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Officer’s Report

1. SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES

1.1 The principle of redevelopment of the site for hotel use.

1.2 The principle of the demolition of the former nurses accommodation and the impact of the scale, massing and design of the replacement structure upon the listed General Lying In Hospital (Hospital Building).

1.3 The visual impact of the buildings on the character of the adjacent Conservation Area.

1.4 The impact of the scale and massing of the tall building on the surrounding townscape, and impact upon views.

1.5 The amenity impact on surrounding residential occupiers.

1.6 Transport, parking and access issues.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site lies to the east of County Hall, sitting on the corner of Addington Street and York Road. The site contains two buildings, the General Lying-In Hospital (GLIH) and the adjacent former nurses accommodation.

2.2 The General Lying-In Hospital is a Grade II listed building that sits on the corner of the junction of Addington Street and York Road. The General Lying-In Hospital is an early 19th Century, two-storey building (three storey equivalent with attic and basement) finished in red brick with stuccoed overlay. The building was built originally as a maternity hospital before being used for training purposes and offices ancillary to Guys and St Thomas Hospital. The statutory list description states:

*Early-Mid C19. Two storeys, attic and basement, 7 windows on west front. Red brick with stuccoed attic storey above entablature, and stuccoed recessed 3-bar centre, treated as full height tetrastyle Ionic portico in antis. Stuccoed pilasters at angles of side sections. Inscription in frieze: GENERAL LYING-IN HOSPITAL, UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HER MAJESTY AND HRH THE PRINCESS OF WALES. Replaced sash windows with glazing bars, outer ones in moulded architraves. Central flight of steps to porch, and double door side lights. Similar south elevation but without porch and with alterations to attic storey. Wrought iron area railings.*

2.3 The second building, the former Nurses accommodation is a curtilage structure to the listed building which sits to the north of the hospital building further up York Road. The building was built in the 1930s and is constructed of brown brick and fronts York Road at five storeys high above a basement with a mansard roof. The building was previously used as nurses accommodation but has stood vacant for a number of years.
2.4 The nurses accommodation is not listed in its own right. The building was considered for listing in 2003, but the Department of Culture Media and Sport declined to list the building. It should also be noted that the statutory list description of the General Lying-In Hospital (see para 7.2.1) makes no mention of the nurses accommodation. Nevertheless the accommodation, in terms of its historical relationship with the hospital building and evidence of a physical link structure joining the two buildings confers the listing protection of the 1828 building and is considered to be a curtilage structure.

2.5 An entrance yard at the rear of the General Lying-In Hospital has access onto Addington Street through the adjacent Addington Street apart-hotel site. Both the General Lying-In and nurses accommodation have pedestrian accesses onto York Road.

Surrounding area

2.6 The surrounding townscape is rapidly changing, especially with the erection of several new buildings within the immediate area.

2.7 Immediately to the east of the site sits the Addington Street site which contains a 13 storey (plus plant) 398 bed apart-hotel that has recently been constructed.

2.8 To the south of the site across Addington Street lies the Westminster Bridge Road Roundabout and Island Block site, at which a 16 storey 1037 room hotel is under construction.

2.9 To the west of the site across York Road sits the Grade II* listed County Hall complex which consists of the main riverside building, the North and South Blocks together with Forum Magnum Square which itself sits directly opposite the hospital building giving views to and from the main listed County Hall building.

2.10 To the north sits Prospect House (75-79 York Road), an 11 storey office building that fronts York Road and is currently being refurbished with residential accommodation on the 11th floor.

2.11 Further north along York Road is the Elizabeth House redevelopment site, which has recently been to an enquiry as the application was called in by the Secretary of State.

2.12 The site is directly adjacent to, but not within, the South Bank Conservation Area which lies across York Road. Within this Conservation Area, as stated above, County Hall faces the hospital building directly across Forum Magnum Square. Approximately 200m to the south east on the other side of Waterloo Station lies the Lower Marsh Conservation Area.

2.13 The site lies within a river prospect view towards County Hall from Victoria Embankment as identified in the London View Management Framework (LVMF), and could potentially be seen above County Hall from views out of Parliament Square.

2.14 Within the wider area, Waterloo Station is situated further north along York Road, with the London Eye to the north west and St Thomas and Guys Hospital situated to the south west.
2.15 The site is situated within the Central Activities Zone, the Waterloo Opportunity Area Planning Framework (WOAPF) and the Waterloo Visitor Management Area.

2.16 York Road and Addington Street are part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). The site has a public transport accessibility level (TPAL) level of 6b, which is the highest level of accessibility to transport provision that can be attained. Given the proximity to Waterloo Station a wide range of public transport services are available, including London Underground Services (Bakerloo, Northern, Waterloo and City and Jubilee Lines), fourteen standard and various night time busses. National rail services from Waterloo Station provide overland connections to South London and beyond.

3 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 In 2001 Listed Building and Town Planning Consent (ref: 00/01724/FUL; 00/01726/LB) was granted for alterations including the establishment of vehicular access way to Addington Street, involving the installation of vehicle gates to Addington Street elevation, external and internal refurbishment involving demolition of link corridor between Hospital and Nurses Accommodation, establishment of wheelchair access ramp to front and new means of escape stairwell to rear.

3.2 In 2003 Listed Building and planning application (ref: 03/03031/FUL; 03/03032/LB) proposed the erection of railings on the portico at the front of the building to match the railings surrounding the flanking basement areas. Both applications were subsequently refused on the basis that the design and materials of the railings are out of keeping with the character of the GLIH and therefore detract from the special character of the listed building.

3.3 In 2004 Listed building and Town Planning consent (ref: 04/03509/FUL; 04/03505/LB) was granted for removal of existing railings and gate on podium to York Road entrance and replacement with wrought iron railings painted black.

3.4 In September 2008 Listed Building and Planning permission (ref: 08/02752/FUL; 08/02753/LB) were refused for change of use and works to the existing General Lying In Hospital and demolition and redevelopment of the adjacent former nurses accommodation with a replacement part five, part thirteen, part sixteen storey (plus plant) building (maximum height 53.44m AOD) to provide a 246 room hotel with accompanying restaurant/cafe and associated servicing facilities and plant accommodation. The planning application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its height, bulk, scale and massing, would appear over dominant and overbearing from the 11th floor residential property to the north on York Road, which would result in an un-neighbourly and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the detriment of the residential amenities of these occupiers. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).
2. Insufficient information has been submitted to enable the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the scheme would not cause any unacceptable loss of sunlight and daylight to the surrounding residential properties. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies 33 and 40 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

3. Inadequate information submitted to enable the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the scheme would not impact upon designated views. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of UDP Policies 40 and 41 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

4. Based upon the documentation submitted with the application, the Local Planning Authority is unable to satisfactorily determine whether the proposed development would be able to offset at least 10% predicted CO² emissions through the use of on site renewable energy generation. As such the application is contrary to the provisions of UDP Policy 34 (2007).

5. Inadequate information was submitted regarding transport issues (including servicing strategies, and on site disabled parking) to allow the Local Planning Authority to assess whether the application site would be, or could be rendered, suitable for the use proposed without detrimental impact to highway and pedestrian safety, on street parking stress or to the servicing demands of the adjacent site. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 9 and 14 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

The listed building application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed replacement structure, by means of its height bulk and scale and design, would harm the setting and special character of the adjacent Grade II Listed General Lying-In Hospital. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies 33, 40 and 46 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

2. The proposed internal works to the General Lying-In Hospital, involving the loss of the staircases, the demolition of walls and the sub-division of spaces within the listed building would harm the special interest and character of the Listed Building. As such, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy 46 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

Adjacent Sites

3.5 The adjacent Addington Street site has been developed for apart-hotel use, with a recently completed 13 storey building standing containing a 398 room hotel (ref: 03/03187/FUL; 05/00491/FUL; 07/03696/FUL).

3.6 Planning permission was granted in January 2008 (ref: 07/00965/FUL) for a 16 storey 1037 room hotel at the Former County Hall Island Block, and which is currently under construction.

3.7 75-79 York Road (Prospect House (75-79 York Road)), immediately to the north of the site had planning permission granted in 2008 (ref: 08/02047/FUL) for refurbishments to the office building and building
works including the construction of a new 11th floor containing 5 residential units.

3.8 Further to the north along York Road sits Elizabeth House, subject to a Major Development Proposal for a mixed use scheme proposing three buildings with a maximum height of 33 storeys (ref: 07/02628/FUL). The application was recently the subject of a public enquiry after being called in by the Secretary of State, the decision of which has not been issued at the writing of this report.

4. SCHEME DETAILS

4.1 The scheme proposes the redevelopment of the site to provide a 234 room hotel, and associated servicing facilities and plant accommodation. Planning permission and Listed Building Consent are being sought.

4.2 The scheme specifically proposes the change of use and internal and external works to the hospital building in connection with its use as a hotel (from use class C2 to use class C1), the demolition of the nurses accommodation and the erection of a new building comprising basement, ground and 14 upper floors in order that the buildings are used for hotel provision.

4.3 The internal works proposed to the hospital building for which listed building consent is required are; the removal of a staircase and partition walls in the basement; the removal of a lift shaft, party walls and toilet cubicles on the ground, first and second floors; the provision of a restaurant in basement; internal links to the new structure at ground, first, second and third floor levels; new internal partitions and glazing; and new servicing, lighting, heating and drainage.

4.4 The external works proposed to the hospital building for which listed building consent is required are; the replacement of later and unsympathetic windows with in keeping joinery and glazing; the restoration of the double leaf front doors; the removal of brick the clad rear extensions and staircase and replacement with a glazed stair enclosure; the section of altered rear (east) and part of (north) wing to be removed to accommodate the service stair, lift, and new build extension.

4.5 The existing nurses accommodation is to be demolished in its entirety and a new part four, part thirteen, part fifteen storey building erected in its place. The building’s massing would be split into distinct volumes, starting at four storeys where it would front York Road, and rising up in scale to thirteen then fifteen storeys in height at the centre (maximum height 49.84m AOD), before dropping down to thirteen storeys at the rear of the site.

4.6 The rear of the first, second, third and fourth floors of the building would wrap behind the hospital building by 9.4m, but would not rise above the roofline of the listed building. The upper element of the south elevation that rises above, and faces the hospital building would curve away from the hospital building. The basement would contain a restaurant, toilets and a kitchen ancillary to the hotel. The ground floor would contain the reception, servicing facilities and hotel rooms. The first and upper floors of the building would contain hotel rooms.
4.7 Access for servicing and deliveries is proposed at the rear of the site, with access gained through the servicing area of the adjacent Addington Street site. Due to the footprint of the hospital building, the size of the courtyard area at the rear of the building is too small for vehicles to turn or manoeuvre. As such, the Addington street servicing area is proposed to be used for vehicles turning and manoeuvring to enable them to park on the site.

4.8 One disabled car parking space is proposed at the rear of the site, accessed through the adjacent Addington Street site, which would also be used as a disabled pick up point.

4.9 The main pedestrian entrance for the hotel is proposed on York Road through the ground floor of the replacement structure, with a secondary entrance through the front of the hospital building. A staff entrance is proposed on Addington Street.

4.10 An internal refuse storage area is proposed to the rear of the building with access to the courtyard area.

4.11 The application is referable to the Mayor of London due to the fact that the building is over 30m tall.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Consultation on the application was carried out from 24 March 2009.

5.2 Letters of notification were sent to the MP for Lambeth North and the ward Councillors for Bishops Ward.

5.3 As part of the consultation process six site notices were erected in the vicinity of the site on 1 April 2009.

5.4 The application was advertised in Lambeth Life on 1 April 2009.

5.5 A copy of the application was sent to Waterloo Library on 24 March 2009.

5.6 Letters of notification were sent to 1856 neighbouring properties on the following roads:

- Addington Street
- Baylis Road
- Belvedere Road
- Chicheley Street
- The Concourse Waterloo Station
- The Colonnade Waterloo Station
- Forum Magnum Square
- Lambeth Palace Road
- Launcelot Street
- Lower Marsh
- Lower Road
- Mepham Street
- Murphy Street
- Spur Road
- Upper Marsh
- Waterloo Road
- Waterloo International Terminal
- Waterloo Station Approach
- Westminster Bridge Road
- York Road
18 letters and emails from local addresses were received as a result of the consultation exercise. These comprise 14 objections, 3 observations and one email of support. The objections made on the consultation are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of sunlight and daylight to County Hall building</td>
<td>The applicant’s sunlight/daylight study has been independently verified by the Councils consultant and its contents are considered acceptable as development would retain acceptable levels of sunlight and daylight for surrounding residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in noise and traffic</td>
<td>This development is not considered to result in any issues with regards to noise, fumes or pollution that would cause detriment to the residential amenity of any nearby properties. The development would not give rise to an unacceptable increase in traffic generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing of the site would conflict with the servicing needs of the Addington Street site.</td>
<td>A Servicing management strategy would be required as part of the s106 agreement. This would ensure that the servicing requirements of both this site and the Addington St site are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing of the site would add to traffic congestion</td>
<td>Servicing management strategy so be provided via s106 obligation. This would ensure that servicing takes place from the public highway. The Councils highway team and TfL are satisfied with the servicing arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development is in conflict with the adjacent listed building</td>
<td>The replacement building would not harm the setting and special interest of the Grade II listed building, irrespective of the fact that it is a modern building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement building too high and bulky</td>
<td>Height and bulk of the replacement structure is acceptable with regards to the setting and special interest of the Grade II listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of privacy</td>
<td>The replacement structure is positioned at a satisfactory distance from County Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential blocks to ensure no unacceptable issues of overlooking would arise. It is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also located on the other side of a London Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many hotels in the area – another one is not needed.</td>
<td>The hotel use is considered acceptable, is in a central London location and complies with UDP Policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic</td>
<td>The scheme is not of a scale that would result in harm to highway users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection to the loss of the nurses accommodation</td>
<td>The replacement structure is of a high enough architectural standard and an appropriate scale to justify the loss of the nurses accommodation. There is also little merit in the retention of the 1930s building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights from the hotel would affect residential amenity.</td>
<td>The internal lighting of the hotel would not affect residential amenity to buildings on the opposite side of the street. External lighting is also the subject of a condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed development would result in loss of sunlight/daylight and outlook for 8 Leake Street.</td>
<td>This property is a commercial property, and as such loss of sunlight/daylight and outlook is not a material consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact upon infrastructure/utilities</td>
<td>S106 agreement contains a range of contributions and measures to mitigate against any impact the development would cause upon the locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application does not address existing use class of the buildings</td>
<td>Site is use class C2. The change of use to use class C1 in this location is considered acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 There has been one representation of support from a local address.
5.8 Letters of notification were sent out to the following statutory bodies, external consultees and local amenity groups, any responses of which are detailed:

- **Greater London Authority, including Transport for London;**
  
  On balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan. The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan:

  *Inclusive design:* The applicant should demonstrate how taxi/drop-off facilities will be provided in order for disabled guests to access the reception with ease, and increase the proportion of accessible hotel-bedrooms.

  *Climate change mitigation and adaptation:* The applicant should submit a sustainability strategy which assesses the scheme against the essential and preferred standards within the London Plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG, and relevant London Plan policies. In addition, the applicant should provide further information regarding the energy efficient design measures proposed, further information demonstrating that there is sufficient space in the plant room for the proposed energy equipment, particularly reviewing whether thermal storage will be required, and further justification regarding the quantum of photovoltaic incorporated.

  *Transport:* The applicant should provide further information to demonstrate that the scheme provides sufficient cycle parking in accordance with TfL’s minimum cycle parking standards and deliver local cycle lane improvements, and further information on taxi and coach drop-off facilities. TfL also requests a financial contribution towards the maintenance of the Strategic Walking Network, a construction logistics plan, delivery and servicing, and final version travel plan.

- **English Heritage;** As with the 2008 application, this proposal envisages demolition of the Nurses Accommodation building adjacent to the General Lying In Hospital. These structures are curtilage to the principal Listed Building, and contribute its setting. They are constructed in a neo-Georgian style, characterised by a strong vertical rhythm and limited void-to-solid ratio. The brick construction provides a visual link to the brick panels of the adjacent lying-in hospital, as does the similar form of fenestration.

  While recognising the Nurses’ accommodation is capable of substantial modification, we remain disappointed that this latest proposal does not seek to incorporate these buildings into the overall development. We acknowledge that the nurses accommodation is of little internal architectural or historic interest, but consider the York Road elevation to contribute significantly to the wider setting of the Listed Building. York Road lost many historic buildings during the later part of the 20th century, and the former General Lying In Hospital and associated curtilage structures stand isolated amidst more recent development.

  At the time of the previous application, we did not comment on the “tower” elements of the scheme to the rear of the site. However, while the previous proposal was for a building which appeared to be modulated into a set of relatively slender towers, this element of the proposals is revised.
in the latest scheme. The "tower" element is now articulated as one large building faced in glass and ceramic panels. When viewed from York Road looking North, this elevation is stark, monolithic, and overbearing on the setting of the principal Listed Building. Coupled with the proposed loss of the nurses’ accommodation, this new building will greatly exaggerate the sense that the former Lying-In Hospital is isolated in a mass of modern development.

The previous application was correctly refused planning permission for several reasons, amongst which were the adverse affect the proposals would have on the setting of the Listed Building and the lack of a justification for the loss of the curtilage structures. We do not consider these revised proposals to satisfactorily address either of these reasons for refusal.

Recommendation
We consider that the proposed development involves the unjustified demolition of a curtilage Listed Building, and the proposed replacement structure detracts from the setting of the Grade-II Listed former Lying-in Hospital. This application is contrary to both local and national policy, and we therefore urge you recommend refusal.

☐ English Heritage Archaeology; No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme for investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only take place in accordance with the detailed scheme pursuant to this condition. The archaeological works shall be carried out by a suitable qualified investigating body acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

☐ Environment Agency; No response received to date

☐ Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment; We regret to say that we are unable to review this scheme, as we are consulted on more projects than we have the resources to deal with.

☐ City of Westminster; No response received to date

☐ Thames Water; Development shall not 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 the sewerage undertaker. 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 strategy have been completed”. Reason - The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation is inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Control Department (telephone 01923 898072) prior to the Planning Application approval.
Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

There are public sewers crossing this site, and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval. Should a building over / diversion application form, or other information relating to Thames Waters assets be required, the applicant should be advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777.

Water Comments

In order that the development does not detrimentally effect the water supply infrastructure, Thames Water recommend the following condition be imposed: Development should not be commenced until: a) full details, including anticipated flow rates, and detailed site plans have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water) b) Where this development forms part of a larger development, arrangements have been made to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority (in consultation with Thames Water) for the provision of adequate water supplies for the whole of the development. Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand.

- **Network Rail;** Network Rail has no comment to make.
- **Metropolitan Police;** No response received to date
- **20th Century Society;** No response received to date
- **Georgian Society;** No response received to date
- **Victorian Society;** No response received to date
- **County Hall Owners and Residents Association (CHORA);**
  The proposed development is significantly larger than the existing building and will therefore reduce the light falling onto County Hall, particularly the lower blocks of North Blocks.

  We believe that the access routes proposed by the developers are inadequate and that coaches and service vehicles arriving at and departing from the site will cause significant congestion around York Road. Dirt and pollution would also increase.
We are concerned that such a large development would crowd the architectural amenity of the façade of the General Lying-In Hospital and render it out of keeping with the local environment.

County Hall would be materially overlooked by the development.

We would ask that planning officers require an assurance from the developers that their development will not place an intolerable strain on the area’s infrastructure and in the event it does, that they will pay for any remedial works necessary and compensate residents for any loss of amenity.

CHORA supports the aim of the Waterloo Development Framework. However, we are very keen to ensure that the needs of those who have chosen to make their homes here are accorded due weight. We believe very strongly that the emotional and financial investment of an owner or resident of the area should be considered, as well as the weight of numbers.

□ Waterloo Action Centre; No response received to date

□ Waterloo Community Development Group (WCDG);

We are very pleased that the proposed retention and use of the General Lying-In Hospital (GLIH) building would be sustainable, and accept that this would be made possible by the use of the rest of the site for the development of a modern hotel building. We welcome the reduction in overall height and bulk from the original proposal and the resultant increase in the proportion of visible sky, which makes the GLIH and the whole area feel less impinged upon. The curving of the new building successfully contrasts with and provides an appropriate setting for the GLIH, as does the detail of the design and the generally lighter materials. The servicing arrangements and the absence of customer parking are welcome.

Regarding some of our previous concerns:

We are very concerned at the volume of hotel proposals coming forward – there are currently 7 hotel proposals in Waterloo (in addition to the 5 existing hotels) of which 3 are on site. The borough of Lambeth currently has the greatest growth in new hotel stock in London, much of which is concentrated in Waterloo. Nevertheless we accept that demand is high at the hotels in County Hall and that this proposed 3* hotel would contribute to the mix of accommodation coming forward.

Retention of the 1930's façade: although we have not seen the detail of the report regarding the PP15 tests, we accept that our aspiration to retain this is in conflict with our desire to see active frontage at ground floor on at least part of the site, and that the creation of a modern building with active frontage beside the retained GLIH will provide an appropriate balance.

Active frontage: it is disappointing that the new building will not provide the significant active frontage originally conceived i.e. a café/restaurant. We are also concerned that without activity the GLIH frontage will easily
become sterile and a receptacle for the rubbish and dirt which is blown down York Rd.

We would expect this development to generate a significant s106 package to ameliorate the impact of this proposal. Since Waterloo is deficient in open space, and the proposal does not provide for amenity space or children’s playground facilities (both of which are important facilities for family hotel users in particular), we would expect a significant amount towards amenity space and playground facilities.

Part of the reason we welcome the development of this site is that we expect customers of the proposed hotel to bring some of their purchasing power to the shops and market in Lower Marsh. Unfortunately the most direct route would be Leake Street, which is currently not fit for purpose. We would expect some s106 towards improvements to Leake Street. We also expect to see contributions towards training and employment programmes for local people.

Email received on 09.05.2009 raising the following points:

Coach drop-off: the applicant is not proposing any coach dropping-off or parking facilities, and it is our recollection that they do not wish to encourage their hotel customers to arrive by coach. It would be foolish in the extreme to encourage visitors to forego using the existing public transport networks in order to clog our roads with coaches and our kerbsides with coach drop-off points. Furthermore, Waterloo’s air quality is the 7th worst in the UK, and each additional coach simply exacerbates this appalling situation. There should be a clause in the s106 or in the conditions expressly discouraging the use of coaches and no coach drop-off spot should be located in Waterloo.

Libraries: We do not accept the applicant’s claim that the hotel will not place any strain on local libraries. Firstly the local authority is required to provide library services for those working in the borough, i.e. hotel staff. Secondly libraries are often a key information and service point for visitors.

Parks and open spaces: £162k in capital is not sufficient to cover the additional wear and tear generated by the daily addition of up to 234 families visiting Waterloo as a result of this application.

Revenue contribution – what is this?

What arrangements for cascading payments are proposed?.

South Bank Employers Group (SBEG);
I am writing to express support of the Group for the above application on the basis that the new hotel will contribute economic benefit in the area in the form of new jobs and additional services and facilities which will reinforce the tourism offer of the South Bank. We are also glad to see an effective reuse of a listed building and welcome the active frontage which the development will bring to the site.

We also welcome the developer’s commitment to our work to develop a South bank de-centralised energy network for the intention expressed in
the applicant’s Energy Statement to design engineering systems for the development in such a way as to make it easy to connect to any future district network.

We note the developer’s proposals for the s106 agreement. In the absence of any information on the Council’s response to the document we are unable to comment at this stage.

Further email received on 04.05.3009

Our comments regarding the s106 agreement are:

A contribution of £43,840 towards the Thames Path/Jubilee Walkway – We really do not understand where this has come from.

A contribution of £50,000 towards the implementation of a ‘cycle parking lane’ along York Road. We are not clear what this is or if it is needed.

The applicant to agree a coach and taxi drop off strategy with TfL. Such a strategy is already being funded via the Visitor Management Group (ie the London Eye S106).

Sustainability plan to include: a renewable energy plan to offset at least 10% CO2 emissions from on site renewable energy sources. These targets have been superseded and that the focus should be on decentralised energy as in the draft SPD.

A contribution of £162,417 towards parks and open space within the borough – there should be discussion with Waterloo Open Spaces Partnership on how this is allocated.

The provision of public art, or a contribution towards public art to total £50,000. The SPD is suggesting pooling such contributions to allow coordinated local commissioning. Is it really in line with Council policy and the Sustainable Community Strategy that the public art contribution is virtually the same as the employment contributions.

Revenue contribution of £16,242- what is this for?

☐ Association of Waterloo Groups; No response received to date

5.9 Internal Consultations:

☐ Conservation and Urban Design team:
Site - Historic Assets
The General Lying-In Hospital (GLIH) was statutorily listed at Grade II on 27 March 1981. The list description states:

Early-Mid C19. Two storeys, attic and basement, 7 windows on west front. Red brick with stuccoed attic storey above entablature, and stuccoed recessed 3-bar centre, treated as full height tetrastyle Ionic portico in antis. Stuccoed pilasters at angles of side sections. Inscription in frieze: GENERAL LYING-IN HOSPITAL, UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HER MAJESTY AND HRH THE PRINCESS OF WALES. Replaced sash windows with glazing
bars, outer ones in moulded architraves. Central flight of steps to porch, and double door side lights. Similar south elevation but without porch and with alterations to attic storey. Wrought iron area railings.

The hospital building (1828) was designed by Henry Harrison and built at a cost of £3,000. It is in the Neo-Classical style typical of the late Georgian period. The adjoining nurses hostel (1930-33) is in brick and has four storeys with a mansard and is in the Neo-Georgian style. The ground floor is treated in faïence with a decorative porch and keystone and the windows are traditional timber sliding sashes with Georgian style glazing; those to the central bay have segmental heads.

The buildings share many common features: -

1) They are of a similar scale.
2) They both have traditional iron railings to the street frontage.
3) They both use brick in their important street elevations.
4) They speak the same Georgian and Neo-Georgian architectural language:
   (i) Use of details such as columns at the entrance.
   (ii) A similar solid to void ratio of wall and window.
   (iii) Use traditional sliding sash windows.
   (iv) Exhibit fine detailing at a small 'human scale'.
   (v) Vertical rhythms and traditional built forms.

Together the hospital and nurses hostel form the whole of the GLIH group. The associated historic relationship of these two buildings and evidence of a physical link structure joining the two buildings on 1 July 1948 confers the listing protection of the 1828 building onto the nurses hostel. This is accepted by the Council and the applicant.

Urban Context

The development of the imposing County Hall annex complex in the 1930s and a great deal of comprehensive redevelopment in the post-war decades has resulted in the GLIH group being surrounded by slab blocks and tower blocks of a much larger scale and modern / contemporary appearance.

However, it should be noted that recent development has sought to respect the historic group. The recently completed Park Plaza County Hall, Addington Street is separated from the hospital by a 3 storey annex which creates a suitable transition of scale and massing between the Park Plaza’s 16 storey tower and the GLIH; such a treatment was deemed by the Council essential to ensure that the historic building is not overwhelmed by new development of a much larger scale.

Similarly with the refurbishment scheme at Prospect House, 75 – 77 York Road, where the Council sought to restrict the height of the podium extension so that it did not overwhelm the setting of the GLIH group. In both cases the protection of the setting and architectural / historic integrity of the historic group was the Council’s objective.

With regard the setting and wider townscape contribution of the hospital the nurses hostel and the Park Plaza Annex to Addington Street each performs a similar function in terms of its scale and massing, allowing the GLIH room on either side and a sense of space above and around. Such a setting is
fundamental in preserving both the setting and the special interest of the listed building within the context of the surrounding urban form.

South Bank Conservation Area
The South Bank Conservation Area lies on the other side of York Road. The principle views out of the conservation area are across York Road and across Forum Magnum Square. The view of the GLIH group is deemed to contribute to the setting of the Conservation Area. The character appraisal within the South Bank Conservation Area Statement (adopted 2007) states:

York Road is an urban corridor with four lanes of traffic, including bus lanes and wide pavements. The boundary of the conservation area runs down the middle of the road. Large-scale commercial 1960s buildings line its N and S sides. The development is similar in scale to the low parts of the Shell Centre and County Hall blocks giving a sense of enclosure to the street. At the S end, facing Forum Magnum Square, is the former Lying-in Hospital (architect H Harrison) a three storey late Georgian building and its good Neo-Georgian neighbour (architect E Turner Powell) both of which provide an attractive termination of the view E out of Forum Magnum Square.

The view from the South East end of Forum Magnum Square is probably the best one of the hospital group and allows an appreciation of their facades and the space above and around the buildings.

Contribution of the nurses hostel
The GLIH building and nurses hostel together explain the evolution and function of maternity care in the 19th and early 20th Centuries. The hostel complements the hospital architecturally and provides an understated / subdued neighbour of sympathetic form and design which enhances the setting of the hospital and contributes to its special interest in the widest sense. The two also have townscape value in terms of the wider locality – providing a modest ‘landmark’ historic group at the corner of an otherwise undistinguished modern street.

Replacement of the nurses hostel
The demolition of the nurses hostel in order to facilitate the erection of the proposal scheme is unacceptable in terms of the harm it will cause to the special interest of the GLIH.

The hospital and nurses hostel explain historic maternity care; the loss of the hostel would thus rob the hospital of its historic integrity and thus harm its special interest as a building of special historic interest. There would also be loss to the architectural interest of the hospital - the nurses hostel currently complements and reinforces the architectural integrity of the hospital by offering a built form of sympathetic scale and exhibiting materials and fine detailing which are shared and complementary – brickwork, Georgian style sash windows and Neo-Classical proportions in terms of solid-void ratios, and rhythms. There would also be diminution in terms of the townscape contribution to the wider locality if the nurses hostel was to be lost; the hospital would become isolated and alone and a dominant and alien contemporary landscape.

Planning Policy
PPG15 states:
C.7 Modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation… Successful extensions require the application of an intimate knowledge of the building type that is being extended together with a sensitive handling of scale and detail.

UDP Policy 45 states that consent for alterations and extensions to listed buildings may be granted where the result preserves the special interest of the building. The policy states that where extensions are necessary, they must relate sensitively to the original building. The policy goes on to state that development which adversely affects the setting of a listed building, or significant views of a listed building, will be refused.

Impact of the proposal on special interest of the Hospital

1. Building form, height and mass
It is accepted that the new building is noticeably reduced when compared to the previous scheme and that the applicant has gone to some length to create a scheme that sits more comfortably with the GLIH. However, our in principle concerns remain in relation to the loss of the nurses accommodation.

2. Relationship with the GLIH
The proposal is essentially an extension to the listed building – both elements functioning as a single hotel entity. However, the proposal building has a contemporary ‘stand alone’ form, height and treatment that make no attempt to reconcile the fact that it is an extension to a Grade II listed building. The casual observer would have no idea that the two are related. This, in our view, is unacceptable and further alienates the listed building from its wider townscape.

Impact on the special interest of the Listed building – Interior

Existing Interior
The GLIH building is laid out symmetrically from the main entrance to York Road. From the portico an entrance vestibule leads to a central hallway beyond which is a transverse corridor running left to right and serving the ground floor. To either side of the central hallway are rooms and behind each of these are staircases which are accessed off the transverse corridor. The left staircase serves the first floor and the right staircase serves the basement and the first floor.

Archive drawings from the 1870s show that the building has changed little since that time with the following exceptions:

1. The stairwells were originally completely contained within rooms and accessed through doorways from the corridor. By the 1950s the party wall between each stairwell and the corridor had been removed. Similarly the wall between the left staircase and the central hallway had also been removed by that time. This work appears to date from the late 19th or early 20th Century.

2. In 1879 an additional storey was added to the building in a sympathetic manner. This additional floor and its roof are accessed by new secondary stairwells from first floor level. The secondary stairwells are located to the extreme left and right sides of the building and appear to date from the late 19th or early 20th Century.
In 2002 the building, which was in very poor condition and ‘at risk’, was subject to a major refurbishment to facilitate a change of use. This work was sympathetically undertaken with restoration and repairs to original joinery and plasterwork. A lift was installed to the remaining part of the central hall.

Despite these changes the historic, symmetrical plan form of pre 1878 remains substantially unaltered and is very likely to be the original 1828 plan. Many of the additions are themselves of interest, especially the secondary stairs which exhibit attractive tiling.

**Proposed Interior**
Basement – the proposal would remove partition walls within the basement and remove the basement stair. The basement stair is shown in its location on the 1878 plan. It is a cantilever stair in stone with iron balusters which suggest a 19th Century / early 20th Century date.

First Floor & Second Floor – the proposal would remove the left secondary staircase which exhibits good robust ironwork and attractive glazed tiling.

**PPG15 states:**

3.5 The issues that are generally relevant to the consideration of all listed building consent applications are:

- **ii.** the particular physical features of the building (which may include its design, plan, materials or location) which justify its inclusion in the list: list descriptions may draw attention to features of particular interest or value, but they are not exhaustive and other features of importance (e.g. interiors) may come to light after the building’s inclusion in the list;

- **iii.** the building’s setting and its contribution to the local scene, which may be very important, e.g. where it forms an element in a group, park, garden or other townscape or landscape, or where it shares particular architectural forms or details with other buildings nearby;

- **iv.** the extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment (including other listed buildings).

**C.62 Staircases:** The removal or alteration of any historic staircase is not normally acceptable. The stair is often the most considerable piece of design within a building and can be important dating evidence. In retail premises, the removal of the lowest flight of stairs - which will preclude access to and use of upper floors -should not be allowed.

In conclusion we do not feel that the ground of refusal have been adequately addressed in terms of the loss of historic fabric and loss of the nurses hostel.

- **Crime Officer:** No response
- **Planning Policy team:**
  The site comprises the former Lying-In Hospital (a listed building) and associated former nurses accommodation. The facilities are surplus to
NHS requirements (although there has been more recent temporary use of the hospital building for training purposes). The existing use of the site should be considered as C2. The site is not the subject of an MDO designation. It is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and Waterloo Visitor Management Area.

The proposed development involves the creation of a 234 room hotel.

The key policies to consider in this case (other than those relating to design and conservation and highways) are:


Policy 3 resists the loss of Central London Supporting Activities in the CAZ where the existing use contributes to the character and function of the area. Supporting activities include local services such as hospitals, but in this case the former uses have been out of service for a number of years and cannot be considered to contribute to the character and function of the area. Policy 26 resists the loss of community facilities (including hospitals and residential training centres with the C2 use class) unless adequate planning obligations are secured to mitigate against their loss.

Policies 3 and 79 promote the development of activities which contribute to London’s role as a World City and Capital City and this includes hotels and other tourism facilities. Policy 28 identifies the Waterloo Visitor Management Area as an appropriate location for large hotels.

Policy 3 and 79 also encourage mixed use development in the CAZ, as defined in policy 20. Policy 20 states that a mix of compatible land uses should be retained and enhanced in the development of all sites in the CAZ. In this case, the proposed development does not include a mix of uses. However the proposed layout has been developed in order to maintain the integrity of the listed building internally and externally.

The main entrance to the hotel provides a publicly accessible use with significant ground floor window display and it is considered that this would satisfy the requirements of policy 19.

On balance, the redevelopment of the site as a hotel would contribute to the regeneration of the wider Waterloo area, subject to securing adequate planning obligations to mitigate against the loss of the C2 use and to ensuring the retention of an active frontage (entrance and window display) at street level. These comments are also subject to separate comments to be provided by design and conservation and highways colleagues, and the implementation team in relation to s106 contributions.

Finally, the scheme should include provision for the generation of 10% of predicted energy requirements in a renewable way in accordance with policy 34, and should incorporate sustainable design and construction principles in accordance with policy 35.
The application notes that a previous Lambeth planning refusal dated 07/11/08 was on the grounds that insufficient energy was derived from renewable sources. However the report then notes ‘due consideration has been given to each possible renewable technology in this strategy. It is not considered appropriate or feasible to extend the provision of renewable technologies beyond the 7% described here and this is clearly stated in the strategy’.

The report provides information on the different renewable technologies and assesses their suitability.

The proposed development is of 5, 13 and 15 storeys and the solar PV is proposed for the 15 storey block. No information is provided as to why solar PV is not being installed on the 5 and 13 storey elements of the development.

It is noted that the energy efficiency measures and gas fired CHP will deliver significant CO2 reductions, and the move to ensure the development can be joined up to an area CHP network is welcomed.

A BREEAM pre-assessment has been done using the BREEAM 2006 methodology which has now been superseded by BREEAM 2008. This updated methodology came into force on 1st August 2008.

Transport/Highways team;
I am concerned that deliveries will need to be made from Addington St or York Road and just want to be clear that TfL is satisfied that it will be possible for an agreement to be reached for this. Personally, I would be happier if the developer could provide an indication of how they intend to service the development prior to any planning consent because it could be problematic if consent were to be granted, the hotel constructed (or part constructed) but no agreement can be made regarding deliveries either with TfL or the adjacent hotel operator.

6. Policy Context

6.1 Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) sets out the Government's policy to provide for sustainable development through the planning system. PPS1 provides that planning authorities should:

- “promote urban and rural regeneration to improve the wellbeing of communities, improve facilities, promote high quality and safe development and create new opportunities for the people living in those communities…” (para 27(ii)); and
provide improved access for all to jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities, open space, sport and recreation, by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car…"

6.2 PPS1 further states, “Good design ensures attractive usable, durable and adaptable places and is a key element in achieving sustainable development. Good design is indivisible from good planning…. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.” (para. 33 and 34).

6.3 PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres) sets out the Government's key objectives for town centres. PPS6 states that the key objective is to promote their vitality and viability by:

- Planning for the growth and development of existing centres; and
- Promoting and enhancing existing centres, by focusing development in such centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all.

The main town centre uses to which this policy statement applies are:

- Retail (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres);
- Leisure, entertainment facilities, and the more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls);
- Offices, both commercial and those of public bodies; and
- Arts, culture and tourism (theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).

In addition, housing would be an important element in most mixed-use, multi storey developments.

6.4 PPG13 (Transport) deals with transport and particularly the way in which it integrates with the proper planning of the environment. It seeks to promote more sustainable transport choices and accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling and discourages the need to travel by car. Paragraph states that parking standards should not be expressed as minimums and requires planning authorities to revise parking standards to allow for lower levels of off street parking especially in locations which are served by good public transport.

6.5 PPG15 (Planning and the historic environment) states that the objective of the planning process should be to reconcile the need for economic growth with the need to protect the natural and historic environment. PPG15 advises that the desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should also be a material consideration in the planning authority's handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area. The Circular advises that issues relating to listed building consent applications are:
The importance of the building, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest and rarity, in both national and local terms.

The particular physical features of the building (which may include its design, plan, materials or location) which justify its inclusion in the list.

The building's setting and its contribution to the local scene, which may be very important, e.g. where it forms an element in a group, park, garden or other townscape or landscape, or where it shares particular architectural forms or details with other buildings nearby;

The extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment.

6.7 The London Plan is the Mayor’s spatial strategy, which seeks to accommodate significant growth in ways that respect and improve London’s diverse heritage while delivering a sustainable World City. It proposes to achieve this through sensitive intensification of development in locations well served by public transport.

6.8 The London Plan provides the strategic policy for London. Relevant policies in the London Plan:

- Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria
- Policy 2A.2 Opportunity Areas
- Policy 2A.5 Town Centres
- Policy 3C.22 Parking Strategy
- Policy 3B.1 Developing London’s Economy
- Policy 3B.10 Tourism industry
- Policy 4A.7 Energy efficiency and renewable energy
- Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- Policy 4B.3 Maximising the Potential of Sites
- Policy 4B.7 Respect local context and communities
- Policy 4B.10 London’s built heritage
- Policy 4B.11 Heritage conservation
- Policy 4B.16-17 Views

6.10 The Waterloo Opportunity Area Planning Framework (Waterloo OAPF) (CD7/3) was published by the Mayor in October 2007 and is Mayoral guidance supplementary to the London Plan. It is a material planning consideration for planning applications of a strategic scale and making decisions on the wider planning and development of Waterloo. The Waterloo OAPF identifies tall buildings in Waterloo to be suitable above and around Waterloo Station.

6.11 Relevant policies from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

- Policy 1 The Vision for Lambeth
- Policy 3 The Central London Activities Zone
- Policy 4 Town Centres and Community Regeneration
- Policy 6 Development of Brownfield sites
- Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 Transport Impact
- Policy 10 Walking and Cycling
6.12 The Council prepared a draft Waterloo Supplementary Planning Document in July 2008. The locational policies for tall buildings are based on London Plan policy, English Heritage/CABE guidance on tall buildings and a detailed analysis of the area. The draft Waterloo SPD encourages regeneration of Waterloo whilst protecting its built heritage and that of its surroundings, and enhancing the role of Waterloo as a world-renowned cultural destination. Following a consultation period late last year, the document will be reported to Cabinet for adoption in June 2009.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Land Use

7.1.1 The proposed development involves the creation of a 234 bed hotel with an ancillary restaurant.

7.1.2 The established use of the site is as a former hospital with 1,191m² of office/training floorspace ancillary to the main C2 use class (residential institutions). The applicant states that the facilities are surplus to NHS requirements, and as such the site has been sold by the hospital trust. The site is not the subject of an MDO designation. It is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and Waterloo Visitor Management Area.

7.1.3 UDP Policy 26 safeguards the loss of community facilities falling within the D1 use class. While the definition of community facilities includes hospitals, C2 use classes are not specifically safeguarded within the wording of the policy. Considering that the building has been largely vacant for some time and the hospital trust has sold the site off, being surplus to its needs, the principle of
redevelopment for a hotel use which is appropriate for the area is acceptable with regards to the provisions of UDP Policy 26.

7.1.4 UDP Policy 3 resists, in the CAZ, the loss of activities supporting the role of London as a World City where the existing use contributes to the character and function of the area. Activities include local services such as hospitals, but in this case the former uses have been out of service for a number of years and cannot be considered to contribute to the character and function of the area. The existing use is also seen as being surplus for the requirements of the hospital use. On the other hand the proposed hotel use is classified as an activity that contributes to London’s role as a World City, and is therefore an acceptable use under Policy 3. Taking this into account it is considered that the proposal ensures that the site would provide an activity that contributes to London’s role as a world class city.

7.1.5 UDP Policy 79 promotes the development of activities which contribute to London’s role as a World City and Capital City and this includes hotels and other tourism facilities. UDP Policy 28 identifies the Waterloo Visitor Management Area as an appropriate location for large hotels.

7.1.6 The proposed extension would include a curved, glazed entrance lobby to the hotel fronting York Road, set back behind a canopy. This is in line with UDP Policy 19 which requires that, along the main pedestrian routes in the Waterloo Visitor Management Area, development should have uses with active frontages open to the public, and that all street frontage buildings in these locations should have frontages and entrances orientated towards the street. Further, a secondary entrance to the hotel would utilise the existing front entrance of the hospital building which would increase and enhance the active frontage.

7.1.7 UDP Policy 23 states that where land is or has last been in employment use, loss of floorspace to non-employment use will not be permitted. Although the policy states that the above is primarily to safeguard B1 business floorspace, it should be noted that the hospital building contains office space that is ancillary to the main C2 hospital use class. Fully utilised, the 1191m² of office floorspace could accommodate 63 employees (based on the English Partnerships 2001 document ‘Employment Densities’ calculation of 1 employee per 19m² of office floorspace). However, the proposed 234 room hotel would generate 123 employees (based on the English Partnerships 2001 document ‘Employment Densities’ calculation of 1 employee per 2 hotel rooms). The proposal would therefore result in an uplift in employment for the locality and be fully in accordance with the provisions UDP Policy 23.

7.1.8 On balance, the proposed mix of uses is considered acceptable on this site and would contribute to the regeneration of the wider Waterloo area, subject to securing adequate planning obligations. The proposal would ensure that the land continues to be in employment use, whilst introducing an activity that contributes to London’s role of as a World City and bringing a listed building back into use along with an active frontage.

7.2 Design and Conservation Area Considerations

The General Lying-In Hospital
7.2.1 The General Lying-In Hospital (GLIH) was statutorily listed at Grade II on 27 March 1981. The list description states:

*Early-Mid C19. Two storeys, attic and basement, 7 windows on west front. Red brick with stuccoed attic storey above entablature, and stuccoed recessed 3-bar centre, treated as full height tetrastyle Ionic portico in antis. Stuccoed pilasters at angles of side sections. Inscription in frieze: GENERAL LYING-IN HOSPITAL, UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HER MAJESTY AND HRH THE PRINCESS OF WALES. Replaced sash windows with glazing bars, outer ones in moulded architraves. Central flight of steps to porch, and double door side lights. Similar south elevation but without porch and with alterations to attic storey. Wrought iron area railings.*

7.2.2 The hospital building (1828) was designed by Henry Harrison and built at a cost of £3,000. It is in the Neo-Classical style typical of the late Georgian period. The adjoining nurses’ accommodation (1930-33) is in brick and has four storeys with a mansard and is in the Neo-Georgian style. The ground floor is treated in faïence with a decorative porch and keystone and the windows are traditional timber sliding sashes with Georgian style glazing. Those to the central bay have segmental heads.

**Listed building consent; works to the interior and exterior of the General Lying-In Hospital (GLIH)**

**Internal works**

7.2.3 Internal works proposed to the hospital building for which listed building consent is required are; the removal of a staircase and partition walls in the basement; the removal of a lift shaft, party walls and toilet cubicles on the ground, first and second floors; the provision of a restaurant in basement; internal links to the new structure at ground, first, second and third floor levels; new internal partitions and glazing; and new servicing, lighting, heating and drainage.

7.2.4 The previous listed building application involved the removal of the primary staircases running through the building, along with the removal of internal walls within the ground floor to make way for a reception and circulation areas. These changes were deemed unacceptable and would have harmed the special interest of the listed building, which was contrary to the provisions of PPG 15 and UDP Policy 45.

7.2.5 For the current application the primary staircases retained along with internal walls on the ground floor. In doing so, the historic plan layout and circulation of the building has been respected. Subject to conditions requiring full details of materials, finishing, and workmanship to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, the proposed internal changes are acceptable with regards to the special interest of the listed building.

**External works**

7.2.6 External works proposed to the hospital building for which listed building consent is required are; the replacement of later and unsympathetic windows with in keeping joinery and glazing; the restoration of the double leaf front
doors; the removal of brick the clad rear extensions and staircase and replacement with a glazed stair enclosure; the section of altered rear (east) and part of (north) wing to be removed to accommodate the service stair, lift, and new build extension.

7.2.7 Notwithstanding the replacement nurses accommodation which is discussed later in this report, proposed external changes are considered to be sensitive and in keeping with the special interest of the building. The Proposed works to the exterior to the rear of the building would merely be removing later additions that add little to the special interest and are not objected to. Conditions are attached requiring full details and samples of all external materials and finishing, together with a schedule of all works, including specifications of the tools to be used and joinery to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

The nurses accommodation

7.2.8 The nurses accommodation is not listed in its own right. The building was considered for listing in 2003. However the English Heritage Inspectors report concluded that the building was ‘not of sufficient architectural or historic interest to merit listing’, and the Department of Culture Media and Sport declined to list the building. It should also be noted that the statutory list description of the GLIH (see para 7.2.1) makes no mention of the nurses accommodation. Nevertheless, the accommodation, in terms of its historical relationship with the GLIH and evidence of a physical link structure joining the two buildings on 1 July 1948 confers the listing protection of the 1828 building and is considered to be a curtilage structure. Therefore any application to demolish the building together with a replacement structure would be considered as an extension/alteration to a listed building and as such the provisions of UDP Policy 45 and PPG15 would apply.

Urban Context

7.2.9 The development of the County Hall annex complex in the 1930s and a great deal of comprehensive redevelopment in the post-war decades has resulted in the hospital building and nurses accommodation being surrounded by development of a considerably larger scale and massing and with more contemporary appearances.

7.2.10 The mid 20th Century North and South blocks of County Hall, opposite the site on York Road are 7 storeys in height and have a considerable visual prominence due to the continual frontages and unbroken facades they present to the street scene.

7.2.11 The 13 storey Addington Street apart-hotel immediately to the east of the site, and the 16 storey Island Block on the site of the former County Hall extension are both imposing structures of considerable proportions, and represent the largest and most contemporary additions to the immediate urban context.

7.2.12 Whilst much of the surrounding development is of a wholly different scale, massing and design to the hospital building, it should be noted that recent development has sought to respect the historic building. The Addington Street apartahotel is separated from the hospital by a 3 storey annex which creates
a transition of scale and massing between the Park Plaza’s 13 storey tower and the hospital building. In doing this, the newer development to the west visually acknowledges the smaller scale and massing of the hospital building.

7.2.13 Similarly with the refurbishment scheme at Prospect House immediately to the north (75 – 79 York Road), the Council sought to restrict the height of the podium extension so that it did not overwhelm the setting of the hospital building. The use of a podium structure, of a similar height to the hospital building and nurses accommodation, with larger massing behind, allows the two different scales to sit together in a manner which ensures the lower scale of the hospital building and nurses accommodation that front York Road are respected when viewed from the streetscene. This lower massing on York Road plays a vital role in drawing the eye away from the taller massing behind.

Replacement of the nurses accommodation and impact of replacement structure upon hospital building

7.2.14 The nurses’ accommodation currently complements the architectural integrity of the hospital by offering a built form of sympathetic scale. The 1930s buildings use of materials and Georgian style sash windows respect the setting of the hospital building. Any replacement structure would have to be of an outstanding quality of design, with proportions, massing and materials that complement and respect the setting and special interest of the hospital building.

7.2.15 PPG15 states: -

'C.7 Modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation… Successful extensions require the application of an intimate knowledge of the building type that is being extended together with a sensitive handling of scale and detail.'

7.2.16 UDP Policy 45 states that consent for alterations and extensions to listed buildings may be granted where the result preserves the special interest of the building. The policy states that where extensions are necessary, they must relate sensitively to the original building. The policy goes on to state that development which adversely affects the setting of a listed building, or significant views of a listed building, should be refused.

7.2.17 Policy 41 states that permission will not be granted for developments which detract from important views, backdrops or settings of listed buildings.

7.2.18 The proposed replacement structure would be part four, part thirteen and part fifteen storeys in height and would link through to the ground, first, second and third floors of the hospital building.

7.2.19 The four storey element fronting York Road would abut, and be of a lower height to the podium structure of Prospect House and follow the same building line from where it would curve in as it nears the flank wall of the hospital building, creating the appearance that this structure is ‘turning a corner’, before terminating 10m behind the main front wall of the hospital building.
7.2.20 The part thirteen and fifteen storey element would be set a minimum of 700mm from the flank wall of the hospital building to the south. On plan form this element would follow on from the four storey element to the west, with its south wall gently curved so that the eastern and western elements would be set further back from the hospital building than the tallest fifteen storey central element, and be angled away from the listed building.

7.2.21 The previous refused scheme was five storeys fronting York Road, rising up to sixteen storeys in height at the rear of the site. The rear of the first, second and third floors of the building would have wrapped behind the hospital building by 9m. The rear-most element of the fourth to fifteenth floors would have wrapped behind the GLIH by 1.5m. The entire sixteen storey south elevation would also have presented a near continuous vertical wall that directly abutted the listed building, finished in predominately dark material.

7.2.22 It was considered that the previous scheme would have harmed the setting of the hospital building by means of its height bulk and scale and design. It was held that the abrupt termination of the taller elements of the building in such close proximity to the hospital building would have resulted in a stark contrast of scales between the two built forms. The sheer wall, facing the hospital building would have created a ‘cliff edge’ type effect that would have failed to acknowledge the lower massing of the listed building and left the structure visually isolated. The tallest sixteen storey elements would have further exacerbated this, being compounded by the use of dark materials which would have been at odds with the much lighter finishing of the hospital building.

7.2.23 The proposed five storey structure fronting York Road would have projected 3m further forwards than the hospital building façade and as a result it would have presented a blank rendered return flank to the hospital building that would have been highly visible from the south. It was held that, although similar in proportion to the nurses accommodation and hospital building, the forward projection onto York Road taken with the unusual and top heavy design would have been at odds with, and harmful to the setting of the listed building. The two structures would have been completely at odds with each other, with the podium sitting at an awkward angle to the hospital building, and completely failing to acknowledge the listed building in any way other than its height.

7.2.24 It should be noted that, with reference to the previous refused scheme, representations received from English Heritage considered that the higher sixteen storey element was not objectionable with regards to the listed building. Rather, English Heritage considered that the lower podium structure had the greatest implications in terms of the impact upon the listed building due to its immediate presence in the streetscene.

7.2.25 The current application includes the following design changes as compared to the refused scheme.

- Reduction in overall bulk and height
- Removal of bulk to rear of the site
- Increase in proportion of visible sky to the rear of the site
- Curving of the York Road element to reduce impact at street level
- Lighter materials
7.2.26 The revised proposal also aims to be lighter in appearance and lighter in bulk with increased areas of sky being visible around the proposals. The curving four storey element to York Road was introduced for a number of reasons:

- To pull away from the hospital building and let the listed building ‘stand alone’
- To give breathing space between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ building
- To reveal more of the hospital building
- To give space back at street level
- To form a curved termination to the massing that would be sympathetic to the listed building

7.2.27 Immediately adjoining the nurses building is Prospect House (75 – 77 York Road). This is a 1960s building which has recently been extended and enlarged. The form, height and massing of this proposal reflects that of Prospect House in order to avoid any adverse impact on its architectural integrity and outlook. Where the refused scheme abruptly terminated to the south when abutting the hospital building, the current scheme presents a curve to this south elevation. This is done in direct acknowledgement of the hospital building, to avoid a ‘cliff edge’ or an insensitive termination of scale occurring.

7.2.28 As stated earlier, the tallest element of the scheme has been reduced in height and bulk, with the removal of the rear ‘wrap around section’. The result is a structure with retains more open sky around it and allows glimpses of sky behind and above the hospital building when seen from Forum Magnum Square to the south. This prevents the hospital building from sitting in front of a backdrop of almost continuous modern high-rise development.

7.2.29 The use of light materials prevents the replacement building from appearing overbearing or drawing the eye away from the hospital building which is itself finished in predominately light coloured materials. The use of reflective glazing would allow reflections of the sky to further lessen the visual impact of the building.

7.2.30 The proposed podium element fronting York Road would be curved around behind the front wall of the hospital building, to create the impression of a distinct separation between the two buildings. This emphasises the separation and gives the hospital building space to be viewed separately. The curve also eliminates the blank return elevation that projected forwards of the hospital building and was considered unacceptable with regards to the previous application. The reduction in height ensures that this structure would appear subservient in height to the hospital building.

7.2.31 The detailed design and fenestration of the podium structure has been kept simple, with light coloured materials to avoid visually competing with the detailed finishing of the hospital building structure. The use of pillars to support a recessed canopy on the ground floor leading to the entrance has direct references, although on a more modest scale, to the portico of the hospital building.

7.2.32 The Waterloo area is typified by a diverse and dense range of building types, scales, uses and ages. It is considered that the proposed replacement
structure has been sensitively designed so as to respond to, and respect the character and setting of the hospital building. As such the extension would ensure that the special interest of the listed building would be preserved, and the application accords with the provisions of UDP Policy 45 and PPG 15, whilst ensuring that the long term use of the building is safeguarded.

Impact of the scale and massing of the building on the adjacent Conservation Area

7.2.33 In accordance with the provisions of UDP Policy 47 and the content of PPG15, any development outside Conservation Areas should not harm the setting of the area or harm views into or from that area.

7.2.34 The site is directly adjacent to the South Bank Conservation Area, the eastern boundary of which runs down the centre of York Road. The Conservation Area contains a variety of built forms and open spaces, many with distinct characters. In the vicinity of the application site Forum Magnum Square is framed to the north and south by post modern blocks with Neo-Classical detailing, with the Grade II* listed County Hall Building facing the hospital building at the west of the square.

7.2.35 The Council has a formally adopted (2007) Conservation Area Statement that is a material consideration. The Conservation Area Statement lists the hospital building as a building which adjoins and contributes to the character of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Statement states that the hospital building, and its good Neo-Georgian Neighbour (nurses accommodation), both provide an attractive termination of the view east out of Forum Magnum Square.

7.2.36 The view of the hospital building is deemed to contribute to the setting of the Conservation Area. The character appraisal within the South Bank Conservation Area Statement states: -

York Road is an urban corridor with four lanes of traffic, including bus lanes and wide pavements. The boundary of the conservation area runs down the middle of the road. Large-scale commercial 1960s buildings line its N and S sides. The development is similar in scale to the low parts of the Shell Centre and County Hall blocks giving a sense of enclosure to the street. At the S end, facing Forum Magnum Square, is the former Lying-in Hospital (architect H Harrison) a three storey late Georgian building and its good Neo-Georgian neighbour (architect E Turner Powell) both of which provide an attractive termination of the view E out of Forum Magnum Square.

7.2.37 The replacement structure would be seen in views out from Forum Magnum square, and in views onto the Conservation area along York Road.

7.2.38 It is considered that the view out from Forum Magnum Square to the east would not be harmed by the proposed replacement structure. The hospital building directly faces the square, and views towards it would not be obscured. It is accepted that whilst the structure would be taller than the existing building, it would not be fully visible from many views to the east of the site, as it sits opposite the North Block of County Hall rather than opposite the square. Large amounts of sky would still be visible in views out of Forum
Magnum Square. Further, the square is already dominated by large imposing buildings, and the erection of the building as proposed would not harm either the setting, or views into or from the Conservation Area. The proposed building is of a high quality design quality, and its slim form prevents the setting of the listed building and views from the Conservation Area being effected.

7.2.39 Members should also note that although the existing nurses building appears to be a late 19\textsuperscript{th} Century building, it was in fact built in the 1930s. The Secretary of State has also refused to list the building specifically because of its lack of design merit. If it was not for the fact that it was within the curtilage of the listed building, it could be demolished without the need for consent. Planning officers are of the view that the proposed structure is an improvement in design terms to that currently on site. Members attention is also brought to the fact that English Heritage would have preferred a façade retention scheme with a new building emerging from the rear of the nurses building. This idea was considered to be banal in design terms (an example can be seen in the Design and Access Statement) and has not been pursued by officers.

**Impact of the scale and massing of the building on the surrounding townscape**

7.2.40 UDP Policy 33 requires that Major development should relate satisfactorily to the adjacent townscape, taking into account its scale, character, historic street layout and uses.

7.2.41 The townscape along York Road consists predominately of tall and medium rise buildings built close onto pedestrian footway. Towards the north end of York Road the buildings are taller, with the Shell Centre and Elizabeth House featuring most prominently. The North and South Block of County Hall are imposing buildings, as is Prospect House (75-79 York Road). The podium structure of Prospect House ensures that the massing of the hospital building and Nurses Accommodation is continued north along York Road from Addington Street to Leake Street.

7.2.42 The footprint of the proposed replacement structure would be similar to that of the nurses’ accommodation that it would replace, whilst the four storey podium element fronting York Road would be similar in height to the existing structure. Although the fifteen storey structure behind would be taller than the building it replaces, it would be similar in height to many other buildings in the immediate vicinity, and smaller than buildings further north along York Road.

7.2.43 The Proportions of the proposed replacement structure follow the podium and tower format as described above. The four and fifteen storey elements continue the form of Prospect House (75-79 York Road). The general massing of the proposal follows the form of the surrounding townscape which is typified of buildings of a considerable scale, many of them over 30m tall, and is not objected to. The proposed extension would not appear at odds with the surrounding townscape.

**Tall buildings and impact upon views**
7.2.44 Policies 4B.1, 4B.3, 4B.8 and 4B.9 in the London Plan and Policy 40 in the UDP address issues that cover tall buildings. London Plan Policies 4B.16-18 and UDP Policy 41 address views. The Lambeth draft Waterloo SPD and the Waterloo Opportunity Area Planning Framework (WOAPF) give specific guidance regarding tall buildings in the Waterloo area.

7.2.45 Policy 40 of the UDP defines tall buildings as those over 30m (when not adjacent to the River Thames). It states that tall buildings should not be located where they would harm the character or settings of conservation areas, listed buildings, historic or characterful parks, riverscape and townscape, strategic views and locally significant views, and the Palace of Westminster World Heritage site.

7.2.46 Policy 40 of the UDP also states that high buildings are more likely to be acceptable in locations where they will make a significant contribution to the focus and momentum of regeneration or which have high public accessibility and capacity. For sites suitable for tall buildings, proposals would need to meet the design objectives of policy 40 which state that tall buildings should be of the highest architectural and constructional quality and should enhance the skyline through profile and use of materials. Bulky or solid structures will not be acceptable and any new building should be constructed to a high standard of quality and design, and vision from the architect.

7.2.47 Policy 40 also in turn refers to tall building guidance provided by CABE and English Heritage. These set out a list of criteria for evaluating tall building proposals, requiring them to relate to their wider context, creating a positive relationship with the existing landscape. Proposals would therefore be expected to relate to their wider context, creating a positive relationship with the existing landscape. Emphasis is therefore placed on a proposals impact on the local environment including both in terms of the protection of the areas built heritage and the amenity of the local environment, as well as the mitigation of wind turbulence.

7.2.48 The proposal would have a maximum height of 49.84m (AOD). The location has excellent public transport accessibility (PTAL 6b). As stated previously, the building would not harm the character or setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, or the listed hospital building. Officers consider the design is of the highest standard.

7.2.49 The Waterloo Opportunity Area Planning Framework (WOAPF) identifies the site as within a key area (zone 3) suitable for development of tall buildings, and establishes that development on the site needs to respect local views of County Hall and the designated view from Victoria Embankment and consider the impact upon the Palace of Westminster world heritage site.

7.2.50 The draft Waterloo SPD sets out design evaluation for tall buildings, proposing that tall buildings should, *inter alia*, not harm the setting or views of conservation areas, historic assets or London Wide views, relate to local character and have outstanding design.

7.2.51 The GLA London View Management Framework (LVMF) is a material consideration in determining planning applications. The LVMF Identifies London Panoramas, Linear Views, River views and Townscape views. The site does not fall in any protected vistas from either the Primrose Hill or Parliament Square panoramas, nor does it fall in any linear views. There is
however potential for the building to be seen in river views from Westminster bridge looking downstream (view 18B.1), and from Victoria Embankment looking towards County Hall (View 20A.1). Information has been submitted showing how the proposed structure would not rise above the roofline of County Hall when seen from these views and as such it would have no detrimental impact.

7.2.52 There is potential that the building could be seen from Parliament Square World Heritage Site looking east. Information has been submitted indicating that the proposed structure would not rise above the roofline of County Hall when seen from Parliament Square.

7.2.53 Officers are satisfied that the proposed building would have no material impact upon any of these views, vistas, panoramas or from the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site.

7.2.54 A wind microclimate study has been submitted with the application. Officers are satisfied with the content of the study, which concludes that the proposed building would not result in significant change in local wind conditions from those already experienced, and which are acceptable.

7.2.55 Taking the above into account the proposed tall building is acceptable with regards to the provisions of UDP Policies 40 and 41, London Plan Policies 4B.16-18, the LVMF, the WOAPF and the draft Waterloo SPD.

Design and Conservation Area Conclusions

7.2.56 Officers consider that the applicants have addressed the reasons for which the previous application was refused and that the current scheme preserves the setting and character of the hospital building and views into and out of the adjoining South Bank conservation area. The loss of the nurses building is considered acceptable as it is not within the nearby Conservation Area, not listed in its own right, and has insufficient merit in design terms for its retention. The replacement building is ell designed and is considered to be an improvement on the existing building. The works to the listed building are considered sympathetic and welcome. It is considered that the scheme would preserve important local and strategic views, and would sit comfortably within the surrounding townscape.

7.3 Refuse

7.3.1 Policy 56 of the UDP seeks to ensure that adequate provision for refuse and recycling storage is made within new developments. The Council’s guidance for ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ also provides a more comprehensive guide to waste storage provision.

7.3.2 An internal refuse storage area is proposed to the rear of the building, with access to the rear courtyard. The refuse stores would be secure and situated in the most convenient location for refuse collection. It is considered that adequate space has been provided in an accessible location for the storage of waste and recyclable materials.
7.4 Residential Amenity

Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing

7.4.1 UDP Policy 33 requires consideration of the impacts of new developments on the amenities of existing and adjoining residential occupiers. In assessing daylight and sunlight impacts of the proposed development upon existing residential neighbours, Policy 33 states that regard will be had to the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight Sunlight’.

7.4.2 The BRE has developed a series of quantitative tests for daylight, which if all are failed, the development could be considered unacceptable in terms of loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. One of the tests used in this case is the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), which measures the amount of available daylight from the sky received at a particular window. It states that “if the Vertical Sky Component, with the new development in place, is less than 27%, and less than 0.8 times its former value, then occupants of the existing building would notice a reduction in the amount of skylight”. If the remaining vertical sky component (VSC) is greater than 27% then enough skylight should still be reaching the windows of the existing building. The maximum VSC value obtainable at a flat window in a vertical wall is 40%.

7.4.3 If a development fails the VSC test, a ‘Daylight Factor’ (ADF) test should be undertaken. The BRE guidelines suggest that a minimum daylight factor (df) of 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1.0% for bedrooms should be achieved in order for satisfactory levels of interior daylight to be maintained in existing neighbouring properties.

7.4.4 The application includes a study of the daylight and sunlight impact of the development on the existing surrounding residential properties. The study analyses 5 ‘points’ which represent the nearest residential windows to the development site which are most likely to be effected.

Existing surrounding residential properties

7.4.5 The surrounding existing residential properties that could potentially be materially affected by sunlight/daylight by the proposal are the property to the south of the 11th floor of Prospect House (75-79 York Road), and properties within the County Hall North and South blocks that front York Road.

7.4.6 The applicants’ sunlight and daylight report states that a good level of daylight and sunlight would be retained to the neighbouring properties across York Road in County Hall North and South blocks, and for the 11th floor of Prospect House.

7.4.7 An independent specialist consultancy has been instructed to verify the information provided and assess whether the impact on the levels on sunlight and daylight received into the surrounding properties would be acceptable.

7.4.8 The consultant has confirmed that all data in the applicant’s sunlight/daylight study is correct and is satisfied that all rooms to surrounding residential properties would retain acceptable levels of daylight, with the acceptable ADF
standards being met for all residential rooms facing the proposed development.

7.4.9 The Councils independent consultant is satisfied that all rooms orientated towards the south would remain affected by less than 20% in terms of reduction in sunlight or retain in excess of 25 annual probable sunlight hours, and is satisfied that these rooms would retain sufficient sunlight.

7.4.10 The consultant concludes that the proposal allows high levels of daylight and sunlight to be retained to the adjoining properties.

**Overlooking and sense of enclosure**

7.4.11 UDP Policy 33 requires that development should protect residential amenity of existing and future residents by ensuring acceptable standards of privacy and not creating an undue sense of enclosure. Adopted SPD ‘Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and Housing Conversions’ explains and provides further guidance with regards to overlooking and sense of enclosure.

**Overlooking**

7.4.12 The closest windows that would face the windows of the properties across York Road would have a minimum separation of one another of at least 21.5m. The upper thirteen storey element would be set back by 25m. Considering the central urban setting of the development, this arrangement is satisfactory and would not result in any unacceptable issues of overlooking for the residential properties across York Road.

7.4.13 The new structure would abut the boundary with adjacent property 75-79 York Road (Prospect House), which contains 11th floor residential use. The resultant structure would sit close to the south elevation of the southern most property on the 11th floor, which contains a living room with windows facing the hotel. There would be one column of windows facing the property, set back 4m from its glazing. The remaining hotel rooms on the north elevation have been designed so the windows do not face this 11th floor residential property. A condition is attached requiring the windows facing the 11th floor residential property to be obscurely glazed to protect residential amenity, and as such there would be no unacceptable issues of overlooking for this property.

**Sense of enclosure**

7.4.14 The residential properties directly across York Road from the proposed new structure would sit 21.5m from the four storey front element and 25m from the taller thirteen storey element. This arrangement is considered acceptable in relation to the scale of the proposal to ensure that no sense of enclosure occurs for any of these properties.

7.4.15 The new structure would sit close to the boundary with adjacent property 75-79 York Road (Prospect House), which contains 11th floor residential use. The south elevation of this 11th floor residential use contains a living room, set back behind a balcony. This living room would face the proposed hotel which would, in part, rise up a further two storeys. The previous application was refused as the hotel would have been directly adjacent to this south elevation,
followed the boundary line, and risen up a further three storeys. This was considered unacceptable with regards to the residential amenity of this property. For the current revised scheme, the building has been reduced in height by one storey, and the western element angled away from this property to increase outlook. The design and access statement contains rendered views from within this 11th floor property looking towards the south to indicate the outlook that would remain for this property. Officers are satisfied that the changes to the scheme retain sufficient outlook for this residential property and ensure that its residents would not be unacceptably enclosed by the proposal.

7.5 Sustainability

UDP Policy 34, Energy

7.5.1 Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan seeks to achieve sustainable design and construction in accordance with the ultimate aim of reducing carbon dioxide emissions as set out in Policy 4A.1 of the London Plan. Alterations to this document include policies on reducing carbon dioxide (CO²) emissions by 20% through the use of on-site renewable energy generation for new development. Policy 34 of the UDP requires all major development to incorporate equipment for renewable power generation so as to offset at least 10% of their predicted CO² emissions.

7.5.2 Policy 4A.4 of the London Plan and Lambeth’s adopted “Sustainable Design and Construction” SPD advocate that major applications should include an energy strategy indicating CO² savings below a base rate calculation following the, “be lean, be clean, be green” hierarchy:

- Be Lean: The reduction of energy demand and CO² emissions from using less energy, in particular by adopting sustainable and passive design and construction measures;
- Be Clean: Proposals for the reduction of energy demand and CO² emissions through supplying energy efficiently, including the feasibility of Combined heat and Power (CHP) / Combined Cooling, Heating and Power Systems (CCHP);
- Be Green: Details of renewable energy technologies to be incorporated in the development, demonstrating that CO² emissions from expected energy use will be reduced by a minimum of 10% (The London Plan target is 20%) through on site renewable energy generation.

7.5.3 The applicant has sought to comply with the London Plan requirement of offsetting at least 20% of their predicted CO² emissions. An Energy Statement has been submitted with the application that appraises a range of energy technologies as potential on site energy generation sources, and an assessment using the above criteria. The energy statement proposes passive design and energy efficiency measures, a CHP unit and solar thermal photovoltaics and ground source heat pumps as on site renewable technology. The breakdown of the carbon savings using the above criteria is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technologies</th>
<th>CO2 savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.5.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement over Baseline emissions</th>
<th>used (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings from energy efficiency (be Lean)</td>
<td>Energy efficiency measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from CHP (be Clean)</td>
<td>Gas fired CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from renewables (Biofuel boiler and solar-thermal) (be Green)</td>
<td>Ground Source Heat Pump and Solar PV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.5 The report indicates that a total CO² savings over the baseline calculation of 27.7% can be achieved, with 7% of those coming from on site renewable energy technologies.

7.5.6 Council and GLA officers are principally in favour of the intent of the energy scheme, and the overall reduction of 27.7% CO² emissions over baseline emissions is commendable. However, concerns have been raised regarding the use of solar thermal collectors, and clarification is needed regarding the feasibility of using Ground Source Heat Pumps on the site. A s106 obligation is therefore attached requiring an energy and sustainability report to be submitted prior to construction to demonstrate that the above technologies (or some other alternative) can produce at least the above requirements in terms of CO² emissions and on site renewable energy technologies.

7.5.7 The application site lies within the planned district heat network for the Southbank area. The applicant has stated that the proposed energy systems would be designed to enable future connection to this system. It is proposed that this is obligated through the s106 agreement.

7.5.8 Taking the above into account, it is considered that the development is in principle acceptable with regards to the provisions of UDP Policy 34.

**UDP Policy 35, Sustainable Design and Construction**

7.5.9 Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan sets out measures that should be incorporated into developments to ensure that they meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction. UDP Policy 35 states that development proposals should demonstrate how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

7.5.10 Lambeth’s adopted “Sustainable Design and Construction” SPD sets out the minimum standards to be met for various types of development. The minimum standard for hotel development is BREEAM Bespoke.

7.5.11 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Assessment with the application that sets out to address how sustainable design and construction principles are integrated into the proposal. This tackles the design of the development, the use of materials, the mitigation of micro effects, waste and other issues.
7.5.12 It is considered that BREEAM Bespoke post construction certificates should be submitted to the Council prior to occupation to ensure that the above standards are met, and that the provisions of UDP Policy 34 are adhered to.

7.6 Safety and Secure by Design

7.6.1 Policy 32 of the UDP seeks to ensure that proposed developments enhance community safety and no not create opportunities for crime or result in an increase in the risk of public disorder.

7.6.2 The Crime Prevention Officer has been consulted but has yet to provide comments. A Condition is suggested requiring details of how the scheme would comply with Secure by Design principles.

7.6.3 A further condition is suggested requiring full details of measures to mitigate against the impacts of terrorism to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7.7 Highways and Transportation Issues

7.7.1 TfL are the public transport authority and also the Highway Authority for Addington Street and York Road.

Drop off facilities

7.7.2 Whilst TfL acknowledge that it is legal for London Taxis to pick up/drop off on either a red route, or bus stop, this should be discouraged. TfL does not consider the option to pick up/drop at Waterloo Station to be feasible in this location, and instead would encourage continued dialogue with the developers of the 1 Westminster Bridge proposal to share the taxi pick up/drop off area. Alternatively, pre-booked (by the hotel) taxis should be directed to the rear courtyard accessed via the Park Plaza hotel. This will need to be secured by use of a planning obligation, but would have to be agreed with the operators of the neighbouring hotels.

7.7.3 The transport assessment states that there will be minimal coach activity generated as a result of this development. TfL disagrees with this statement, as any hotel located in central London is generally known to attract large organised groups which often arrive and depart by coach. The coach parking bays located on Belvedere Road are deemed to be unsatisfactory for this proposal and instead TfL would encourage continued dialogue with the developers of the 1 Westminster Bridge proposal to share the coach pick up/drop off area. Alternatively, the applicant should investigate using the access road beside the Park Plaza hotel. A coach and taxi drop off strategy is to be agreed with TfL via s106 obligation.

Cycle and car parking

7.7.4 TfL welcomes the proposal for a car-free development, with the exception of one disabled parking space.

7.7.5 A total of six cycle parking spaces are proposed on site. Considering that 123 employees would be generated on the site this is not an acceptable provision.
As such a condition is attached requiring details showing increased cycle parking provision together with shower and changing facilities to be submitted prior to occupation. TfL notes that there are no dedicated cycle lanes along York Road, and expects the applicant to contribute to the introduction of a cycle lane in this location as part of the development proposals. This will ensure compliance with London Plan Policy 3C.22 Improving conditions for cycling.

Walking

7.7.6 The site is located within close proximity to the Jubilee Walkway and the Thames Path, which form part of London’s Strategic Walk Network. TfL requests a financial contribution towards the maintenance of these pedestrian walkways. This will ensure compliance with London Plan Policy 3C.21 Improving conditions for walking.

Construction Logistics plan, delivering, servicing, and travel

7.7.7 TfL requests the submission of a construction logistics plan, and delivery and servicing plan as set out in the London Freight Plan 2008. These should aim for load consolidation and avoid peak rush hour to work deliveries and should be secured by s106 agreement. TfL will welcome a commitment by the developer to use environmentally sustainable firms who are members of TfL’s Freight Operator Recognition Scheme. This will ensure compliance with London Plan Policy 3C.25

7.7.8 Due to the footprint of the hospital building and the proposed extension, servicing vehicles would not be able to turn or manoeuvre within the site. The applicant is proposing that service vehicles use the adjacent Addington Street apart-hotel service yard to turn in before parking within the curtilage of the application site. There is a legal right of way allowing the Addington Street site to be used for access to the GLIH. However, the Addington Street site operators have objected to this application on the grounds that their servicing area should not be used for servicing of the GLIH, and that if this did occur, the servicing demands of their hotel would be prejudiced. Swept paths have been submitted indicating that the Addington Street site would not be used for parking, rather for turning and manoeuvring of vehicles, enabling them to park within the GLIH site. Considering the constraints of the Addington Street site, a Delivery and Servicing Plan, including details indicating how the service area of the Addington Street apart-hotel can be utilised without compromising the servicing demands of that hotel is to be submitted and approved prior to construction.

Freight Strategy

7.7.9 A draft version of the workplace travel plan has been submitted. Additional information, including how the travel plan will be funded should be included. A final version of the travel plan will need to be submitted and reviewed by TfL prior to the grant of planning permission.

7.8 Planning Obligations

7.8.1 ODPM Circular 5/2005 states the intention of planning obligations is to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning
terms. It goes on to set out the appropriate tests for seeking planning obligations, as follows:

- relevant to planning
- necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms
- directly related to the proposed development
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and,
- reasonable in all other respects.

7.8.2 The application has been submitted with a consultation summary, detailing the pre-application consultation carried out on behalf of the applicant with local stakeholders. The report details feedback received from these stakeholders and also suggestions with regards to the s106 agreement. A draft Heads of Terms was also received with the application, which has been included within the material made publicly available with the planning application as part of the statutory consultation process.

7.8.3 Officers consider that there are a number of impacts resulting from the scheme that would need to be mitigated if Members were minded to approve the proposal. It is considered that these issues would be best secured by way of a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The following planning obligations are proposed:

- A travel plan to be approved prior to occupation to ensure users and employees have access to information about sustainable transport options.
- A travel plan monitoring fee of £1,000
- Delivery and Servicing Plan, demonstrating that the GLIH will be serviced by vehicles no larger than a 7.5t lorry, and that the service area of the Addington Street apart-hotel can be utilised for turning without compromising the servicing demands of that hotel.
- Construction Logistics Plan
- A contribution of £43,840 towards the Thames Path/Jubilee Walkway
- A contribution of £50,000 towards the implementation of a cycle parking lane along York Road
- A coach and taxi drop off strategy.
- Energy and sustainability report to be submitted and approved prior to construction to demonstrate that the proposed technologies (or some other alternative) can produce at least 27.7% CO\textsuperscript{2} emissions reductions over baseline emissions.
- An obligation to connect to the Southbank district heating system if and when this becomes operational.
- Sustainable design and construction scheme demonstrating a commitment to meet BREEAM Bespoke standards for the hotel use.
- A contribution of £32,669 towards local libraries within the borough
- A contribution of £8,461 towards sport and leisure within the borough
- A contribution of £162,417 towards parks and open space within the borough
- The provision of public art, or a contribution towards public art to total £20,000
- Use of local labour in construction and trainee subsidy of £28,750
- A contribution towards general employment and training of £27,166
- Revenue contribution of £16,242
A Monitoring Fee of 2.5% of total value of contributions

7.8.4 A number of issues were raised by the SBEG and WCDG regarding the Heads of Terms. Officers would respond making the following points:

Transport Contribution

TfL are the Highway Authority for York Road and much of the adjoining road network in Waterloo. They have identified mitigation projects from the development independently from the Council, and which are considered necessary to mitigate against the impact of the development.

Coach Drop Off

A Coach Management Review has been proposed by SBEG to be funded out of the London Eye “ongoing measures” S 106 planning obligation, and will be considered by the Visitor Management Group on Monday 18 May in terms of commissioning. Once completed this work will inform the future Coach Management Strategy for Waterloo, which TfL will need to be consulted on, and sign up to as the Highway Authority for a substantial number of network roads in Waterloo, including York Road. The GLIH scheme is on York Road and therefore will be required to agree a coach and taxi drop off strategy with TfL as the scheme progresses. The points raised by WCDG regarding discouraging drop off points for coaches will need to be addressed in both the Coach Management Review and for the GLIH scheme for the coach and taxi drop off strategy in operational detail with TfL.

Sustainability

The development would offset 27.7% CO² emissions over baseline calculations, and is in line with UDP Policies 34 and 35.

Parks and Open Spaces Contribution

Discussions with Waterloo Opens Space Partnership (WOSP) on the allocation of another S 106 Parks and Open Spaces contribution are currently occurring, and there should be no operational reason why this would not occur with the GLIH contributions. It would be then for this group to feed back to the Council how this money should be applied taking into account the requirement to link expenditure to the impact of development. SBEG and WCDG are members if WOSP.

Public Art

Policy 30 of the adopted UDP supports the securing public art, and the draft Waterloo Area SPD reflects that promoting public art is an important part of development proposals to define and enhance public realm, as well as being an integral part of any major development. The S 106 planning obligations SPD has a policy of having a target of 1% of the construction value as public art. However, on the basis of the target 1% approach, the public art contribution would be considerable higher, and the £20,000 is a negotiated sum.

Revenue Contributions
The S 106 planning obligations SPD has a simple additional formula charge of 10% of any public realm capital contributions, for maintenance purposes. This will be collected as a lump sum and be used to maintain and up keep public realm funded from the principle S 106 public realm contribution over a 10 year maintenance cycle, after which it is assumed that normal public sector funding formula provision will cover maintenance in line with circular 05/2005.

Libraries

The formula approach for Libraries in the adopted S 106 planning obligations SPD is based on permanent residential and workforce population use of Libraries. This application is clearly a hotel, and as such officers are aware of the potential for tourists to use local libraries. As such the contribution towards local libraries has been increased above the formula amount.

8. Conclusions

8.1.1 The proposal represents a development that would regenerate a largely redundant site and bring forwards a use appropriate to the Central London Activities Zone. The employment provision on the site would increase, whilst the terms of the s106 agreement will ensure that the effects of the development will be mitigated against where necessary. The revisions to the scheme ensure that design is of a high quality and would preserve special interest of the listed building and nearby Conservation Areas, and ensure that any impact on local amenity in relation to loss of sunlight/daylight or loss of privacy is kept to a minimum. The development would have no detrimental impact upon parking or highway safety subject to the conditions and planning obligations. Officers consider that the reasons for refusing the previous application have been fully addressed and that the current application is acceptable in planning terms.

8.1.2 The application is referable to the Mayor.

9. Recommendation 1

Application A

9.1 It is recommended planning permission be granted subject to a S106 legal agreement to deliver the obligations listed above and the conditions listed below, and any direction by the Mayor of London.

Application B

9.2 It is recommended listed building consent be granted subject to a S106 legal agreement to deliver the obligations listed above and the conditions listed below, and any direction by the Mayor of London

Recommendation 2
1.1. That if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by the 15 June 2009, the Head of Development Control is given the authority to refuse the planning application on the grounds of lack of mitigation for the following reasons.

Reasons for recommendation 2

1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a travel plan, would cause undue stress on parking provision on the site and would not assist in the Council's aims to discourage car ownership in the Borough contrary to Policies 8, 14 and 57 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a delivery management plan and a taxi and coach drop off strategy, would cause a detrimental impact to highway and pedestrian safety and to the servicing demands of the adjacent hotel site. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 9 and 14 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007).

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards local cycle lanes and pedestrian walkways, would cause an unacceptable strain upon local footways and cycle paths that would not be mitigated against. A such, the proposal is contrary to Policy 10 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Sustainability and Energy plan to include: a renewable energy plan, a commitment to achieve 'BREAM Bespoke', standards, the use of sustainable materials in construction, a minimum of 20% reduction in energy emissions above building regulations, would be contrary to Policies 34, 35 and 57 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of financial contributions towards library and sports and leisure facilities, would place undue stress on community facilities, contrary to Policies 26 and 57 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

6. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of financial contributions towards improving open space facilities, would place undue stress on local parks, contrary to Policies 50 and 57 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

7. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of financial contributions towards public art, would place undue stress on local parks, contrary to Policies 30 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).
Application A; Planning permission; 09/00841/FUL

Conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice. Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development shall take place until detailed elevational drawings, together with samples and a schedule of all materials to be used in the elevations, balconies, roofing and windows/joinery of the development hereby permitted are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality. (Policies 33, 40, 47 and 58 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer.)

3. No development shall take place (including demolition) until full details of the proposed construction methodology, in the form of a Method of Construction Statement is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method of Construction Statement shall include details regarding: the notification of neighbours with regard to specific works; advance notification of road closures; details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage; details regarding dust mitigation, details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway, and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area. The details of the approved Method of Construction Statement must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the demolition and construction process. Reason: To ensure minimal nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers and of the area generally, and avoid hazard and obstruction to the public highway. (Policies 9, 31, and 48 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer.)

4. No development shall take place until a crime prevention strategy is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall demonstrate how the development meets 'Secured by Design' standards and shall include full detailed specifications of the following: Means of enclosure, gates to the basement car park, CCTV provision, external lighting provision, electronic access control, specifications of all external doors and all residential doors, windows and glazing. The approved measures are to be carried out in full and retained thereafter. Reason: To ensure that satisfactory attention is given to security and community safety (Policy 32 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refers).

5. No development shall take place until full measures to mitigate against terrorism is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Metropolitan Police. The approved measures are to be carried out in full and retained thereafter. Reason: In the interests of community safety and designing out crime and in accordance with the provisions of UDP Policy 32.

6. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme for investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only take place in accordance
with the detailed scheme pursuant to this condition. The archaeological works shall be carried out by a suitable qualified investigating body acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To allow adequate archaeological investigation before any archaeological remains may be affected by the development. (Policy 48 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refers).

7. No loading or unloading of goods, including fuel, by vehicles arriving at or departing from the premises shall be carried out other than within the curtilage of the site.
Reason: To avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties (Policies 18 and 15 of the Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan 2007 refers).

8. No development shall take place 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 the sewerage undertaker. 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 strategy have been completed.
Reason: The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development, in accordance with the provisions of UDP Policy 53.

9. No development shall take place until a) full details, including anticipated flow rates, and detailed site plans have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water) b) Where this development forms part of a larger development, arrangements have been made to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority (in consultation with Thames Water) for the provision of adequate water supplies for the whole of the development.
Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand, and in the interests of UDP Policy 53.

10. No plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed to the external faces of buildings.

11. Details of a waste management plan, incorporating provision for refuse storage and recycling facilities on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted. The refuse storage and recycling facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to commencement of the use and shall thereafter be retained as such for the duration of the permitted use.
Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse and the provision of recycling facilities on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area. (Policies 9, 33, 56 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer.)

12. No development shall take place until impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.
Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with additional demand generated by the development (Policy 53 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer).
13 Prior to the commencement of buildings works, full details of the surface water drainage system, including details of discharge rates to sewer from both foul and surface water systems, as well as any proposed sustainable source control measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the local planning authority, in consultation with Thames Water. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and improve water quality (Policy 54 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refers).

14 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with measures indicated in any Sustainability Strategy approved by virtue of the Section 106 legal agreement, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that the environmental impacts of the development are acceptable (Policy 34 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) refers).

15 Ground source heat pump systems using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: In the interest of the protection of the natural environment, with regards to the provisions of UDP Policy 48.

16 No development (including demolition) shall take place until provision has been made to accommodate all site operatives', visitors' and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning during the construction period in accordance with details to be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To minimise danger and inconvenience to highway users (Policies 9, 31 of the adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer.)

17 No development (including demolition) shall take place until a construction logistics plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction logistics plan should address ways to minimise construction impact movements on the nearby TLRN especially during peak hours. Reason: In order to ensure the proposals are in accordance with London Plan Policy 3C.25 Freight Strategy

18 No development shall take place until details of the provision to be made for an increased provision in cycle parking, along with changing/showing facilities, is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the building hereby permitted is occupied and retained thereafter. Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport (Policies 9, 10 and 14 of the Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan (2007) refer)

19 No development shall take place until full details of the proposed lighting of the exterior of the new building are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting is to be provided in accordance with the approved details and maintained it and retained thereafter. Reason: To safeguard and enhance the water tower, and in the interests of the visual amenity of the locality and the conservation area (Policies 33, 40, 47 and 58 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan).
20 Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development shall take place until full details of measures to prevent and mitigate issues of overlooking into the 11th floor residential property to the north, are submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures are to include design features such as brei soleils, and frosted glass. The approved measures are to be carried out and retained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to prevent instances of actual or perceived overlooking, in accordance with the provisions of UDP Policy 33.

21 The disabled car parking space hereby permitted shall be designed, laid out and permanently allocated for use by disabled persons only. The spaces shall be used solely for this purpose and no other.
Reason: To ensure parking provision is available for people with disabilities, in accordance with the provisions of Policy 14 of the Unitary Development Plan.

22 No development shall take place until full details of works to make do any damage to the listed boundary wall to the Addington Street site are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Particular reference is to be made to any replacement brickwork/joinery and any structural work to ensure the long term structural integrity of the listed wall. The wall shall be maintained in that form thereafter.
Reason: To safeguard the visual setting and structural integrity of the listed wall, in accordance with Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Application B; Listed building consent; 09/00842/LB

Conditions:

1. The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this decision notice.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18(1)(a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the General Lying-In Hospital permitted shall match those of the existing materials. All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match the adjacent work with regards to the methods used and the material, colour, texture and profile, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is obtained to any variation, or except where otherwise stated on the approved drawings.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

4. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, samples and detailed drawings (or samples as appropriate) of the doors and windows of the General Lying-In Hospital at a minimum scale of 1:5 and 1:1 indicating construction detail including reveals, materials & finishes shall be submitted and approved by or on behalf of the LPA prior to works commencing on site. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
5. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, a detailed method statement and schedule of works in relation to all external remedial/repair works to the General Lying-In Hospital (including but not limited to mortar mix, colour and pointing, new materials to match, cleaning method, engineers report if structural works are needed) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the LPA prior to works commencing on site. All works to be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

6. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, detailed drawings indicating the interface between proposed extensions and the General Lying-In Hospital indicating the means of joining and knocking through are to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to works commencing on site. All works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

7. All works of demolition relating to the General Lying-In Hospital are to be undertaken by hand (or by tools held in the hand other than power driven tools).
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

8. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, full details of the proposed lighting of the exterior of the building are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

9. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, a full structural survey of building works is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

10. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, details of all internal works, including samples of materials and work making good to match existing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
11. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, Details of all plant and servicing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

12. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, details of all steps and handrails and railings are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

13. Prior to the commencement of any building work to the General Lying-In Hospital, Details of specification of all work of soundproofing, fire upgrading, insulation and other requirements showing how they would affect the historic fabric are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

14. Notwithstanding approved plans, no pipes, plant or vents are to be installed to the General Lying-In Hospital without prior approval
Reason: To ensure that the development is not detrimental to the character, appearance or interest of the listed building (Policy 45 of the Unitary Development Plan (2007)).

Notes to Applicants:

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

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

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

4. You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Health Division concerning compliance with any requirements under the Housing, Food, Safety and
Public Health and Environmental Protection Acts and any by-laws or regulations made thereunder.

5. You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Health Division with regard to the extraction of fumes from the premises.

6. Your attention is drawn to the necessity to register your food business with the Council's Environmental Health Division, under the Food Premises (Registration) Regulations 1991 before the use commences. Failure to do so may result in prosecution.

7. Your attention is drawn to Sections 4 and 7 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and the Code of Practice for Access for the Disabled to Buildings (B.S. 5810:1979) regarding the provision of means of access, parking facilities and sanitary conveniences for the needs of persons visiting, using or employed at the building or premises who are disabled.

8. Your attention is drawn to Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and the Code of Practice for Access for the Disabled to Buildings (B.S. 5810:1979) regarding the provision of means of access, parking facilities and sanitary conveniences for the needs of persons visiting, using or employed at the building or premises who are disabled.

9. You are advised of the necessity to consult the Transport and Highways team within the Transport Division of the Directorate of Environmental Services, with regard to any alterations affecting the public footway.

10. You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council's Streetcare team within the Public Protection Division with regard to the provision of refuse storage and collection facilities

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

12. 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.

13. You are advised that permission will be required for the installation of a new shopfront at these premises.

14. In connection with the soundproofing condition, you should consult the Council's Building Control Section before carrying out any works.

15. As soon as building work starts on the development, you must contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer if you need to do the following- name a new street- name a new or existing building- apply new street numbers to a new or existing building. This will ensure that any changes are agreed with Lambeth Council before use, in accordance with the London Buildings Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 and the Local Government Act 1985. Although it is not essential, we also advise you to contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer before applying new names or numbers to internal flats or units. Contact details are listed below. Rachel Harrison
16 You are advised to consult the National Rivers Authority at Wah Kwong House, 10 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7SP (tel: 0171 735 9993) regarding the method and extent of the site investigation and details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of ground water and surface water.

17 You are advised that under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the National Rivers Authority is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld. Contact Mr D DeCoster on 0181 310 5500 for details.

18 You are advised that under the terms of the Water Industries Act 1991, the prior written consent of the London Borough of Lambeth, Sewerage Contractor for Thames Water Utilities Ltd is required for any development works draining into, or connecting to, the public sewers. Contact Mr S K Bellehehew on 0171 926 7108.

19 You are advised to contact Thames Water Utilities regarding mains/supply pipe connections for the development at Network Services Waterloo District, Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Waterworks Road, Brixton Hill, London SW2 1SB. Contact Mr D Kirk on 0645 200800 for details.

20 It is the view of Lambeth Council that the proposed development has scope for the provision of recycling and/or composting facilities. For advice on incorporation of such facilities please contact: Jason Searles/ Dean Parry 3rd Floor, Blue Star House 234-244 Stockwell Rd London SW9 9SP 020 7926 2624 Dparry@lambeth.gov.uk

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

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

23 You are advised of the necessity to consult Transport for London via email (centrallicensing@tfl.gov.uk), prior to the commencement of construction in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the public highway including scaffolding, temporary/permanent crossovers, oversailing/undersailing of the highway, drainage/sewer connections, hoarding,
excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), temporary full/part road closures, craneage licences etc.

24 Any excavation or new groundworks at street or basement level associated with this development may expose or damage archaeological remains. Such works include the removal of the existing slab and/or foundations, construction of new foundations or floor slabs, lift pits, underpinning or service trenches.

25 The Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that archaeological remains on this site are preserved in situ. The detailed proposals should include appropriate drawings, technical notes and method statements, showing how the objectives of in situ preservation are to be achieved. Particular attention should be paid to the design of foundations and new groundworks including piling, underpinning, new slab levels and slab construction, lift pits and new service trenches. You are advised to contact English Heritage's Archaeological Officers to discuss the submission of details required to discharge the archaeological condition(s).

26 The development of this site is likely to damage archaeological remains. The applicant should therefore submit detailed proposals in the form of an archaeological project design. This design should be in accordance with the appropriate English Heritage guidelines.

26 To prepare the Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, we would refer the applicant to both the recommendations of the accepted FRA and Chapter 6, paragraphs 6.16 to 6.22 of the Government Guidance "Development and Flood Risk - A Practice Guide Companion to PPS25".

27 Piling or other penetrative methods of foundation design can cause unacceptable risks to groundwater. A risk assessment should be carried out as per our guidance ‘Piling into Contaminated Sites’. This and other guidance on piling into potentially contaminated sites is available on our website (www.environment-agency.gov.uk). Click on the publications and search for piling.

28 The water table is likely to be shallow at the site. It is therefore susceptible to pollution from oils and fuels from construction machinery.

29 The Environment Agency strongly recommends that the applicant consults our Pollution Prevention Guidance notes (PPGs). These are aimed at a wide range of industries and activities that have the potential to cause pollution. They can be downloaded from our website www.environment-agency.gov.uk. Type PPG into the search engine or paste this link into your browser: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppg/

30 Before any work commences on site the agent is to contact London Underground with full details of the proposed works and foundation agreements. LU engineers will need to agree to the proposal before work can commence. If the developer of their agent is already working with LU or its agents on this project they should continue to do so, so as to ensure the safety of the railway and the development.