PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday 24 November 2015

Time: 7.00 pm

Venue: Karibu Centre, 7 Gresham Road, SW9 7PH

Copies of agendas, reports, minutes and other attachments for the Council’s meetings are available on the Lambeth website. www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov

Members of the Committee

Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Bernard Gentry, Councillor Diana Morris (Deputy Chair), Councillor Sally Prentice, Councillor Mohammed Seedat, Councillor Joanne Simpson and Councillor Clair Wilcox (Chair)

Substitute Members

Councillor Liz Atkins, Councillor Anna Birley, Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Councillor Tim Briggs, Councillor Marcia Cameron, Councillor Jane Edbrooke, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Robert Hill, Councillor Jack Hopkins, Councillor Louise Nathanson, Councillor Jane Pickard and Councillor Sonia Winifred

Further Information

If you require any further information or have any queries please contact:
Henry Langford, Telephone: 020 7926 1065; Email: hlangford@lambeth.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting. If you have any specific needs please contact Facilities Management (020 7926 1010) in advance.

Queries on reports

Please contact report authors prior to the meeting if you have questions on the reports or wish to inspect the background documents used. The contact details of the report author are shown on the front page of each report.

@LBLdemocracy on Twitter http://twitter.com/LBLdemocracy or use #Lambeth
Lambeth Council – Democracy Live on Facebook http://www.facebook.com/
Digital engagement

We encourage people to use Social Media and we normally tweet from most Council meetings. To get involved you can tweet us @LBLDemocracy.

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.

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.

Representation

Ward Councillors (details via the website www.lambeth.gov.uk 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).
While the Town Hall is closed meetings will take place at the Karibu Education Centre or International House. Please refer to the front page of this agenda to see meeting location.

Karibu Education Centre, 7 Gresham Rd, London SW9 7PH

International House, Canterbury Crescent, London SW9 7QE
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

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2015 will be agreed at the next meeting of the committee.

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

3. 42 Clapham Manor Street (Clapham Town) 15/02266/FUL & 15/02267/LB

Officer’s recommendation:

Application 15/02266/FUL - Grant conditional Planning Permission.

Application 15/02267/LB - Grant conditional Listed Building Consent.

4. Lambeth College, 54-56 Brixton Hill (Brixton Hill) 15/04340/FUL

Officer’s recommendation:

Grant conditional permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement.
1  Who sits on the PAC?
The Council has established a PAC, which consists of seven Councillors (elected members).

2  Where and when do PAC meetings take place?
Meetings are usually held at the Karibu Education Centre, 7 Gresham Rd, London SW9 7PH. The meetings are normally held on a Tuesday evening at 7pm 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/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteeId=600
A limited number of 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 two 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 the Ward Members can address the meeting at the Committee’s discretion for a maximum of two minutes each.

You must register your wish to speak on any application by telephoning Democratic Services on 020 7926 1065 or emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk by 12 noon on the last working day before the meeting. Ideally, you will supply in writing an outline of the points you wish to raise at the meeting. If you telephone, Democratic Services will record these points.

Where the number of requests to speak exceeds three, and/or it is clear the speakers wish to make similar points, speakers will be asked to liaise so that all the points can be raised succinctly.

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:

1. Applications which are withdrawn or which officers recommend should be deferred.
2. Applications where there are no notified speakers present wishing to address the committee and members have no questions to ask the applicant or officers.
3. Applications which have been deferred from a previous meeting or have been the subject of a site visit.
4. Applications for developments which would be in receipt of public funding and which are subject to deadlines affecting delivery and other applications subject to specific deadlines.
5. Applications regarded as a priority due to the large number of people present, or where applicants, objectors or other members of the public have special requirements.

8 What is the process for considering an application at the meeting?
Officers will introduce each application with a brief presentation which will usually include drawings and photographs of the application site. The Committee will then hear from and question all interested parties. Any registered objectors will speak first with applicants having the right of reply. 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 9.00pm 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 10.00pm. At 10.00pm, if the meeting has not ended, the meeting will decide which business can be completed by 10.45pm 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. Members of the public can attend the visit and explain how they believe the development may impact on them if this cannot be done in a satisfactory way through the submission of written representations or visual material. However, the site visit is not an opportunity to discuss the merits of the application.

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.

12 If I am unable to attend the PAC meeting, how can I find out the decision?
Decisions will be posted on Twitter from @lbldemocracy immediately as the decision is taken. You can also contact Democratic Services by telephone or email. The minutes from the meeting will also be available on the Council’s website five 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: planning@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
### Guide to Use Classes Order in England (May 2013)

The table below is intended as a general guide. Reference needs to be made to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Use/Description</th>
<th>Permitted change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 Shops</strong></td>
<td>Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices, pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.</td>
<td>Mixed use as A1 and up to 2 flats above. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A2, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 Financial &amp; professional services</strong></td>
<td>Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies and betting offices.</td>
<td>To A1 where there is a display window at ground floor level and to mixed-use as A2 and up to 2 flats above. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 Restaurants &amp; cafés</strong></td>
<td>For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.</td>
<td>To A1 where there is a display window at ground floor level, and A2. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4 Drinking establishments</strong></td>
<td>Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (not night clubs).</td>
<td>To A1, A2 or A3. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5 Hot food takeaways</strong></td>
<td>For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.</td>
<td>To A1, A2 or A3. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **B1 Business**  | a) Office other than a use within Class A2.  
     b) Research and development of products or processes.  
     c) Light industry appropriate in a residential area.                                                                                                                                                    | To B8 subject to total floorspace being no greater than 500sqm. B1(a) permitted change to C3 subject to: prior approval process; previous use timings; limitations and exempt areas (until 30.05.16). Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, A3. To state-funded school, subject to prior approval. |
<p>| <strong>B2 General industrial</strong> | Use for industrial process other than one falling within class B1 (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).                                                           | To B1 and B8. Permitted change to B8 is subject to total floorspace being no greater than 500sqm.                                      |
| <strong>B8 Storage or</strong> | This class includes open air storage.                                                                                                                                                                           | To B1 subject to total floorspace being no                                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hotels, boarding and guest houses where no significant element of care is provided (excludes hostels).</td>
<td>To state-funded school, subject to prior approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Residential care homes, hospitals, nursing homes, boarding schools, residential colleges and training centres.</td>
<td>To state-funded school, subject to prior approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2A</td>
<td>Prisons, young offenders' institutions, detention centres, secure training centres, custody centres, short term holding centres, secure hospitals, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.</td>
<td>To state-funded school, subject to prior approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Use as a dwellinghouse: a) A single person or by people to be regarded as forming a single household; b) Not more than six residents living together as a single household where care is provided for residents; c) Not more than six residents living together as a single household where no care is provided to residents (other than use within Class C4).</td>
<td>To C4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Small shared houses occupied by 3-6 unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. NB Large HMOs (more than 6 people) are unclassified and therefore sui generis.</td>
<td>To C3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Clinics, health centres, crèches, day nurseries, day centres, schools, art galleries (other than for sale or hire), museums, libraries, halls, places of worship, church halls, law court. Non residential education and training centres.</td>
<td>Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Cinemas, music and concert halls, bingo and dance halls (but not night clubs), swimming baths, skating rinks, gymnasiums or area for indoor or outdoor sports and recreations (except for motor sports, or where firearms are used).</td>
<td>To state-funded school, subject to prior approval. Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150sqm to A1, A2, A3, B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui Generis</td>
<td>Includes theatres, large houses in multiple occupation, hostels providing no significant element of care, scrap yards, petrol filling stations and shops selling and/or displaying motor vehicles, retail warehouse clubs, nightclubs, launderettes, taxi businesses, amusement centres and casinos.</td>
<td>No permitted change except casino to D2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>15/02266/FUL &amp; 15/02267/LB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Address</td>
<td>42 Clapham Manor Street SW4 6DZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SITE DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of designation</th>
<th>Applicable designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Grade II listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>(CA2) Rectory Grove Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Priority Areas</td>
<td>Clapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk Zone</td>
<td>No designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>0.05ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Floorspace (Gross External Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Class D1</td>
<td>Ballet School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Class D1</td>
<td>Ballet School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The application proposes a single storey plus basement extension and associated internal alterations to a Grade II listed building along Clapham Manor Street. The building has an established use as a ballet school (Use Class D1) which is operated by the London Russian Ballet School (LRBS) and the proposals seek to significantly enhance the quality of this teaching facility. The scheme has been fully assessed against national, regional and local planning policies. Officers are of the opinion that the application is in general compliance with the NPPF and relevant Development Plan policies.

In land-use terms, the proposals are supported as they would help to support and promote an established community facility within the Borough. The proposals would enable the school to provide a better quality of ballet teaching and learning for both children and adults.

The proposed extension requires the lower section of the building’s rear elevation to be removed. The council’s Design Officer has assessed the level of harm which these works would have on the identified designated heritage assets (Rectory Grove Conservation Area and Grade II listed 42 Clapham Manor Street). It was concluded that the works would result in less than substantial harm on the heritage assets. It is Officers' assessment, having both that, having both (a) accorded considerable weight to each identified instance of harm to individual heritage assets and then (b) taken those instances of harm together and accorded them considerable weight, that the identified harms to heritage assets would be outweighed by the benefits (economic, social and environmental) derived from the Development.

Whilst the scheme would significantly increase the building’s floorspace, the majority of this additional floorspace would be at basement level. The majority of the resulting massing would only be visible within the site. The proposed rear extension is single storey and when viewed in the context of the massing of the existing building is considered by the Design Officer to represent a subordinate addition. The architectural design of the development is contemporary, but considered by the Design Officer to respond positively to the historic character and appearance of the listed building and the Rectory Grove Conservation Area. The proposed palette of materials is modern but reasonably harmonious and sympathetic in terms of the building’s context.

Officers have given careful consideration to the amenity concerns raised by local residents, in respect of matters such as daylight/sunlight, outlook, noise, privacy and the construction impact of development. In this regard, it is considered that, subject to planning conditions, the scheme can be supported on amenity grounds.

Other important planning considerations such as transport and school’s impact of the local highway network, sustainability and energy, archaeology and biodiversity have also been fully assessed and subject to appropriate conditions, would comply with relevant National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Development Plan policies.

Officers consider that the scheme 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 applications should otherwise be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the development, subject to conditions in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon Local Planning Authorities by the NPPF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (General)</th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (Disabled)</th>
<th>Bicycle Spaces</th>
<th>Motorbike Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None designated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER’S REPORT
Reason for referral to PAC: The applications have been called in to Planning Applications Committee by Cllr Wellbelove.

1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1 The application relates to 42 Clapham Manor Street and the site’s rear yard. The total site area is approximately 500sqm. The building fronts the western side of Clapham Manor Street between the junctions with Elmhurst Street (to the southeast) and Shamrock Street (to the northwest). To the east is Cubitt Terrace which bends around to the south of the site. Knowles Walk is also to the east of the site which leads on to Larkhall Rise to the north.

![Figure 1: Aerial view of the site, facing northeast](image)

1.2 The building has a long and varied history of mainly providing community facilities and services and as a taxi driver training school. Its current and established use is as a ballet school (Use Class D1) and is occupied by The London Russian Ballet School (LRBS).

1.3 The building is listed (Grade II) and was originally constructed in 1860. It is two-storeys and constructed from grey brick. The front facade contains five bays at ground floor level which are repeated above. The bays are highlighted by white stucco features and red brick dressings. The building is centrally positioned within an almost continuous terrace of properties. The massing of the building is separated into two piles (the front and the rear piles – refer to Figure 2 below).

![Figure 2: Existing Section Drawing](image)
1.4 There are several ancillary structures in the rear yard of the site. A detached garage is situated in the southwest corner of the site and has been internally fitted out and used as an additional ballet studio. There are also some lightweight timber lean-to structures on and near the boundaries that are used to store equipment relating to off-site performances (e.g. stage). A high brick wall and gate defines the southwest boundary of the site to Cubitt Terrace.

1.5 Adjoining development to the north and south of the site consist of regular rectangular allotments that accommodate attached dwellings in the form of a terrace row. The rear boundary of the site adjoins a two storey residential flat development. The site and some of the surrounding area is situated within the Rectory Grove Conservation Area (CA 02) and an Archaeological Priority Area. Nos.66-68 and Nos.70-74 Clapham Manor Street are listed buildings situated to the south of the site.

![Figure 3: Aerial view of the site, facing southeast](image)

1.6 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character; however there are some examples of non-residential uses that are established in this context. These include two public houses, a medical centre and convenience store. The southern end of Clapham Manor Street intersects with Clapham High Street and is characterised by existing commercial and retail uses in the town centre. Clapham Leisure Centre, a non-residential institution is located on the corner of Clapham Manor Street and Voltaire Road towards the high street and district centre.

2 PROPOSAL

2.1 The London Russian Ballet School (LRBS) has submitted a full planning application together with an application for listed building consent for the following:

- Demolition of existing studio outbuilding, kitchen and store and partial removal of rear facade of main building;
- Erection of new single storey rear extension and excavation of new basement area beneath building;
- Associated internal works, comprising a reconfiguration of the main building (including the removal of non-historical walls) to provide changing facilities, studios, plant room, new reception area and foyer.
2.2 The proposed works are to ensure the continued use of the property as a ballet school as the existing buildings and structures are considered by the LRBS to provide cramped conditions, namely the low floor to ceiling heights. The proposals include an area in the basement for ballet students to practice performances. The applicant has confirmed in their supporting information that this part of the building will not be used for public performances.

2.3 The exterior of the main extension would comprise pre-cast concrete panels with a textured stone surface. The interior would have a stone floor finish to the front lobby, as well as lining the steps that lead into the basement studio. The brick exterior of the of the existing building would be exposed.

2.4 The rear office building is proposed to be clad in stained and treated timber to reflect the reduced scale and form. It is also intended to offer a more domestic scale, reflecting a shed-like out-building structure.

2.5 The applicant has confirmed individual classes would be limited to 40 pupils and the building as a whole would have a maximum of 70 pupils at any one time. The proposed class size restriction is set out in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Class Size Restriction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio (Basement)</td>
<td>200sqm</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio (Ground floor)</td>
<td>165sqm</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio (First Floor)</td>
<td>129sqm</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Studio Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>494sqm</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 students (dancing)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Proposed ballet school class sizes

2.6 The scheme would provide 10 cycle parking spaces at the front of the property in the form of 5 Sheffield stands. In terms of vehicle parking, one space would be provided in the rear yard, situated alongside a vehicle turning bay.

2.7 Provided below are existing and proposed floor plans, a section drawing and indicative images of the proposals (Figures 4 – 11):
Figure 8: Proposed First Floor Plan

Figure 9: Existing Section Drawing

Figure 10: Proposed Section Drawing - the relationship between the retained rear elevation and the new extension
Figure 11: 3-D visual of the proposed extension from Cubitt Terrace to the rear

Figure 12: Photograph of the scale model (looking south)

Figure 13: Photograph of the scale model (looking north)
3 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 The existing building on the site was designed and constructed circa.1860 as the Clapham General and Provident Dispensary providing free medical and surgical aid. In May 1959, the Special Committee of Alderman of the London Borough of Wandsworth resolved to inform the London County Council that the Borough Council has no objection to the proposed use of the building as an occupation centre and an industrial training centre for people with special needs. Plans from this time show a single storey extension reaching almost to the rear of the boundary of the site.

3.2 The property was transferred from Social Services to Amenity Services in 1972 after it became vacant. The site was to be redeveloped as a community centre and pre-school playgroup with building work programmed to commence in 1976 however this scheme was ultimately suspended.

3.3 Planning permission was granted in November 1980 for the use of the site as a pre-school playgroup. Subsequently in November 1982 planning permission was granted for use of the property as an adult education and training centre including for the construction of a single storey brick building at the rear.

3.4 At some point in 1989 the property became vacant and a significant fire damaged the rear and interior.

3.5 Planning permission was granted on 11 November 1991 (ref: 91/00625/PLANAP) for external alterations and the erection of a mezzanine/first floor to provide a training school at ground floor and the use of the first floor as offices (Use Class B1) together with the erection of a car port in front of the garage. Condition 3 limited the use of the ground floor to the taxi training school and no other use falling within the D1 use class. It is understood that the taxi school operated the site until sometime around 2005/06 when the council disposed of the property.

3.6 In late 2011, applications for full planning permission (ref: 11/03503/FUL) and listed building consent (ref: 11/03503/LB) for the refurbishment of the existing ballet school and extension to the rear of the building were received by the council. During the course of the assessment the neighbours objecting to the proposals questioned the lawful use of the premises by the ballet school. Council officer advice at the time was to either confirm the lawfulness of the use through a Certificate of Lawful Development or alternatively make an application for planning permission to regularise an unauthorised use.

3.7 An application for a Certificate of Lawful Development (ref: 12/02867/LDCE) relating to the existing use of the premises as a ballet school (Use Class D1) was subsequently lodged. Following the issue of an assessment letter (dated 24 September 2012) advising that the Authority was not satisfied that the use was lawful the application was withdrawn.

3.8 A second application for a Certificate of Lawful Development (ref: 12/03835/LDCE) was made. This application was refused in December 2012 for the following reason: ‘The application has failed to demonstrate that, on the balance of probability, the first floor of the existing building at 42 Clapham Manor Street has been used as a Ballet School (Use Class D1) continuously and without significant interruption for a period of 10 or more years. The evidence available to the Authority was ambiguous and unclear as to the nature of the use of the first floor on the commencement date and whether this did in fact comprise a ballet school’.

3.9 During the assessment of the Certificate of Lawful Development application (ref: 12/03835/LDCE), planning permission was sought for use of the premises and ancillary garage as a ballet school (D1 Use Class) (ref: 12/04174/FUL).
3.10 An application for listed building consent (ref: 12/04175/LB) was also submitted at this time. It was however determined unnecessary to secure consent for the minor internal works undertaken in or around 2008 as it was acknowledged that the interior was damaged due to a fire in or around 1989 and subsequently replaced with a modern finish. The application (ref: 12/04175/LB) was subsequently withdrawn.

3.11 In May 2013 planning permission was granted (ref: 12/04174/FUL) to use the existing premises and ancillary garage as a ballet school (Use Class D1). The consent was granted subject to nine conditions. All of the conditions which required the submission of details have been discharged. These are summarised and listed below in the order they were approved:

- Condition 6 (Details of parking, manoeuvring and the loading and unloading of vehicles), ref: 13/03119/DET
- Condition 8 (Details of cycle parking), ref: 13/03132/DET
- Condition 9 (Details of a Travel Plan), ref: 13/03133/DET
- Condition 7 (Noise Assessment), ref: 13/03707/DET

3.12 In August 2013 an application was submitted for the variation of Condition 1 (approved plans), Condition 3 (ballet classes), and Condition 7 (noise assessment) (ref: 13/03733/VOC). These amendments sought to enable the removal of modern partitions and increase the size of the existing first floor studios while the removal of Condition 3 is proposed to enable the use of studios on the ground and first floor levels (the condition did not permit the use of the ground floor of the building as ballet studios). This was granted on 11 October 2013.

3.13 The owner of the property sought the removal of Condition 2 (The site shall be used for the purpose hereby approved and for no other use including any other purpose in Use Class D1) of planning permission 12/04174/FUL (ref: 13/05297/VOC). This application was refused for the following reason: ‘In the absence of further supporting information, the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the removal of condition 2 of planning permission 12/04174/FUL would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring and surrounding properties and the local highway network, contrary to Policy 7 of the Saved Unitary Development Plan.’ The decision was subsequently appealed but was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate in August 2014 (PINS ref: APP/N5660/A/14/2218450).

4 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Pre-Application

4.2 Since 2010, proposals to extend the existing building have been subject to on-going pre-application discussions between the ballet school, council officers and Historic England (formally English Heritage). There have been a number of amendments which considerably reduces the scale, height and massing of the proposals. These are explained in Figure 14 (extracted from the submitted Design and Access Statement):
Figure 14: Scheme evolution from 2011 to the current application.

4.3 Statutory Consultees

Transport for London – It has been confirmed that Clapham Manor Street is currently located along a proposed ‘Quiteway (Waterloo to Croydon)’, but the route is yet to be confirmed. TfL have raised no objection to the proposal.

Thames Water – Comments received 02/06/2015. No objection, but request for an informatives to be appended to any planning approval regarding piling and drainage.

The Environment Agency – Comments received 17/06/2015. No objection to the proposals as they are considered to have a low environmental risk.

The Clapham Society – Comments received 03/07/2015. Object to the proposals as they will continue to have the effect of intensifying that use which, coupled with the building works proposed will have damaging implications for neighbouring resident’s amenity, the listed building and the character of the conservation area and increased traffic generation.

London & Middlesex Archaeological Society (LAMAS) – Comments received 09/07/2015. No objection subject to conditions controlling details of materials and archaeology.

4.4 Internal Council Consultees

Transport and Highways – Comments received 17/06/2015. No objection is raised subject to a condition (relating to cycle parking).

Conservation and Design – Comments received 30/06/2015 and also provided within the body of the report.

No objection is raised and the scheme is considered to respond positively to the listed building and the character of the Rectory Grove Conservation Area. The development is considered to represent a subordinate addition to the host building. The new interior is regarded to be highly contemporary, accommodating significant changes in level (due to the excavations) and flows freely between the host building and extension.
The extension is carefully considered and the palette of materials is a modern but reasonably harmonious and sympathetic one in terms of the context. The illustrations in the Design and Access Statement suggest that the architect has an eye of good detailing and an aspiration to make an excellent piece of architecture through the use of high quality materials. There is however considered to be some harm to the host building through the removal of the rear façade of the building. This harm is less than substantial and should be weighed up against the public benefits of the scheme.

**Sustainability and Energy Consultant** – Comments received 29/06/2015 & 04/08/2015. Support the measures outlined in the Energy and BREEAM Assessment.

**Building Control** – Comments received 17/08/2015. No objection to the proposals and agree with the findings of the submitted Basement Impact Assessment.

4.5 **Adjoining owners/occupiers**

4.5.1 A total of 20 residents were first consulted on these applications in writing on 26 May 2015. Site notices were displayed from 12 June 2015 and the application was advertised in the local paper on 12 June 2015. The statutory consultation period ended on 3 July 2015.

4.5.2 On the 30 July 2015 the case officer conducted a site visit. This included meeting with the occupiers of No.40 & 44 Clapham Manor Street and viewing the application site from their rear gardens.

4.5.3 The applicants submitted an updated daylight/sunlight assessment in response to the concerns of local residents and at the request of officers. This document was subject to a 14-day public consultation period which closed on 1 September 2015. As part of the consultation period it was identified that some of the submitted drawings had minor discrepancies in relation to the siting of the artists studio at the rear of No.40 Clapham Manor Street and adjoining boundary walls.

4.5.4 A further public consultation period on amended drawings and additional supporting information provided by the applicants commenced on 23 October 2015. This closes on 13 November 2015.

4.5.5 Any comments received after the publication of this report will be reported (1) by way of addendum; and/or (2) verbally at Committee.

4.5.6 At the time of writing, 47 letters and 1 petition (containing 139 signatures) of support were received. The proposals are supported for the reasons summarised below:

- The proposals would be of great benefit to the local community;
- The LRBS achieves social integration in an area which has different socioeconomic groups;
- The LRBS is not run for big profits, but by passion and for community;
- The ballet teachers at the school are some of the best in the UK and the improved facilities would further improve their teaching;
- The school carries out important Outreach work and the facilities will improve their ability to undertake this;
- The proposed scheme is in keeping with the area and it would enhance the rear of the building.
- The development proposals would provide a high quality teaching facility.
4.5.7 Support has been expressed by Stockwell Primary School & Children’s Centre and Jessop Primary School. Both schools praise the ballet school for their performances to pupils, parents and the wider community and also for the under-cut priced lessons for after school clubs. In the case of Stockwell Primary School the LRBS are said to have helped increase popularity of ballet in the school and as a result they have opened a second ballet club.

4.5.8 A total of 85 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of properties within the locality (Clapham Manor Street, Elmhurst Street, Shamrock Street, Nightingale Lane, Rodenhurst Road, Venn Street, Clapham Common South Side, Cubitt Terrace, Grafton Square, Fitzwilliam Road, Offerton Road, Larkhall Rise, Wandsworth Road and Rectory Grove), other parts of the Borough and wider London at the time of writing.

4.5.9 A summary of the concerns raised is set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-use</th>
<th>Officer’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The development represents an 85% increase in the amount of Class D1 floorspace and 100% coverage of the site with built form. This large scale non-residential, commercial use fails to respect the character and function of the surrounding land uses and will change the way in which the area functions.</td>
<td>The site has an established use as a ballet school. The development proposals would provide an operational extension to this existing use and is not considered to change the character of the area. The enhancement of community facilities is supported by policies S1 and S2 of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new facilities will provide a significant increase in the amount of space which can be used for more ‘classes’, ‘rehearsals’ and events / concerts on the site.</td>
<td>Whilst the proposed development would increase the floorspace that can be used by the ballet school, its purpose is to enhance the quality of the accommodation, and in turn the teaching offer. It is not the schools intention to increase the class sizes. The use of the property would be controlled through conditions restricting the use of the building and the size of ballet classes (refer to Recommendation A - Condition’s 4 &amp; 17 of this report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that the basement would be rented out as a theatre and that non-ballet activities (such as music rehearsals) would take place within the building.</td>
<td>The use of the property for ballet classes would be controlled through conditions (refer to Recommendation A - Condition’s 3, 4 and 17 &amp; of this report). The use of the existing, and extended building is and shall continue to be restricted to being a ballet school only as upheld at appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As required by the Local Plan, Officers should give consideration to whether alternative sites are ‘suitable and available’ for the D1 use.</td>
<td>The application proposes an extension to an existing and established D1 use. There is not a requirement for the LRBS to identify suitable and alternative sites for relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to substantial harm being caused to heritage assets and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Design Officer does not consider the proposals meet the higher test of substantial harm. Officers support this view and this is discussed below in paragraphs 6.2.10 to 6.2.60 of this report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The council’s SPD on Building Extensions and Alterations and the Local Plan requires 70% of rear gardens to be maintained. |
| Officers consider that whilst the proposed would infill most of the footprint of the rear yard, it is designed sensitively not to overwhelm the character and appearance of the area and it would not impact on the sense of openness to the rest of the terrace in either direction. |

| The proposed extensions do not represent a subordinate addition to the building because of its height, massing and scale. |
| The Design Officer considers that the proposed extension is subordinate to the host building. This is discussed in paragraphs 6.2.5 to 6.2.9 of this report. |

| The proposals are modern and do nothing to enhance the character of the area. They are out of kilter with the style of the conservation area. |
| The proposed extensions and alterations are considered by the Design Officer to represent a relatively harmonious addition to the host building. Please refer to paragraphs 6.2.10 to 6.2.55 of this report. |

| The development would result in a significant loss of historic building fabric. |
| The property lost the vast majority of its historic building fabric to fire. Please refer to paragraphs 6.2.43 of the report |

| Detrimental impact on the original plan form of the building which does not contain a basement or rear full width addition. |
| The Design Officer has reviewed the proposals and raised no objection to the building accommodating a rear extension and basement level. |

<p>| The council’s SPD on residential alterations and extensions stipulates a maximum extension depth of 3m for terraced houses and states that full width rear extensions should be avoided if the rear elevation has a particular architectural character. |
| This objection is based on the now superseded SPD for building extensions and alterations. However, the guidance within the SPD has been taken out of context as whilst the building might be attached to terraced housing it is not a terraced house in a residential use. The policy is therefore not applicable to this application. The updated SPD on Building Extensions and Alterations only refers to subordinate extension being acceptable. The council’s Design Officer considers that the extension |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amenity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Details</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased noise and disturbance on residents within the local area as a result of an increase in usage of the site.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraphs 6.3.37 to 6.3.39 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing sound insulation measures currently do not work and the development will make the situation worse.</td>
<td>The 2013 planning consent was subject to a condition which required a scheme of sound insulation to be installed. The applicant duly discharged this condition and implemented the works to the satisfaction of the council's Environmental Health Team. A condition is proposed which would require the submission of details of sound insulation prior to the commencement of use of the new extension (please refer to Recommendation A, Condition 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential noise disturbance which would emanate from the plant room which is proposed in the basement.</td>
<td>Please refer to Recommendation A, Condition 6 which requires that the plant in the basement does not exceed noise standards. No undue impact is envisaged to arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sense of enclosure / loss of outlook as a result on the size of the proposed rear extension.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.3.34 to 6.3.36 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of daylight / sunlight to habitable rooms</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.3.4 to 6.3.31 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of light to the garden room/artist's studio in the rear garden of No.40 Clapham Manor Road.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.3.17 to 6.3.19 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light pollution resulting from the two stretches of glazed ceilings.</td>
<td>The roof lights on the proposed extension would be sited over 6m from the rear windows of the adjoining dwellings. They are not considered to result in light pollution which would be detrimental residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased pollution levels in the locality resulting from the use of the development.</td>
<td>The proposed development is not considered to significantly increase pollution levels in the area. An assessment of the sustainability and energy proposals are set out in paragraph 6.5.2 to 6.5.6 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust, dirt and vibrations from construction of the basement would harm amenity and the ability of a local artist to work.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.3.40 to 6.3.41 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional vehicle movements required for dropping off and picking up of children and young adults using the facility would have a harmful impact on the transport network.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.4.4 to 6.4.7 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The movement of vehicles to remove earth and bring materials to and from the site during the construction phase of development would have a detrimental impact on the area for a considerable period of time.</td>
<td>This matter would be addressed by the applicant through the submission of Construction Management Statement, please refer to Recommendation A, Condition 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of vehicle parking within the rear yard of the site.</td>
<td>Please refer to paragraph 6.4.8 to 6.4.9 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Manor Street is proposed to be along the ‘Waterloo-Clapham Quietway route’ and the existing parking situation would be made worse by the removal of parking spaces along one side of the road.</td>
<td>The site is located along a proposed Quietway, however TfL have raised no objection to the development proposals. <em>A Quietway will be a network of radial and orbital cycle routes throughout London that follow backstreets, through parks, along waterways’ or tree-lined streets.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other issues raised</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The basement could have an adverse impact upon the structural stability of adjoining building and increase the risk of flooding through displacing the water table and ground water movement.</td>
<td>The Council’s Building Control Team and Thames Water have raised no objections to the proposals set out in the submitted Basement Impact Assessment. Please refer to paragraphs 6.5.9 to 6.5.11 and Recommendation A, Informative 9 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been no material change in circumstances since the previous refusal to remove restrictions of the building as a ballet school.</td>
<td>The ballet school would still be subject to restrictions on its use through conditions imposed. The proposals do not seek to alter the restrictions on the use of the premises, required by planning permission ref: 12/04174/FUL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over the accuracy of the daylight/sunlight report which has been produced.</td>
<td>The submitted daylight/sunlight report was updated to include additional tests on light to neighbouring dwellings and gardens. The submitted daylight/sunlight report has been reviewed by an external consultant at the request of officers. The updated daylight/sunlight report submitted by the applicant is considered to be accurate and the tests were prepared in accordance with BRE guidelines. The findings of the report are assessed in paragraphs 6.3.5 to 6.3.8 and 6.3.13 to 6.3.15 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of soft landscaping opportunity within the rear yard</strong></td>
<td>The site possesses no existing vegetation, only outbuildings and areas of hardstanding. The development would improve the existing situation through the provision of a green roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The applicants failed to work closely with the neighbouring residents as required by the Localism Act and the NPPF.</strong></td>
<td>Section 5c of the Design and Access Statement explains that the owners have met with neighbouring residents and taken into consideration the issues which have been raised through: - lowering the height of the extension; - setting the main bulk of the extension from the boundary with No.40; - proposing only a small increase in the number of students attending classes at any one time; - removing the residential element from the scheme; - reduce noise spill through proposing air conditioning which reduces the requirement for operable windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The plans have not been drawn accurately with regard to the siting of the outbuilding in the rear garden of No. 40 Clapham Manor Street, the boundary wall with No. 40 and wall at the rear of properties along Knowles Walk.</strong></td>
<td>The architects have amended the plans to reflect the identified discrepancies. Officers are satisfied with the accuracy of the amended drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This building will take too long to build, the traffic just linked with digging the hole will be massive, noisy, dirty and damaging to the environment which is also a short walk away from a doctors surgery, and two schools adding to school traffic and potentially putting children at risk and those with breathing problems due to the fumes and the environmental effects.</strong></td>
<td>Officers do not consider that there will be an increased adverse impact on the health of local residents given the scale of development which is proposed. Any noise, dirt and odours resulting from the development’s construction would be managed through a Construction Management Plan and Environmental Health regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 POLICIES

5.1 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.

5.2 The Development Plan in Lambeth is the London Plan 2015 (Further Alterations of London Plan) and the Lambeth Local Plan (adopted September 2015).

5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in 2012. This document sets out the Government’s planning policies for England including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is a material consideration in the determination of all applications. Since March 2014, Planning Practice Guidance for England has been published online.
5.4 The current planning application has been considered against all relevant national, regional and local planning policies as well as any relevant guidance. Set out below are those policies most relevant to the application, however, consideration is made alongside the development plan as a whole.

5.5 **The London Plan (March 2015) (FALP):**
Policy 3.16 - Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
Policy 3.19 - Sports facilities
Policy 4.1 - Developing London’s economy
Policy 4.6 - Support for and enhancement of arts, culture, sport and entertainment
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 5.9 - 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 5.15 - Water use and supplies
Policy 5.18 - Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 5.21 - Contaminated land
Policy 6.3 - Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.4 - Enhancing London’s transport connectivity
Policy 6.5 - Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.7 - Better streets and surface transport
Policy 6.9 - Cycling
Policy 6.10 - Walking
Policy 6.13 - Parking
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 7.13 - Safety, security and resilience to emergency
Policy 7.14 - Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 - Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment
Policy 7.19 - Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 - Community infrastructure levy

5.6 **Lambeth Local Plan (adopted September 2015):**
D2 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
ED11 – Visitor attractions leisure, arts and culture
S1 – Safeguarding existing community premises
S2 – New or improved community premises
5.7 Supplementary Planning Document: Building Alterations and Extensions (2015)

6 PLANNING OFFICER’S ASSESSMENT

6.1 Land Use

6.1.1 As set out in the planning history section above, the use of the existing premises and ancillary garage as a ballet school (Use Class D1) was established in May 2013. The ballet school, operated by the London Russian Ballet School (LRBS), currently functions from five studios within the buildings, including two on the ground floor and two on the first floor in the main building and one in a converted garage at the rear of the site. Other parts of the building are utilised for bathrooms, changing rooms, storage and an ancillary offices with kitchen facilities associated with the ballet school use. In 2005 the LRBS started the charity Kids Love Lambeth to offer an Outreach programme to local schools within the area. As a part of this programme the LRBS provide teaching in school ballet clubs, performances in schools, offer reduced rates on theatre performances and subsidised tuition to children with families on a low income attending classes at the ballet school.

6.1.2 The development proposes to extend, upgrade and refurbish the existing ballet school building. The LRBS have submitted these set of proposals with the intention of creating an improved facility and studio space to enhance the teaching facilities. These improvements to the facility would comprise higher floor to ceiling heights, to enable more lifting moves to be performed, the creation of a performance practice area, larger changing facilities as well as general improvements to how the building’s internal layout will function.
6.1.3 The proposals would increase the internal area of the buildings to 1,032sqm (an increase of 553sqm) providing three studios ranging between 200sqm and 129sqm (totaling 494sqm) and an Office/Classroom (63sqm). The applicant has confirmed that the performance practice studio at basement level would only be used by the students for rehearsing dance routines in an environment which is similar to performing on a stage in front an audience. There is no intention of staging public ballet performances or other live musical / performance events.

6.1.4 In considering the land use element of the proposals, Policy S1(a) of the Local Plan states that ‘The council will support and encourage the most effective use of community premises to address different and changing priorities and needs in the borough, in accordance with agreed strategies where relevant’. Furthermore, part (b) of Policy S1 seeks to ensure that community premises will be safeguarded. As the extensions and alterations to the building would meaningfully improve the quality of the teaching facilities at the existing ballet school the proposals are considered to accord with the aims of Policy S1.

6.1.5 Turning to Policy S2 of the Local Plan, this policy supports proposals for new or improved premises for community uses where:

(i) the site or buildings are appropriate for their intended use and accessible to the community; and

(ii) the location, nature and scale of the proposal, including hours of operation, do not unacceptably harm the amenities of the area through noise, disturbance, traffic generation, congestion, local parking or negative impacts on road safety; and

(iii) buildings and facilities are designed to be flexible, adaptable and sited to maximise shared community use of premises, where practical.

6.1.6 The use of the site as a ballet school was supported under the 2013 planning consent on the basis that the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Rating (PTAL) of 4 which is considered ‘Good’ and therefore entirely appropriate for a community facility of this size. Whilst this scheme proposes to increase the existing floorspace, the applicant’s supporting information explains that there would be a maximum of 70 ballet students using the facility at any one time. This represents a marginal increase in the number of students, from 67 students to 70 students and is considered to accord with Part (i) of Policy S2.

6.1.7 Concerns have been raised by local residents that the new facilities represent a significant increase in the amount of floorspace which can be used for more classes and events/concerts, as well as other performance-based uses (such as music rehearsals). As stated above, the applicants have confirmed the building would be used for practicing ballet performances only and would be attended by the students using the school. The hours of use of the building for classes will also not extend beyond the current restriction in place under Condition 4 of the 2013 planning consent (8:45am - 9:30pm Monday to Friday inclusive, 9:00am - 6:00pm on Saturdays and 11:00am - 17:00pm on Sundays). Officers consider that through conditions it would be entirely appropriate to restrict the teaching of ballet classes to Studios within the building, as well as the number of students attending each class, in line with Part (ii) of Policy S2. The LRBS have confirmed that they accept these conditions.

6.1.8 The proposed layout of the building is considered to provide flexible and adaptable floorspace, as required by Part (iii) of Policy S2. However, to ensure that the proposed extension and basement are used solely in connection with the current ballet school use it is considered appropriate to append a condition the planning consent removing permitted development rights to any other use with the D1 use class.
6.1.9 In summary, the proposed extensions and upgrading of an existing ballet school is welcomed in land-use terms as it supports and promotes community facilities within the Borough. The proposals are considered to comply with policies S1 and S2 of the Local Plan as well as the supporting the Council’s strategic aim of promoting healthy living.

6.2 **Conservation and Design**

6.2.1 The section below deals with conservation (heritage) and design matters arising from the proposed development. Careful consideration is given to the following matters:
- Scale, massing and appearance of the proposals;
- Legislative and national policy considerations;
- Impact on heritage assets: Rectory Grove Conservation Area (RGCA);
- Impact on heritage assets: Grade II Listed Building - 42 Clapham Manor Street;
- Impact on heritage assets: Summary;
- Assessment of Benefits;
- Harm vs Benefits Assessment;

6.2.2 The scheme entails remodelling the listed building interior, part demolition of the rear elevation and the erection of a single storey (plus basement) extension in the rear yard. The new interior would be highly contemporary, accommodating significant changes in level (due to the excavations) and enabling the users of the ballet studio to move easily between the host building and extension.

6.2.3 Under regulations set out in the ‘Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications – Notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015’, which came into force on 15 April 2015, there was not a statutory requirement to consult Historic England on the application. It should be noted that Historic England were consulted on the previous proposals as these entailed considerably more demolition.

6.2.4 As documented above, the current proposals have been subject on-going pre-application discussions between officers and LRBS and their project team. The current set of the proposals has the support of the council’s Design Officer.

*Scale, massing and appearance of the proposals*

6.2.5 The existing building is double pile, the front pile measures 8.4m in depth and 10.2m in height. The rear pile of the building measures 9.6m in depth and 8.4m in height. Attached to the rear elevation is a store room, changing facility and toilet. These are all single storey with pitched roofs. There is also an outbuilding in the rear yard that extends to the boundary which measures 7m wide, 7m length and has a height of 4.5m to the top of a pitched roof. The area of this structure is 49sqm.

6.2.6 The proposed extension would project from the rear elevation of the property by 13.4m at a height ranging between 3.2m and 4.4m and then by a further 5.6m at a height of 3m. The total length of the extension would be 18.8m.
6.2.7 The Design Officer recognises that there is a significant uplift in floorspace, the proposed extension is however single storey and considered to represent a subordinate addition to the host building, in terms of both height and form. The basement level provides the majority of the uplift in floorspace which would not be visible from outside the site and is therefore not considered to impact visually upon the openness of the area. This visual impact to neighbouring properties is shown below in Figures 19 & 20.

6.2.8 The existing large outbuilding in the rear yard is used as studio space for the ballet school. The adjoining property to No.40 Clapham Manor Street also has a sizable outbuilding building which is used as an artist’s studio. The Design Officer considers that the proposed extension through being single storey would not impact upon the openness of the area. Furthermore, they identify that the site has existing tall boundary walls on either side, which would hide most of the new extension from public view points. The proposal is therefore not considered to represent a prominent feature in the area when viewed from the streetscene.

6.2.9 The detailed design of the proposed extension is regarded by the Design Officer to be carefully considered and palette of materials is a modern but reasonably harmonious and sympathetic in terms of the building’s context. The illustrations in the submitted Design and Access Statement propose the use of high quality materials. which is supported by the Design Officer However and to ensure that this is achieved, the Design Officer recommends that any consent should be subject to a conditions requiring detailed construction drawings (1:10 scale) and sample panels of materials to be approved by the Council. Officers consider that these conditions are appropriate.

Legislative framework and national policy considerations

6.2.10 This section sets out the legislative and national policy context for the officer assessment of the impact of the development proposal on the historic environment and its heritage assets.

Legislative framework

6.2.11 The following legal commentary is provided.

6.2.12 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("PLBCAA") provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
6.2.13 Section 72(1) PLBCAA provides that in the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of (amongst others) the planning Acts, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6.2.14 The South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment case and the Barnwell Manor case (East Northamptonshire DC v SSCLG) establish that “preserving” in both s.66 and s.72 means “doing no harm”.

**National Policy**

6.2.15 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out 12 “core planning principles” that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Those principles include the following:

“Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations”.

6.2.16 The NPPF defines a “heritage asset” as:

“A building, monument, site place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest”.

6.2.17 The definition includes both designated heritage assets (of which, a Listed Building and a Conservation Area are relevant here) and assets identified by the Local Planning Authority (including local listing).

“Significance” is defined within the NPPF as being:

“the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting”.

6.2.18 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting its setting), taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. That assessment should then be taken into account when considering the impact of the proposal on the heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

6.2.19 Paragraphs 131 and 132 of the NPPF provide as follows:

‘131. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.’
132. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional…'

6.2.20 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF deals with substantial harm to, or total loss of significance, of a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF provides that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

6.2.21 Officers also have regard to the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance to the NPPF in respect of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Approach required

6.2.22 Turning to consider the application of the legislative and policy requirements set out above, the first step is for the decision-maker to consider each of the designated heritage assets (referred to hereafter simply as “heritage assets”) which would be affected by the proposed development in turn and assess whether the proposed development would result in any harm to the heritage asset.

6.2.23 The decision of the Court of Appeal in Barnwell Manor confirms that the assessment of the degree of harm to the heritage asset is a matter for the planning judgement of the decision-maker.

6.2.24 However, where the decision-maker concludes that there would be some harm to the heritage asset, in deciding whether that harm would be outweighed by the advantages of the proposed development the decision-maker is not free to give the harm such weight as the decision-maker thinks appropriate. Rather, Barnwell Manor establishes that a finding of harm to a heritage asset is a consideration to which the decision-maker must give considerable importance and weight in carrying out the balancing exercise.

6.2.25 There is therefore a “strong presumption” against granting planning permission for development which would harm a heritage asset. In the Forge Field case the High Court explained that the presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. But a Local Planning Authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

6.2.26 The case-law also establishes that even where the harm identified is less than substantial (i.e. falls within paragraph 134 of the NPPF), that harm must still be given considerable importance and weight.

6.2.27 Where more than one heritage asset would be harmed by the proposed development, the decision-maker also needs to ensure that when the balancing exercise is undertaken, the cumulative effect of those several harms to individual assets is properly considered. The decision-maker might for example conclude that there are adverse impacts on heritage features which individually and cumulatively result in less than substantial harm. However, less than substantial harm does not mean insignificant harm. Considerable importance and weight must be attached to each of the harms identified and to their cumulative effect.
6.2.28 What follows is an officer assessment of the extent of harm which would result from the proposed development to the scoped heritage assets provided by the applicant as part of its submission. This addresses the impact of the development on the Rectory Grove Conservation Area and the Grade II listed 42 Clapham Manor Street. Both an individual assessment against each heritage asset as well a cumulative assessment is provided. This is then followed by an assessment of the heritage benefits of the proposals.

6.2.29 In reaching their assessment, officers have taken into account the Design Officer’s comments who has carried out an assessment of the significance required by paragraph 129 of the NPPF.

**Heritage asset: Rectory Grove Conservation Area (RGCA)**

6.2.30 The Design Officer has considered the impact of the development. The applicant has identified that the Rectory Grove Conservation Area (RGCA) is the only Conservation Area which may be affected and requires consideration. Officers agree. Figure 14 below shows the site’s location within the RCGA.

![Figure 16: Site’s location within the RCGA](image)

**Character of the RGCA**

6.2.31 The Design Officer identifies that the RGCA is largely residential where a consistent rear building line and rear garden plots are characteristic features of the houses. The RGCA is mainly characterised by mid 19th Century residential development in brick with detailing inspired by classicism. Front gardens, established building lines, rear returns and rear gardens / yards are a key element of the character and appearance.

6.2.32 As with other buildings in the area the building typically has the greatest amount of ornamentation on the street façade and a relatively plain rear elevation. Indeed, this is characteristic of much of Lambeth’s 19th Century development.

6.2.33 The application site shares attributes or age, construction, materials and built form with many other buildings within the RGCA. It was also designed by Mr Knowles (Snr) who was a local architect of note. Its historic use as dispensary reflects the development of healthcare in Lambeth during the urbanisation period of the mid 19th Century. The application property should therefore be considered to be a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the RCGA.
Assessment of impact on RGCA

6.2.34 The Conservation Area designation seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the whole area; it is not merely concerned with public views from the street. The contribution made by rear elevations and rear garden spaces is just as important; even if they can only be appreciated from private rear gardens or other similar spaces.

6.2.35 The Design Officer points out that the building was never residential and its historic form and character reflect this and it is not unusual for non-residential buildings to extend out into their backyards. Furthermore, No.40 Clapham Manor Street has a sizable outbuilding at the end of the rear garden. The Design Officer therefore considers that the proposed extension would cause limited harm to the openness of the RGCA.

6.2.36 The rear yard of the site is largely screened from Cubitt Terrace by a high boundary wall and the removal of the lower section of the rear elevation and proposed extension is therefore considered by the Design Officer to result in very slight harm to the character of the RGCA.

6.2.37 The Design Officer considers the level of harm resulting from the removal of the rear elevation and the new extension to be less than substantial. Officers have visited the RGCA and concur with this assessment.

Heritage asset: Grade II listed building - 42 Clapham Manor Street

Character of the listed building

6.2.38 42 Clapham Manor Street is located on the west side of Clapham Manor Street and dates back to circa 1860. The building received its Grade II listing in July 1975. The listing description reads as follows:

‘Two-storey, 5-bay building of grey brick with dressings of red brick and stucco. Modified ground floor and top entablatures, the latter with modillion cornice. Round-arched windows in deep hollow-chamfered reveals have flat stucco surrounds with ears and feet on first floor and moulded architraves, with impost string and heavy pendent keystones, below. Similar treatment, with mask on key, to central entrance well set back. Shaped panels in raised borders between ground floor windows.

Built by public subscription as the Clapham Dispensary.’

6.2.39 The main building is currently in two parts (piles); the grand frontage building (front pile) and a lower, simpler rear building (rear pile). There are single storey outbuildings attached to either side of the rear elevation of the rear pile. All of the building is constructed in brick with timber windows and slate roofs.

6.2.40 The rear pile appears to have been raised in height slightly (likely to accommodate the insertion of a new first floor level after a fire). The rear windows have been accordingly altered but in a sympathetic manner to the historic appearance of the building.

6.2.41 In the site’s rear yard is an outbuilding which provides studio space. This building has a brick construction and does not form part of the listing.
6.2.42 Exterior of the building: The Design Officer notes that the whole building is listed. He states that the listing description is purely for identification purposes and therefore the ornate principal façade should not be considered the sole element of significance although it clearly has a higher aesthetic value than the other elements. However, the building as a whole has historic interest and evidential value. The front and rear piles and rear returns contribute collectively to the significance of the listed building as a whole; it would be unreasonable to unpick the external envelope any further by attributing differing values to individual elements. As it stands the building exhibits (externally at least) a near original external appearance) albeit that the rear pile has been slightly raised and the windows sympathetically altered.

6.2.43 Interior of the building: The Design Officer points out that none of the historic interior survives as this was destroyed by fire. It is therefore completely modern inside. The only feature which appears to have been reinstated is the historic floor levels in the front pile. Whilst the rear pile was raised slightly and subdivided internally the external walls define the original footprint of the hall and in this respect the original plan form is still legible in spite of the subsequent modern interventions.

Assessment of impact on 42 Clapham Manor Street

6.2.44 Internal works: The submission is accompanied by a Heritage Statement which was undertaken by Heritage Collective. The Design Officer has reviewed the findings which identifies that the principal façade, roof profile and the side elevations are the only remaining original features of significance as the main body of the building was altered and subject to fire damaged through its history. The Design Officer considers that the proposed internal works (listed in paragraph 2.1 of this report) cannot therefore be seen to adversely impact on the historic character of the building or the plan form. Indeed, the scheme has the potential to improve upon the extension modern interior and thereby delivering an enhancement to the building internally. Officers are supportive of this view.

6.2.45 Extension: The proposals would however result in the removal of the lower section of the building’s rear elevation. This is necessary to connect the extension to the main building and the Design Officer considers that the works would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. Officers agree with this assessment.

6.2.46 As identified earlier in this report, the proposed extension is considered to represent a subordinate addition to the building. The Design Officer furthers considers that the extensions would not adversely impact upon the historical character of the building.

Impact on heritage assets: summary

6.2.47 The Design Officer has considered the heritage assets individually and collectively and assessed impact of the development. Overall, he concludes that less than substantial harm would result and Officers concur with these findings.

Assessment of Benefits

6.2.48 A definition of public benefits is given in the NPPG. It advises that public benefits:

“may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework. Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature of scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits”
6.2.49 The NPPG further identifies that a public benefit can include securing a buildings optimal viable use: “the vast majority of heritage assets are in private hands. Thus, sustaining heritage assets in the long term often requires an incentive for their active conservation. Putting heritage assets to a viable use is likely to lead to the investment in their maintenance necessary for their long-term conservation.”

6.2.50 On the issue of optimum viable use, when the applicant acquired the building it had fallen victim to fire damage. The subsequent repair works which took place brought the building back into active use, as a ballet school. The LRBS consider that the current proposals would enable them to continue to improve the functionality of the building as a school and in turn enable the long-term viable use of the building.

6.2.51 As part of the additional supporting information which has been submitted, the applicant has set out what they considered to be the benefits (economic, social, and environmental) of the scheme. These are given consideration below.

6.2.52 **Economic:** The applicant identifies that the proposals would provide jobs in the construction industry during the demolition, excavation and building works. They have not provided any information on the anticipated number of construction workers which would be employed. Nevertheless, the works are likely to take place over the space of two years. Officers however consider that this would provide a meaningful period of employment for contracted workers and is therefore of benefit to the local economy.

6.2.53 **Social:** As part of its work with the local community the LRBS explains that it provides support for ballet clubs which are run in local schools (namely Jessops Primary School and Stockwell Primary School & Children’s Centre). The support which the LRBS offer to school clubs includes providing supervising teachers, the current students and/or volunteers. The Stockwell club and one of the Jessop clubs are taught by a bursary student of the LRBS. The supervision and teaching of ballet classes by artistic staff from the LRBS within local schools is also considered to encourage a pathway between school clubs and LRBS and engage children from deprived parts of the local community. The LRBS consider that the enhanced facilities created by proposed extensions would in turn improve the standard of teachers which it is able to provide, both within the ballet school and local schools.

6.2.54 The LRBS puts on performances within local schools to children, parents and teachers (known as their Outreach programme). They also make 100 seats available at reduced rates (£4 per ticket and £15 for a family ticket) for Lambeth children and their families for any public theatre performances. The performance area in the basement of the new extension will be used by the ballet students to practice their performances in front of fellow students and teachers and this is considered by the LRBS to help improve the quality of the shows which the students will to perform at the local schools and public theatres. This is considered to be of public benefit as the LRBS will be able to provide better and aspirational learning for local children and adults attending performances.

6.2.55 The LRBS uses both its association with school clubs and the Outreach programme to recruit new students (aged between 4½ years up to adult). They also offer a subsidised rate for children whose families are on a low income. According to the LRBS over 75% of the young students are Lambeth residents and of these 60% are currently subsidised. The level of subsidy available to a student joining the LRBS is on an application by application basis (as set out on the LRBS’s website) with some students from families with an income of less than £19,500 receiving a full subsidy. The LRBS have stated that the proposals would enable the school to improve the quality of its facilities and teaching, which would enable a higher fee to be charged for adult amateurs to generate further income for the school. This could in turn enable the LRBS to offer more subsidised rates or places at a higher rate of subsidy.
6.2.56 The proposals support the diversity of recreational and leisure facilities within the Borough and this would in turn promote opportunities for healthy lifestyles.

6.2.57 Environmental: As identified above, the proposals are, from a heritage point of view, identified as conserving the physical form of a listed building by enabling its optimal viable use for the future. The proposed works are also considered to modernise the building and include design and renewable energy measures such PV panels to ensure that it meets BREEAM ‘excellent’ and 35.4% carbon dioxide emissions reduction (against Building Regulations Part L baseline).

Harm vs Benefits Assessment

6.2.58 As set out above at subheading ‘Legislative and national policy considerations’ considerable importance and weight is required to be given to identified harm to heritage assets.

6.2.59 It is Officers’ assessment, having both (a) accorded considerable weight to each identified instance of harm to individual heritage assets and then (b) taken those instances of harm together and accorded them considerable weight, that the identified harms to heritage assets would be outweighed by the public benefits derived from the development.

6.2.60 Officers agree that the proposed works would ensure the LRBS can provide a high quality teaching facility in a building which is well maintained and has its historic features long into the future, securing its optimum viable use.

6.3 Amenity

6.3.1 Policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the development does not unacceptably harm the amenity of local residents in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and noise.

6.3.2 At the rear (southwest) the site is adjoined by No.1-4 Knowles Walk at a distance of approximately 4m from the boundary / existing single storey studio. The height of the boundary wall is ranges between 2m and 2.6m when measured from the rear garden area of No.1-4 Knowles Walk.

6.3.3 No.40 & 44 Clapham Manor Street directly adjoin the northwest and southeast side boundaries (respectively) of the application site. The rear elevations of the properties are approximately 6m and 9m (respectively) from the rear yard of ballet school. No.40 has an existing artist’s studio in the rear garden which is on the northwest boundary of the site.

Daylight / Sunlight

6.3.4 Policy Q2 of the Local Plan only supports development that would not have an unacceptable impact on the levels of daylight and sunlight on adjoining properties. The applicant has submitted daylight/sunlight assessments, which have been undertaken in accordance with required guidelines set out the Building Research Establishment Report ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice 2011 (BRE Guide) and the British Standard 8206-2: 2008 ‘Lighting for Buildings - Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylight.

6.3.5 As part of the consultation process, a number of objections were received from the occupiers of adjoining properties with regard to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing issues. They also questioned the scope and accuracy of the submitted daylight/sunlight report. The applicant has updated the report to include additional testing on Nos. 1-8 Knowles Walk which had initially not formed part of their assessment.
6.3.6 At the request of officers, the updated daylight / sunlight report by Malcolm Hollis ('MH Report') has been assessed by an independent consultant, Schroeders Begg. The assessment undertaken by Schroeders Begg ('SB Report') also has full regard to the objection letters submitted by, and on behalf of, the occupiers of adjoining dwellings.

6.3.7 As is usual practice by the authority (amongst others) the instruction to Schroeders Begg was to advise on the suitability of the methodology of assessment carried out by Malcolm Hollis, the criteria employed for the study, the conclusions reached from those criteria and the results obtained. Schroeders Begg however considered it appropriate to run a model of the site which provided their own testing for No.40 Clapham Manor Street given that the property and its rear garden are north of the application site and the level of objections received.

6.3.8 Schroeders Begg did not undertake their own tests on No.44 Clapham Manor Street and No’s 1-8 Knowles Walk given that these properties are sited southwest and southeast (respectively) of the site. They however agree with the findings of the MH Report in respect of these properties.

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing tests

6.3.9 Daylight: the BRE Guidelines stipulate that there should be no real noticeable loss of daylight provided that either:

- The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) as measured at the centre point of a window is greater than 27%; or the VSC is not reduced by greater than 20% of its original value. (Skylight); or
- The area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is not reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value. (No Sky Line / Daylight Distribution)

6.3.10 Sunlight: Sunlight the BRE Guidelines confirm that windows which do not enjoy an orientation within 90 degrees of due south do not warrant assessment. For those windows that do warrant assessment, it is considered that there would be no real noticeable loss of sunlight where:

- In 1 year the centre point of the assessed window receives more than 1 quarter (25%) of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH), including at least 5% of Annual Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WSPH) between 21 Sept and 21 March – being winter; and less than 0.8 of its former hours during either period.

6.3.11 The BRE guidelines also advise that the spaces such as gardens, parks and playing fields, children’s playgrounds should be tested for the availability of sunlight. For gardens and open spaces at least half of the amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March (Spring Equinox).

6.3.12 It is widely acknowledged that daylight and sunlight are fundamental to the provision of a good quality living environment and for this reason people expect good natural lighting in their homes. Daylight makes an interior look more attractive and interesting as well as provide light to work or read by. Inappropriate or insensitive development can reduce a neighbour’s daylight and sunlight and thereby adversely affect their amenity to an unacceptable level.

Assessment of results

6.3.13 Residential windows, rooms and rear gardens of the following properties have been considered for the purposes of daylight and sunlight impacts as a result of the proposed development.
6.3.14 Schroeders Begg are satisfied with the scope of the assessment on neighbouring dwellings and amenity spaces undertaken by Malcolm Hollis.

6.3.15 The following paragraphs summarise and comment on the results MH Report and the review of this document prepared by Schroeders Begg in their independent assessment (‘SB Report’). Schroeders Begg have confirmed that they agree with the findings and accuracy of the MH Report in respect of these properties.

40 Clapham Manor Street

6.3.16 **Daylight:** The MH Report tests 17 windows for VSC at 40 Clapham Manor Street, which serve the rear elevation of the property and artist studio outbuilding in the property’s rear garden. The SB Report tests these 17 windows and one additional window (a side kitchen window) which was not analysed for VSC by the MH Report.

6.3.17 Schroeders Begg has confirmed that all 18 windows serving the building’s rear elevation and the outbuilding comfortably pass the BRE test for VSC. The main loss of VSC would be to a ground floor window serving the studio outbuilding (refer to Figure 17 below). This window would experience a 9.8% loss according to the HM Report (8% loss according to the SB Report). In the main house, there would be a 4% loss in VSC to a side kitchen window (the window not tested by Malcolm Hollis). These windows are all well within the 20% BRE guide for a loss in VSC.

![Figure 17: Outbuilding at No.40 Clapham Manor Street – the window experiencing an 8% / 9.8% loss in VSC is identified above.](image)

6.3.18 **Turning to Daylight Distribution,** the MH Report tests only the outbuilding at No.40, however the study confirms that this passes the BRE tests. Schroeders Begg agrees these findings. The SB Report provides a further assessment on the main building as Schroeders Begg were able to gain access to all the habitable rooms. Again, these rooms all comfortably pass the Daylight Distribution tests, with there being only a 1% reduction in light to a bedroom at lower ground floor.

6.3.19 **Sunlight:** The MH Report carries out ASPH and WSPH tests on 10 windows in the main building at all levels. There is no requirement for the 8 windows in the outbuilding to be tested as they do not face 90 degrees of due south. The SB Report confirms findings of the MH Report that all of the windows which were tested pass for ASPH and WSPH.
6.3.20 The additional side window (serving the kitchen) which was tested by Schroeders Begg experiences a 6% loss for APSH and a 25% reduction for those in winter. It should have been recognised that whilst the winter reduction is greater than 20%, the window is left with 6% of winter sun which is over the 5% benchmark set by the BRE Guide.

6.3.21 Overshadowing: In terms of the potential overshadowing of No.40’s rear garden, the tests by Malcolm Hollis and Schroeders Begg confirm that over half of the total area of the garden (53.96% area - MH Report and 55% area - SB Report) would receive at 2 hours of sunlight during the Spring Equinox with the new development in place. This passes the BRE test and is commensurate with the urban context of the site.

6.3.22 In response to concerns expressed by the occupiers of No.40, Schroeders Begg undertook an additional optional test as part of their independent assessment to consider the effect on overshadowing during summertime (21st June - 'mid-summer') and wintertime (21st December - 'mid-winter'). Using the same BRE test the proposal is identified as have a negligible effect on overshadowing for mid-summer (93% area as existing situation and 92% area as proposed situation) and for mid-winter (0% area as existing and 0% area as proposed).

44 Clapham Manor Street

6.3.23 Daylight: All 10 windows on the rear elevation of No.44 Clapham Manor Street were tested for VSC. These windows all comfortably pass the BRE test, with the only loss of VSC being 0.58% to a ground floor window which serves a kitchen. Given the relationship of No.44 to the proposed extension and the almost negligible impact on VSC, Schroeders Begg consider that there is no requirement for Daylight Distribution testing to be undertaken on this property.

6.3.24 Sunlight: All 4 of the windows which required testing (i.e. serving habitable rooms and do not face 90 degrees of due south) pass the APSH and WSPH tests in both the through experiencing zero loss of sunlight.

6.3.25 Overshadowing: In terms No.44’s rear garden, the MH Study confirms that over half (63.7%) of the total area of the garden would receive at 2 hours of sunlight during the Spring Equinox. This passes BRE test for overshadowing.

1-8 Knowles Walk

6.3.26 Daylight: The main VSC losses (of 7.81% and 8.13%) would be experience by two ground floor windows. Officers are not certain about room types which would experience a reduction in light as they were unable to gain access into the property. Given that windows have pulled curtains and are not obscurely glazed they appear to be habitable rooms (see Figure 18 below). However, all 11 windows on the rear of No.1-8 Knowles Walk pass the BRE test by experiencing less than a 20% loss of light.
6.3.27 None of the rooms required testing for Daylight Distraction as the development does not subtend to an angle of less than 25 degrees to the centre of the lowest window on the property.

6.3.28 Sunlight: The windows on main wall of these properties do not face 90 degrees of due south and therefore under the BRE Guide do not require testing.

6.3.29 Overshadowing: The rear gardens of No’s 1-8 Knowles Walk were tested and over 50% of the total area of the garden (figures of 80.28% and 84.37%) would receive 2 hours of sunlight during the Spring Equinox. This comfortably passes the BRE test for overshadowing.

**Daylight/sunlight summary**

6.3.30 The proposed development would result in minor loss of daylight and sunlight to some windows serving habitable rooms, it is however considered to respond extremely well to its urban context. Schroeders Begg have confirmed that the target criteria for permissible reductions in daylight/sunlight and that the extent of such reductions does not exceed 20% of former value (thus there are no noticeable reductions), satisfying the BRE Guide.

6.3.31 There would be some overshadowing of rear gardens, however over 50% of the area of each garden tested would receive at least 2 hours of sunlight during the Spring Equinox, in accordance with the BRE Guide.

**Privacy**

6.3.32 The scheme has had full regard to the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings at No.40 and 44 Clapham Manor Street through ensuring that there are no windows proposed on the flank wall to the southeast or northwest elevations respectively.

6.3.33 The rear elevation of the main bulk of the extension is glazed, broken up by the slatted detailing that allows light into the basement and ground floor studio. This element of the proposal is however contained within the site, and due to floor levels and existing boundary treatment (measuring 1.8m in height), there would be no direct overlooking to Nos.1-4 Knowles Walk.
Outlook

6.3.34 The proposed extension would be visible through the trees and vegetation from the rear garden of No.44 Clapham Manor Street to a height of 1.8m above the boundary wall. Officers have visited the property and reviewed the plans and supporting information provided by the applicant and consider that the proposal would not harm the enjoyment of the property in terms of a loss of outlook. This is illustrated in Figure 19 below:

![Figure 19: Photo of the existing situation looking out from the rear No.44 and a CGI showing the proposed extension in-situ (Council photo from site visit on 30/07/2015 and CGI taken from the submitted Design and Access Statement page 7g)](image)

6.3.35 Turning to No.40 Clapham Manor Street, the top of the extension would be visible over the wall from windows on the rear elevation of building at ground floor level and from the glazed doors of the single storey extension. The main bulk of the proposed extension is set back from the site boundary by 1.6m. The nearest window serving a habitable room (a kitchen / dinner) is approximately 8m away from the main bulk of the extension. Officers have visited this property and reviewed the plans and supporting information and consider that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook. This is illustrated in Figure 20 below:

![Figure 20: Photo of the existing situation looking out from the rear façade of No.40 and a CGI showing the proposed extension in-situ (Photo supplied by the applicant and CGI taken from the submitted Design and Access Statement page 7g)](image)
6.3.36. In respect of No. 1-4 Knowles Walk, there would be a 0.8 m increase in height on the boundary as a result of the proposed extension. However, the proposed office/admin room element of the extension would measure 3.3 m at its tallest point. This is lower than the height of the existing garage of 4.5 m at the ridge. It is therefore considered that the quality and level of outlook from the rear of these properties would be marginally improved by the proposals.

Noise

6.3.37. The submission is accompanied by a noise report, which included an environmental noise survey. The survey results are used to derive limits for the emissions of noise from the premises, in accordance with the conditions and measures imposed by the May 2013 planning consent. To ensure that the future use of the property does not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents through noise disturbance it is considered appropriate to require that a scheme of sound insulation is submitted to the Council for approval by the Environmental Health Officers. This should be accompanied by a further condition requiring that noise from activities within the ballet school when measured externally at 1 m from any noise sensitive window (L[Aeq],5min) shall not exceed the representative background noise level (L[A90],5min).

6.3.38. The application proposes a plant room at basement level to serve the whole building, to ensure that there would be no loss of amenity through noise disturbance the plant room is required to be sound insulated through a condition. A further condition requiring that the plant shall be a rating level of at least 5 dB(A) below the background noise level L[A90] Tbg measured or predicted at 1 m from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive premises is recommended.

6.3.39. It should be noted that the existing studio outbuilding at the rear of the site is accessed from within the yard, either by students exiting the rear of the main building or via the entrance off Cubitt Terrace. The proposed extension and alterations would ensure that students only ever have to move around the internal fabric of the building to access studios and changing facilities. The proposals are therefore considered to minimise any incidental noise disturbance that could have previously occurred.

Construction Management

6.3.40. In order for the scheme to be built it is recognised that a significant amount of earth would need to be removed from the site as well as the outbuilding and parts of the main building. It is proposed that this would be taken away by construction vehicles. Local residents have therefore raised concerns that this would harm their living conditions for a couple of years.

6.3.41. During the demolition and construction periods, as may be expected, a level of noise is anticipated, as to it is possible for disturbance caused by vibration, as common with construction projects in urban locations. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) should be secured by condition. Measures to minimise the impact would include careful selection of construction methods and plant to be used; switching off plant when not in use; enforcement of restricted working hours for excessive noise activities; use of temporary acoustic barriers and boundary monitoring of noise and vibration levels linked to an alarm system to warn site management of possible significant levels. Consequently, with imposing such a condition, together with the separate regulatory remits of Building Regulations and Environmental Health, the no detriment to the amenity of the surrounding residents is envisaged.
6.4 **Transport**

6.4.1 The existing ballet school use at the site was given a thorough assessment under the May 2013 consent in terms of its transport and traffic implications on the surrounding area. The consent was subject to conditions which required the submission of further details of parking, manoeuvring and loading of vehicles. This information was given careful consideration by the council and approved.

6.4.2 There is 4 part-time and 12 full-time staff employed on the premises. The application does not show any growth in the staff and only a very marginal increase in student numbers from 67 to 70.

6.4.3 The existing infrastructure includes the front entrance from Clapham Manor Street and rear access from Cubitt Terrace. At this location there is a backyard which has off-street parking for one vehicle to enable a transit sized van to undertake deliveries, which is restricted under the previous consent. At times the yard is also used for dropping off and picking up the students.

*Trip Generation and Travel Plan*

6.4.4 The maximum class size is 40 students and the maximum number of students who are likely to be on the school premises is 70 at any one time. The submitted Transport Statement identifies that during the peak morning session (08.00-09.00), the number of students arriving by car would be 12. For the peak evening sessions (17.00 - 18:00), 24 students arrive by car and this includes 12 trips each way. The majority of trips will be made by foot and small amount by bus and bike. This is shown in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>AM (08.00-09:00)</th>
<th>PM (17:00-18:00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car driver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Modes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Trip Generation by Mode*  
(Extracted from Transport Statement submitted with the application)

6.4.5 The submitted Transport Statement compares the ballet school with another Lambeth school site - John Burns Primary School. The Modal Split for the John Burns School is such that 13% of all journeys to and from the school are made by car. The figure for car journeys to and from the ballet school is 17%. Whilst this percentage is higher than for the John Burns School, this is to be expected as the ballet school has specialist school use. The Council’s Transport Officer has confirmed that this figure is still low for a use of this nature.

6.4.6 Clapham Manor Street is identified as having a one-way hourly flow capacity of 750 vehicles, (based on a 60% / 40% split of traffic). The submitted Transport Statement shows that the two-way peak is that of the PM peak period with a flow of 128 vehicles, 60% (77 is vehicles), which is well below the 750 vehicle capacity of the road. The Transport Officer agrees that the road can therefore not be considered to be busy and would not cause congestion, even if a vehicle were to stop in the road for pupils of the ballet school to be dropped off/picked up.
6.4.7 The submission is accompanied by a Framework Travel Plan, which includes objectives, targets and measures. An updated Travel Plan and its adoption should be required through a planning condition.

Vehicle Parking

6.4.8 The proposed expansion of the school would extend into the rear yard which would almost completely remove the rear parking area – one space and servicing bay will remain. As stated above, the site has ‘Good’ access to the public transportation with a PTAL 4 rating. The Transport Officer has confirmed that this is entirely appropriate for a community facility of this type and size, in line with Policy T7 of the Local Plan.

6.4.9 The site is within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Clapham ‘C’. It is in operation from Monday to Friday between the hours of 8.30am to 6.30pm. The resident parking is from 8.30am to 8.30pm. The CPZ includes disabled parking bays and also Pay and Display Parking bays which are well used by the residents and visitors in this locality. However the parking stress at peak times for the resident parking bays which include disabled parking and Pay and Display parking bays is less than 90% at most times. Outside the above controlled hours on street parking is unrestricted and as such on street parking is available to the staff and students in the school. This level of provision is considered to be an adequate for the demand that would be experienced by the use.

Cycle Parking

6.4.10 The submitted Framework Travel Plan and proposed ground floor plan demonstrate the provision of cycle parking. Ten uncovered cycle spaces are proposed at the front of the site in the form of five Sheffield cycle stands. The applicant has confirmed that the cycle parking will be under CCTV surveillance for security reasons.

6.4.11 Policy T3 (Cycling) of the Local Plan requires for cycle parking to be retained within a secure shelter. However, given that the host building is Grade II listed, and the most practical / useable location for cycle parking is at the front of the property then in design terms this would prohibit the provision of a covered shelter.

6.4.12 The council’s Design Officer has raised no objection to the type and location of the proposed spaces subject to details (including a plan showing the exact positioning of the stands) being submitted to the council through a planning condition.

Transport Summary

6.4.13 The Transport Officer considers that the proposals would, subject to conditions, comply with policies T1, T3 and T6 of the Local Plan as the extensions would not generate a significant number of trips or put pressure on the parking within the local area, provide a sufficient number of cycle parking spaces for the school’s operations and promote the sustainable modes of transport.

6.5 Other important planning considerations

Refuse and Waste

6.5.1 Policy EN7 of the Local Plan deals with sustainable waste management and provides overarching requirements for waste management. The site has existing refuse and recycling storage arrangements in place at the rear of the site and there are no proposed changes to method by which it would be collected. It is considered that there would be no significant change to the operation of this use that would require the existing facilities to be modified.
Energy and Sustainability

6.5.2 The supporting text to Policy EN4 (Sustainable design and construction) of the Local Plan states that development proposals of any scale are required to demonstrate sustainability principles. London Plan Policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) notes that development proposals should be designed in accordance with the London Plan energy hierarchy, and should meet a 35% carbon dioxide emissions reduction over the 2013 Building Regulations.

6.5.3 The applicant has submitted a BREEAM LZC Feasibility Study detailing how the development can achieve an ‘Excellent’ rating of 72%. It has been reviewed by the council’s Sustainability Consultant who confirmed that as the minimum score for an ‘Excellent’ rating is 70%, the applicant has created a sufficient buffer-zone to help ensure that the same standard is achieved at the post-construction stage.

6.5.4 In terms of the submitted energy statement, the development has incorporated measures to achieve a 35.4% carbon dioxide emissions reduction against BRUKL baseline. The stated carbon dioxide emissions have been supported by the associated BRUKL reports at each stage of the energy hierarchy.

6.5.5 To demonstrate where renewable energy sources would be provided the applicant has submitted a plan showing the location of PV panels, which is suitable as there is limited scope for any further provision due to heritage constraints. However, details on the type / projection of these panels should be secured through a condition.

6.5.6 The applicant also amended the energy statement to enable the connection to a feasible district heating network in the future. This is the positive approach to the development which the council expects and corresponds with planning policy.

Ecology / biodiversity

6.5.7 The site’s rear yard has an outbuilding, timber shelter and areas of hardstanding and possesses no existing vegetation. The main roof of the rear extension is proposed to have a green roof covering, measuring 108sqm. The provision of a green roof is supported by Policy EN4 of the Local Plan this will add improved biodiversity value for the area and help to reduce surface run-off. Further details of the green roof should therefore be secured through a condition.

Archaeology

6.5.8 The site is situated within an Archaeological Priority Area. The application is accompanied by a Desk-based Archaeological Assessment which was undertaken by CgMs consulting. This study concludes that a modest archaeological potential exists given the site’s previous agricultural activity. In line with Policy Q23 of the Local Plan, it is appropriate to condition that a programme of archaeological work is undertaken in accordance with a written scheme for investigation which should be submitted to and approved by the council in consultation with Historic England prior to development commencing.

Structural Stability and Flooding

6.5.9 Policy EN5 of the Local Plan states that in determining proposals for new basements the council requires an assessment of the scheme’s impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability. This is to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity and would not result in flooding or ground instability.
6.5.10 In support of the proposed basement excavation the applicant has submitted a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) which was undertaken by qualified structural engineer. The Council's Building Control Team have reviewed the BIA and agree with its findings and the measures proposed to ensure that the extensions would remain structurally sound once constructed.

6.5.11 Furthermore, the site is not located within an area which is at risk from surface water flooding and both Thames Water and the Environment Agency have raised no objections to the proposals.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposal reacts positively to a number of planning considerations. In relation to land use policy, the proposed extensions and alterations to the building are supported as they help to support and promote an established community facility within the Borough. The proposals would also enable the LRBS to provide a better quality of ballet teaching and learning that in turn assists to improve the Outreach programme within the local area.

7.2 Whilst the scheme would significantly increase the building's floorspace the majority of this would be at basement level. The rear extension is single storey and when viewed in the context of the massing of the existing building is considered to represent a subordinate addition. The design of the proposed extension and internal alterations are carefully considered and the palette of materials is a modern but reasonably harmonious and sympathetic one in terms of the context. This has been achieved through extensive negotiations between the applicants and officers at pre-application stage.

7.3 The proposed extension requires the lower section of the building's rear elevation to be removed, a non-original feature of the existing building. The council's Design Officer has assessed the level of harm which these works would have on the significance of the heritage assets (Rectory Grove Conservation Area and a Grade II listed building) required to be considered with the proposal and concluded that they would result in less than substantial harm. Officers consider that this level of harm would be outweighed by the numerous benefits (economic, social and environmental) derived from the development.

7.4 As addressed above, the proposals are also considered acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity, the quality of proposed transportation, energy and sustainability, ground stability and archaeology, subject to appropriately worded conditions.

7.5 The comments made by residents have been given careful consideration, as have responses from consultee bodies.

7.6 Officers consider that the scheme 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 applications should otherwise be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the development, subject to conditions in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon Local Planning Authorities by the NPPF.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Application 15/02266/FUL - Grant planning permission, subject to conditions set out below in Recommendation A.

8.2 Application 15/02267/LB - Grant listed building consent, subject to conditions set out below in Recommendation B.
**Recommendation A: Planning Permission Conditions and Informatives**

**Conditions**

1. **Time limit Condition**
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. **Approved plans**
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. **Land-Use**
The extensions hereby approved shall be used in connection with the existing ballet school use and for no other use including any other purpose in Use Class D1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987.

   **Reason:** To preserve the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents where the site may not be suitable for an alternate use, in accordance with policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

4. **Classes**
Ballet classes shall only take place within rooms identified as 'Studio' on the basement plan (Dwg no. 0910/0120 Rev I by Edgley Design 13/10/15), on the ground floor plan (Dwg no. 0121 Rev K by Edgley Design 13/10/15) and on the first floor plan (Dwg no. 0122 Rev L by Edgley Design 13/10/15).

   **Reason:** To preserve the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents in accordance with policies Q2 (Amenity) and S2 (New or improved community premises) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

5. **Hours of operation**
No ballet teaching lessons or classes shall be carried out on at the premises except between the hours of 8:45am - 9:30pm Monday to Friday inclusive, 9:00am - 6:00pm on Saturdays and 11:00am - 17:00pm on Sundays.

   **Reason:** To preserve the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents in accordance with policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

6. **Noise - plant**
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 protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in accordance with policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

7. **Noise - use**
Noise from activities within the ballet school when measured externally at 1 metre from any noise sensitive window (L\text{Aeq},5\text{min}) shall not exceed the representative background noise level (L\text{Aeq},5\text{min}) without the ballet school operating.
Reason: To preserve the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents in accordance with policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

8 Sound insulation
Prior to the commencement of use of the extension hereby approved, all party walls, the ceiling / floors and plant room at basement level shall be soundproofed and insulated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter be retained for the duration of the use, so as to prevent noise permeating into the adjoining properties.

Reason: To preserve the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents in accordance with policy Q2 (Amenity) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

9 Construction Management
No demolition or development shall commence until full details of the proposed construction methodology, in the form of a Method of Construction Statement, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Method of Construction Statement shall include details regarding:

   a) The notification of neighbours with regard to specific works;
   b) Advance notification of road closures;
   c) Details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage;
   d) Details regarding dust mitigation;
   e) Details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway; and
   f) Any other measures to mitigate the impact of construction upon the amenity of the area and the function and safety of the highway network.

No demolition or development shall begin until provision has been made to accommodate all site operatives’, visitors’ and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site or otherwise during the construction period in accordance with the approved details. The demolition and development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details and measures approved in the Method of Construction Statement.

Reason: To avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and to safeguard residential amenity, in accordance with policies Q2 (Amenity), T8 (Servicing) and EN4 (Sustainable design and construction) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

10 Energy and BREEAM
The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the details set out in the Energy Strategy and BREEAM (Synergy Consulting Engineers, Aug 2015).

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (FALP March 2015) and policy EN4 (Sustainable design and construction) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

11 Materials
No above ground development shall take place until a schedule and samples of the materials (which shall be inspected on site) to be used in the external elevations of the proposed extensions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be thereafter built in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory, that it preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area and protects the setting and interest of the listed buildings. In accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), Q11 (Building alterations and extensions), Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) and Q22 (Conservation Areas) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

12 Detailed drawings
No above ground development shall take place until drawings at 1:10 scale for all external and internal construction details for both new build and making-good to historic fabric shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area and protects historic interest and character of the listed building. In accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), Q11 (Building alterations and extensions), Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) and Q22 (Conservation areas) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

13 Archaeology
A) No demolition or development shall commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
1 The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
2 The programme for post investigation assessment.
3 Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
4 Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
5 Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
6 Nomination of a competent person or persons/ organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

B) No demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A) of this condition.

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A) of this condition and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To safeguard the heritage of the Borough by ensuring that any archaeological remains that may exist on site are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed, in accordance with policy Q23 (Undesignated heritage assets: local heritage list) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

14 Cycle parking
Prior to the commencement of use of the new extension hereby permitted, details of the provision to be made for the provision of 5 x Sheffield cycle stands shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details before the use hereby permitted commences and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport, in accordance with T3 (Cycling) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).
15 Green roof details
Prior to the installation of the green roof, a detailed specification of the green roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The specification shall include details of the quantity, size, species, position and the proposed time of planting of all elements of the green roof, together with details of their anticipated routine maintenance and protection. The green roof shall only be installed and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to improve biodiversity, in accordance with policies EN1 (Open space and biodiversity) and EN4 (Sustainable design and construction) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

16 Travel Plan
Prior to the commencement of use an updated Travel Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The measures endorsed in the Travel Plan shall be implemented immediately following the approval of the plan and shall be so maintained for the duration of the use of the site unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that the travel arrangements to the ballet school are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements in accordance with policy T1 (Sustainable travel) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

17 Student Numbers
The number of students attending ballet classes in each ‘Studio’ shown on the approved plans shall be limited to:

- 40 students per class - basement level Studio
- 15 students per class - ground floor Studio
- 15 students per class - first floor Studio

Reason: To ensure that the travel arrangements to the ballet school are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements in accordance with policies T1 (Sustainable travel) and S2 (New or improved community premises) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

18 PV panels
Details of the photovoltaic panels and window cleaning apparatus) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing. The panels shall be installed and maintained strictly in accordance with the details so approved and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of good design and ensure that any roof-level structures do not have a harmful impact on the surrounding area or the host building, in accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), Q11 (Building alterations and extensions), Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) and Q22 (Conservation areas) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

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 of 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. Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements of 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. Access control and external lighting should accord with Secured by Design Part 2 Physical Protection standards.

7. Please be advised that this decision notice requires the submission of details and further works to be undertaken in accordance with the planning conditions above. This will require the preparation of further drawings and information for the further approval of the Local Planning Authority under ‘Approval of Details’ applications within specified timeframes. Failure to submit these applications within the nominated timeframe may result in enforcement investigation and action.

8. Due to the use attracting young children, it is recommended that the operator/manager of the site reviews the security and access arrangements to ensure that management practices and security systems are in place (e.g. access control system on all entrances, locking systems, CCTV, reception desk) to mitigate risk to children.

9. A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water’s Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.

10. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the Piling Method Statement.

Piling or other penetrative methods of foundation design on contaminated sites can potentially result in unacceptable risks to underlying groundwaters. The Environment Agency recommends that where soil contamination is present, a risk assessment is carried out in accordance with their guidance ‘Piling into contaminated sites’. They will not permit piling activities on parts of a site where an unacceptable risk is posed to controlled waters.

**Recommendation B: Listed Building Consent Conditions**

**Conditions**

1. **Time limit**
   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 requirements of Section 18(1) (a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2 Approved Plans
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 Samples
Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a schedule and samples of the materials (which shall be inspected on site) to be used in the external elevations of the proposed extensions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be thereafter built in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development sustains and enhances the setting and interest of the listed buildings and structures within the site. In accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), and Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

4 Detailed drawings
Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, drawings at 1:10 scale for all external and internal construction details for both new build and making-good to historic fabric shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area and protects historic interest and character of the listed building. In accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), Q11 (Building alterations and extensions), Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) and Q22 (Conservation areas) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

5 Vents, extracts and plant
No vents, extracts or plant other than those shown on the submitted and approved plans shall be affixed or installed within the building.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development sustains and enhances the setting and interest of the listed buildings and structures within the site. In accordance with policies Q8 (Design quality: construction detailing), and Q20 (Statutory listed buildings) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).
**ADDRESS:** Lambeth College 54-56 Brixton Hill, London SW2 1QS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number: 15/04340/FUL</th>
<th>Case Officer: Andrew L Mulindwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward: Brixton Hill</td>
<td>Date Received: 30th July 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:** Erection of 2-5 storey buildings to provide an Educational Campus (Use Class D1) for 3 institutions comprising Lambeth College, Trinity Academy and Southbank Engineering University Technical College including the provision of new Sports Hall, Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), external play/seating/social spaces, relocation of the existing Grade II listed fountain sculpture, soft landscaping, cycle parking and disabled car parking (following demolition of existing buildings).

**Drawing Numbers:**

**Documents:**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant conditional permission subject to a s106 agreement

**Associated Application:** Listed building consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number: 15/04341/LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Proposal:** Refurbishment and relocation of the existing Grade II listed Kinetic Fountain Sculpture within a new pool.
**Drawing numbers:**

**Documents:**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant conditional listed building consent

**Applicant:**
Bowmer & Kirkland and the Education Funding Agency (EFA)

**Agent:**
Mr Cecil Gray
DPP PLANNING
66 Porchester Road
London
W2 6ET

**SITE DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant site designations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone</td>
<td>Flood Risk Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>Partial in Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Kinetic Fountain Sculpture Grade II listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Heritage</td>
<td>Brixton Causeway Roman Road Archaeological Priority Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road hierarchy</td>
<td>Brixton Hill - TLRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places and Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>22 trees on site covered by TPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE DETAILS**

| Site area | Full application: 0.96 ha |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Floorspace (Gross Internal Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>D1 Non-residential Institutions</td>
<td>7,555 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>D1 Non-residential Institutions</td>
<td>13,855 sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PARKING DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (general)</th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (Disabled)</th>
<th>Bicycle Spaces</th>
<th>Motorbike Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed (Trinity Academy)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed (Lambeth College)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed (Southbank UTC)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed (Combined; to be available at first occupation)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed (Combined; future parking subject to demand)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The application site is currently occupied by a two storey 1950/60s building fronting onto Brixton Hill and a three storey building fronting onto Horsford Road. It is in use by Lambeth College and Trinity Academy. There is also a single-storey sports hall in the north-west corner to the rear of properties in Torrens Road and a number of other smaller single and two-storey buildings on the site. Within an internal courtyard there is a Grade II listed Kinetic fountain sculpture. The open land in front of the building onto Brixton Hill is within a conservation area and trees on the site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Lambeth College is seeking to downsize its facility on this site, it already runs below capacity and the intention is to reduce its capacity to 420. Trinity Academy seeks to enlarge its secondary school and sixth form offer increasing pupil numbers from 240 to 840. Southbank UTC is a new college that will specialise in building and medical engineering academic and technical courses for students aged 14-19. It is proposed to provide 600 student places.

The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings and erect a building of 2-5 storeys to provide educational facilities for Lambeth College, Trinity Academy and Southbank University Technical College (UTC). The building is broadly formed of two parallel blocks which align with Brixton Hill and a third which joins the two on the northern boundary. The block fronting Brixton Hill is 3 storeys with a setback 4th floor. The block fronting onto Horsford Road is 3-5 storeys. A new Sports Hall and a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) are proposed along the western boundary of the site. The existing listed sculpture is to be refurbished and relocated within a courtyard adjacent to Horsford Road. The only car parking to be provided on-site is a disabled bay. Servicing is to take place off-street on the Brixton Hill frontage and on-street from Horsford Road.
The key planning issues are summarised as:

- The increase in education floorspace on the site;
- The scale, massing, form and design of the proposed building and its impact on heritage assets;
- The impact of the works to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed sculpture.
- The impact on neighbouring amenity;
- The impact on the highway network;
- Loss of trees and landscaping

The continued use of the site for educational purposes is welcomed and supported by policy. The Local Plan acknowledges that Lambeth College intend to review their sites and reduce capacity in Brixton to reflect their move toward more part time courses. The enlargement of Trinity Academy and the introduction of Southbank UTC will all use of the site for educational provision to be maximised. The institutions will provide much needed additional places for students at secondary level education.

The loss of the existing college building is considered acceptable as it does not make a positive contribution to the area. The proposed building is of a height and mass which responds well to the local context. There is an increase in scale, but the materiality and simple design of the replacement building does not dominate the street scape or views of the listed church. The refurbishment and relocation of the fountain sculpture within a generous setting with some potential public views of it from Horsford Road is also supported. In terms of the impact on amenity there is a limited impact on neighbours. Daylight and annual sunlight levels would not be affected, there would be a loss of winter sunlight to two windows in excess of BRE guidelines, but it is considered that taking account of the fact that those properties continue to receive a good level of annual sunlight and have other windows which would continue to receive good winter sunlight that this alone does not justify refusal of the scheme.

The potential for overlooking or loss of outlook to neighbours is quite limited because of the way the proposed scheme has been arranged; the exception is the impact to some windows in the flank elevation of Brixton Hill Court. The distance and relationship of the existing building to this residential property is not dissimilar to the proposed building, however, because of the increase in height some windows will experience a more noticeable change. The relationship is tight, but not unusual in a tight urban context and often occurs where windows have been placed in the side elevation of a building enjoying outlook and views across their neighbours land. It is considered that the impact is acceptable and does not justify refusal of the scheme.

Transport modelling has indicated an increase in trip numbers, but a relatively small share of this would be met by car journeys as the site is so well served by public transport (PTAL 6a). It is considered that the potential increase in the demand for car parking and drop off can be met. The proposal would result in an increase in bus and tube journeys and in this regard planning obligations are sought to mitigate this increasing bus services and better signage at the underground. A lot of students are likely to walk and cycle to the site and it is considered improvements should be made to make this safer for them. A signalised pedestrian crossing is proposed on Brixton Hill in the vicinity of the main entrances to both Lambeth College and Trinity Academy and traffic calming measures are proposed on Horsford Road this will be
secured by S106 agreement. Relevant travel, servicing and construction management plans will also be secured.

The proposal will result in the loss of 7 trees from the site which is regrettable, however, the loss if considered necessary to facilitate the development, many high value trees are being retained and it is proposed to introduce new planting across the site to mitigate.
OFFICERS REPORT

Reason for referral to PAC: The applications are reported to the Planning Applications Committee in accordance with part 1(b) of the Committee's terms of reference as they relate to a development for the provision of more than 1000sqm of floorspace.

1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1 The application relates to a site south of Brixton town centre on Brixton Hill. It is currently occupied by a two storey 1950/60s building fronting onto Brixton Hill (Block A) and a three storey building fronting onto Horsford Road (Block B). There is a disused pool containing a Grade II listed Kinetic fountain sculpture in a courtyard within the centre of the building fronting onto Brixton Hill. The buildings are currently in use by Lambeth College and Trinity Academy who provide secondary, further and higher educational facilities (Class D1). Lambeth College is currently accommodated in Block A whilst Trinity College uses Block B and an adjacent single storey building (Block Z).

1.2 A number of other buildings are located to the rear of the site including a hall (Block C) located in the north-west corner, this sits adjacent to the rear gardens of the residential properties in Torrens Road, a two storey classroom building (Block D) located south east of this, a single storey building to the rear of Block B (Block Z) as well as a number of single storey temporary buildings. There is a landscaped amenity area between Blocks A and D, which extends to the boundary with Brixton Hill Court which is located north of the site. The site contains a number of mature trees, notably along its Brixton Hill frontage in the landscaped amenity space and along the Horsford Road frontage. The trees are subject to a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Elsewhere, the site has hard landscaping including the land adjacent to the boundary with properties in Torrens Road and part of the strip of land to Brixton Hill, which is used for car parking.

1.3 The site is bounded to the east by Brixton Hill, with Rush Common – a linear park with grass planting and mature trees located on the other side of the road. The Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area covers the park and extends across Brixton Hill to include the strip of land in front of the college building. To the south on the opposite side of Horsford Road, is the Grade II* listed Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church and the Corpus Christi primary school. To the west (rear), the site abuts the rear gardens of two and three storey semi-detached and terraced residential properties in Torrens Road. The northern boundary of the site adjoins Brixton Hill Court, two purpose-built 6-storey residential blocks set around a central car parking courtyard and garage block, which is positioned closest to the boundary with the application site.

1.4 The surrounding area is characterised by large prominent buildings typical of a main thoroughfare. The buildings either side of the college represent different phases of the historical development in the area. The 1930s six storey redbrick mansion blocks of Brixton Hill Court are adjoined to the north by Olive Morris House (the Brixton Customer Centre), a 1970s office development of brown and red brick construction, which also rises to 4 storeys of staggered elevations. To the south of the site is the Grade II* Corpus Christi Church with orange red brick facades articulated by stone dressings and some classical detailing, which is a landmark building that dominates views along Brixton from the north facing south. On the opposite side of Corpus Christ Church in Trent Road is a terrace of up to five-storey mixed commercial and residential buildings, fronting onto Brixton Hill. The scale of development falls down to a more domestic scale
of two and three storey building in the surrounding residential streets to the west and southwest of the site.

1.5 The Brixton College building, which uses different materials and methods of construction from its older neighbours, is described within the Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area Appraisal as being "far too low in height in relation to the reminder on Brixton Hill – a building of say four storeys would have been far more appropriate". The building typifies the low cost prefabricated design of local authority schools during the inter-war and post-war austerity periods.

1.6 The site lies partially with the Brixton Causeway Roman Road Archaeological Priority Area.

1.7 The site is currently accessed for servicing and/or car parking from Brixton Hill and Horsford Road via existing vehicular access points. There are 11 parking spaces, which are accessed from Brixton Hill and 18 spaces from Horsford Road. The main pedestrian entrance to Lambeth College is on Brixton Hill and for Trinity Academy on Horsford Road.

1.8 The surrounding residential streets are located within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), which operate on weekdays from 08:30 to 17:30/18:30. Brixton Hill forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) known as “red routes” over which the TfL exercises parking and loading control as the Highway Authority. Parking is not allowed at any time on double red lines and only within restricted times on single redlines. The site is located within walking distance of Brixton Underground Station and Brixton National Rail Station. There are fifteen bus routes operating along on Brixton Hill. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a, which is categorised as “excellent”.

1.9 The site and surrounding area is illustrated in the following series of images aerial views, existing plans and elevations.

**Figure 1**: Layout of existing buildings
Figure 2: Area view from south showing existing buildings and site context

Figure 3: Aerial view of existing buildings facing north-west
2 PROPOSALS

2.1 Lambeth College has sites in Brixton, Clapham and Vauxhall. The college has reviewed its need for all these sites and prepared a strategy, which seeks to make more effective use of its land. The proposal is for Lambeth College to continue operating from the Brixton Hill site but for the remaining part of the site to be used by other educational institutions.

2.2 It is proposed to demolish the existing buildings in two phases and redevelop the site to provide a new education campus. Lambeth College and Trinity Academy would be accommodated within the 3-4 storey blocks which front onto Brixton Hill and extend into the site along the boundary with Brixton Hill Court. Southbank University Technical College (UTC) would be accommodated in a part 3, part 5 storey wing, located in the centre of the site with its frontage onto Horsford Road. A detached part single storey, part double height building would be erected in in the north-west corner of the site to provide a new sports hall, adjacent to this and fronting onto Horsford Road would be a MUGA.

2.3 The campus building is comprised of three, four and five storey interlocking rectangular forms, stepped so that the building presents to Brixton Hill as a 3 storey building, the fourth floor is set back from the main building line to Brixton Hill and also along the boundary with Brixton Hill Court. The five storey block sits within the centre of the site and is interlocked with a block of three and four storeys where it presents to Horsford Road. Two courtyards are created between the blocks one of which opens up in front of the sports facilities and a second, which opens onto Horsford Road opposite the church.

2.4 The proposed building line of the block onto Brixton Hill largely follows that of the existing building to maintain the green strip of land containing mature trees however, the building line steps forward at the northern end to respond its neighbour at Brixton Hill Court. The layout of the blocks facing Horsford Road respond to the presence or absence of buildings on the opposite side (Corpus Christi Primary School) and respond to the building line of the end terrace property in Torrens Road.

2.5 The new sports hall would be broadly located in the same location as the existing facility but would be 1.3m further from the boundary wall of the rear gardens of properties in Torrens Road (the proposed sports hall is 3m from the boundary). This alignment sits marginally forward of the rear building line of the 6 storey Brixton Hill Court block that runs parallel to the rear gardens of properties in Torrens Road.

2.6 The proposed MUGA would replace an existing area of hard standing used for car parking and part of the existing 3 storey classroom building fronting onto Horsford Road (Block B). The courtyards between the blocks as well the existing green strip containing trees along the Brixton Hill and Horsford frontages would be used as outdoor play/seating/social spaces.

2.7 Figure 4 shows the proposed footprint of the new campus building superimposed over the footprint of the existing buildings. Figure 5 shows the proposed layout of the new campus building and their separation distances from neighbouring properties. Figure 6 shows the massing and form of the proposed building looking towards the northwest from Brixton Hill. Figure 7 shows the location of the MUGA and sports hall in the context of the properties in Torrens Road and of the massing and form of the proposed building looking towards the northeast from Horsford Road.
Figure 4: Footprint of proposed building superimposed over existing buildings

Figure 5: Layout of proposed buildings
Figure 6: Proposed Site Plan

Figure 7: Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Figure 7: Massing and form of the proposed building looking towards the northwest
Figure 8: Location of the MUGA and sports hall in the context of the properties in Torrens Road & Massing and form of the proposed building looking from Horsford Road

Figure 9: Proposed Sections
Figure 10: Proposed street elevations Brixton Hill and Horsford Road
2.8 The proposed building would be of masonry and metal construction. It would be clad in red bricks of textured and smooth finishes; the smooth red brick would be used for the main mass of the building and the textured brick to elements of the building, which include the northeast corner of the building adjacent to Brixton Hill Court, the 3 storey part of the building in Horsford Road and the single storey part of the sports hall. Metal cladding in a light grey zinc finish is proposed for the 5th storey. The upper floor of the sports hall would also be metal clad with panels of light grey, green and white.

2.9 The fenestration would be polyester powder coated metal windows incorporating louvred ventilation panels in a dark grey finish. The windows would be set within recesses with the reveals lined with a coloured aluminium finish. The ground floor of the building would have feature windows, which would contain vertical coloured laminate spandrel panels to signal the entrances to each institution. Each institution would have its own street entrance, which would be recessed into the brickwork with coloured feature panels to mark the main entrances to each institution. The same colour scheme would be used for each institution as means of way-finding.

2.10 The proposed Lambeth College block would provide 2100sqm of Class D1 floorspace, the majority of which would be classrooms; there are also staff offices, a dining room and social space. The main entrance to Lambeth College would be on Brixton Hill, with a secondary access on Horsford Road. The College will provide space for 420 FTE student and 25 staff, opening Monday-Wednesday: 09:00–17:00, Tuesday-Thursday: 09:00-19:00(term time only) and Friday 09:00-16:00.

2.11 Trinity Academy would operate from the largest block within the proposed development, which provides 6360sqm of Class D1 floorspace and the capacity to accommodate up to 840 pupils including sixth form and 82 FTE staff. The main entrance to the academy would be on Brixton Hill, with a secondary entrances accessed via Horsford Road. It would have large communal spaces on the ground floor including a double height assembly hall and drama studio, a 6th form study area, library and dining room. The upper floors would provide classrooms and offices. The core operational hours for the academy are to be 08:20-16:30 Monday to Friday, however the majority of pupils will be expected to attend Breakfast Club (08:00-08:20) and Enrichment classes (16:30-18:00). The ground floor of the academy block is designed in order to maximise the potential for community use outside hours as the library and computer room are capable of being used without compromising the security of the rest of the building. The dining room and kitchen are also located adjacent to the sports hall and therefore can be isolated from the rest of the school for use by the community.

2.12 Southbank UTC is a new college that will specialise in construction and medical engineering academic and technical courses for students aged 14-19. Southbank UTC would occupy the central block which provides 4809sqm of Class D1 floorspace for 600 students and 70 staff. The main entrance to this block with would be on Horsford Road. There will be large workshops and classrooms at ground level along with a dining room. On the upper floors are smaller workshops, laboratories, a double height assembly hall and offices. The courtyard between this block and that occupied by Lambeth College would become home to the relocated listed sculpture. The proposed core operational hours for the UTC will be 08:30-17:00 Monday to Friday.

2.13 The proposed Sports Hall and MUGA are to be shared between UTC and Trinity Academy under a shared user agreement. The sports hall would be available for use by community groups and organisations outside core school operation hours. It would be accessed via the Trinity Academy lower school gates on Horsford Road. The MUGA
would not have floodlighting and would be fenced, gated and covered by CCTV.

2.14 Hard and soft landscaped external play/seating/social spaces would be provided in courtyards located within the site and along the Brixton Hill/Horsford Road frontages. Trinity Academy would have independent use of the courtyard between the sports hall, the UTC block and the MUGA as well as the open space to the north of the site adjacent to the sports hall and the boundary with Brixton Hill Court. The latter contains retained trees and new planting and is enclosed by the brick boundary wall and the row of garages at Brixton Hill Court. The UTC would have independent use of the courtyard containing the relocated grade II listed fountain sculpture as well as the space containing new planting located next to the main entrance on Horsford Road. Lambeth College would have independent use of the hard landscaped area behind green strip of land containing retained trees on Brixton Hill.

2.15 The areas in the immediate vicinity of the new buildings would be predominantly hard surfaced so that they are flexible for use as external learning, physical activity, play and dining spaces. The hard landscaping is to incorporate four paving materials.

2.16 There are 7 trees in the amenity space towards the north-western end of the site and along Horsford Road, which are to be removed. Two mature Ash trees on the northern boundary of the site would be retained with the rest within this group of trees being removed. All trees to be removed are proposed to be replaced by 10 trees as part of a landscaping strategy. The trees along the Brixton Hill frontage and at its junction with Horsford Road demarcate part of the western edge of the Rush Common and Brixton Conservation area. All these trees would be retained except two on Horsford Road, which includes a Lime tree located at the proposed entrance to the UTC block and a self-seeded Sycamore located in the south-west corner of the site.

2.17 No student, staff or visitor car parking is proposed on site other than a single Lambeth College designated disabled car parking bay in front of the Trinity Academy main entrance and adjacent to the vehicular entrance on Brixton Hill. Two on-street blue badge holder bays would be provided on Horsford Road.

2.18 The existing vehicular access on Brixton Hill would be retained, but limited to drop off/pick up of disabled students and refuse, servicing and emergency vehicles. It would afford access for refuse collection and deliveries for Trinity Academy and refuse collection for Lambeth College from a service yard located in its current position, along the boundary of the site with Brixton Hill Court. A refuse and recycling store is proposed next to the service yard.

2.19 All other servicing would be on-street from Horsford Road with emergency vehicles only being permitted to enter the site through gated entrances to the courtyard/play area designed for use by UTC and Trinity Academy. Separate refuse stores for UTC and Lambeth College (for temporary storage purposes only) are to be located on site along Horsford Road. Servicing, deliveries and refuse collection for Southbank UTC and deliveries to Lambeth College will take place on Horsford Road.

2.20 Figures 11 and 12 identify the trees to be retained and those to be removed and, show the landscaping treatment of areas around the site not covered by the new building including new tree and shrubbery planting.
Figure 11: Tree Retention and Removal Plan

Figure 12: Illustrative Masterplan showing soft and landscaping proposals
Amendments

2.21 There have been no significant amendments to either application since submission other than a further exploration of the materiality of the sports hall; a clarification of colour scheme and detailed window design; change of construction materials for the refuse stores from timber to brick with metal doors; the rationalisation of cycle parking and; inclusion of shelters to cycle stands along the western and northern facades of the building. Further information and advice has been provided in relation to: transport and highways matters; energy modelling of the development in respect of the requisite carbon dioxide emission reduction targets; waste and water infrastructure required to accommodate the needs of the development and; a review of the submitted archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Planning permission was granted in October 2011 for redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a part2/part 3/part 4 storey college building, the erection of an ancillary single storey "energy centre" building in the north western corner of the site, the provision of an enclosed games court, the relocation of the existing Grade II listed fountain and the comprehensive landscaping of the site, and associated on-site car parking, motorcycle parking and cycle parking (Ref 09/01364/FUL). An associated listed building consent application for relocation of the Grade II Listed Fountain Sculpture as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site was approved in July 2009 (Ref: 09/01365/LB). The permission and its associated listed building consent were not implemented and have now expired. The drawing below illustrates the Brixton Hill and Horsford Road elevation of the above scheme.
4 CONSULTATION

4.1 Statutory Consultees

4.1.1 **Environment Agency**: No objection subject to conditions to secure further ground investigation if contamination not previously identified is found during construction a piling method statement and, advises against use of infiltration methods for draining surface water. The EA notes that whilst the site is located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore has “a low probability of river and sea flooding”, it is located over a Secondary Aquifer and is within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ1) and as such the development could pose a risk to groundwater.

4.1.2 **Historic England (Heritage)**: No objection to demolition of the existing building and the proposed replacement building. The existing building makes no particular contribution to the special character of the Brixton Hill Conservation Area and the boundary of the Conservation Area was drawn to specifically exclude the site. HE are satisfied that the building line, massing and materiality of the replacement building will respond satisfactorily to the character of the Conservation Area. In relation to the setting of the Grade II* listed church, HE is the view that notwithstanding the increased scale of the proposed building, the simple elevation treatment and materiality of the new building should allow the church to retain its primacy within key townscape views. HE recommended that the application should be determined in accordance with local policy guidance. In relation to the proposed removal, refurbishment and relocation of the listed Kinetic fountain sculpture, which is in an increasingly deleterious condition, HE do not object and consider it consistent with its special interest and conservation. HE has referred the application to the Secretary of State. To date SoS has not directed that the application be referred to them.

4.1.3 **Historic England (Archaeology)**: HE have reviewed the applicant’s desk-based Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigations and state that works associated with the demolition and redevelopment of the site could, without robust archaeological mitigation measures, have an adverse impact on archaeological remains. HE recommends a staged process of archaeological investigations to evaluate and clarify via trial trenches the nature and extent of surviving remains and, if necessary undertake fuller excavation/mitigation.

4.1.4 **Thames Water**: Thames Water has identified that the existing water infrastructure cannot accommodate the needs of the development and would require upgrading. They have requested a condition requiring that no development should commence until an impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure has been submitted to the local planning authority for approval in consultation with Thames Water. Thames Water has also requested conditions to secure a piling method statement and a drainage strategy and SUDs to be approved by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water.

4.1.5 **Sport England**: No comment
4.1.6 Transport for London (TfL): TfL welcomes the car-free nature of the development given the excellent PTAL rating of the site. TfL recommends that a signalised pedestrian crossing on Brixton Hill should be secured. Other recommended conditions included: details of cycle parking; a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) including phasing and implementation plan; and a Servicing Management Plan. TfL also requires a financial contribution towards improvements to bus routes to address the increased number of trips and contributions to upgrade signage within Brixton Underground Station.

4.1.7 Other Statutory Consultees and/or Societies who were notified of the application but who have not responded to date include the Victorian Society, the Twentieth Century Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, the Garden History Society, the Georgian Group, Natural England, London Transport Buses, Traffic Director for London, Bus Priority and Traffic Unit and the London Fire Brigade and Emergency Planning Authority. Any comments submitted by these consultees after publication of this report will be reported by way of addendum.

4.2 Internal Consultees

4.2.1 Transport and Highways Officer: The Council Transportation and Highway officers have reviewed the Transport Assessment including the parking survey, Framework Travel Plan and draft Construction Management Plan and have raised no objection. Given the PTAL rating of the site and the significant spare car parking capacity in surrounding streets as well as the provision of a new signalised pedestrian crossing on Brixton Hill, officers consider that the increase in trip generation and demand for on-street parking associated with the intensified use of the site would not impede the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network. Officers recommend the funding of highway safety improvement works in Horsford Road and a road safety study for cyclists in relation to the junction of Brixton Hill with Trent Road and Brixton Water. Details of the cycle parking, construction management plan, a delivery and service management plan should be secured by condition and S106 agreement as appropriate.

4.2.2 Conservation and Urban Design Officer: The massing, form and design of the development has evolved in response to planning and urban design officers’ advice during extensive pre-application discussions. Further design details of the scheme including construction details especially of the window and door openings, colour and textures of finishing materials, rooftop plant including screening and PV panels should be secured by condition to ensure that the development is of high quality design.

4.2.3 Biodiversity Officer: Supports the proposals but recommends that further details of the soft and hard landscaping should be sought by condition, there should also be a commitment to incorporate within the scheme measures to promote biodiversity such as features attractive to bats and/or wild birds.

4.2.4 Arboricultural Officer: No objection to removal of the specified trees, subject to appropriate replacement tree planting. Conditions are recommended to secure further details of tree protection measures and soft landscaping including replacement tree planting.

4.2.5 Regulatory Service (Noise and Pollution): No reply to date
4.2.6 **Street Care**: No reply to date.

4.2.7 **Designing Out Crime Officer**: No objection subject to a condition requiring the scheme to comply with Secured by Design – Schools 2015 minimum standards for physical protection. The listed sculpture should also be securely fitted with vandal/theft resistant fixtures and property marked in accordance with Crime Prevention strategy for Lambeth Borough Listed Heritage Assets - Property protection.

4.2.8 **Sustainability**: The GLA advises that a revised energy statement demonstrating how the development can secure a 35% carbon dioxide emissions reduction against Part L of the Building Regulations (2013) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement should include details of how the London Plan energy hierarchy would be utilised in the scheme design and construction in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions across the site. Further details of the PV panels including location and size should be secured by condition

4.3 **Adjoining owners/occupiers**

4.3.1 8 Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site from the 21st August 2015 and the applications were advertised in the local press (The Weekender) on the same date. 1094 letters were sent to the occupiers of properties in neighbouring streets. The formal consultation period ended on the 11th September 2015. In response to the neighbour consultation, 9 letters of objection and 17 letters of support have been received as well as 11 representations, which neither object to nor support the proposals. In addition, 9 letters of support from students and staff at the site were submitted.

4.3.2 The issues raised in support of, objection to and as commentary on the proposal are summarised below with officers’ response to them provided in relevant sections of the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of objections</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of sunlight, daylight and outlook to the gardens of properties in Torrens Road due to the height and proximity of the proposed sports hall building and the UTC block including loss of views towards Corpus Christ Church and the Rush Common</td>
<td>A detailed assessment on neighbour amenity impacts is provided section 6.4 of the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about impact on amenity due to the duration and hours/days of construction and wish to obtain written commitment to regular meeting with representatives of local residents, building contractors and local authorities during the construction process</td>
<td>The applicant will submit a method of Construction Management Statement which would include a requirement to notify residents of the construction process would be managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and highway impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of existing residents’ on-street parking, which should not be made available to staff, pupils and parents</td>
<td>See paras 6.2.16-6.2.17. Officers are satisfied that there is sufficient car parking capacity on surrounding roads to accommodate parking demand associated with the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming road works and speed limits should be introduced to discourage the use of Trent Road, Torrens Road and the portion of Horsford Road in the interests of safety.</td>
<td>Traffic calming measures would be introduced on Horsford Road as a planning obligation pursuant to these proposals (see details in section 6.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site vehicles should not use Torrens Road; all construction vehicles should use Brixton Hill</td>
<td>The applicant will submit a method of Construction Management Statement which would include details of how the site would be accessed during all phases of construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security of the gated access path between sports hall and MUGA; if the gate is not sufficiently high and people can get over, the development would represent a security risk to residents in Torrens Road</td>
<td>The application would be required as a condition of consent to meet relevant secured by design standards and would include CCTV at all access points including at the gates to the sports hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need clarification regarding boundary treatments in particular whether appropriate trees would be planted to provide a visual screen to resident in Torrens Road. Details of boundary treatment are reserved as a condition of consent including the provision of a visual screen along the boundary with properties in Torrens Road.

4.3.3 The points raised in support of the proposal are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal would help expand education provision in the area. Lambeth College will continue to reach a range of students with the new facilities providing a better learning experience at the College. As a student of Lambeth, the new building would provide more and improved facilities and by remaining in Brixton would benefit existing students. The facility will provide high quality education facilities to benefit learners of all ages especially young local people and provide facilities for the local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment will significantly improve on the current run down condition of the college. The existing buildings are no longer fit for purpose. The brick building would be in keeping with the surrounding area and the scheme appears to be well designed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally support the scheme but there is concern over the period of time it will take to construct the building and the noise and disturbance associated with the use of the MUGA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal would provide opportunity for local families whose children have to travel long distances to attend a secondary school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new campus would encourage more businesses to open in Brixton thus creating more opportunities for local people</td>
<td>Local people would be employed as part of the local labour force during the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4 The points raised in the neutral representation submitted in respect of the proposal are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of representations</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developers/applicants have made effort to engage with local residents during formal consultations and have acted upon several comments made by local people before submitting the application. However some issues remain unresolved including the impact of the sports hall on the light and outlook of properties in Torrens Road. The Sports hall should have been located on Horsford Road to replace the existing large building on the site where it would also have created a more secure environment against the existing criminal and illegal activity that takes place on this road. All routes and gates to and from the MUGA will to be secured. The MUGA should not be floodlit and should not be used during unsociable hours and not at weeks, early mornings or after 6pm</td>
<td>See section 6.1, which deals with neighbour amenity include the impacts of the MUGA and sports hall on residential amenity. There are no plans to floodlight the MUGA and its use would be controlled as a condition of consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development would be disruptive, noisy and long drawn out; construction hours should be restricted and residents should have a point of contact to liaise with should issues of concern arise during construction. A deadline must be put in place in relation to the period of construction</td>
<td>These matters will be addressed within a Method of Construction Statement, which is required as a condition of consent. The Council cannot exercise control over the period of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and highway impacts</strong></td>
<td>See paras 6.2.4 - 6.2.26 which deals transport and highway impacts resulting from the new campus. Traffic calming measures would be introduced as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully support the car free nature of the scheme, however traffic is likely to increase and the drop off of children and additional traffic would endanger safety for local children who are currently able to play safely in the quiet surrounding streets. Traffic calming measure need to be provided on Horsford Road, Torrens Road and Hayter Road. Parking for residents must be safeguarded; the scheme should not lead to a reduction in parking bays for residents and parents, teachers/staff should not be permitted to park in these roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some trees on site are causing damage to neighbouring properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>planning obligation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The redevelopment of the site includes new landscaping proposals; a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition of consent requires landscaping features including new and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing trees to be maintained for the long term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality borders should be used and residents should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consulted about the materials they plan to use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5  POLICIES

5.1 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.

5.2 The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (March 2015) and the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015). 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 Lambeth Local Plan sets out planning policies for Lambeth to guide growth in housing and jobs, infrastructure delivery, place shaping and the quality of the built environment over the next 15 years to 2030. Along with the London Plan it forms the new statutory development plan for the borough.

5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2012. This document sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and is a material consideration in the determination of all applications. Paragraph 14 introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which requires that permission should be granted for proposals that accord with an up-to-date Local Plan, unless the harm caused by the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits.

5.4 The current applications have been considered against all relevant national, regional and local planning policies as well as any relevant guidance. Set out below are those policies most relevant to the applications, however, consideration has been made against the development plan as a whole.

5.5 The London Plan (2015)

Policy 1.1: Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
Policy 3.1: Ensuring equal life chances for all
Policy 3.18: Education facilities
Policy 3.19: Sports facilities
Policy 5.1: Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2: Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3: Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.5: Decentralised energy networks
Policy 5.6: Decentralised energy in development proposals
Policy 5.7: Renewable energy
Policy 5.12: Flood risk management
Policy 5.13: Sustainable drainage
Policy 6.3: Assessing effect of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.9: Cycling
Policy 6.10: Walking
Policy 6.13: Parking
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 7.8: Heritage assets and archaeology;
Policy 7.13: Safety, security and resilience to emergency
Policy 7.14: Improving air quality
Policy 7.15: Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 7.19: Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy 7.21: Trees and woodlands
Policy 8.2: Planning obligations
Policy 8.3: Community infrastructure levy

5.6 Lambeth Local Plan (2015)

Policy D1: Delivery and monitoring
Policy D2: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy D3: Infrastructure
Policy D4: Planning obligations
Policy ED14: Employment and training
Policy S1: Safeguarding existing community premises
Policy S2: New or improved community premise
Policy S3: Schools
Policy T1 Sustainable travel
Policy T2: Walking
Policy T3: Cycling
Policy T6: Assessing impacts of development on transport capacity and infrastructure
Policy T7: Parking
Policy T8: Servicing
Policy EN1: Open space and biodiversity
Policy EN3: Decentralised energy
Policy EN4: Sustainable design and construction
Policy EN5: Flood Risk
Policy EN6: Sustainable drainage systems and water management
Policy EN7: Sustainable waste management
Policy Q1 Inclusive environments
Policy Q2 Amenity
Policy Q3 Community Safety
Policy Q5 Local distinctiveness
Policy Q6 Urban design: public realm
6 ASSESSMENT

6.1 Principle of the Development

Land Use

6.1.1 Policy 3.18 of the London Plan (2015) relates to educational facilities and states that development proposals that enhance education provision will be supported, particularly those which address the projected shortage of secondary school places. It states that proposals for new schools should be given positive consideration and should only be refused where there are demonstrable local impacts, which outweigh the desirability of establishing new schools and whose impacts could not be mitigated through appropriate conditions or obligations. The London Plan also has a presumption in favour of development proposals, which maximise the extended or multiple-use of education facilities for community or recreational purposes. It encourages the co-location of services between schools and colleges to maximise land use, reduce cost and develop the offer which the school or college are able to provide.

6.1.2 The policy position is similar at a local level. A key priority of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) is to provide essential infrastructure. The Council recognises that Lambeth's future housing growth, economic development and environmental sustainability cannot be achieved without the provision of essential supporting infrastructure such as schools and other educational facilities. Policy S3 states that ‘proposals for new primary and secondary schools or the extension or expansion of existing schools, will be supported where they help to deliver the Council's agreed strategy for the provision of additional state-funded school places in the borough’.

6.1.3 The supporting text states that state-funded schools include local authority maintained schools (community, foundation and voluntary aided and controlled schools), academies and free schools. In terms of the provision of higher and further education facilities, Policy S2 states that they would generally be supported where the site/building is appropriate and accessible to the community, the location is appropriate and would not harm amenity or the highway. It requires (c) that buildings for this use are designed to be flexible and adaptable to maximise shared community use.

6.1.4 The application site is currently in use as an educational facility and its continued use for this purpose is considered to be appropriate. Lambeth College have been operating from the site for a significant period of time. They are the largest provider of adult and community learning in the Borough with centres in Vauxhall, Clapham and Brixton. Annex 2 of the Local Plan (Infrastructure Programmes & Schedule)
identifies the need for reconfiguration and investment to meet future need. The Brixton Hill site is to be downsized. The facility already operates below capacity with only 500 FTE students enrolled (the building was built to accommodate 1400 FTE) and part of their original building being given over to Trinity Academy who have been there since September 2014. The proposal would result in a further reduction in student numbers to 420 with a drive to provide more part time courses. The continued presence of Lambeth College in Brixton is supported.

6.1.5 Trinity Academy is a free school which currently has capacity for 240 secondary school students. The proposed redevelopment of the site would allow expansion of the secondary school and the creation of a sixth form, increasing the number of students to 840. The proposal would also allow a new institution to move to the site. Southbank University Technical College (UTC) specialises in building and medical engineering academic and technical courses to students aged 14-19. It would have a capacity of 600 students.

6.1.6 The provision of new secondary school facilities within the Borough is support in principle subject to demand. The need for school places in Lambeth has been classified by the Department for Education (DfE) as severe (with a predicted shortfall of greater than 5% capacity). The shortfall in secondary school places within the catchment area of the application site is forecast to be 1.4% in 2016-2017 rising to 10.8% in 2016/19. The projected demand for additional secondary school places in the borough has been estimated at 3,108 by 2017; this equates to a requirement of 488 additional school places to meet demand for Year 7 by 2017.

6.1.7 The Cabinet report "Primary and Secondary School Place Planning in Lambeth up to 2019/2020" dated 13 January 2014, noted that there would be an increase as children currently in primary come through the system and need a secondary school place. It stated that “because of the opening of a number of new secondary provisions including ‘free’ schools, projections indicate a surplus of places until 2019/20. After 2019/20 Lambeth may have a shortage of secondary places and this will have to be evaluated in the light of demographic changes and any additional ‘free’ schools that may open.” The need for new secondary school places is not contested and as such the proposal is considered acceptable.

6.1.8 In view of the above it is considered that the proposed redevelopment of the site for continued use by Lambeth College alongside other educational facilities providing secondary school place is supported. The increase in pupil numbers to 1860 is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to compliance with other policies of the plan such as transport, design and amenity.

Standard of the educational accommodation

6.1.9 Guidance on space standards for school sites is set out in Area Guidelines for Main Schools Building Bulletin 103 (BB103) dated June 2014 prepared by the Education Funding Agency. The guidance includes standards for internal and external spaces. In terms of the internal space standards for classrooms and other accommodation Trinity Academy have been assessed as meeting these BB103 criteria whilst those for Southbank UTC fail to meet all internal space standards. The priority for the EFA in funding this development proposal has been to maximise the range of educational offer on a constrained site and they have advised that they do not consider the deficiency to be problematic.
6.1.10 In terms of external spaces the most recent guidance takes a more relaxed approach, with lower standards than its predecessor. On the basis of the guidance, the site would be categorised as a ‘restricted site’; because space is considered a premium in these locations, a flexible approach to the site area and management of the use of space is recommended. The guidelines prioritise the provision of hard, rather than soft, informal social and hard outdoor physical education. As the priority is to provide hard informal social space the scheme includes the provision of 2234sqm of hard social space for the 1440 students (excludes Lambeth College students). This exceeds the amount of hard social space set out in the guidelines, which would equate to 1840sqm for 1440 students. In addition there is a MUGA measuring 84sqm for hard outdoor physical education with the rest of the site being landscaped for soft informal social purposes. The total amount of hard and soft space being provided on site is equivalent to a total of 3021sqm.

6.1.11 Lambeth College falls outside of the remit of BB103 so has not been assessed against the standards.

6.1.12 **Figure 13** shows the external space allocated to Southbank UTC and Trinity Academy. Lambeth College would utilise the hard landscaped space to the front of their block.

**Figure 13:** Floor area given to each institution to meet BB103 requirements

![Floor area given to each institution](image)

**MUGA, Sports Hall and Community Use**

6.1.13 In addition to the MUGA, which is included within the assessment for the requisite outdoor play space for schools, the scheme also includes a replacement new sports hall. Both the MUGA and sports hall would be shared between the Southbank UTC and Trinity Academy under a shared use agreement. The MUGA would allow some PE or team games to be played on site and therefore obviate the need to travel off
the school premises for such activities which is welcomed. The applicant has indicated that the MUGA would only be used during school core hours to minimise noise and disturbance to neighbours and that no flooding lighting is proposed. Further consideration about whether it is necessary to restrict use of the MUGA is set out in the amenity section of this report.

6.1.14 It is considered that the proposed buildings should be available for use to the wider community outside core hours, in line with local and regional policy, but this should be managed to ensure no impact on residents’ amenity.

6.1.15 There are no specific details of community use of the proposed school buildings and sports facilities at this stage, however, it is intended that the sports hall be made available to community groups. It has specifically been designed with small office and services so it would be able to operate independently from the rest of the campus and could be accessed via the lower school gates from Horsford Road.

6.1.16 Community groups would also be able to access areas of the building such as the library, ICT suite, drama studio, assembly hall and dining hall located on the ground floor of the block proposed for Trinity Academy. The Southbank UTC also intends to make its block available to the community in the evenings and at weekends as well as providing space for student and community classes during school holidays. Lambeth College intend to maintain and build on its current community provision.

6.1.17 It will be necessary to agree access arrangements to enable local residents and community groups to benefit from the proposed facilities. It will also be necessary to ensure that appropriate hours of operation are agreed to ensure that such use does not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents in this respect it is considered a community use management plan should be secured by condition.

6.2 Transport

6.2.1 Policy T1 of the Local Plan requires development proposals to be planned on the basis of maximising the use of sustainable modes of transport reducing reliance on private motor vehicles and encouraging walking and cycling. Policy T1 (c) states that developments that are likely to generate a significant number of trips should be located in areas with a good PTAL where public transport capacity can accommodate the increase in trips, or the capacity can be increased to an appropriate level through obligations.

6.2.2 Policy T6 seeks to ensure that development has a limited impact on the highway network in terms of performance and safety. It states where adverse impacts are likely proposals should to contribute towards improving transport capacity and infrastructure and/or include measures to improve safety.

6.2.3 The application site is located on Brixton Hill which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). The site is located within walking distance of Brixton Underground and National Rail Station. There are fifteen bus routes (414, P4, 432, 37, 2, 196, 3, 133, 59, 118, 256, 159, 333, 45 and 109) serving the site. The site has a PTAL rating of 6a ‘excellent’ it is therefore the type of location which the local plan considers to be acceptable in principle for large trip generating uses like educational facilities.
Transport Impact

6.2.4 In line with policy, the applicant has carried out a transport assessment (TA) to consider the potential increase in trips generated by the development and whether this can be accommodated without harm to the highway network or public transport.

6.2.5 The proposed development would result in an increase in pupils from 500 to 1860 as well as an increase in staff from 25 to 177. The TA includes an assessment of the predicted trip generation from both students and staff and the modal split associated with the three proposed institutions. For Lambeth College, given that the number of students is expected to fall from 500 to 420 and there is no change to level of staff provision, no additional trips have been assumed; officers accept this assumption. Trinity Academy is already present on site but the proposed development would result in a significant expansion with more students and staff. The overall increase in trips associated with this institution is 1570 and this is split with 119 (7.5%) being car, 7 (0.4%) motorcycle, 895 (57%) public transport and 549 (35%) walking and cycling. Southbank UTC would be new to the site and would generate increased trips from the students and staff. The overall trip generation associated with this institution is 601 and this is split with 42 (6.9%) being car, 7 (1.16%) motorcycle/scooter, 396 (65.8%) public transport and 156 (25.9%) walking and cycling.

6.2.6 In terms of the anticipated number of car trips generated by the development this is relatively low. The reason for this is that a small number of students are expected to be drivers (1%, which equates to 14 trips) and given their age are less likely to be dropped off by parents; this would need to be on Horsford Road. The fact that there is no on-site parking provision and given the existing on-street parking restrictions in the area, travel by car would be an unattractive proposition. It is anticipated that 111 students would be dropped off, based on the average occupancy of 1.4 students, and taking account of car sharing, this would result in 90 trips.

6.2.7 In total 104 additional trips can be expected during the AM and PM peaks. However this will result in only a short duration of vehicle activity in both periods as the majority of these vehicles will not require long-term parking and given the age of students, those dropping off would not dwell for long, resulting in a minor impact on Horsford Road. In order to minimise the impact, it is recommended that detailing on how drop off and pick up would be managed should be included in the Travel Plan which is to be secured by S106 agreement.

6.2.8 The proposed development is predicted to generate an additional 278 bus arrivals in the AM peak hour and a further 278 departures in the PM peak hour. TfL have advised that the increased pressure on bus services in the area should be mitigated via a contribution to increased services. They have recommended that funding for four return journeys (4 in one direction for the AM peak hour and 4 in the other direction for the PM peak hour) should be sought. This requires a maximum contribution of £1,800,000.00 (4 x £90,000 x 3/5 years), payment of which will be phased as demand for bus journeys increases with growth in student numbers. The bus improvement contribution would need to be secured through the section 106 agreement.

6.2.9 The proposed development is predicted to generate an additional 248 trips to Brixton Underground in the AM peak hour and 173 trips from it in the PM peak hour. TfL have advised that the additional trips can be accommodated and no mitigation is
required to address capacity. However, they have advised that as the development would contribute a number of trips on the underground network that a contribution of £25,000 should be sought towards signage improvements within the station. The contribution should be secured through a section 106 agreement.

6.2.10 Policy T2 deals specifically with walking and requires that development proposal likely to generate an increase in walking trips should make provision for improved, safe convenient and direct routes to and from the site. The expectation is that there would be an increase in the number of people reaching the site on foot or by bike as well as increased footfall around the site generally.

Access

6.2.11 The main entrance to Lambeth College and Trinity Academy would be on Brixton Hill, whilst the entrances for Trinity Academy’s Year 7 and 8 and Southbank UTC would be from Horsford Road. Assuming Years 7 and 8 represent at least a third of the total school roll, this would mean 877 students from both institutions would access the site from Horsford Road and the remaining 983 students from Trinity Academy and Lambeth College would access it from Brixton Hill.

6.2.12 In view of the large number of students to be accommodated on the site, as well as the location of Corpus Christi Primary School opposite the site, it is considered that a highways improvement scheme to Horsford Road should be secured to provide an improve the pedestrian environment for example through the use of build outs and an raised table. This should be secured via S106 agreement.

6.2.13 The TA also includes an accident analysis, which lists accidents that have occurred in the vicinity of the site. One of the largest concentrations of accidents is at the junction of Brixton Hill/Brixton Water Lane/Trent Road, where 27 accidents have occurred, two of the three serious accidents involved a cyclist or pedestrian, and an additional 12 of the less serious (slight) accidents involved pedestrians or cyclists. The TA also highlights a safety concern because of the number of people that currently follow a desire line from Lambeth College to southbound bus stop BB, where there is currently no crossing facility.

6.2.14 Given that large numbers of students can be expected to cross Brixton Hill to and from the southbound bus stop BB, it is recommended that a new signalised pedestrian crossing facility is secured via S106 legal agreement. TfL has advised that it has carried out some initial traffic modelling work which indicates that the facility would not have an undue impact on traffic flow on Brixton Hill. Alongside this it is considered that the student management plan could also encourage students to cross Brixton Hill safely.

6.2.15 The TA includes an assessment of the distribution of cycle trips to and from the site which suggests that the busiest route will be to and from the east via Brixton Water Lane. Given the relatively high concentration of accidents involving cyclists at this junction, it is considered that a S106 contribution of £30,000 should be sought towards a road safety study at this junction, with a view to providing cycle and pedestrian safety improvements in this location.
Car Parking

6.2.16 There are 11 car parking spaces on site which are accessed from Brixton Hill, and a further 18 car parking spaces which are accessed from Horsford Road. The proposals do not include any car parking, with the exception of one on-site disabled parking space accessed from Brixton Hill. The Council encourages car-free development, particularly in areas where alternative means of public transport are available and where public transport accessibility level is high (Policy T7). Officer’s support the car-free nature of the development given the excellent PTAL of the site.

6.2.17 The site is surrounded by Controlled Parking Zones which control parking on weekdays until 17:30/18:30. It is anticipated that the only demand for on-street parking would come from staff who could apply for teacher parking permits (expected to be a small number given the cost, and the excellent PTAL of the site - the TA estimates 15 which highways officers consider reasonable), and a small number of blue badge holders – the TA estimates 14. The TA includes the details of a recent parking survey, which indicates that there is significant spare capacity on surrounding streets to accommodate this demand, with parking stress on Horsford Road alone at a maximum of 33%. This would increase to 50% stress if all 29 potential additional vehicles were to park on Horsford Road. This analysis does not take account of the fact that the proposal would result in a reduction in parking on street to accommodate the proposed ‘School Keep Clear’ markings and on-street disabled bays. Officers consider that even taking this into account that there would still be sufficient capacity to accommodate the potential level of car parking generated by the proposal.

Cycle Parking

6.2.18 Policy T3 of the Local Plan requires development likely to generate additional cycle trips to provide appropriate, secure and covered cycle parking in accordance with minimum standards set out in the London Plan. Development for education uses are expected to include provision for showers, changing facilities and lockers consummate with the number of cycle parking spaces provided.

6.2.19 The total number of bike spaces required by the London Plan is 345. The application drawings show the provision of 272 cycle parking spaces within the grounds of the institutions 74 of which are to be provided to Lambeth College, 74 to Southbank UTC and 124 for Trinity Academy. The spaces are Sheffield standards, a proportion of which are located within covered shelters.

6.2.20 The overall level of provision falls short of the number required under the London Plan. However, it would be possible to provide further cycle parking within the ground in the event that there was high demand. It has been agreed the reduced level of provision is acceptable initially, but that an additional 88 spaces should be provided across the site if required, the need for these spaces will be monitored through the Travel Plan.

6.2.21 All cycle access would be from Horsford Road, to encourage cyclists to approach the site from quieter routes.

Refuse and Servicing
6.2.22 Policy T8 requires that appropriate consideration is given to how development proposals would be serviced. The expectation is that servicing is carried out on-site unless it is demonstrated that it can take place on-street without affecting the flow and safety of traffic. Major developments should be supported by a delivery and servicing plan.

6.2.23 The proposals would retain the existing vehicular access point on Brixton Hill and remove the existing vehicular access on Horsford Road. Occasional vehicular access from Horsford Road would be needed for emergency access so two crossovers are provided. The westernmost access point will also provide easy access to the bin store for UTC, refuse collection vehicles will not access the site, but will wait on-street with bins being wheeled to the waiting vehicle.

6.2.24 Policy Q12 relates to refuse and recycling storage and requires arrangements for waste storage to be integrated into the design of a development from the outset to ensure that it is attractively designed and conveniently located for users and collection.

6.2.25 Refuse and servicing for the site is largely proposed off-street via the access on Brixton Hill, as per the existing arrangement. A swept path is included in the TA which demonstrates that a 10m vehicle can turn within the site. Secondary servicing and refuse collection will take place on-street from Horsford Road. Vehicles will be able to stop on the School Keep Clear markings outside of the restricted hours (likely to be 08:30-10:30 and 14:30-16:30 Monday to Friday), thus avoiding the hours when students are arriving and leaving the site.

6.2.26 The storage units have been redesigned in accordance with Conservation and Design officer recommendations. In terms of design and location the proposals for refuse/recycling storage meet the Council’s waste and recycling storage and collection requirements guidance document (October 2013). However, it is recommended that a Waste and Servicing Management Plan should be submitted for further consideration by the Council. In addition, construction details of the refuse and recycling storage units including contextual elevations showing their location in the relation to the street and service yard are reserved as a condition of consent. The Council’s Streetcare team was consulted on the proposal, in particular whether the capacity of the refuse and recycling storage is sufficient for but has not responded.

6.2.27 A Servicing and Delivery Management Plan should be secured via condition, detailing how servicing would be undertaken across the site. The plan should identify efficiency and sustainability measures to be undertaken once developments are operational. The condition would be discharged by the Council in consultation with TfL.

Construction

6.2.28 A draft Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted with the application. However, the Plan does not include any detail on the proposed traffic management associated with the proposed construction methodology; officers
recommend in line with policy T8 that a more detailed Demolition and Construction Statement should be secured by condition. The plan should be provided prior to the commencement of development in view of its purpose which is to minimise the impact of construction on the highway network. The condition should state that the submission should include phasing and implementation plans and that any details will be referred to TfL for their consideration.

Travel Plan

6.2.29 A site wide school travel plan has been provided. Full travel plans for each institution and a contribution towards monitoring should be secured in a section 106 agreement in accordance with Policy T6.

6.3 Design and Conservation

6.3.1 Policy Q5 of the Local Plan states that Lambeth’s local distinctiveness should be sustained and reinforced through new development. It states proposal will be supported if the design of a new development responds to positive aspects of the local context including urban block and grain; built form and roofscapes; siting, orientation and layout; materials; and quality and architectural detailing. It seeks to achieve visually interesting, well detailed/proportioned design.

6.3.2 Policy Q6 supports development that provides *inter alia*: (i) the most effective use the site in the context of the proposed use; (iii) a building line that maintains or improves upon the prevailing building line with forward encroachment of established building lines being supported only where no harm to amenity or local character will occur; (v) new or enhanced open space (including gaps between buildings) and landscaping/trees; (ix) retains and enhances the heritage value of existing spaces, in terms of spatial form, function, connection and relationship with surrounding buildings.

6.3.3 Policy Q7 deals specifically with new development and states that new development will be supported if it is of quality; has a bulk and scale/mass, siting, building line and orientation, which preserves or enhances the prevailing local character. Policy Q8 of the Local Plan relates to detailed design and seeks to ensure that proposed building designs and details are buildable and visually attractive.

6.3.4 In respect of development affecting statutory listed buildings, Policy Q20 of the Local Plan supports only those proposals that would preserve and not cause harm to the significance or setting of the listed building. In Conservation Areas, it is the stated objective of Policy Q22 of the Local Plan to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the area.

6.3.5 In terms of the impact of the proposed development on heritage assets, it is considered that the setting of the designated assets listed below is likely to be affected by the proposal. The proposal would also be likely to disturb archaeological remains that might be present on the site.

- Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church (Grade II*)
- Listed Fountain (Grade II)
- Brixton Hill & Rush Common Conservation Area (CA49)
6.3.6 It is the local planning authorities statutory duty when considering development that affects listed buildings and/or its setting to pay special regard to the desirability or preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest its possesses. It is also the authority’s statutory duty when considering any development that affects a conservation area to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

6.3.7 This section of the report describes the immediate context of the site and assesses the scale and layout the development as a whole in the context of surrounding buildings; the appearance of the proposed development resulting from its detailed design and materiality and considers the impact of the development on the setting of the conservation area and the adjacent listed church. Separate sections considers the proposal for the refurbishment and relocation of the existing listed fountain sculpture required to facilitate the redevelopment of the site as proposed and also the potential impact on archaeological remains.

Context, Scale and Layout

6.3.8 The immediate context of the development site is varied in scale and mass, which adds to the unique sense of place. To the north of the site lies Brixton Hill Court a well-proportioned six storey residential block with impressive red brick frontage along Brixton Hill with a six storey rendered L-shaped block at the rear. The taller residential blocks of St Matthews Estate are located further east beyond the boundary with Rush Common and the Brixton Hill and Rush Common conservation area, approximately 40m from Brixton Hill.

6.3.9 To the south of the site, separated by Horsford Road is the ‘magnificent’ Grade II* Corpus Christi Church. Begun in 1886 to designs of renowned architect John Francis Bentley, architect of Westminster Cathedral, lack of money resulted in only the chancel and transepts being built. Constructed in red brick with striped stone accents and stone window surrounds, the church is set back from Brixton Hill creating a generous soft landscaped forecourt. The forecourt walls, piers and railings are Grade II listed.

6.3.10 Although set back approximately 16m from the street the elevated height and impressive frontage of the church means the church has a strong and undeniable presence along Brixton Hill appearing prominent in views leading north and south along Brixton Hill. North and south views of the church along Brixton Hill and the area between have been identified as key views where Bentley’s architecture can be fully appreciated. Further west along Horsford Road the scale of development reduces to two storeys at the Corpus Christi Primary School before rising again to a three storey Victorian terrace. The rear gardens of the terrace on Torrens Roads bound the site to the north-west. Houses along Torrens Road are typically Victorian and modest in scale comprising two storeys with two storey outriggers.

6.3.11 Set between Corpus Christi Church and Brixton Hill Court, the site itself has relatively low scale buildings in comparison. The Rush Common & Brixton Hill Conservation Area Appraisal (1997) specifically mentions the college scale and states that ‘the main criticism of this complex is that it is too far low in height in relation to the remainder of Brixton Hill’ the appraisal goes on to say that ‘a building of say four stories would have been far more appropriate’. This assessment is accurate; Brixton Hill is a wide road with an assortment of grand and appropriately scaled buildings
typically four to six storeys in height. The existing building at two storeys is clearly under-scaled and stands out for this reason in the streetscene. The existing building is of no significant architectural merit and does not make a positive contribution to the area; there is no objection to demolition of the building.

6.3.12 The proposed building would be part three, part four and part five storeys in height. The plan form of the building is based on two parallel linear blocks aligned with Brixton Hill 17m apart. The first block would front directly onto Brixton Hill accommodating Lambeth College and standing at three storeys stepping up to four storeys in height towards Horsford Road. The second block would be located further into the site, at the sites centre, and would accommodate the Southbank UTC and have a maximum height of five storeys. The Southbank UTC would extend along Horsford Road stepping down to present a four and three storey building along the street. A third linear block aligned in an east-west orientation would contain the Trinity Academy connecting the parallel blocks at their northern end. The main entrances to Lambeth College and Trinity Academy are to be on Brixton Hill and Southbank UTC on Horsford Road. A freestanding sports hall is propose on the north-west corner of the site.

Brixton Hill frontage - Lambeth College and Trinity Academy

6.3.13 There has been extensive discussion throughout the pre-application process regarding the proposed height, mass and building line of the frontage building along Brixton Hill. The discussion explored how best to mediate between the varying scales and building lines of Corpus Christi Church and Brixton Hill Court. The site’s frontage is important for several reasons: it is a highly prominent site along a historically important and busy route leading into central Brixton; it would impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II* church and conservation area; and being located adjacent to a residential block.

6.3.14 For the most part, the proposed building would follow the existing Lambeth College building line along Brixton Hill. At its northern end, which would form part of Trinity Academy, the building would project forward of this building line by 2.5m to align with Brixton Hill Court gable end. Maintaining the existing building line would mean that the eastern part of the site that contains soft landscaping and a number of TPO’s, would be retained. This landscaped area forms part of the Brixton Hill Rush Common Conservation Area and contributes significantly to the open and verdant character of Rush Common hence its specific inclusion within the conservation boundary. This space also provides an open aspect and breathing space as you travel along the hill, reinforcing and supporting the open and soft landscaped forecourt of the listed church. Its retention within the scheme is therefore commended and supported.

6.3.15 The frontage building is proposed at three storeys with a fourth storey set back from the frontage by approximately 4.2m. The proposed building line and mass would ensure that the church retains its prominence in views looking south whilst the set back of the fourth storey would allow for the upper elements and roof of the church to remain visible in this key view. Sketch views of from Brixton Hill looking south show that the proposal would be much lower in height than the church and Brixton Hill Court and demonstrate that development would comfortably mediate and not overbear neighbouring buildings or Brixton Hill. Again, in sketch views looking north
the proposed building would not appear dominant in the view or overwhelm neighbouring development.

6.3.16 The proposed projected building line would not impinge on views of the church when looking south, instead the projection would help break up the elevation frontage, mediate effectively between varying neighbouring building lines, increase the prominence of the Trinity Academy entrance and create a distinction between the two institutions of Lambeth College and Trinity Academy. In terms of mass and layout, the frontage building would make a successful contribution to the streetscene and the conservation area helping to unify and reinforce the streetscene with an overall height consistent with advice set out in the conservation area appraisal (1997).

6.3.17 Trinity Academy is located close to the northern boundary of the site and would connect the Southbank UTC and Lambeth College at their northern extremities. This block would be part three and part four storeys in height and between 13.5m and 21m distance from Brixton Hill Court. The building would be approximately 62m in length, running parallel to the northern boundary of the site. The north elevation would have two significant 3 storey projecting bays, which would assist in breaking up the elevation, provide modelling to the building’s form and reduce the perceived mass of the building when viewed from Brixton Hill Court. The proposed height of the building is much lower than that of Brixton Hill Court; in this respect the proposal would not appear overbearing or dominant when viewed the Briton Hill Court.

**Horsford Road frontage – Southbank UTC**

6.3.18 The UTC building would run parallel with the Brixton Hill frontage building and sited at the centre of the site with its frontage to Horsford Road. It would be a part three and part four storey building along Horsford Road, stepping up to five storeys at the centre of the site. This would be the tallest part of the overall scheme and the proposal would evidently be taller and larger than the existing building on site. At a maximum of five storeys, the building would not be out of character within the surrounding context.

6.3.19 As noted above, there is a variety of building scales in the immediate locality, which add to the areas diversity and richness; the differing scales working harmoniously with each other. Indeed the adjacent Brixton Hill Court, Effra Court and Olive Morris House along the western side of Brixton Hill are approximately 5 to 6 storeys high and form an integral part of the character of the area. The applicant’s strategy to locate the tallest element of the scheme at the centre of the site would successfully reduce the overall impact on neighbouring development and reduce the perceived scale of the block when seen from the street. A part three, part four storey frontage along Horsford Street would not be dissimilar from the existing building in this part of the site, which stands at three storeys along a substantial portion of Horsford Road.

6.3.20 Although the five storey element is located within the setting of the church, the proposal would be quite a distance from the listed church, at approximately 30m from the church’s frontage. Sketch views indicate that the five storey element would not be seen in key views of the church along Brixton Hill and officers are satisfied that the height and scale of the proposal would not adversely impact the setting of the church.
Sports Hall building

6.3.21 By locating the lower scaled building of the sports hall towards the rear of the site the proposal seeks to create a similar impact as the existing hall in the north western corner of the site. From an urban design perspective, the sports hall at a maximum height of 8.3m, set back 3m from the site boundary and aligned with the adjacent Brixton Hill Court block, would not constitute an overly dominant structure. However, the impact of the increase in height and width compared with the existing building in this part of the site on the light and outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties in Torrens Road needs to be carefully considered (see section 6.4).

6.3.22 Overall, officers are satisfied that the strategy to maintain the existing the building line and limit the overall height of the building along Brixton Hill to three/four storeys would retain the prominence of the listed church in keys views and would create an appropriately scaled street frontage along Brixton Hill. Locating taller elements at the centre of the site would maximise the sites potential with minimal impact on neighbouring visual amenity and heritage assets.

6.3.23 It should be noted that Historic England (HE) has been consulted and they share the same view about the context, scale and layout of the proposed development as officers. They state in their letter to council dated 19th August 2015 that they 'are content that the building, line massing and materiality will respond acceptably to the character of the conservation area. With regard to the setting of the grade II* listed church, we note that, whilst the new building will present an increase in scale from the existing building, the materiality and simple treatment of elevation should allow the church to retain its primacy with the key townscape views.'

Appearance: Detailed Design and Materials

6.3.24 The proposal has a contemporary aesthetic with regularly arranged window openings, simple material palette and retrained ornamentation. The simple, fuss-free and functional modern appearance contrasts successfully with the ornately decorated listed church and the bold and sparingly adorned Brixton Hill Court. The visually modest building would not compete in terms of scale or appearance with the listed church or neighbouring development. The architectural expression of the building centres on solid and void, creating a robust brick façade with windows punctuating the façade.

6.3.25 Brick is a durable material that will generally improve with age without the need for regular maintenance. Officers support the use of brick as it is used extensively within the context and is a key element of local distinctiveness. The scheme has evolved dramatically from the initial pre-application stage when a building clad in timber and render was originally proposed. The applicants have taken on board officers’ views and recommendations regarding the choice of the principal façade materials. The proposed red brick elevations would respond positively to the Corpus Christi Church and Brixton Hill Court, also constructed in red brick. It is officers view that the used of red brick would fit seamlessly into the streetscene.

6.3.26 Generously sized windows throughout the scheme serve to break up elevations and in most instances relieve the dominance of brick. Windows are staggered or arranged vertically creating an interesting rhythm with clear vertical emphasis complimenting the building’s horizontal form.
6.3.27 The general appearance of the proposed development is acceptable and is considered a significant improvement on the appearance of the existing building. The existing building is under-scaled, uses different materials to its neighbours and as such appears incongruous in its context. In officers’ view by incorporating brick facades into the scheme, the proposal positively responds to the local distinctiveness. Overall the introduction of the proposal would be an enhancement to the areas and would improve the setting of the listed building and make a positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area.

6.3.28 Whilst the general appearance and materials are considered acceptable there are aspects of the design relating to window detailing, entrances, plant screening and materials that require careful attention by officers subject to a successful application. It is therefore recommended that conditions are imposed to ensure acceptable detailed design and that quality is not lost through construction.

Appearance: Window detailing

6.3.29 Throughout the pre-application process officers have expressed a preference for windows with deep reveals to give depth and modelling to the elevations. The applicant has indicated this is not possible due to the potential impact on internal light levels, ventilation and sustainability. It is important that the aspiration of depth is pursued in order to secure modelling of façades. One way to secure depth is to ensure that windows contrast and appear recessive to the brick façade. This can be achieved by selecting a dark grey colour window frame. Currently the design and access statement shows two colour options for windows; grey and bone. Where grey is proposed two shades would be used within the window unit and could appear overly fussy. It is considered that the window detailing is a matter which can reasonably be dealt with as a condition. Officers have set out above what they are seeking to achieve so members can be confident about the nature of the details being sought.

Appearance: Entrances

6.3.30 The main entrance to each institution is double height for emphasise and to assist with way-finding. Colour and interest would be introduced through building signage and by application to the metal window surrounds of a limited number of windows adjacent to the entrances. Entrances would also have coloured cladding/back painted glass and each entrance would have a different colour reflecting each institution.

6.3.31 Officers consider that the colours proposed do not complement each other or the overall robust appearance of the scheme and instead appear unrelated within each institution. Although officers acknowledge that the use of colour can be useful in enlivening elevations, emphasising entrances and aiding legibility, in this case it is considered that more could be done to elevate the entrances’ visibility and appearance.

6.3.32 Interest could be achieved by introducing a recessed panel where signage is currently proposed, for example. Each panel could include ceramic tiles, stone or GFRC designed in a pattern inspired by the institutions logo or the internal ceramic tile patterns, which remain within the staircase of the building and could be reclaimed...
and reused. It is considered that these detailed elements of the development could be resolved later and therefore will be secured by condition.

**Appearance: brickwork and rooftop plant screening**

6.3.33 The proposal would incorporate two different textured red bricks to help break up the visual mass of the building; this approach is supported by officers. However, the brick selection would need to be adequately different in colour and texture in order to create a visual distinction. It is considered this aspect of the development could be resolved later and therefore the choice of brickwork is reserved by condition.

6.3.34 In addition, it is noted that the plant screen on the Southbank UTC roof would appear as an extension of the metal clad fifth storey. Without the benefit of window openings, the screening would appear solid, which is likely to give the plant screen the appearance of a large grey unarticulated box. A condition should be imposed to ensure that an appropriate screening treatment is secured.

**Grade II Listed Fountain**

6.3.35 The fountain sculpture located in the courtyard of the existing Lambeth College is designated Grade II listed. Over the years the sculpture has suffered neglect, is in a poor state of repair and no longer functions. The listing entry provides the following description of the fountain:

‘Kinetic fountain sculpture. 1960-1 by Kenneth Martin, commissioned by the London County Council. Stainless steel, five feet high above water level, over three feet in radius. Spiral of seven platforms tapering in size upwards, and a parallel spiral form of seven pipes which channel the water. The spiral construction of the fountain and the way that the water activates it is developed from careful mathematical principles of screw propulsion, with which Martin had experimented since 1951. It is devised from Russian constructivism, the writings of Charles Biederman and the work of Vantongerloo, and engages with the movement of light as well as water. The spiral activity of the work complements the rectilinear buildings around it. Martin designed only one other public steel fountain, in Gorinchem, Holland. Included as a rare and particularly fine example of kinetic sculpture.’

6.3.36 It is proposed to bring the fountain back to working order and relocate it at the heart of the development, within the courtyard of the Southbank UTC. The courtyard setting of the fountain is an important part of the fountain’s significance. Relocating the refurbished fountain within the new courtyard is considered to be in keeping with original design intent and its proposed location is considered acceptable.

6.3.37 The fountain would be observed from a number of angles providing observers with a constantly changing and ‘kinetic’ experience of the fountain as Martin intended. The proposed location would result in the fountain being a ‘presence’ rather than a ‘distraction’ forming part of a wider landscaping scheme within the courtyard.

6.3.38 The UTC courtyard would be open to Horsford Road such that the relocated fountain would now be visible to in the public domain. The ability for the public to appreciate the listed fountain is a clear heritage benefit and one supported by officers and Historic England. The redevelopment of the site presents opportunity to repair this heritage asset, which has fallen into disrepair and would secure its future use within
an acceptable location/setting. Officers recommend attaching a condition requiring
details of the methodology, specification and schedule of works for refurbishing and
relocation of the fountain sculpture to be submitted agreed prior to its removal.

**Impact on archaeological heritage assets**

6.3.39 In respect of undesignated heritage assets on the Council’s Local Heritage List,
which, includes archaeological areas, Policy Q23 of the Local Plan has a
presumption against development that would cause destruction to such an asset and
expects “applicants to retain, preserve, protect, safeguard and enhance them and
treat them sensitively when development proposals affect them”.

6.3.40 The site lies partially in the Brixton Road (Brixton Causeway) Archaeological Priority
Area. Notwithstanding 19th and 20th redevelopment of site and World War II bomb
damage to the site, construction activities associated with the proposed
redevelopment of the site could result in the loss of archaeological remains. The
applicant’s Heritage and Archaeological Statement recommends that there will be
a need to undertake a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written
scheme of investigation. The applicant submitted a desk-based Archaeological
Written Scheme of Investigations, dated January 2015 and drafted by Mott
MacDonald which identified the need to undertake a trial trench evaluation to assess
the nature and significance of archaeological remains that might be present on site.

6.3.41 Historic England (HE) has reviewed the report and is concerned that any major or
minor works associated with the demolition and redevelopment of the site could,
without robust archaeological mitigation measures, have an adverse impact on
archaeological remain. HE recommends a staged process of archaeological
investigations, first in accordance with the applicant’s desk-top report to evaluate via
a trial trench dig and clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains and, if
necessary to undertake fuller excavation/mitigation. A condition should be imposed
on the permission to secure this.

6.3.42 In conclusion, officers consider the layout, scale, massing and the detailed design
and appearance of the proposed building to be acceptable having regard to the aims
of Policies Q5, Q6, Q7 and Q8 of the Local Plan and subject to conditions to secure
further details of construction and finishing materials. It is also considered that the
proposals complies with Policies Q20, Q22 and 23 of the Local Plan, which state that
the Council would support development if it does not harm the significance or/setting
(including views to and from) a statutory listed building and/or a conservation area.
The proposed relocation and works to the listed fountain sculpture would secure its
long heritage value. Existing archaeological will also be identified and if present
protected.

**6.4 Neighbour Amenity**

6.4.1 Policy Q2 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the new development does not
unacceptably harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight,
sunlight, outlook, privacy and noise. These issues are examined in the following
paragraphs.
Daylight and Sunlight

6.4.2  Policy Q2 (iv) states that development will be supported if it would not have an unacceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight received at adjoining properties. In support of the application a daylight and sunlight report prepared by Arup has been submitted. This quantitative assessment has been carried out using the methodologies set out in BRE guide (BRE guidance ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2011)) and British Standard Guidelines. The guide is for advisory purposes only and as such does not contain mandatory standards.

6.4.3  The BRE sets out the methodology for an initial test as to whether levels of daylight received by a neighbouring property would be adversely affected by a proposed development. This first test provides that if no part of the proposed development would subtend a plane drawn from the centre of the lowest window at an angle of 25° from the horizontal, then it is unlikely that the proposed development would have a substantial effect on the daylight enjoyed by the existing building. The BRE also provides that loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the proposed development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window.

6.4.4  The BRE Guide contains two further tests, which measure diffuse daylight to windows. The first test is the Vertical Sky Component [VSC] (expressed as a percentage of the sky visible from the centre of a window). Diffuse daylight may be adversely affected if after a development the Vertical Sky Component is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value. Therefore if the VSC is greater than 27% then enough skylight should be reaching the window of an existing building. BRE provides that any reduction below 27% VSC should be kept to a minimum. The BRE suggests that a VSC value of not less than 80% of the existing values would not result in a noticeable reduction in natural light currently enjoyed by existing occupants.

6.4.5  The second test is daylight distribution; the BRE guide states that where room layouts are known, the impact on the daylighting distribution can be found by plotting the ‘no sky line’ in each of the main rooms. The no-sky line is a line, which separates areas of the working plane that can and those that cannot have a direct view of the sky. Daylight may be adversely affected if after the development the area of the working plane in a room, which can receive direct skylight, is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value.
6.4.6 With regard to sunlight the BRE provides that sunlight may be affected if after a development the centre of the window receives less than 25% of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) and less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours or it has a reduction in sunlight received amongst the winter months to less 5% of annual probable sunlight hours and less than 0.8 times its former value. It states that ‘if the window point can receive more than 25% of APSH, including at least 5% of APSH in the winter months between 21st September and 21st March (WPSH) then the room should receive enough sunlight’.

6.4.7 It should be noted that a sunlight assessment only needs to be undertaken in relation to windows of neighbouring properties, which face within 90 degrees of due south. Also only main habitable need be measured with kitchens and bedrooms considered less important. And in non-domestic buildings any space deemed to have special requirements for sunlight should be assessed.

6.4.8 The assessment was carried out in respect of Brixton Hill Court, 57-61 Horsford Road and 27-40 Torrens Road, all of which are in residential use. In accordance with BRE guidance the Corpus Christi Catholic Church, which is not a residential building and therefore has no reasonable expectation for natural light, was not assessed. Windows facing onto the central courtyard area of Brixton Hill Court and in relation to the school were not analysed beyond the initial 25 degree test because the new development is sufficiently removed from this section of the blocks and the school and as such it would not have a substantial effect on light.

6.4.9 The proposed building has been designed to ensure that its siting, height and massing would have minimal impact upon levels of daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. The section drawings below show the spatial relationship between the proposed main building and Brixton Hill Court and between the sports hall and the properties in Torrens Road.
Sections showing spatial relations between new building and Brixton Hill Court
Sections showing spatial relationship between Sports Hall & Torren Road properties.
6.4.10 These were identified as the properties that would be most likely to be affected by the proposed development. The VSC assessment indicates that the new development has the potential to reduce daylighting below the target value of 27% at Nos. 29-37 Torrens Road and in the properties at ground and first floor levels of Brixton Hill Court (East), which have facing windows in the flank elevation.

6.4.11 Taking the existing VSC value (baseline) as the existing condition, the assessment analysed windows in the above properties and found where the proposed development resulted in the VSC falling below the 27% target value, the resulting VSC value (with the development in place) would be greater than 80% of the existing (baseline) condition. In the circumstances, according to the BRE guidance, the occupants should not notice a reduction in daylight and as such the fall in daylight levels is considered acceptable.

6.4.12 All other calculated points demonstrated that the VSC values with the development in place would remain above the 27% target and as such the windows to these properties would receive sufficient daylight. The assessment also indicates that several properties including Nos. 27, 28, and 37 Torrens Road, 57, 59 and 61 Horsford Road and Brixton Hill Court West would have improved daylight with the development in place. The results have been verified by officers and indicate that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact upon levels of daylight received by neighbouring properties.

6.4.13 Those properties tested for daylight were also tested for sunlight if they had windows facing within 90 degrees of due south. The Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) analysis indicates that 30 and 36 Torrens Road would be likely to experience a reduction in sunlight availability below the BRE target value of 25% with the new development in place. However, taking account of the existing APSH value, the resulting APSH value (with the development in place) would be greater than 80% of the existing (baseline) condition. In these circumstances, according to the BRE guidance, the occupants should not notice a reduction in sunlight and as such the fall in sunlight levels is considered acceptable.

6.4.14 In relation to Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WPSH), the analysis indicates that the new development has the potential to reduce sunlight availability below the target value of 5% at Nos. 32 and 33 Torrens Road. In this case the analysis found that WPSH value (with the development in place) would be less than 80% of the existing (baseline) condition. In the circumstances, according to the BRE guidance, the occupants would notice a reduction in winter sunlight. All other calculated points demonstrate that the WPSH would be above the target value of 5% indicating that sufficient winter sunlight would reach the measured windows. The assessment also indicates that several properties including Nos. 27 36, 37 and 38 Torrens Road and Brixton Hill Court West would have improved winter sunlight with the development in place.
6.4.15 The impact of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight is negligible for most surrounding properties except 32 and 33 Torrens Road where in 1 window in each property will see a noticeable reduction in probable winter sunlight hours. It should be noted that the BRE guidance is not mandatory and should not be considered as an instrument of planning policy. It is advised that the findings must be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors to consider in site layout design. 115 window locations were analysed for winter sunlight impacts and in only 2 locations do the values fall below target. The BRE guidance criteria for sunlight and annual probable sunlight hours were met at all locations analysed. Given the urban town centre location of the site, the benefit that would flow from the proposed development, the fact that these properties would continue to get a good level of winter sun from other windows it is not considered that the minor adverse impact is considered sufficient to justify refusal of this application.

Outlook/ Sense of Enclosure

6.4.16 Policy Q2 (iii) states that developments would be supported if ‘adequate outlooks are provided avoiding wherever possible any undue sense of enclosure or unacceptable levels of overlooking (or perceived overlooking’.

6.4.17 The proposed buildings would be set away from the site boundaries on all sides. At the closest point the part three, part four storey section of the Trinity Academy block would be sited 12.7m away from the southern flank wall of the adjacent six storey Brixton Hill Court block, which fronts onto Brixton Hill. This flank elevation contains a number of facing windows, some of which appear to serve habitable rooms. As existing, the ground floor windows in this block face onto a high brick boundary wall, which is to be retained in situ. Above ground floor level, views from these facing windows are obstructed by an existing mature Holm Oak tree (T173), located on the application site and which is also to be retained. The existing building is two storeys in height and presents an unrelieved flank elevation to the facing window in the flank elevation of the adjacent Brixton Hill block.

6.4.18 The proposed Trinity Academy block would be located along a similar footprint as the existing Lambeth College building in relation to the adjacent Brixton Hill Court building. It would rise to three storeys in height (11m) and then step back into the site by 1.7m to four storeys in height (15m). Although taller than the existing building, it is considered that occupiers in the flats at ground and first floor levels would not experience an increased sense of enclosure or loss of outlook as a result of the location, height and massing of the new building.

6.4.19 It is acknowledged that the additional height would reduce the amount of visible sky and outlook available to the occupiers of the flats on the upper floors, especially for those at second and third floor level. However, the windows affected are in flank/end elevation and appear to serve bedrooms and bathrooms/toilets rather than living rooms. In the circumstances, outlook from the side windows would not be expected to be to the same level as that to windows facing onto the street. The step back the forth storey from the edge of the building would help to relieve the loss of aspects associated with the increased height of the building in relation to adjacent Brixton Hill Court flats.
6.4.20 Elsewhere, there would be a separation distance of up to 33m between the new building (Trinity Academy block) and the other Brixton Hill Court residential block, which lies beyond an open courtyard and a row of garages and therefore the building would not appear imposing or cause loss of outlook.

6.4.21 The other pinch point, which has potential to raise concern over loss of outlook and sense of enclosure is the relationship between the proposed new sports hall to be erected in the north western corner of the site and the properties on Torrens Road and Brixton Hill Court. This corner of the site is currently occupied by single storey hall building with a high double pitched roof (4m eaves height and 6.5m ridge height). This building presents its long elevation to the rear gardens of properties in Torrens Road and is located 1.4m from the boundary with these neighbouring properties. Its short elevation runs parallel to the flank elevation of the 6 storey high Brixton Hill Court block, which abuts the rear gardens of properties in Torrens. Next to it and set back into the site is a part single, part two storey classroom block. These two buildings would be removed and replaced by the new sports hall.

6.4.22 The new sports hall would comprise a part single, part double height flat roofed building (8.3m). It should be noted that the gradient of the land rises towards the Torrens Road properties with ground levels at the houses being about 1m higher than on the college site. The replacement hall would be located 3m from the rear garden boundaries of the adjacent properties in Torrens Road, about 1.3m further away from the boundary than the existing building. It would align with the rear building line of the adjacent Brixton Hill block. The Section drawings above illustrate the spatial relationship between the proposed sports hall and the neighbouring properties in Torrens Road. The extent of the existing hall is outlined (in red) for purposes of comparison.

6.4.23 It is acknowledged that the proposed sports hall would have an impact upon the outlook and open aspects currently enjoyed by the occupiers of several properties in Torrens Road (especially Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33) by reason of its siting, height, massing and width. Options for alternative locations of the sports hall were considered during pre-applications discussions in relation to the layout, massing and scale of the new campus as whole. Having been left with the proposed location of the sports hall as the only viable location, options to reduce its impact including lowering it into the ground were considered and discounted on several grounds including the need to meet Council policy for inclusive environments (Policy Q1). In view of this and taking account of the fact that the new building is set further away than the existing hall (which mitigates some of the increase in height); that the existing building has a negative impact on visual amenity because of its dilapidated appearance and; the fact that the height cannot be lowered as hall needs to meet Sport England’s height standards for a Community level hall, the impact is considered to be acceptable on balance subject to mitigation measures proposed.

6.4.24 The treatment of the upper elevation of the sports hall above the brick plinth is to be comprised of banded coloured metal panels, which will help break up the mass and the manner in which it presents to the neighbouring properties. In addition, planting or provision of trellis with climbing plants would soften its presence and act as a visual screen thereby acting to minimise its impact on views from the immediately neighbouring properties. These mitigation measures are reserved as conditions of consent.
6.4.25 Officers are satisfied that the proposed mitigation measures set out above would minimising its impact on the neighbouring properties.

Privacy

6.4.26 Policy Q2 (ii) and (iii) require the privacy of neighbouring occupiers to be protected. There are limited instances in this development, which could give rise to loss privacy or where neighbours would be unacceptably overlooked.

6.4.27 Windows in the main building face onto the church and the primary school buildings on Horsford Road and across Brixton Hill towards the open park of Rush Common. In relation to properties on Torrens Road, the new building is sufficiently remote so as not to give rise to the potential for loss of privacy or unacceptable levels of overlooking or perceived overlooking. Windows facing west towards these properties would overlook the expanse of space occupied by the MUGA, sports hall and open courtyard to Trinity Academy. The west facing elevation of the sports hall, which lies closest to properties in Torrens Road, contains no window openings.

6.4.28 A separation distance of not less than 33m would be maintained between the proposed building and the facing windows of the adjacent residential blocks comprising Brixton Hill Court. Only the flats in the Brixton Hill Court that faces onto Brixton Hill, which have facing windows in the southern flank elevation stand to be affected. However, as noted above, the new building would mainly affect the flats at second and third floor levels with Brixton Court. The windows in the new building service classrooms to a secondary school, which would primarily be in use during daytime and therefore the potential for loss of privacy would be limited.

6.4.29 It is not considered reasonable to require the facing windows in this section of the building to be obscure glazed because this would diminish the amount light reaching the classrooms, especially where the classrooms have only a single aspect.

Noise

6.4.30 Policy Q2 (v) relates to noise and requires development to minimise the adverse impacts of noise through attenuation, screening, distance, or internal layout/orientation.

6.4.31 The applicant commissioned Blue Tree Acoustic to carry out an environmental noise assessment; in June 2015. Whilst the report was intended to inform the design of the new building, having regard to the requirements contained in recently amended (February 2015) Building Bulletin 93 ‘Acoustic Design of Schools (BB93), the survey data has also been used to establish background noise levels (existing noise climate) at the nearby noise sensitive receptors. These consist primarily of the residential properties in Horsford Road, Torrens Road, Hayter Road and Brixton Hill Court and the Corpus Christi Primary School.
6.4.32 Whilst it is accepted that the increase in pupil numbers on the site would lead to greater levels of activity on the site than at present, it is not considered that the day to day operation of the expanded education campus would result in levels of noise that would give rise to significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The core hours of operation of the proposed new institutions (Trinity Academy and South bank UTC) would not be earlier than 08:00 or later than 18:00 Monday to Friday and, Lambeth College would continue to operate on its core hours between 09:00 and 17:00 Mondays to Friday and 09:00 to 19:00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The core hours of operation of the 3 institutions will be controlled as conditions of the consent. As set out earlier in this report the intention to open up use of the new facilities (except the MUGA see below) outside core hours for community use; the spaces available, the hours and details of users etc. have not yet been agreed and would need to be properly considered as part of the community use management plan.

6.4.33 The sports hall does not have doors, windows or ventilation opening in the elevations facing the neighbouring properties in Torrens Road and therefore the potential for noise egress, resulting in adverse impact on the amenity of these neighbours is minimal. In addition, potential for noise egress from the new school building would be minimised by the provision of hybrid/mechanical ventilation, which would allow windows to be closed. The above report considers that the main potential for noise at the new school campus is from the external courtyard and the MUGA.

6.4.34 The MUGA is to be located in the south western corner of the site. It would be fenced with wire mesh fencing and would only be used during typical school hours. There is an existing brick boundary wall with timber fence panels on top, which gives the boundary wall along this boundary a total height of 3m. If the existing wall is retained it would act as an acoustic barrier between the MUGA and the rear gardens of the nearest residential properties in Torrens Road, this will be secured by condition. The Acoustic assessment considered typical noise levels at the perimeter of a MUGA with a wire fence and compares it with existing noise levels at the nearest residential property.

6.4.35 The results of the assessment set out in the Table 1 below, indicate that the predicted noise levels from the MUGA would be below or within measured prevailing noise levels and therefore the impact of the MUGA, having regard to the existing noise climate would be negligible. The report concludes that whilst the maximum noise levels could be more audible in comparison to existing noise levels, the magnitude of impact would be small, being no greater than the prevailing levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>dBA $L_{Aeq}$</th>
<th>dBA $L_{Amax}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUGA Source Noise Level @ 8m</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance correction from centre of MUGA to nearest dwelling</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 x Log(19/8))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier attenuation</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise level at nearest dwelling due to MUGA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing noise levels measured at the western site boundary (Location D1)</td>
<td>51 – 60</td>
<td>65 – 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.36 The report predicts, based on previous noise monitoring of similar activities at secondary schools, that increase in noise levels associated with the use of the MUGA and from other activities in open areas including play and socialising and from footpaths, would not have a significant impact on the existing noise climate and would only occur for limited period during daytime hours. The results of noise measurements at the adjacent primary school were taken into account. Whilst the sound from children is audible at the nearby properties in Horsford Road and Torrens Road, activity at the new campus would only generate a slight increase in overall noise levels in the area.

6.4.37 Given the magnitude and character of the prevailing noise climate around the site, including the existing education use of the college buildings and the nearby primary school the noise impact from the use of external areas including the MUGA is not likely to have a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity. The hours of use of the MUGA and the use of the sports hall by community groups should be controlled by condition.

6.4.38 The potential for noise disturbance from mechanical building services and rooftop plant were also considered. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition is applied requiring details of all plant (including an acoustic report demonstrating it will be inaudible at the nearest noise sensitive location) and any necessary mitigation measures such as noise barriers, lagging materials or acoustic louvres to be submitted for approval.

6.5 Trees and Landscaping

6.5.1 Policy Q9 and Policy Q10 of the Local plan relate specifically to landscaping and trees, respectively. Policy Q9 (ii) states that development will be supported where landscaping “retains and enhances existing planting landscaping feature of value and protects them during construction”. Policy Q10 (ii) has a presumption against development that would result in loss of trees of significant amenity, historic or ecological/habitat conservation value. Such trees should be retained and protected during the construction process and should be integrated into the new development.

6.5.2 An arboricultural survey report and method statement was submitted with the application. The report identifies all trees within the site – a total of 22 trees, all protected under a tree preservation order (TPO). The report has categorised the trees in accordance with their landscape value to the local area with 1 no. tree (T172) having high amenity value (Category A), 17 no. trees having moderate amenity value (Category B) and 4 trees having low value (Category C). These trees are identified on the submitted 'Tree Retention and Removal Plan'.

6.5.3 A total of 7 no. trees will be removed to accommodate the new College block. The trees to be removed are identified on the 'Tree Retention and Removal Plan' and can be summarised as Trees T165 (Sycamore), T166 (Lawson’s cypress), T167 (Beech), T168 (Holm oak), T169 Mulberry, T172 (Copper Beech) and T186 (Lime). The above Copper Beech tree is a Category A specimen. The 7 trees that will be removed as part of the proposal will be replaced as part of the new
landscape provision for the site. An indicative plan has been submitted that identifies replacement trees and areas of new planting.

6.5.4 All of the existing trees fronting Brixton Hill will be retained as part of the development. The majority of these trees are Category B specimens and provide substantial visual amenity to the local area due to their prominence. The 6 no. trees situated to the front of Horsford Road will also be retained with all but one of these being Category B specimens. The 2 no. large Ash trees (T170 & T171) on the northern boundary of the site will also be retained as part of the development of the site. The submitted Arboricultural Report has set out the necessary tree protection measures to ensure that the trees to be retained are suitably safeguarded during the construction phase.

6.5.5 The report has been reviewed by the Council’s Arboricultural Officer. Whilst the loss of the 7 trees, particularly the Copper Beech, is regrettable it is considered that subject to the provision of replacement tree planting it is acceptable. Although an indicative planting plan has been provided it is consider that a condition should be imposed to secure further details of all planting including the trees to ensure that they are of an appropriate species and maturity.

6.5.6 The submitted Arboricultural Report also sets out the necessary tree protection measures to ensure that the trees to be retained are suitably safeguarded during the construction phase. It is recommended that conditions are imposed requiring the submission of further details of tree protection measures, method statements for works within the root protection zone, details of service and drainage routes outside of root protection zones and proposed monitoring and supervision.

6.6 Ecology and Biodiversity

6.6.1 Policy EN1 relates to open space requirements within the borough and in relation to new development it seeks to ensure the protection of valuable existing habitats and to maximise opportunities for creating or adding to biodiversity.

6.6.2 The application was referred to the Council’s Parks Project officer, who advises on biodiversity issues who raised no objection to the proposal and recommended a condition to secure more detail regarding the proposed external hard and soft landscaping. This would ensure that replacement trees are appropriate and sustainable in terms of species, their location and add ecological benefit and visual amenity.

6.6.4 It is recommended that an informative is added advising that landscaping schedules should endeavour to include, within reason, measures to promote biodiversity including features attractive to bats and/or wild birds, and the use of native species typical of locality and ground conditions or 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.
6.7 Land Contamination, Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

6.7.1 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 as defined in the Lambeth Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Policy EN5 (c) of the Local Plan requires all major development proposals to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment (FRA), which should be proportionate with the degree of flood risk posed to and by the development. Policy EN5 (d) requires FRA to consider the risk of flooding to and from all sources including surface run-off, groundwater, ordinary watercourses, sewer and reservoirs.

6.7.2 Policy EN6 relates to sustainable drainage systems and water management and states that development should seek to ensure that the layout and design of development does not have a detrimental impact on floodwater flow across the site. It advises that in order to ensure a net decrease in both volume and rate of run-off leaving the site, development should incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) consistent with the London Plan drainage hierarchy and National SUDS Standards. It also requires that the local water supply and public sewerage networks have adequate capacity to serve the development and that any necessary improvements are carried out before occupation of the development.

6.7.3 The application is accompanied by a Ground Investigation (GI) Report drafted by Mott MacDonald (dated September 2014) and a Drainage Strategy Study drafted by Curtins Consulting Limited (dated June 2015). The GI report was previously commissioned by the EFA in relation to a proposal involving demolition of the building on site and redevelopment of the site in a mixed residential and education scheme. The intrusive ground investigations established that there were some slightly elevated concentrations of hydrocarbons and metals in the soil and groundwater, but concentrations were not considered to represent a significant risk to controlled waters. The drainage strategy study reported on the existing hydrological conditions and made recommendations for a drainage system incorporating sustainable principles.

6.7.4 The application and accompanying reports were reviewed by the Environment Agency (EA) and Thames Water. The EA advised that whilst the proposed development is classified as 'more vulnerable' the location of the site within Flood Zone 1 means the site has a “low probability” of river and sea flooding. It noted that other sources of flooding such as surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding could be an issue and that measures should be taken to manage flood risk for the proposed development. The EA noted whilst the site is located over a Secondary Aquifer and within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ1) it agreed with the conclusions of the GI report that the concentrations of hydrocarbons do not represent a significant risk to controlled waters. Accordingly the EA does not consider that remedial measures are required.

6.7.4 The EA suggested several conditions being imposed to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to remedy any contamination not previously identified. They also consider that a condition should secure details of piling method of construction and to infiltration of surface water drainage.
6.7.5 In relation to water Thames Water (TW) has identified that the existing water infrastructure may not be able to accommodate the needs of the development. They have recommended a condition requiring that no development should commence until an impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure has been submitted and approved by the Council in consultation with Thames Water. They have advised that the study should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and identify a suitable connection point.

6.7.6 TW has reviewed the submitted drainage strategy. It has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application and has recommended that no development should commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. In addition no discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the submitted drainage strategy have been completed.

6.7.7 Thames Water also advises against the use of impact piling unless a piling method statement is submitted and approved in by the Local Planning Authority consultation with Thames Water and that surface water should be disposed of on-site using SUDs in accordance with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

6.8 **Sustainability**

6.8.1 Policy EN4 (Sustainable design and construction) of the Local Plan requires all development to meet high standards of sustainable design and construction, having regard to the scale, nature and form of the development proposal. Proposals are required to demonstrate that these standards are integral to the design, construction and operation of the development. Non-residential developments are required to show how the development would meet the British Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) target credit rating of “Excellent”. The London Plan policy 5.2 seeks to ensure that proposals make the fullest contribution towards minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy of energy efficiency, decentralized energy and renewable energy technologies. Policy EN3 of the Local Plan requires that all major development should connect to existing decentralised energy networks in the vicinity of the site. Where such networks do not exist development should be future proofed to allow for connection to future networks.

6.8.2 The application was not accompanied by a BREEAM assessment. The BREEAM tools provide national recognised standards, which comprise a framework for promoting sustainable design, incorporating categories such as energy, water, materials, transport, waste, pollution, health, wellbeing, management, land use and ecology. These categories are scored to provide a credit to be achieved and how it would be achieved. In the absence of a BREEAM pre-assessment it is recommended that the no development is allowed to commence a pre-assessment BREEAM assessment is submitted for review by the Council.

6.8.3 The development is expected to achieve at least Excellent unless it is demonstrated that it is not technically feasible or viable to do so, in which the
prop 
osal should demonstrate a Very Good rating with a minimum score of 63%. A post-construction certification of the building’s performance against the BREEAM standards would also be required. Conditions to secure these policy requirements are recommended.

6.8.4 An energy statement prepared by Beverley Clifton Morris (BCM) has been submitted as part of the application. The statement has not been prepared using the standard methodology set out in the London Plan. The London Plan requires a 35% reduction in CO2 emissions against those required by the Part L of the 2013 Building Regulations (this is taken to be broadly equivalent to a 40% reduction against Part L of the 2010 Building Regulations). The Education Funding Agency (EFA) has its own standards for education buildings set out in the Facilities Output Specification (FOS) and this has been used for the purpose of the energy statement. The standards go beyond Part L of the Building Regulations, thus the carbon dioxide emission reductions set out are higher than they would be if they were assessed against the London Plan methodology. The FOS standards take a similar approach to the London plan energy hierarchy focusing on energy efficiency and clean energy before turning to renewables.

6.8.5 Officers have some reservations about the approach that the applicant has taken to estimating the carbon dioxide emissions reductions and also the lack of firm commitment by Lambeth College to take the same design approach to meet the savings set out. The approach that has been taken to focus on reducing energy demand is welcomed and the provision a site wide energy centre is also extremely positive. Officers consider that they have adequate information to be confident that that the carbon dioxide reduction can be achieved, but require that a revised energy statement based the GLA’s Energy Planning Guidance for calculating carbon emission baselines and reductions is secured by condition.

6.8.6 The proposal includes the provision for a future connection to a local district heating network. There is no existing district heating network in the immediate vicinity of the site; the nearest is located some 2 miles away on a site in Camberwell. However, the proposal does include a site-wide heat network to be shared between the 3 institutions. This will be used as the connection point for a future local district heating network in the area. A condition should be imposed to secure details of the development’s energy centre including confirmation that all the 3 institutions will be connected to the single energy centre via a site-wide network.

6.9 Community Safety / Designing out Crime

6.9.1 Policy Q3 requires development to be designed in a manner that does not engender opportunities for crime or anti-social behaviour or create a hostile environment that would produce fear of crime. Therefore development should 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 a planning application.
6.9.2 The Design Out Crime Officer was consulted during the pre-application process and their advice has been incorporated into the scheme design. The building layout has been designed to offer good passive surveillance within the building and across the site. Secure lobbies at entrances to each institution would offer safety to the pupils and staff within. CCTV is proposed at all entrance points to the building and along the perimeter of the sports facilities. Further details of the CCTV should be secured by condition to ensure that it is acceptable in design terms, covers vulnerable spots and does not affect neighbour privacy.

6.9.3 The Design Out Crime Officer has recommended a condition be imposed requiring the development to comply with Secured by Design – Schools 2015 minimum standards for physical protection.

6.9.4 It is also recommended that the listed sculpture should be securely fitted with vandal /theft resistant fixtures and property marked in accordance with Crime Prevention strategy for Lambeth Borough Listed Heritage Assets - Property protection. This should be secured by condition.

6.10 Planning Obligations and CIL

6.10.1 Policy D4 of the Local Plan refers to circumstances in which the Council can seek S106 Planning Obligations to mitigate the impact of a development on the local infrastructure or secure additional facilities that are required as a result of the development coming forward. As set out in the body of this report the following site specific planning obligations are considered necessary to make the development acceptable.

Public Transport and Highway Improvement Works

- Highways improvements on Horsford Road including: traffic calming measures comprising build-out and raised table and replacement of existing Resident’s Permit/Pay-and-Display parking along northern side of Horsford Road with ‘School Keep Clear’ markings and 2 Blue Badge bays.

- Highway works on Brixton Hill including the introducing a controlled (signalised) pedestrian crossing.

- £25,000 towards a full signage review of Brixton Underground Station including installation of illuminated signage in the station.

- £1,800,000 towards bus improvements (funding 4 additional return journeys )

- £30,000 towards a road safety study for cyclists: Brixton Hill/Brixton Water Lane/Trent Road junction.

Plans

- Revised travel plan for Lambeth College (should include monitoring of cycle parking demand and details of managing student drop off/pick up).

- New travel plans for Trinity Academy and Southbank UTC (should include monitoring of cycle parking demand and details of managing student drop off/pick up).
• £1000 toward travel plan monitoring.

Local labour in Construction

• An Employment and Skills Plan
• Notification of vacancies
• Trainee/apprenticeship placements (one trainee/apprentice per 10 construction workers on site)
• Financial contribution for support coordination, identification and preparation of local labour in construction initiatives prior to commencement of development (£2,500 per £1m of capital construction costs)
• Accredited training

Brixton Construction Co-ordination

• Establishment, hosting and management of a neighbourhood construction consultation group throughout the construction period;

• Establishment of a construction management group prior to commencement of development if such a group does not exist at the date 1 month prior to commencement of development or membership of the group if such a group does exist at the date 1 month prior to commencement of development and participation thereafter in the hosting and management of the group throughout the construction period; and

• Membership of a governance group responsible for the oversight of Brixton regeneration schemes if such a group exists at the date of commencement or any time during the construction period.
6.10.2 If the application is approved and the development is implemented, a liability to pay the Lambeth Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will arise. However, the Lambeth CIL contribution would not be payable because of the proposed use of the site as an educational facility. The London Mayoral CIL would also be nil.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed development would provide a new and expanded educational facility in accordance with Policies S2 and S3 of the Lambeth Local Plan and Policy 3.18 of the London Plan. The proposal would help to deliver the Council agreed strategy for the provision of additional state funded school places in response to a predicted shortfall secondary school places and a requirement for additional accommodation for further and higher education including adult and community learning.

7.2 The site is able to accommodate the increased number of students on the site having regard to the requirements for classroom and outdoor play and social space as set out in government guidance in BB103 (2014) for main schools building design. The provision of an expanded education facility on this site is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements and demand for parking in the local area, as well as public transport facilities, but it is considered that this can be accommodated with appropriate public transport improvements and the impact minimised through highway improvements and a Travel Plan to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.

7.3 The scale, massing, layout and design of the building are considered appropriate in the context of surrounding development. The proposed building would complement the scale of existing in this part of Brixton Hill and would not harm the significance or setting of the adjacent listed Corpus Christi Church and the Brixton Hill and Rush Common Conservation Area or other heritage assets. The refurbishment and relocation of the existing listed fountain structure would secure its long term heritage value.

7.4 In light of the assessment that has been carried out it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, noise or general disturbance. The proposals therefore meet the requirements of relevant policies of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION A

Application 15/04340/ FUL

1) Grant conditional planning permission subject to S106 Legal Agreement.

2) In the event the S106 Legal Agreement is not signed by the determination deadline of 11.12. 2015 (or in accordance with any agreed extension of time), delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning and Development to consider refusing the application in the absence of a S106 Legal Agreement.

3) 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 S106 Legal agreement in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector.
8. **Conditions(s) and Reasons(s)**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years 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. No development works above ground level shall take place until detailed 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. 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) all external window and door systems (including technical details, elevations, plans and cross sections showing cills and reveal depths/colour) at scale 1:10;
   
   ii) screening to plant at roof level;
   
   iii) Solar photovoltaic (PV) panels to roof (including elevation and section illustrating pitch and orientation);
   
   iv) rain water goods (including locations, fixings, material and colour)

   Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Brixton Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed building in particular, and the visual amenities of the locality in general in accordance Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q20, and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

4. No development works above ground level shall take place until detailed drawings, samples and a schedule of all external materials to be used in the elevations and roof of the development hereby permitted, including details of cladding (method of fixing, size and colour) and brickwork (including colour, texture, pointing and facebond), 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.

   Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Brixton Hill and Rush Common Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed building in
particular, and the visual amenities of the locality in general in accordance with Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q20, and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

5 No vents, pipes or extracts 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 the character and appearance of this part of the Brixton Conservation Area and the architectural interest of the locally listed building in accordance with Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

6 No development above ground level shall take place until details of the siting and design of all walls, gates and/or fencing and the existing boundary walls that are to be retained - which for clarity should include that along the western boundary of the site - (showing at scale of not less than 1:20 any acoustic fencing/trellis to be attached to the existing wall or erected along the western boundary of the site), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such walls, gates or fencing as may be approved shall be erected prior to the first occupation of the new building unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority to any variation has been obtained.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and standard of amenity of the site; to prevent unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and; to minimise the opportunities for crime (Policies Q2, Q3, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q15, Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) refers)

7 The proposed new buildings including the sports hall 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 to safeguard the character and appearance of this part of the Brixton Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed building in particular, and the visual in general and amenities of the neighbouring residents (Policies Q2, Q5, Q7, Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

8 Notwithstanding the approved drawings prior to commencement on the relevant part of the development details including the layout, siting and elevations of the refuse and recycling stores for the development hereby approved (at a scale of not less than 1:20) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The provision for waste storage and recycling shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the London Borough of Lambeth's 'Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers' (October 2013). The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details and permanently maintained and retained thereafter.
Reason: To ensure the adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse and recycling on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area and to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the completed development in accordance with Policies Q2, Q7, Q12, Q22 and EN7 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

9 No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until a Waste Management Strategy outlining the operation and management of waste storage and collection (including arrangements for the collection, storage and disposal of general refuse, recyclables’, litter, food waste and hazardous waste) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include details how waste shall be transported between the temporary store designated for Lambeth College and the main refuse/recycling store adjacent to the Trinity Academy block. The Waste Management Strategy will align with the guide for architects and developers on waste and recycling storage and collection requirements. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details and permanently maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate arrangements are put in place for the storage and disposal of waste from the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area and the safe operation of the adjacent public highway in accordance with Policies Q2, Q12, EN7, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

10 Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to commencement on the relevant part of the development detailed drawings of the cycle stores and stands and associated lockers and showers including their layout, elevations and manufacturers’ specifications shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Secure provision shall be provided for a minimum of 272 cycle parking spaces unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of the buildings and retained as such for the duration of the use.

Reason: To ensure that adequate cycle parking is available on site, to promote sustainable modes of transport and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies Q2, Q7, Q13, Q22, T1 and T3 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

11 No development above ground level shall take place until details of hard and soft landscaping (including replacement tree planting and other measures to enhance biodiversity) showing the treatment of all other parts of the site not covered by the new building including external lighting (whether fixed to the building or free standing) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- The specification shall include details of the quantity, size, species, position and the proposed time of planting of all trees and shrubs to be planted, together with an indication of how they integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to their mature size and anticipated routine maintenance and protection. In addition all shrubs and hedges to be planted that are intended to achieve a significant size and presence in the landscape shall be similarly specified. 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.
Details should include new paving and tarmac materials as well as a routine maintenance and protection plan to ensure appropriate landscaping in the long term.

The external lighting scheme shall include a specification of the proposed light fittings, lux levels, light spillage and details of shielding to neighbouring properties.

All hard landscaping and external lighting as may be approved shall be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall be permanently maintained and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high quality of landscaping, which contributes to the visual amenity and to character and appearance of the Conservation Area as well as the ecological value of the site and to ensure the safety and security of future occupiers of the site and of adjoining properties in accordance with Policies EN1, Q2, Q3, Q6, Q7, Q9, Q10, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

12 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping (condition 11) 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 that the development achieves a high quality of landscaping which contributes to the visual amenity and to character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

13 No trees other than those shown to be removed on the approved drawing: ALA263LD9 (Tree Retention and Removal Plan) 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 in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

14 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a Tree Protection Plan that accords with BS5837: 2012 and relates to all retained trees on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Tree Protection Plan shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details and put in place before any machinery, demolition, materials storage or development commences on the site.
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 in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

15 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement in accordance with BS5837: 2012 relating to groundwork within the Root Protection Area of retained trees shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method Statement shall 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 in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

16 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a drawing showing the confirmed route of all service and drainage routes outside of all retained tree root protection areas (BS5837:2010) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

17 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved details of all arboricultural site monitoring, site supervision and subsequent recording keeping of all tree protection measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 in accordance with policies Q2, Q10 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

18 Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, details of all plant and mechanical equipment to be installed externally to the building (including elevation drawings showing proposed screening and product specifications, an acoustic report demonstrating plant will be inaudible at the nearest noise sensitive location and any necessary mitigation measures such as noise barriers, lagging materials or acoustic louvres) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Lambeth Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be retained and satisfactorily maintained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers and the surrounding area and the visual amenity of the application site in accordance with Policy Q2, Q7, and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

19 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 (in
consultation with TfL). The Method of Demolition and Construction Statement shall include details and arrangements regarding:

- phasing and implementation plans;
- 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;
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works and;
- other measures to mitigate the impact of construction upon the operation of the highway, cycle super 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 in accordance with Policies, Q2, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015)

The first use of the new buildings hereby permitted shall not commence until a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Transport for London). The use of the site shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved details. The submitted details must include the following:

a) Expected Frequency of deliveries to the site;
b) Expected Frequency of other servicing vehicles such as refuse collections;
c) Dimensions of delivery and servicing vehicles;
d) Proposed loading and delivery locations;
e) A strategy to manage vehicles servicing the site and;
f) Details illustrating how larger serving vehicles, unable to manoeuvre on site, will be prevented from using the vehicular access on Brixton Hill.

Reason: To avoid hazard and obstruction being cause to the users of the adjacent public highway and to limit the effects of the travel movements within the locality in the interests of the amenity of the surrounding area in accordance with Policies Q2, Q12, EN7 and T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved an impact study of the development on the existing water supply infrastructure shall be undertaken by the applicant and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The study should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.
Any necessary improvement works to the water infrastructure must be carried out in full prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand in accordance with Policy EN6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

22 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. Any necessary drainage works outlined in the approved drainage strategy must be carried out in full prior to occupation of the development. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the works have been completed.

Reason: To ensure that the waste water infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand and in order to avoid adverse environmental impacts in accordance with Policies EN5 and EN6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

23 No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent guidance), and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall include:

a. information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
b. a timetable for its implementation; and
c. a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To manage the water environment of the development mitigate the impact on flood risk, water quality, habitat and amenity value in accordance with policies EN5 and EN6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

24 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details thus approved and verified and reported to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the any risk associated with contaminants is properly treated and made safe and that the development does not result in a risk to public health
through contamination of controlled waters in accordance with in accordance Policy EN5 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015) and Policy 5.21 of the London Plan (2015).

25 No impact piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods 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 or underlying ground or controlled waters, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water and the Environment Agency. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the approved piling method statement.

Reason: To ensure the protection of underground water infrastructure and to ensure that he development does not result in a risk to public health through contamination of controlled waters in accordance with in accordance Policy EN5 and EN6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015) and Policy 5.21 of the London Plan (2015).

26 No development other than demolition to existing ground level shall take place until:

A) The applicant (or their heirs and successors in title) has implemented a programme of geo/archaeological investigation in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation contained in the approved Heritage, Archaeological Statement by Matt MacDonald (dated July 2015).

B) Dependent upon the results of Part B, no development other than demolition to existing ground level shall take place until the applicant (or their heirs and successors in title) has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation site work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority in writing and a report on that evaluation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

C) Under Part B, the applicant (or their heirs and successors in title) shall implement a programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation.

D) The site investigation and post-investigation assessment will be complete prior to one year post the completion date of the development as defined by the borough building regulation officer, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved dated July 2015 and under Parts B, and the provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of the archaeological results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: Heritage assets of archaeological interest may survive on the site. The planning authority wishes to secure the provision of appropriate archaeological investigation, including the publication of results, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policy Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015)

27 Prior to the commencement of development, a revised Energy Statement demonstrating how the new building can secure a 35% carbon dioxide emissions reduction against a Part L of the Building Regulations (2013) baseline shall be
submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. The statement shall be drafted in accordance with the methodology for calculating carbon emission baselines and reductions set out in the GLA's Energy Planning Guidance (April 2015). The Energy Statement shall include details of how the London Plan energy hierarchy would be utilised in the scheme design and construction in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions across all elements of the development. The development shall be constructed in full accordance with the details thus approved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets sustainable design and construction requirements and to facilitate a reduction of Co2 through the use of renewables in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015) and Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

28 Prior to the commencement of development details of the PV panels (including plans and sections, indicating the layout, pitch, orientation, number and size, as well as manufacturers' specification) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A supporting statement shall be provided describing how the contribution to carbon dioxide emission reduction accords with the targets set out in the revised Energy Strategy (condition 27). The development shall be constructed in full accordance with the details thus approved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets the sustainable design and construction requirements and to facilitate a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions through the use of renewables in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015) and Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

29 Prior to first occupation of any part of the new building hereby approved a Community Use Management Plan (including the spaces available, hours of use and potential users) 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.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate community access to the school facilities is provided and to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, to prevent conditions prejudicial to the function and safety of the highway network and to ensure the security of the site in accordance with Policies S2, S3 T6 and Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)

30 The development shall be constructed and thereafter operated so as to achieve ‘Secured by Design Schools 2015’ accreditation (or such equivalent national measure of sustainability which replaces that scheme). Evidence of such shall be submitted within 6 months from the commencement of use of any of the development hereby approved, or within any other timetable agreed by the Local Planning Authority, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce opportunities for crime as far as is reasonable in accordance with Policy Q3 of the Lambeth Local Plan

31 Prior to commencement on the relevant part of the development detailed drawings (plans, sections, elevations and manufacturers specification) of the proposed CCTV system to be installed across the site (including at the entrances and along the
The perimeter of the sports facilities) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CCTV system thus approved shall be installed and working prior to first occupation of the buildings and permanently maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To reduce opportunities for crime as far as is reasonable in accordance with Policy Q3 of the Lambeth Local Plan.

32. Prior to first occupation of the buildings hereby approved the listed sculpture to be installed within the courtyard shall be securely fitted with vandal/theft resistant fixtures and property marked in accordance with Crime Prevention strategy for Lambeth Borough Listed Heritage Assets - Property Protection. The fixtures and marking shall be permanently maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To reduce opportunities for crime as far as is reasonable in accordance with Policy Q3 of the Lambeth Local Plan.

33. No non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) shall be used on the site unless it is complaint with the NRMM Low Emission Zone requirements (of any superseding requirements) and until it has been registered for use on the site on the NRMM register (or any superseding register).

Reason: To ensure that air quality is not adversely affected by the development in line with London Plan policy 7.14 and the Mayor’s SPG: The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition.

34. No development works shall take place until detailed drawings (scale of 1:10 and 1:20) to confirm the detailed design and materials of main entrances including surrounds should be submitted to and approved 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 character and appearance of this part of the Brixton Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed building in particular, and the visual amenities of the locality in general in accordance Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q20, and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

35. The use of the Multi-use Games Area (MUGA) for play/social purposes shall not operate outside the following core school hours unless otherwise agreed in with the Local Planning Authority to any variation.

0800 to 1700 Mondays to Fridays

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties in accordance with Policies, S2, S3 and Q2, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015)

36. No development above ground shall commence until a BREEAM pre-assessment estimator (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) has been submitted to and
approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating how an Excellent (minimum score 70) rating will be achieved.

(Within three months of work starting on site a BREEAM Design Stage certificate and summary score sheet (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to show that an “Excellent” rating will be achieved.

Prior to first occupation of the building(s) a BREEAM Post Construction Review certificate and summary score sheet (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to show that an Excellent rating has been achieved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets sustainable design and construction requirements and to facilitate a reduction of Co2 through the use of renewables in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015) and Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

RECOMMENDATION B

Application 15/04341/LB

1) Grant conditional listed building consent.

9 Conditions(s) and Reasons(s)

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 (1) (b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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 a methodology, specification and schedule of works for removal, refurbishing and relocating the fountain sculpture shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the conservation area in accordance with Policy Q20 of the Council’s Local Plan (2015).
10 **Informatives (applicable to Full Planning permission only)**

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 of 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 of the necessity to consult the Council’s Highways team prior to the commencement of construction at drw@lambeth.gov.uk 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.

5. 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.

6. You are advised that landscaping schedules should endeavour to include, within reason, measures to promote biodiversity including features attractive to bats and/or wild birds, and the use of native species typical of locality and ground conditions or 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.


8. Contaminated soil that is, or must be, disposed of is waste, therefore its handling, transport and disposal is subject to waste management legislation including:

   - Duty of Care Regulations 1991;
   - Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2010;

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised, both chemically and physically, in line with BS EN 14899 (2005): characterisation of waste; sampling of waste materials; framework for the preparation and application of a sampling plan” and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, please contact the Environment Agency for advice at an early stage, in order to avoid delays and to discuss the issues likely to be raised. Applicants should be aware that any permit may not be
granted. Please visit the relevant section of the national government website for further environmental permitting guidance.

Please note that, if the total quantity of waste material to be produced or taken off site is hazardous waste, and is 500 kilograms (kg) or greater in any 12 month period, the developer will need to register with the Environment Agency as a hazardous waste producer.

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 or existing building
- apply new street numbers to a new or existing building
- register new flats or new buildings with Royal Mail

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.

The correct street number or number and name must be displayed prominently on the premises in accordance with regulations made under Section 12 of the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939.

Contact details are listed below.

e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283
fax: 020 7926 9104

10 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 adjacent 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.

11 In relation to surface water management the applicant is encouraged to reduce surface water run-off rates to Greenfield rates, manage surface water run-off as close to its source as possible, in line with a given drainage hierarchy, and to utilise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) wherever practical, as required by the Greater London Authority’s London Plan (Policy 5.13) and the relevant ‘priorities’ within the associated Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (Section 3.4).

12 You are advised that 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 found at www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning.
Background documents – Case file (this can be accessed via the planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7 926 1180). For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Democratic Services, 020 796 2170 or email.
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