<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>12/01234/FUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Application Address | St Thomas' Hospital  
|                     | 249 Westminster Bridge Road |

Based on the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright.  
Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

L.B. Lambeth LA 100019338 2005
Site address  St Thomas’ Hospital, 249 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7EH

Ward  Bishops

Proposal  Installation of new glazed skin over the west elevation, installation of two new bed lifts and creation of new atria over existing courtyards, creation of new accommodation at 11th floor level within existing building envelope, re-cladding of existing escape stairs, new plant screens at roof level and relocation of extension to existing flues (East Wing only).

Application type  Full Planning Permission

Application ref(s)  12/01234/FUL

Validation date  11th April 2012

Case officer details  Name: Gillian Nicks  Tel: 020 7926 1206  Email: GNicks@lambeth.gov.uk

Applicant  Guys and St Thomas’ NHS Foundation Trust

Agent  Mr Alan Gunne-Jones


Recommendation(s)  Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Democracy (legal)</td>
<td>08/06/2012</td>
<td>14/06/2012</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>26th April 2012</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise &amp; Pollution</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Equalities &amp; Performance</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich Society/Dulwich Res Assoc</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOL</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background documents
Please see section 3 of the report.

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

1.1 The main issues involved in this application are:

- Land use
- Design:
  - Impact on character and appearance of Lambeth Palace Conservation Area (and neighbouring City of Westminster ‘Westminster Abbey and Parliament Square Conservation Area’)
  - Impact on Setting of Listed Buildings
  - Views
  - Sustainability

2 Site Description

2.1 The application site is approximately 0.34 hectares in area situated within the Guys and St Thomas wider campus, itself bound by the Albert Embankment in parallel with the River Thames to the west, Westminster Bridge Road to the north, Lambeth Palace Road to the South/East. The application relates to the East Wing within the wider campus, a thirteen storey tower circa 1966, accessed from connecting hospital buildings. It currently houses over 200 beds together with catheter suites, clinical offices, teaching facilities and other ancillary plant and stores. It is constructed of Slate, Stainless Steel and Teak and constructed in T-shaped form. It is the second tallest building within the hospital site, surrounded by listed buildings to the west (the South Wing – see 2.2 below), Lambeth Wing to the north, Accident and Emergency sot the east and the most recently completed Evelina Children’s Hospital to the south. It is north west of Lambeth Palace and its associated, designated ‘Historic Park and Garden’.

2.2 Along with a number of statues, the South Wing consists of a number of Grade II listed buildings lining to the back edge of the Albert Embankment. The statutory list notes their importance as being:

“…of major architecture interest as the grandest and most lavish of the English pavilion-plan hospitals, a bold and ambitious architecture set-piece which exploited to the full its riverside setting opposite Westminster Palace in the manner of a series of Venetian palazzo. It is of outstanding historic interest in the continuity of London’s oldest hospital foundation, as an early and influential British pavilion-plan hospital built at an important watershed in C19 healthcare reform, and as the premises of Florence Nightingale’s seminal nursing school. Special architectural interest lies principally in the surviving elevations from Currey’s original design and the early C20 additions by Currey Junior, in the surviving plan form defined by the relationship of the pavilions wards and axial corridors, and in the internal spaces described above, including that of Shepherd’s Hall. The 14-bay block at the South end of the East elevation above ground-floor level (that being part of the Victorian Build, and of special interest) is not of special interest). Notwithstanding its reduced state, the South Wing of St Thomas’ Hospital is one of London’s most prominent and distinguished
riverside buildings, and has outstanding group value with Westminster Palace, a World Heritage Site. Finally it has group value with the former medical school ...”.

2.3 Westminster Bridge to the north is Grade II* statutory listed. Indeed, the site lies opposite the Houses of Westminster on the north side of the River Thames, statutory Grade I listed and a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

2.4 The site is situated within the Lambeth Palace Conservation Area, included under an extension of the same in 1980. The recommendation report for the site’s inclusion within the Lambeth Palace Conservation Area concludes:

“the older parts of St. Thomas’s and the medical school area of high architectural merit. They are part of an internationally important townscape and are significant elements of the nineteenth century development of Lambeth’s riverside.”

The wider hospital site also forms part of the Southbank Conservation Area.

2.5 The site also lies in view of the setting to the neighbouring City Of Westminster ‘Westminster Abbey and Parliament Square’ Conservation Area.

3 Planning History

3.1 Application reference 09/02838/FUL for “All to the East Wing: the retention of: i) CHP (combined heat and power) unit to the southern elevation; ii) an extended gas cylinder storage area to the east elevation; and iii) associated dump radiator units at roof level to the western elevation” approved 10th November 2009.

3.2 Numerous incidental applications for works across the wider campus.

3.3 Application reference 00/01685/FUL for ‘Demolition of Riddell House and ancillary outbuildings and construction of nine-storey building to be used as Children’s Hospital’ dated 23rd July 2001 with associated Conservation Area Consent reference 00/01686/CON.

4 Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the installation of a new glazed skin over the west elevation of the existing building, in turn creating two new atriums over existing underutilised courtyards, together with the installation of two new bed lifts, additional accommodation to the eleventh floor level, new plant screens at roof level and relocation and extension to existing flues. The proposal has arisen as a consequence of the poor state of repair to the existing building with severe water ingress and inadequate lifts to meet current standards including not being of a sufficient size to accommodate some patient beds.

4.2 The new glazed skin would enclose the vertical arm to the existing T-shaped building footprint, resulting in two triangular atriums to the north and south, and also fall across the west and east elevations.
4.3 The west elevation, would see the removal of the currently installed scaffolding, and installation of new single glazing set approximately one metre away from the existing façade, from first to tenth floor level. At each floor level a new access walkway would run between the existing and new facades. The glazing would be fixed to an internal timber frame and hung from new steel work located on the roof. The walkway area would be naturally ventilated by louvers incorporated to the top and bottom of each glazed panel. Below these vents, and to the top of each panel, timber shading louvers would be installed to address solar gain.

4.4 Across the eleventh floor, originally designed as an open air terrace but now covered with extract plant, data centre and some office accommodation, a new shell enclosure would be provided with the former elements relocated. Openings would be enlarged with sliding doors to open out onto a balcony area overlooking the Houses of Parliament with an obscure glazed balustrade.

4.5 At ground floor level around the building, existing glazing would be replaced with double glazing. In some parts this would include opaque panelling to allow for necessary blackout serving an auditorium.

4.6 The atriums would sit above the existing courtyards and rise up to project four metres above the existing roof level, thereby allowing for natural ventilation and screen the existing plant accommodation. The glazed elements would be structured around painted steel columns spaced approximately 2.8 metre vertically, with horizontal trusses at every second floor level. The northernmost atrium would include a vertical pod containing a new bed lift; the southern atrium would involve a smaller pod enclosing an existing boiler flue. Openings in the existing façade would allow for floor connection with the lift.

4.7 The base of each atrium would be at second floor level, constructed of precast concrete with inset glass blocks. The enclosed space would not be publicly accessible, but for maintenance purposes only; the second floor has intensive care units and a number of options are being considered to suitable screen these wards.

4.8 Given the nature of the use at the site, the proposed works are required to consider the existing fire strategy where smoke from a fire is diverted directly outside to avoid it spreading to other floors. Consequently, the proposed roof includes a number of diamond shaped cushions attached to a hot wire system so that in the instance of a fire the wire melts allowing smoke to immediately vent out of the top of the atrium whilst otherwise providing shading to the atria consisting of opaque foil within each ‘diamond’.

4.9 At each end of the western façade of the block, existing stairwells are located. Being currently tile clad, these would be over clad with powder coated metal panels. Timber framed single glazing and fixed aluminium louvers would be incorporated to replace existing condensation damaged windows. Tapered plant screens will conceal existing plant to the stair towers and provide safe maintenance access.

4.10 A tracked cleaning cradle would be installed at roof level.
4.11 Integral to the Trusts proposals for the atrium is to install artwork to decorate the internal voids, and animate the space throughout the day and night.

5 Consultations and Responses

5.1 All properties at the following neighbouring addresses have been consulted (62 in total):

- Ground floor unit 10 Royal Street, London SE1 7LL
- First floor unit 10 Royal Street, London SE1 7LL
- Evelina Children’s Hospital St Thomas Hospital 249 Westminster Bridge Road, London E1 7EH
- 1-52 Stangate Road, London SE1 7EQ
- Stangate Royal, Stangate Street, London SE1 7EQ
- Holy Trinity Centre Hostel, Carlises Lane, London SE1 7LG

5.2 A site notice was displayed on 18th May 2012 and a press notice was published on the same day.

Internal consultation

5.3 The Council’s Highways and Transportation officer – No objection.

5.4 The Council’s Noise and Pollution officer - No representation received.

5.5 The Council’s Conservation Officer:

The proposals follow on from pre-application advice and there do not appear to be any significant revisions. The east block building is of reasonable quality despite its 1950s construction, however its condition has been neglected over this period and enhancements to its appearance and its function are welcomed.

The treatment to the western elevation adopts a contemporary design and appearance. Nevertheless, it would generate a façade that would continue the context set by the extension to the hospital complex containing the Evelina Children’s hospital on the southeast corner. The east wing block is a prominent building within the site featuring within views through and into the site, however, it is considered that the treatment would not detract from or harm the quality of these views or detract from the character and appearance of buildings within and outside of the site.

The detailed plans for the eastern elevation are innovative and attractive and would provide interest to the building when viewed from Lambeth Palace Road. The extensions would rise up above the accident and emergency building and would provide a much improved focus for the buildings here. It is considered that the modern detailing involved with the structure would be suitable in this context.

It is assumed that views into the atria from outside of the site would be possible making the proposed bedlift towers inside the building also visible. It is recommended that these solid structures within the atria do not dissolve the design and character of these glazed atria.
The removal of part of the 11th floor would not present any specific conservation and design issues.

**External consultation**

5.6 Association of Waterloo Groups – No representation received.
5.7 Kennington Oval and Vauxhall Forum – No representation received.
5.8 Lambeth estates Residents Association – No representation received.
5.9 South Bank Employers Group – No representation received.
5.10 Waterloo Community Development Group – No representation received.
5.11 Waterloo Quarter Business Area – No representation received.
5.12 Kennington Association – No representation received.
5.13 Kennington Cross Neighbourhood Association – No representation received.
5.14 County Hall Residents Association – No representation received.
5.15 Lambeth Towers and Lambeth Road TA – No representation received.
5.16 South Bank Board – No representation received.
5.17 South Bank Management Company Ltd – No representation received.
5.18 City of Westminster – No representation received.
5.19 English Heritage – No representation received.
5.20 Environment Agency – No objection
5.21 No representations have been received from neighbouring occupiers. Notwithstanding, a statement of community involvement has been submitted by the applicant which includes details of a public exhibition, website and publication in local press.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Letters sent</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6 Planning Policy Considerations**

**National Guidance**

6.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012 sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It reinforces the Development Plan led system and does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The NPPF sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Moreover, it sets out that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

**The London Plan 2011**

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

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

6.6 The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

- Policy 1.1 – Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
- Policy 2.10 – Central Activities Zone – strategic priorities
- Policy 2.11 – Central Activities Zone – strategic functions
- Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Areas and intensification areas
- Policy 3.1 – Improving equal life chances for all
- Policy 3.2 – Improving health and addressing health inequalities
- Policy 3.16 – Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
- Policy 3.17 – Health and social care facilities
- Policy 5.1 – Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 – Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 – Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.4 – Retrofitting
- Policy 5.9 – Overheating and cooling
- Policy 7.2 – An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.6 – Architecture
- Policy 7.8 – Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.9 – Heritage-led regeneration
- Policy 7.10 – World Heritage sites
- Policy 7.11 – London View Management Framework
- Policy 8.2 – Planning obligations

Waterloo Opportunity Area Planning Framework
London View Management Framework – Supplementary Planning Guidance
March 2012

London Borough of Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)

6.7 The following policies are considered relevant in the assessment of this application:

- Policy S1 – Vision and Objectives
- Policy S3 – Economic Development
- Policy S7 – Sustainable design and construction
- Policy S9 – Quality of the built environment

Policy PN1 – Waterloo

Draft Waterloo Area Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
6.9 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the assessment of this application:

Policy 33 – Building Scale and design
Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 36 – Alterations and Extensions
Policy 41 – Views
Policy 43 – The River Thames Policy Area – Urban Design
Policy 45 – Listed Buildings
Policy 47 – Conservation Areas

7 Land Use

7.1 The site is situated within the Central Activities Zone as designated under the London Plan and within the Waterloo Opportunity Area; the site falls within the ‘Riverside’ Character area of Waterloo under the Core Strategy, being within the boundary covered by the ‘Waterloo Area Supplementary Planning Document’ where it is recognised that support will be given for:

“…the development strategies of St Thomas’ hospital … to achieve the highest quality facilities including related and supporting facilities such as accommodation for staff and students; and the creation of a new primary care centre in the wider Waterloo area”.

7.2 Furthermore, it is recognised that the Guys and St Thomas NHS Trust are:

“working towards achieving the status of an Academic Health Services Centre and has a programme for development and improvements to the range and quality of health services on the site. This programme includes bringing old buildings up to modern standards…”.

7.3 The proposal would result in 1314sqm of additional floor space within Class C2 (hospital) use. Accommodated on the eleventh floor level, 194 sqm of new floor space would be located at the head of the ‘T’ with stair core access from the north and south. The thrust of policy supports the provision of additional floor space here, in association with the retention and refurbishment to the existing building.

8 Design

8.1 The proposal has been the subject of pre-application discussions, including engagement with English Heritage.

8.2 Whilst the subject building within the wider hospital campus is set back from the River and has no especial architectural merit itself being of typical 1950s build stock, it has a particularly sensitive location being within the Lambeth Palace
Conservation Area, and within the setting of not only neighbouring statutory listed buildings, but also Internationally recognised icons – the Houses of Parliament, being Statutory Grade I listed themselves. In addition, it is also safeguarded as being within the ‘Albert Embankment between Westminster and Lambeth Bridges along Thames Path near St Thomas’ Hospital’ designated strategic view under the London Plan (2011).

8.3 The proposal would seek to improve upon the nineteen fifties vernacular encasing the east wing, and introduce a modernised skin, akin to the curved roof form found at Evelina Children’s Hospital to the south; the latter was shortlisted for a RIBA Stirling Prize. Given the T-shaped form and orientation of the existing building the proposal would result in a new form by enclosing the ‘T’, resulting in a particularly contemporary external appearance across the eastern elevation. By extruding an enclosure to the existing voids innovatively solves to remove the instance of further water ingress as well as offering a more superior appearance to the hospitals principle Lambeth Palace Road frontage and more efficiently run building.

8.4 The western façade of the East Wing in part faces directly opposite the Houses of Parliament. The façade follows the architectural vernacular at Evelina Children’s Hospital, and updates the overall appearance of the building in views in and out of the Hospitals most sensitive of settings. Given the relatively tired existing appearance, the proposal will seek to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, no harm is envisaged to result in the setting of both the immediately adjacent listed buildings making up the South Wing of the Hospital, but also the World Heritage site of the Houses of Parliament in accordance with policy 7.10 of the London Plan.

8.5 Through minimal intervention to the existing building by effectively dropping a case to the voids, and across the western façade, the day to day workings of the hospital can continue without interruption, and window replacements to the existing façade occur at a latter date, when they are a secondary skin to the building. This approach seeks to meet the Trusts objectives to modernise their existing building stock and resolves a number of issues with the existing building.

8.6 Views

8.7 The application is accompanied with a Strategic View Assessment given the site’s location within a Strategic River Prospect under the ‘London View Management Framework Supplementary Planning Guidance’, updating that under the London Plan. Two River Prospects are considered. Firstly, River Prospect 18: Westminster Bridge, viewing location 18A, looking upstream from Westminster Bridge from assessment point 18A.3 where the East Wing appears. The second view point is from River Prospect 19A, looking downstream from Lambeth Bridge. Assessment point 19.1 gives a glimpse of the south elevation to the East Wing building. Furthermore, protected vista 23 looking from the Serpentine Bridge towards the Palace of Westminster shows the new glazed enclosure strike minimal intrusion. As noted above, the proposal will result in an improved external appearance and as such there is considered to be no negative impact on the protected views.
8.8 **Sustainability**

8.9 Both local and regional policy anticipates the use of renewable energy modes within new development. Chapter 5 of the London Plan sets out a comprehensive range of polices aimed at achieving climate change mitigation. Key policies include Policy 5.2 which sets out the following energy hierarchy: be lean: use less energy; be clean: supply energy efficiently; be green: use renewable energy. Policy 5.6 requires development proposals to evaluate the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems. Policy 5.4 of the London Plan seeks improvements to the environmental performance of existing building stock through retrofitting. UDP policy 35 presumes that proposals shall demonstrate how sustainable design and construction principles have been incorporated and seek maximum reuse of existing buildings.

8.10 The proposed cladding results in the retention of the existing building stock. The installation of a hanging structure across the western façade, making use of the roof, gives way to fewer materials being used. The facades include passive solar shading measures that will act to reduce solar gain during the summer, whilst being a thermal buffer in winter to reduce heat loss yet allow for natural ventilation – functioning within the brackets of a contemporary building.

8.11 The building is already linked to a site wide combined heat and power scheme. Given the nature of the fire strategy, PVs on the new atrium roofs are not a compatible move. Other renewable technologies would not be compatible with the proposal either. The proposed materials include sustainable sourced laminated timber. Notwithstanding, a number of lean measures are installed, and total energy use saving from existing conditions are anticipated to be at twenty to twenty five per cent overall.

8.12 It is understood that given the nature of the proposed works, by themselves would not qualify for BREEAM assessment. However, there are long term objectives to refurbish the internal accommodation and these works under the subject application could be incorporated into an application for BREEAM assessment in conjunction with the internal refurbishment. The applicant has carried out a pre-assessment to review what credits towards a 2-phased development could be attributed to a single BREEAM assessment. A condition is proposed that at the time the additional accommodation on the eleventh floor is to be first used, given the intention to make use of this in conjunction with the wholesale refurbishment of the building (which in itself is unlikely to require planning permission) certification of at least BREEAM very good is achieved.

8.13 Overall, the proposal is considered an innovative yet simple intervention to improve the existing building stock, enhance its appearance to the benefit of the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings as well as the opposing World Heritage Site of the Houses of Parliament.

9 **Amenity**

9.1 The existing building has a flue that extends three metres above the northern
stair tower, discharging radioactive material from the PET (Positron Emission Tomography) centre. The proposal would see the flue extended to a height of five metres above the height of the atria roof, with no additional discharge above current, licensed, levels. Policy 36 advises that building services equipment should be designed into the development so that it is physically integrated into the envelope of the building. It goes onto state that where this is not practicable they should be located in a visually inconspicuous position on the least important elevations, and be of an acceptable design, positioning and visual impact, with minimum effect on local amenity. The flue will extend two metres above the existing height, given its location over an enclosed space, with modelling of wind tunnel testing and analysis of dispersal agreed with the Environment Agency. Overall, it is considered to be of limited visual prominence.

9.2 The proposal raises no daylight/sunlight/overlooking concerns given its location within the wider hospital campus.

10 Traffic and Parking

10.1 The proposal raises no transport implications. The application seeks to improve the existing accommodation and bears no transport impact.

13 Conclusion

13.1 In conclusion the proposal is acceptable in land use terms as it results in a small increase in hospital floor space accommodation that supports the long term objectives of the Guys and St Thomas’ NHS Trust to modernise their building stock.

13.2 The proposal would result in a new west, south east and north east facades, that takes reference from the successful implementation of glazing at the Evelina Children’s Hospital to the south. The contemporary nature of the material expression does not seek to compete with neighbouring listed buildings, including the opposing World Heritage site that makes up the Houses of Parliament. Overall, it is considered to accord with all pertinent local, regional and national policy.

14 Recommendation

14.1 Grant conditional planning permission

15 Summary of the Reasons

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

beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’):

Policy 33 – Building Scale and design
Policy 35 – Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 36 – Alterations and Extensions
Policy 41 – Views
Policy 43 – The River Thames Policy Area – Urban Design
Policy 45 – Listed Buildings
Policy 47 – Conservation Areas

15.3 London Borough of Lambeth Core Strategy (2011):
Policy S1 – Vision and Objectives
Policy S3 – Economic Development
Policy S7 – Sustainable design and construction
Policy S9 – Quality of the built environment

Policy PN1 – Waterloo

16 Conditions

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

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


REASON: To ensure that the development hereby permitted is carried out in full accordance with the plans hereby approved.

3 Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby approved, full particulars of the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to implementation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.
   a. Identify typical prototype construction details;
   b. Mock up panels following consideration of (a) above, of typical elevation bays, to include aluminium and timber louvers, cladding, glazing and frames;
   c. A sample board for all external materials;
   d. details of the appearance of the internal bed and plant lift tower at a scale of 1:50;
   e. flue design at a scale of 1:50;
REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and does not detract from the character and visual amenity of the Conservation Area nor setting of adjacent Listed Buildings.

5 Prior to the first use of the floor space at eleventh floor level hereby approved, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that a BREEAM Assessment rating of Very Good has been achieved with all reasonable measures demonstrated to achieve a BREEAM rating of Excellent, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.


17 **Informatives**

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

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

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