provider (RP) regarding the needs facing older person’s accommodation the parking was altered to provide 26 of these spaces as disabled parking spaces within the basement levels. While the parking levels are significantly higher than normally permitted within the VNEB area the developer is confident that through a range of sustainable transport measures that vehicle trips will remain in line with a development of much lower parking provision. Council officers are in
discussions with the applicant to ensure that a suitable penalty clause is in place within the s106. The penalty clause would be triggered if the vehicle trip generated from this development increase above the level typical of the VNEB area. Any penalty incurred by the development would be spent by the Council on sustainable transport measure in the local area.

10.6 Electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs) are proposed in line with London Plan standards and have been welcomed by Council officers and TfL.

Access

10.7 The proposed access in to the site for vehicles would be located to the north of the site using a side road which runs in front of the Park Plaza Hotel below the over hang. Discussions are taking place relating to alterations to this road as to better service both sites. The results of these discussions will be reported prior to the committee meeting.

Servicing

10.8 The proposed development would have a full-time management team which would be responsible for managing the operation and maintenance of the development. There would be a 24-hour concierge/security service that would enable a managed system of deliveries. All delivery vehicles would arrive at the site and would be met at the entry point to the servicing area, where vehicles would use the two loading bays within the servicing area which is located to the north of the site adjoining the boundary with the Park Plaza Hotel.

10.9 The residential servicing, drop offs and basement car parking entrance is located to the rear of the site behind Block 3. Officers consider the servicing arrangements would be sufficient to allow for practical servicing of the site for future residents. These servicing arrangements are considered to be acceptable but a Servicing Management Strategy would be secured by condition.

Cycle Parking

10.10 The proposed cycle parking provision exceeds the Council’s minimum requirements and comprises 250+ cycle parking spaces in the basement for residents, along with a further 50+ located securely and covered to the rear of the site for residents and commercial users. A second ground floor level cycle parking bay was altered to provide secure storage for mobility scooters within Block 3 to ensure easy access for future residents. Details of all cycle parking would be secured by condition.

Travel Plan

10.11 The applicant has submitted a Framework Travel Plan for the commercial elements of the scheme. This will aim to minimise the impact of the development of the surrounding highway by promoting non-car modes of travel and encouraging sustainable travel initiatives to be adopted by tenants. This should be secured by condition and a monitoring fee of £1000 included in the S106.
10.12 A Construction Method Statement would be secured by condition as requested by the Council’s Transport department.

11 Refuse and Recycling Considerations

11.1 Policy S8 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that residential, commercial and community development proposals, including changes of use include adequate provision within or as apart of the development for residual and re-cycled water; in terms of facilities for refuse/ recycling containment, litter control and waste disposal. Further guidance on waste management is provided in “Council’s Guidance for Architects and Developers- Waste and Recycling Storage and collection Requirements”.

11.2 Refuse and recycling for the private uses within the development would be stored at basement level and site management would transfer the bins to the collection area at ground floor level on waste collection day. Residents in the senior living accommodation would deposit their waste in general and recyclable eurobins provided at ground floor level. The occupiers of the commercial units would move waste from the business premises directly to the main waste store at ground level.

11.3 The Council’s Streetcare and transport teams have raised no objection to the refuse arrangement. Details would be conditioned regarding the refuse stores and waste management plan. The proposals are considered to be in accordance with Lambeth’s Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements Guidance for Architects and Developers.

12 Other Matters

12.1 Crime Prevention

12.2 Policy 32 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan states that development should enhance community safety and will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder.

12.3 The Council’s Crime Prevention Officer was consulted on the scheme from the pre-application stage and the comments have been incorporated into this scheme. A condition is proposed should permission be granted to ensure compliance with the Secured by Design standards.

12.4 Sustainability and Renewable Energy

12.5 The Government has set a national target to reduce carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions by 20% by 2010 and 60% by 2050. There is scope to achieve this target by ensuring that new buildings are designed to conserve fuel and power and sited to reduce the need to travel and, restraint measures are adopted to encourage more sustainable means of transport. The Mayor’s Energy Strategy has set a target of 20% of energy to come from renewable sources.

12.6 The development plan policy requires all major development to achieve a
reduction in carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficient design, decentralised heat, cooling and power systems, and on-site renewable energy generation. With specific regard to Vauxhall, Policy PN2 of the Core Strategy sets out a support for the highest standards of sustainable design other effective forms of CO2 reduction and climate change adaptation, including innovative approaches.

12.7 The London Plan requires developments to make the fullest contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions, adopting sustainable design and construction measures and prioritising decentralised energy, including renewables. Policy 5.2 sets out a minimum target reduction for carbon dioxide emissions in buildings of 25% over the Target Emission Rates outlined in the national Building Regulations. The London Plan sets out that development proposals should contribute to this by minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the “be lean, be clean, be green” hierarchy:

- Be Lean: The reduction of energy demand and CO2 emissions from using less energy, in particular by adopting sustainable and passive design and construction measures;
- Be Clean: Proposals for the reduction of energy demand and CO2 emissions through supplying energy efficiently;
- Be Green: Renewable energy technologies to be incorporated.

12.8 Be Lean: Energy efficiency measures will be applied to the development. The development will exceed the minimum requirements of Part L1A, L2A and L1B for building envelope and services performance. Measures proposed include improvement to the building fabric air permeability and the use of heat recovery systems, including flue gas heat recovery and waste water heat recovery. The proposed new elements of the development will also reduce the effects of thermal bridging through the use of Accredited Construction Details and benefit from the use of mechanical ventilation heat recovery. The proposed energy conservation measures will reduce the regulated carbon dioxide emissions in comparison to the 2010 Building Regulations compliant case by 4.75 per cent.

12.9 Be Clean: The opportunity for the proposed development to link into an existing or planned decentralised energy network has been explored using the London Heat Map tool. An energy centre is proposed within the north of the VNEB and the proposal would be future proofed to ensure that they would be able to utilise this once constructed.

12.10 Be Green: A feasibility study has been undertaken to establish the most suitable renewable technology for integration at the proposed development. Photovoltaic panels are the recommended renewable technology, providing the most cost effective carbon dioxide emission saving for the proposed development. A 24.8kWp, 180m² photovoltaic system mounted horizontally on the flat roof areas of Blocks B and C, combined with the Be Lean: energy conservation measures will provide a 25.84 per cent reduction in the CO2 emissions over the base case Building Regulations compliant development thereby meeting the requirements of London Plan Policy 5.2 for a 25% and the minimum energy requirements of Code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.
12.11 An Energy Statement and Sustainability Assessment has been prepared by Richard Hodkinson Consultancy and is submitted in support of the planning application. The principles of the energy strategy developed in consultation with the GLA and adopt the GLA policy hierarchy as set out above. In this regard, the design team has incorporated the desire to reduce energy demand and carbon emissions, including façade engineers to incorporate passive measures to limit the building’s energy consumption.

12.12 The developer proposes to demonstrate a commitment to energy efficient design and construction through:


Be Clean Strategy: Then through the application of low carbon energy supply and generation technologies achieve reductions in regulated CO2 emissions that exceed the energy targets of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM Very Good.

Be Green; Consideration has been given to renewable technologies. Whilst there are some technologies that are technically feasible in principle, these are not preferred to a ‘fabric-first’ approach combined with communal CHP.

12.13 The principles of the energy strategy developed in consultation with the GLA and do adopt the GLA policy hierarchy: be lean, be clean, be green. In this regard, the desire to reduce energy demand and carbon emissions has been considered by the Design Team, to incorporate passive measures to limit the building’s energy consumption. In addition, active measures such as energy efficient lighting throughout the building and efficient ventilation systems with heat recovery have been incorporated into the design to contribute to the energy efficient measures which reduce energy consumption. The energy efficiency achieved by the building design ensures that the proposed development would ‘be lean’.

12.14 A number of renewable technologies have been considered as part of the energy strategy. The development of the strategy considered the technical, physical and financial feasibility of incorporating renewable energy technology into the proposals. The outcome of the assessment is detailed in the Energy Statement which concluded that solar photovoltaic (PV) cells and heat pumps would not be suitable for this development, delivering minimal gains.

A single energy centre providing Combined Heat and Power (CHP) is proposed within the development. The use of low carbon technology to generate energy ensures that further reductions in carbon dioxide emissions can be achieved. The provision of a gas-fired CHP ensures that the energy strategy incorporates the requirements to ‘be clean’, and will seek to meet the developments base load heating demand. In addition, consideration has been given to connections to off-site energy networks. The scheme has been designed to ensure that it is future-proofed if the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea District Heating Network becomes available in advance of the detailed design and construction of the
energy centre and appropriate contractual terms of connection are in place.

12.15 The combination of the proposed Be Lean and Be Clean measures ensures that the residential element of the proposal will reduce regulated CO2 emissions by a further 25% beyond Part L 2010 Building Regulation Requirements and will therefore meet the energy target for Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. In addition, the commercial elements of the scheme will be designed to achieve BREEAM Very Good.

12.16 The submitted Sustainability Assessment, which considers the wider issues relating to the sustainability and the development proposals. As well as the combination of the proposed energy efficiency measures and technologies to reduce carbon emissions, the development: makes efficient use of previously development land, provides sustainable transport measures including provision for electric cars and cycle parking, maximises natural light within the proposed residential units due to the orientation of the buildings, incorporates a Site Waste Management Plan, and would use environmentally responsible materials in construction. The Sustainability Statement incorporates a pre-assessment for the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) and BREEAM; it is anticipated that Code Level 4 will be achieved and BREEAM ‘Very Good’. Officers are satisfied that the development, in line with the Energy Strategy and the Sustainability Statement will produce a significant carbon dioxide reduction, complying with Council and London Plan policies. The BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes levels of the pre-assessment will be required by condition to be met, a further post construction condition will be included to ensure this takes place.

12.17 Archaeology

12.18 In accordance with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan and Lambeth Core Strategy Policy S9, the applicant has submitted an archaeological desk based assessment undertaken by CGMS. The Site does not contain any nationally designated (protected) sites, such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings or Registered Parks and Gardens. The Site lies within the London Borough of Lambeth (LBL) Archaeological Priority Area, which includes the historic core of Lambeth village and the entire Thames foreshore environs within the Borough. The LBL Albert Embankment Conservation Area lies adjacent to the west of the Site.

12.19 English Heritage (Archaeology) have recommended the archaeological position of the site should be reserved by attaching a condition to any consent granted. It is anticipated that the archaeological interest can be progressed by the application of a limited programme of trial trench evaluation, the results of which will enable judgements to be made as to whether there is a continued archaeological interest and if so how it may be mitigated. A suitable specification will need to be submitted by the developer appointed archaeological practice and for it to be approved before being implemented.

12.20 Flood Risk

12.21 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Powell Tolner & Associates. The FRA considers the likelihood of flooding from the river,
tides, overland, groundwater and sewer and provides a strategy in respect of drainage.

12.22 The FRA concludes that the proposal will have a low risk of flooding. It is identified that the most significant risk from flooding to the site is a potential breach of the River Thames defences. The proposal does include a residential element which falls within the more vulnerable classification however, all residential apartments are located at first floor and above. Ideally the ground floor level would be set above the predicted maximum water level, however, due to level access requirements to comply with Building Regulations and DDA requirements it is not practical to raise the floor level as high as would be required. Given this and that the flood risk is residual in the event of a defence breach a management system is proposed along with design features to slow down the rate that water would enter the ground floor and basement.

12.23 The Environment Agency were consulted on this proposal and the submitted flood risk assessment and raised no objection to the development.

12.24 Biodiversity and Ecology

12.25 An ecological desk top study and a Phase 1 habitat survey of the site was carried out by the developer’s ecology consultants in May 2012 and the details of those investigations set out in the ecological appraisal report prepared by The Ecology Consultancy, which is submitted in support of the planning application. The site is not subject to any statutory nature conservation designations. The nearest statutory designated nature conservation site is the Battersea Park Nature Areas Local Nature Reserve which lies approximately 2 Kilometres west of the site.

12.26 The Ecology Assessment outlined measures included to enhance the ecological value of the site and has also suggested additional ecological enhancements that could be made which will be considered in more detail prior to the commencement of the development. Planting at ground floor will comprise suitable native species and will add to the flora and fauna on-site. A range of living roofs are also proposed within the scheme including intensive green roofs and extensive green roofs. In addition, other ecological enhancements which may be possible to incorporate are bird and invertebrate boxes which will also enhance the ecological value of the site in accordance with planning policy.

12.27 The Councils Parks and Open Space department were consulted prior to the submission of the planning application and comments were taken on during the development of this proposal. Officers support the development and the measures set out in the submitted Ecology Assessment, as such compliance with these measure would be conditioned.

13 S106, CIL, Impact Upon Local Infrastructure, and Benefits for the Wider Community

13.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 set out that planning permission should only be granted subject to completion of a planning obligation where the obligation meets all of the following tests. A planning obligation should be: (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
(ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

13.2 Policy S10 of the Core Strategy sets out the circumstances in which planning obligations will be expected from developers. In particular it sets out that planning obligations will be sought to mitigate the impact of development, secure its implementation, control phasing where necessary, and to secure and contribute to the delivery of infrastructure made necessary by the development.

13.3 With specific regard to Vauxhall, Policy PN2 of the Core Strategy sets out that the council will ensure that development is linked with the wider area and that it secures benefits for the wider community through contributions to necessary social and physical infrastructure needs arising from development in particular for public transport, education and other community facilities and securing employment and training opportunities to address issues of worklessness in the borough and the setting up of a local project bank in order to mitigate the impacts of development.

13.4 The Council’s adopted SPD on planning obligations sets out the general circumstances across the borough where monies towards community infrastructure would be expected and a framework for calculating amounts that would likely be sought. A number of the SPD items have been superseded by the VNEB tariff.

13.5 More recently, the GLA published the VNEB Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) (October 2010) which investigates the infrastructure required to support the delivery of the expected development within the OAPF. The DIFS proposes a tariff based system for the collection and pooling of monies towards the various infrastructure requirements.

13.6 At Cabinet in January 2012, the Council resolved to adopt the DIFS tariff for the purposes of negotiating Section 106 contributions within the Vauxhall area of the VNEB OA. This translated the various identified costs of infrastructure (Northern Line Extension; other transport; education; health; open space; community and other facilities) into a planning tariff charge expressed in the form of contributions per square metre and per residential unit to be applied to residential; office; mixed use retail; retail and hotel and other floor space. Two sets of residential tariffs were proposed relating to higher values along the riverside (Zone A) and lower values inland (Zone B). The level of the tariff is based on modelling the overall envelop of financial viability for the various new land uses predicted in the VNEB OA, with for the case of residential provision a variation, of what is viable in relation to the level of affordable housing. For Zone B, which is applicable to the Hampton House scheme, this was modelled at £15,000 for 40% affordable provisions, and £20,000 for 15% affordable provision.

13.7 The application of the DIFS for the purposes of securing planning obligations towards the delivery of necessary infrastructure was formally ratified by the Mayor on the adoption of the VNEB OAPF in March 2012.

13.8 Using the DIFS tariff adopted by the council, the development would be
expected to provide a contribution of up to £3,900,000 which the VNEB Strategy Board would then allocate to identified projects in the VNEB area. This is based on the net floorspace increase for restaurants and B1 office provision within the scheme, and a charge on residential units based on the application of a sliding scale of a tariff charge, based on the provision of affordable housing at 33% requiring a £18,000 contribution per residential unit.

13.9 On 1st April 2012, the Mayor’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into effect across London to secure funding for Crossrail. The application development would be subject to a CIL charge, based on £35 per sq m on all new net floorspace based on Gross Internal Area. This floorspace figure applies to the retail, B1 office, residential, basement, and plant areas. In the context of the overall level of viability of charges on development being set by the VNEB Tariff and the London Mayor’s CIL having priority as adopted CIL, the VNEB DIFS tariff is required to be adjusted to accommodate the application of the London Mayor’s CIL, This means that the actual VNEB Tariff will be adjusted to a lower figure.

13.10 The London Mayors CIL is a standard charge of £35 of the net increase of floorspace. The Mayors CIL needs to be taken into account when setting the VNEB Tariff charge, in terms of the schemes overall viability, which in practice has meant that the VNEB charge is adjusted to account for London Mayors CIL resulting in a CIL charge of £1,000,000.

13.11 The application is being recommended for approval on the basis of the following s106 planning obligations, which are considered to satisfy the s106 tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.

S106 Heads of Terms

13.12 As set out above the combined VNEB DIFS and Mayoral CIL tariffs would total £4,900,000 which is a baseline financial contribution. Additional s106 contributions will be sought for items included within the adopted s106 planning applications SPD, which have not been addressed in the VNEB Development Infrastructure Study and would be best secured by way of a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The following planning obligations are proposed:

- A permit capping agreement to prevent residents being eligible for on-street residents parking permit;
- A clause to ensure that 103 of the 106 on site parking spaces are for the residential flats and for no other use on the site;
- A clause to ensure that 26 of the 106 space are retained as disabled parking spaces;
- A penalty clause to ensure the vehicle trips remain inline with the submitted Travel Plan;
- 85 Affordable Housing Units (33.5 %)
- Sustainability plan to include: a commitment to achieve a Code for Sustainable Homes minimum Level 4 for residential element, to achieve a minimum criterion of ‘Very Good’ for the relevant BREEAM standard 2011 for the commercial elements, use of sustainable materials in construction, a minimum of 20% reduction in the energy emissions of the whole building
including the construction of a CHP unit within the development;
• A review mechanism of the financial viability assessment;
• A travel plan to be approved prior to occupation to ensure users have access to information about sustainable transport options, including access to cycle storage and public transport information etc;
• A contribution towards sustainable travel initiatives of £225,400;
• A contribution towards Children’s play space in the vicinity of the site of £79,529;
• A contribution towards Employment in the borough of £35,302;
• A contribution towards Employment and construction in the borough of £75,000;
• A contribution towards Cultural strategy initiatives through Public Realm improvements in and around the Albert Embankment of £200,000;
• A contribution towards Public open Space improvements of £337,298 and
• A 5% monitoring fee.

14 Conclusion

14.1 In conclusion, the development will provide a mixed use scheme comprising commercial/employment use and residential, comprising both private and affordable housing and provide a mixed and balanced scheme within the CAZ. The design is of a good quality and will not have a detrimental effect on local or strategic views, or cause harm to local amenity in relation to an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, sense of enclosure or loss of privacy. It is considered that it would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety.

14.2 The re-development of the Hampton House site provides the following planning benefits:

• The provision of 253 new dwellings;
• The provision of 85 extra care affordable housing units to meet the needs of the Council as set out in the adopted Older Persons Strategy;
• Increased public realm and commercial services which will enhance the Albert Embankment and encourage people to use it more;
• High design standards, creating a landmark building on the Albert Embankment, while being sympathetic to the areas historic materials and being respectful to strategic views of the world heritage site;
• B1 employment floorspace;
• Regeneration benefits for the locality; and
• The promotion of Opportunities for local people to work in the construction of the development.

14.3 The development scheme is subject to a Planning Performance Agreement and the ‘merits’ of the scheme have been largely and positively influenced by the extensive negotiations and discussions that preceded the application submission.

14.4 The development would provide a high quality residential environment for all future occupiers. All of the new dwellings have been designed to meet the
14.5 All necessary reductions in total carbon dioxide emissions from the development would be achieved within the framework of the Mayor’s energy hierarchy to satisfy the Development Plan policy requirements. In addition, the development has been designed in conjunction with advice offered by the council’s Crime Prevention Design Advisor so as to minimise the opportunity for crime as far as is practicable. Furthermore, the development would not impact unacceptably upon the amenity of any neighbouring residential properties or upon the function or safety of the surrounding highway network.

14.6 The proposal is well considered in design terms and responds sensitively to the constraints of the site including the surrounding area and nearby world heritage site. It optimises the development potential while avoiding impact on strategic views, in a manner that would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety.

14.7 The proposal level of parking at 0.42 per residential unit is higher than the guidance level within the VNEB OAPF. Although officers have concerns about this level of parking they consider that sufficient measures are in place to ensure that the impact on additional traffic movements are minimised. Should traffic movements increase over that anticipated a financial penalty clause will come into play. For this reason officers do not consider the excessive level of parking sufficient reason to refuse the scheme.

14.8 The development would also be inclusive of a range of s.106 obligations that would reasonably mitigate the impacts of the development upon local infrastructure. The package of s.106 contributions has been negotiated having full regard to the nature of the development, to the normal expectations conferred upon developers by the council’s s.106 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and to the statutory tests for s.106 obligations set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

14.9 This is a sustainable development that would deliver substantial public benefit. The development would be in general compliance with the Development Plan for the Borough and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should nevertheless be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon Local Planning Authorities by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

15 Recommendation

15.1 Grant planning permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Obligation (Heads of Terms set out in section 12.37 of this report), the attached conditions and referral to the Mayor.
Summary of the Reasons

In deciding to grant planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of five years beginning from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition), full details of the proposed construction methodology, in the form of a Method of Construction Statement, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method of Construction Statement shall include details regarding: the notification of neighbours with regard to specific works; advance notification of road closures; details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage; details regarding dust mitigation, details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway, and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area. The details of the approved Method of Construction Statement must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the demolition and construction process.

Reason: To ensure minimal nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers and of the area generally, and avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway in compliance with Policies 9 and 31 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 along with policy S4 of the Core Strategy.

4. Adequate precautions shall be taken during the construction period to prevent the deposit of mud and similar debris on the adjacent public highways in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: To minimise danger and inconvenience to highway users (Policies 9 and 31 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 along with policy S4 of the Core Strategy).

5. Prior to the commencement of building works, a detailed site investigation shall be carried out to establish if the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and
nature of the contamination present and to determine its potential for the pollution of the water environment. The method and extent of this investigation shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the work. Details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of groundwater and surface water, including provision for monitoring, shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of the groundwater in accordance with policy S6 of the Core Strategy.

Prior to the commencement of building works, a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. That scheme shall include all of the following elements unless specifically excluded, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved.

a) A desk study identifying:- all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site;

b) Site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for an assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

c) The results of the site investigation and risk assessment (2) and a method statement based on those results giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

d) A verification report on completion of the works set out in (3) confirming the remediation measures that have been undertaken in accordance with the method statement and setting out measures for maintenance, further monitoring and reporting.

Any changes to these agreed elements require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of the groundwater (Policy S6 of the Core Strategy)

Prior to the commencement of buildings works, full details of the surface water drainage system, including details of discharge rates to sewer from both foul and surface water systems, as well as any proposed sustainable source control measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the local planning authority, in consultation with Thames Water. The development shall thereafter
be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and improve water quality (Policy S6 of the Core Strategy)

8 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, samples and a schedule of materials to be used in the elevations including all walls, doors, windows front entrances and balconies within the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any building work commences and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.


9 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, detailed drawings to a scale of 1:20 to confirm the detailed design and materials of the:

a) Detailed elevations;

b) Details of windows;

c) Details of balconies and balustrades;

d) Details of entrances;

e) Details of canopies;

f) Details shopfronts;

f) Details of roof including plant, plant screening and building maintenance equipment;

g) Details and locations of rain water pipes;

h) Details of the raised extra care amenity space including materials, structural information and landscaping

Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with Policies 31, 32, 33, 36 and 38 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010)

10 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, a Landscape and
Public Realm Strategy for all external public realm areas within the curtilage of the site hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This Strategy is to include, amongst other things, details of proposed plant and tree maintenance, paving materials, pedestrian priority materials and shared surface treatments, plant species, ground levels, green roofs, boundary treatments and water features. The development shall be in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed landscaping areas are of a high quality and for consistent treatment of the public realm. (Policies 33 and 39 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, full details of the materials and planting to be used in the hard and soft landscaped areas of all internal and external amenity spaces (including winter gardens) and on the public highway, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details. Landscaped areas shall be permanently retained for the enjoyment of occupiers of the scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed landscaping areas are of a high quality and for consistent treatment of the public realm. (Policies 33 and 39 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

Prior to the occupation of the development, a crime prevention strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Police. The strategy shall demonstrate how the development meets 'Secured by Design' standards and shall include full detailed specifications of the following: Means of enclosure, external lighting provision, electronic access control, specifications of all external doors, windows, glazing, basement parking access and cycle storage. The approved measures are to be carried out in full and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory attention is given to security and community safety (Policy 32 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

Prior to occupation, full details of a lighting strategy, including details of the lighting of all public areas, basements, cycle stores and buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved lighting shall be installed before the commencement of the use and maintained thereafter. Development shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal. (Policy 32 and 33 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 along with policy S9 of the Core Strategy)

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with
measures indicated in the Energy Statement and Sustainability Assessment has been prepared by Richard Hodkinson Consultancy, accompanying the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.


15 The residential development hereby approved shall achieve a Code for Sustainable Homes minimum of Level 4 in accordance with the requirements of the relevant BREEAM scheme (Code for Sustainable Homes) or subsequent superseding equivalent BREEAM scheme. No development shall take place until a relevant BREEAM Certificate demonstrating the proposal's achievement of the minimum Level 4 rating has been submitted to and approved by the Council. Within 4 months of the first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, an issued Final BREEAM Certificate stating the BREEAM Level achieved (minimum Level 4) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the Council’s associated Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ (2008)).

16 The building hereby approved shall be constructed to achieve a minimum criterion of 'Very Good' for the relevant BREEAM standard 2011, aiming for 'Excellent'. A BREEAM estimator assessment, indicating credits that are expected and how this will be achieved, shall be submitted for the Local Planning Authority's approval prior to the commencement of building works on site. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with measures set out in the estimator assessment approved. Further to this, a post construction review shall be undertaken and a BREEAM certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved the prescribed minimum 'Very Good' standard (or above) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development.


17 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, full details of the locations of the proposed CHP facilities, including all associated storage, and a strategy for managing deliveries to these facilities are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed and operated thereafter fully in accordance with the approved details.

18 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, full details of sound insulation for the residential units which shall show how the building has been designed to meet the following standards, and the number and location of the units which shall have noise measurements carried out (as required by Condition 19) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

   a) for living rooms, 35 dB(A) LAeq 16 hour between 07:00 and 23:00 hrs;

   b) for bedrooms, 30 dB(A) LAeq 8 hour between 23:00 and 07:00 hrs; and

   c) 45 dB(A) max for any individual noise event (measured with F time weighting) between 23.00 and 07.00hrs.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

19 Noise measurement for a sample of residential units facing the railway, which show compliance with the noise levels set out in Condition 18 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the residential element of the scheme. The sample of units to be measured shall be agreed in accordance with Condition 18.

Reason: To ensure that no railway noise, nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

20 There shall be no amplified sound, speech or music system fixed, used, or audible outside any of the ground floor commercial premises.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

21 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, full details of the soundproofing of premises and insulation of premises (including ventilation and flue systems) for all party walls and the ceiling/floor between the commercial floorspace and the residential use floors, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter be retained for the duration of the use, to prevent fumes, smell and noise permeating into adjoining accommodation.
22 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, full details of internal and external plant equipment and trunking, including building services plant, ventilation and filtration equipment, commercial kitchen exhaust ducting / ventilation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. All flues, ducting and other equipment shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the use commencing on site and shall be retained for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

23 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, a sound insulation scheme for the building services equipment and other mechanical plant approved under condition 22, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme approved shall be retained and maintained in accordance with the details submitted.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

24 Noise from any mechanical equipment or building services plant shall not exceed the background noise level when measured outside the window of the nearest noise sensitive or residential premises, when measured as a L90 dB(A) 1 hour.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

25 All kitchen fume extraction systems shall be constructed to provide a minimum of thirty air changes per hour and / or a velocity of 0.2-0.5 metres / second across the canopy face (1.5 - 2.0 metres/second across the filter).

Reason: Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

26 No process shall be carried out or machinery installed which could not be installed in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of the area because of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke soot, ash, dust or grit.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area. (Policy 7 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)
No pipes or vents (including gas mains and boiler flues) shall be constructed on the external elevations unless they have first been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Any pipes and vents shall be installed as approved.

Reason: Such works would detract from the appearance of the building and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality (saved policies 33, 38 and 47 of the Saved Unitary Development Plan (2007) and Core Strategy Policy S9 (2011).

Notwithstanding the approved plans, no part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or used until full details of the proposed cycle storage, including elevation drawings at a scale of 1:20 of the new storage enclosures and details of manufacturer’s specifications, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as are approved shall be provided prior to first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such for the duration of the permitted use.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the cycle parking on the site, in the interests of the promotion of sustainable modes of transport (Policy 14 of the Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 refer).

Notwithstanding the approved plans, no part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or used until full details of the refuse and recycling storage, hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any building work commences and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse and the provision of recycling facilities on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy 35 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.

Prior to occupation of the development, details of a waste management plan for each individual category of use, incorporating provision for refuse storage and recycling facilities on the site, the provision of litter bins both inside and outside of each commercial premises for use by members of the public and including details relating to the collection of this waste shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of each use. The refuse storage and recycling facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the buildings and shall thereafter be retained as such for the duration of the permitted use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse and recyclables on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area. (Policies 9, 14, 35 of the Saved Unitary Development Plan and Core Strategy policy S9).
Prior to occupation of the development, full details of a servicing management strategy for the management of deliveries and servicing of the development, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Servicing shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority and Transport for London may be satisfied as to the effects of the scheme on the adjacent road network so as to avoid hazard or obstruction to the public highway (Policies 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

No deliveries shall be taken to, or dispatched from, the site other than between the hours of 08.00 and 23.00 Mondays to Saturdays, and at no time on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area. (Policies 7, 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.)

A Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the use hereby permitted commencing. The measures approved in the Travel Plan shall be implemented prior to the residential use hereby permitted commencing and shall be so maintained for the duration of the use, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that the travel arrangements to the residential development are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements. (Policy 9 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010)

Prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby permitted, the ground floor commercial floorspace shall be completed and available for occupation in accordance with the plans hereby approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory provision of employment floorspace on the site (Policy 23 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Core Strategy Policy S3)

The hours of operation of the ground floor commercial floorspace (Class A1 and A3) hereby permitted shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the relevant premises and shall not operate other than in accordance with the agreed hours unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers. (Policies 7 and 29 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010)

All residential flats hereby permitted shall comply with the relevant Lifetime
Homes standard.

Reason: To secure appropriate access for disabled people, in accordance with Policy 33 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.

37 At least 10% of the residential flats hereby permitted shall be designed so that they can be easily adaptable to meet the Wheelchair Housing standard.

Reason: To secure appropriate access for disabled people, in accordance with Policy 33 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010.

38 The development shall proceed in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment by Powell Tolner & Associates.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with additional demand generated by the development (Policy 35 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Core Strategy Policy S6)

17 Informatives

1 This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 You are advised that this consent is without prejudice to any rights which may be enjoyed by any tenants/occupiers of the premises.

3 Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council's Building Control Officer.

4 You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Health Division concerning compliance with any requirements under the Housing, Food, Safety and Public Health and Environmental Protection Acts and any by-laws or regulations made there under.

5 You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Health Division with regard to the extraction of fumes from the premises.

6 Your attention is drawn to the necessity to register your food business with the Council's Environmental Health Division, under the Food Premises (Registration) Regulations 1991 before the use commences. Failure to do so may result in prosecution.

7 Your attention is drawn to Sections 4 and 7 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and the Code of Practice for Access for the Disabled to Buildings (B.S. 5810:1979) regarding the provision of means of access, parking facilities and sanitary conveniences for the needs of persons visiting, using or
employed at the building or premises who are disabled.

8 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Transport and Highways team within the Transport Division of the Directorate of Environmental Services, with regard to any alterations affecting the public footway.

9 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council's Streetcare team within the Public Protection Division with regard to the provision of refuse storage and collection facilities.

10 You are advised that this permission does not authorise the display of illuminated advertisements at the premises and separate consent may be required from the Local Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

11 You are advised that this permission does not authorise the display of advertisements at the premises and separate consent may be required from the Local Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

12 You are advised that permission will be required for the installation of a new shopfront at these premises.

13 In connection with the soundproofing condition, you should consult the Council's Building Control Section before carrying out any works.

14 As soon as building work starts on the development, you must contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer if you need to do the following:

- name a new street
- name a new or existing building
- apply new street numbers to a new or existing building

This will ensure that any changes are agreed with Lambeth Council before use, in accordance with the London Buildings Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 and the Local Government Act 1985. Although it is not essential, we also advise you to contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer before applying new names or numbers to internal flats or units. Contact details are listed below.

Street Naming and Numbering Officer
e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283
fax: 020 7926 9104

15 You are advised that under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the National Rivers Authority is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld. Contact Mr D DeCoster on
You are advised that under the terms of the Water Industries Act 1991, the prior written consent of the London Borough of Lambeth, Sewerage Contractor for Thames Water Utilities Ltd is required for any development works draining into, or connecting to, the public sewers. Contact Mr S K Bellehewe on 0171 926 7108.

You are advised to contact Thames Water Utilities regarding mains/supply pipe connections for the development at Network Services Waterloo District, Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Waterworks Road, Brixton Hill, London SW2 1SB. Contact Mr D Kirk on 0645 200800 for details.

It is the view of Lambeth Council that the proposed development has scope for the provision of recycling and/or composting facilities. For advice on incorporation of such facilities please contact:

Jason Searles/ Dean Parry
3rd Floor,
Blue Star House
234-244 Stockwell Rd
London SW9 9SP
020 7926 2624
Dparry@lambeth.gov.uk

You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Highways team prior to the commencement of construction on 020 7926 9000 in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffolding, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections, Hoarding, Excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licences etc.

It is current Council policy for the Council's contractor to construct new vehicular accesses and to reinstate the footway across redundant accesses. The developer is to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 7926 9000, prior to the commencement of construction, to arrange for any such work to be done. If the developer wishes to undertake this work the Council will require a deposit and the developer will need to cover all the Council's costs (including supervision of the works). If the works are of a significant nature, a Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) will be required and the works must be carried out to the Council's specification.

You are advised of the necessity to consult Transport for London via email (centrallicensing@tfl.gov.uk), prior to the commencement of construction in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the public highway including scaffolding, temporary/permanent crossovers, oversailing/undersailing of the highway, drainage/sewer connections, hoarding, excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), temporary full/part road closures, craneage licences etc.
Any excavation or new groundworks at street or basement level associated with this development may expose or damage archaeological remains. Such works include the removal of the existing slab and/or foundations, construction of new foundations or floor slabs, lift pits, underpinning or service trenches.

The Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that archaeological remains on this site are preserved in situ. The detailed proposals should include appropriate drawings, technical notes and method statements, showing how the objectives of in situ preservation are to be achieved. Particular attention should be paid to the design of foundations and new groundworks including piling, underpinning, new slab levels and slab construction, lift pits and new service trenches. You are advised to contact English Heritage's Archaeological Officers to discuss the submission of details required to discharge the archaeological condition(s).

The development of this site is likely to damage archaeological remains. The applicant should therefore submit detailed proposals in the form of an archaeological project design. This design should be in accordance with the appropriate English Heritage guidelines.

Piling or other penetrative methods of foundation design can cause unacceptable risks to groundwater. A risk assessment should be carried out as per our guidance 'Piling into Contaminated Sites'. This and other guidance on piling into potentially contaminated sites is available on our website (www.environment-agency.gov.uk). Click on the publications and search for piling.

The water table is likely to be shallow at the site. It is therefore susceptible to pollution from oils and fuels from construction machinery.

The Environment Agency strongly recommends that the applicant consults our Pollution Prevention Guidance notes (PPGs). These are aimed at a wide range of industries and activities that have the potential to cause pollution. They can be downloaded from our website www.environment-agency.gov.uk.

The Thames Tunnel project is located within the vicinity of the subject site and includes the construction of a culvert, drop shaft and main tunnel to be built using tunnel boring equipment at depths of approximately 50 metres below ground level. It is therefore advised that you should contact Thames Water's project engineers to discuss your foundation and basement design.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall
not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

30 No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

31 Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water’s Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.

32 Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.