Section 1 – Site Location Map

LAMBETH PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Case Number: 12/02822/FUL

Application Address: Unit 1 and 2, 59 Josephine Avenue SW2 2JZ
Section 2 – Application Summary

Site address        Unit 1 and 2 Hermes House, 59 Josephine Avenue London SW2 2JZ

Ward                Tulse Hill

Proposal            Change of use and conversion of the existing office space to provide 43 student residential units (Sui Generis) involving the installation of new doors and windows on the front and side elevations together with the provision of 24 cycle parking spaces.

Application type    Full Planning Permission

Application ref(s)  12/02822/FUL

Validation date     02.08.2012

Case officer details Name: Andrew L Mulindwa
                      Tel: 020 7926 1214
                      Email: almulindwa@lambeth.gov.uk

Applicant           Mr Mustak Ibrahim

Agent               Mr Gary Loo
                    Boyesrees
                    4th Floor
                    Greyfriars House
                    Greyfriars Road
                    Cardiff
                    Glamorgan
                    CF10 3AL

Site Constraints    Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area
                    Street Under Conversion Stress
                    Rush Common Land

Advert Publication  24.08.2012

Site Notice Display 06.09.2012


Recommendation(s)  Grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
## Report Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Date consulted</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>14.08.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>02.09.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Unit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Society</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Rush Common</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Avenue Group</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23.08.2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

1.1 The main issues arising from this proposal are:

- The principle of change of use from office (Class A2 Financial and Professional Services) and conversion to provide student accommodation (Sui Generis);
- Loss of employment floorspace (Class A2 Financial and Professional Services);
- The standard of student accommodation;
- The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the host building and the Rush Common & Brixton Hill Conservation Area;
- Potential impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The highways and parking implications of the proposal;
- Sustainability issues;
- Whether the development would incorporate sufficient measures to reduce the opportunity for crime;
- Waste storage and collection and;
- Planning obligations/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

2.0 Site Description

2.1 Hermes House is a three storey office building of brickwork construction, located on the south side of Josephine Avenue close to its junction with the A 23 Brixton Hill. The building was formerly part of a gated purpose-built Class B1 (Business) premises containing 24 studio workshop units that occupied the land to rear of Brixton Hill between Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road. The part of the original development fronting onto Arodene Road to the south was truncated from the application site and the premises converted to residential use on the upper floors, with the workshop units on ground floor being retained. That part of the original business premises is now known as Hermes Court.

2.2 The application property is currently vacant but was previously used by the Department of Employment as a Job Centre, which falls within Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). The building has a total floor area of 1297sqm, spread over the three floors. There are 10 designated car parking spaces located in an open courtyard to side/rear of the site. The main entrance into the building is on Josephine Avenue with a One-way vehicular ingress onto the site being on Josephine Avenue and egress on Arodene Road.

2.3 The surrounding area to the northwest on Brixton Hill consists of a terrace of ground floor commercial properties with residential upper floors. To the east, southeast and south the site adjoins terraced residential properties on Josephine Avenue, Helix Gardens and Arodene Road, respectively.

2.4 The site is identified in the Local Development Framework Proposals Map as falling within the Rush Common & Brixton Hill Conservation Area (CA 49) and, as forming part of Rush Common Land. Josephine Avenue is designated as a Conversion Stress Area. The properties on Brixton Hill, between Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road form part of a designated Local Centre.
2.5 The surrounding area has an excellent level of public transport accessibility with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a. The site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Brixton Hill East ‘Q’ and borders other areas of parking restrictions including Brixton Hill, which is a designated Transport for London (TfL) Red route.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

3.1 Outline planning permission was granted on 19 October 1989, following appeal against the failure of the Council to determine within the prescribed time period, an application for planning permission to erect 24 workshops (Use Class B1) in a part 2, part 3 building.

3.2 Planning permission was granted on 19 June 1991 for details pursuant to a condition of the outline consent in respect of the facing materials to be used in the construction of the approved development.

3.3 On 27 January 1992 planning permission was granted for “Reserved Matters” in respect of revised elevations; a traffic management scheme within the site including the layout of means of ingress and egress and associated signage; access gates and the means of enclosure to the eastern and western boundaries of the site.

3.4 On 15 March 1994, planning permission was granted for change of use (of Hermes House) from Class B1 (Business) and conversion to Class A2 (Financial & Professional Services-Employment Services) with the erection of plant and air handling units, the installation of louvred grilles in brickwork and the formation of an access ramp with a handrail to the front entrance (ref. 94/02065/PLANAP).

Adjoining site

3.5 In June 1996, planning permission was granted for change of part of the 1st and 2nd floors (nearest to Arodene Road) and the ground floor adjacent to No. 1 Arodene Road from Class B1 (Business) use and conversion to provide 9 self-contained residential units together with associated elevational alterations (ref. 96/02024/GOE/16725). The consent was subject to a Section 106 agreement to retain the use of the remaining ground floorspace for Class B1 (Business) purposes. This permission was implemented and the mixed-use development is now known as Hermes Court.

4.0 Current Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for change of use and conversion of the existing office space to provide 43 student residential units (Sui generis) involving the installation of new doors and windows on the front and side elevations together with the provision of 24 cycle parking spaces.

4.2 It is proposed to reconfigure the existing office space on all floors to provide the following student accommodation: 11 residential units, a Common room, Laundry room, WC and a Quiet Study room on the ground floor; 16 residential units at first floor level and a further 16 at second floor level. The units would be of varies sizes, ranging from 16.7sqm to 23.5sqm. Each unit would be self-contained and would include an en-suite shower; a kitchenette with cooking facilities, fridge, microwave and a dining table and; a sleeping area with a built-in wardrobe, a desk, shelves and an under-bed storage unit.
The existing lift would be retained in situ with a new a plant room installed on each floor.

4.3 Five (5) out the proposed 43 studios would be made adaptable or accessible for disabled users; 3 located at first floor level and 2 at second floor level.

4.4 Proposed external alterations would include the installation of new metal framed doors and windows in the side elevations (northwest and southeast) of the building at ground, first and second floor levels, to service the proposed residential units.

4.5 Amendments have been made during consideration of the scheme including the retention of the existing entrance and associated ramp to the building on Josephine Avenue, as the primary entrance into the building. The existing ground floor fire exit door located in the southeast elevation of the building would be used as a secondary entrance. The door originally proposed to be formed in the rear elevation of the building and, which would have been accessed via the driveway/courtyard to Hermes has been omitted from the proposal. All the proposed new doors to the ground floor units, which open onto the driveway/courtyard to Hermes Court, would be used for fire exit purposes only. In the interests of safety, a condition to secure this requirement is recommended.

4.6 The internal layout of the accommodation has also been revised; in particular the communal areas including the Common room, Study room and Laundry have been moved to the front section of the building in tandem with the relocation of the main entrance. All dwellings would be accessed from corridors with the access to the upper floor gained via the existing staircase cores or the lift. The existing terraces on the upper floors would be retained as external amenity space.

4.7 The existing refuse store, located within the fabric of the building at ground floor level, would be reused to accommodate 3 x1100 litre bins for general waste and 3 x1100 litre bins for recyclable materials. The existing refuse chutes, which service refuse rooms on the upper floors of the building would be reinstated and designated to hold and transport general waste or recyclable materials to respective receptacles on the ground floor.

4.8 Seven (7) out of the existing 10 car parking space on the site would be retained. The rest of the car parking space would be used to provide a storage area for 24 cycles. Details of how the bicycles will be housed and secured remain outstanding and, are reserved by condition. Given the excellent level of public transport accessibility and, in order to encourage the use of sustainable means of travel, the scheme is to be secured as permit-free so that residents would not be eligible for permits to park on surrounding streets.

4.9 Soft landscaping is proposed to the strip of land on the frontage of the building on Josephine Avenue to provide defensible space and privacy to the ground floor residential units.

5.0 Consultations and Responses

5.1 Consultation letters were sent to 45 adjacent addresses in Josephine Avenue, Brixton Hill and Arodene Road. A comprehensive list of the neighbouring properties consulted is held on the planning file.
A Press Notice was published in the Weekender Press on 24 August 2012 and Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site on 6 September 2012.

Internal consultation

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

The Council’s Conservation and Design officer has not made comment on the proposal given the limited elevational alterations to the building. Further details of the proposed doors, windows and the landscaping scheme are reserved by condition.

The Council’s Highways and Transportation officer considers the proposal acceptable subject to a Section 106 agreement prohibiting occupiers of the development from applying for residents’ parking permits in the existing CPZ. A condition requiring the submission of further details regarding the cycle parking provision is also recommended.

The Council’s Design out Crime officer has no in principle objection to the proposal and, has recommended the installation of Secure by Design (SBD) compliant doors, windows and external lighting and the provision of access controls to communal entrances and gates. The new communal entrance door has been relocated in accordance with this officer’s advice.

The Council’s Streetcare Team was notified in writing of the proposed development but at the time of writing this report no response had been received. It should be noted that the existing provision for recycling and refuse storage and collection would be maintained.

The Implementation team has advised on the Section106 requirements as reported elsewhere in this report.

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

External consultation

The Brixton Society, Friends of Rush Common and Josephine Avenue Group (JAG) were consulted. At the time of writing this report, no response has been received from the Brixton Society and the Friends of Rush Common.

JAG has written in objection to the proposal and reiterated local concerns over the failure of the applicant to consult with local interest groups; the publicity of and consultation on the application during the summer holiday period; the residential density, nature and scale of the development, which would increase the risk of late night nuisance; and lack of detail on how the development would be managed and operated and by whom. JAG also queried the principle of conversion of the office building to provide residential
accommodation given the location of the site in a street under Conversion Stress. They have also questioned the accuracy of the applicant’s declaration on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) application, which suggests that the proposal would not create new dwellings (flats, or houses). JAC requests that because of the potential impact of the development, planning permission should not be granted until open consultations with them and other interested parties are undertaken.

5.12 18 written responses were received from local residents following publicity of the application. The objections raised by local residents, and by JAG and officers’ response to them are summarised in the table below.

5.13 A local resident has written in support of the proposal stating that it would bring back into use an abandoned building and would offer appropriate accommodation for young people who are engaged in positive life choices in education. It is also stated that the development has been erroneously described by a group of local residents as a Youth Hostel, which has resulted in some of the objections to the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. sent of Letters</th>
<th>No. of Objections</th>
<th>No. in support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 17</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objections:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objections</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure of the applicant to consult with local interest groups including JAG in advance of submission of the application.</td>
<td>Whilst there is no statutory or legislative requirement for an applicant to engage in pre-application consultation with local residents/interest groups, the Council positively encourages applicants to engage with the local community. Notwithstanding the applicant’s failure to do so, the Local Planning Authority has carried out a full consultation exercise in compliance with legislative requirements for publicity of applications and therefore local residents and interested parties have had opportunity to raise concerns over the proposal. The potential impacts of the proposal are fully addressed in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application publicised during the summer period when local residents would have been away on holiday.</td>
<td>The legal procedures for publicity of applications make no provisions for holiday periods; the Council has a statutory duty to publicise a valid application for planning permission irrespective of the time of year it is submitted. The application was received on 24 July 2012 and upon receipt of all relevant information, was recorded as valid on 2 August, and publicised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of employment floor space and the appropriateness of providing student accommodation on the site.</td>
<td>In view of the length of time the premises have been vacant, the length of time the property has been marketed for alternative employment use and the limited prospects for growth in demand for the continued use the premises for employment purposes, the loss of the existing floorspace to provide residential accommodation on this site is considered accepted and, would comply with the relevant policies of the local development plan. A detailed assessment of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
land use considerations of the proposal is contained in section 7 of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of conversion of the building to residential use within a street under conversion stress.</th>
<th>Policy S2 (e) seeks to protect all family sized housing from conversion into flats in parts of the borough under conversion stress. Whilst Josephine Avenue is located in a designated conversion stress area, the existing building is not in use as a family dwelling and as such the proposal to convert it to a residential use would not be contrary to this policy objective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property would be converted into flats if the scheme is not successfully occupied as student accommodation.</td>
<td>The proposed use of the property as student accommodation does not fall with a specified category of the Use Classes Order (Sui Generis) and as such its use for any other purpose other than as student accommodation would require the express consent of the Council by the submission of an application for planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impact on residential amenity including late night noise nuisance, general disturbance and antisocial behaviour associated with the residential nature and density of the proposal.</td>
<td>The local development plan provides that student hostels or other shared housing should be located close to institutions they serve, or within easy public transport accessibility to it; in or adjoining town centres, or in residential areas with easy access to local services and good public transport accessibility. The site fits this bill in all these respects. In terms of the scale of development there are no density constraints on this type of housing or standards for accommodation size, which would limit the quantum of development on a site. The only policy constraint on density is whether it would result in over-development, taking into account the impact on parking stress, or in over-concentration of such accommodation, or in unacceptable pressure on services. The proposal is considered acceptable in all these respects and subject to a competent Student Management Plan, there are no reasons to suggest that the number or nature of residents would harm residential amenity in the manner suggested by the objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of detail on the operational use of the site including its management and security on and/or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
<td>There is no requirement to indentify the prospective operators of the site or the institutions, which the facility would serve. However, in the interests of community safety, it is recommended that a Student Management Plan is submitted to and for approval by the Council prior to the occupation of the building, which would include details on the prospective residents, the institutions attended and measures to protect community safety and prevent crime occurring within the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate declaration on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) application.</td>
<td>It is noted that the application under the CIL Regulations to determine whether the development is CIL liable states that the proposals would not result in the creation of one or more dwellings. This is not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correct; for purposes of these Regulations a dwelling is defined as “a building or part of a building occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate dwelling”. Notwithstanding, the development would be liable to the levy under the Regulations not because of the new dwellings created but because it proposes a change of use to a building that has been vacant for more than 6 months. Should planning permission be granted and implemented, the Council as a CIL collecting authority for the Mayor would issue a notice to the applicant to pay the levy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss of privacy associated with the use of balcony areas.</th>
<th>There would be new windows and doors introduced into the northwest and southeast flank elevations of the existing building at first and second floor levels, which would face onto neighbouring residential properties on Brixton Hill and Josephine Avenue. These openings would replace existing fire doors and would open onto existing balconies/walkways. The separation distance between the windows/doors and the neighbouring properties would be a minimum of 20m across driveway/parking area. Whilst it is acknowledged the balconies are more likely to be used as outdoor space than they currently are, the separation distance between the application site and neighbouring properties is considered sufficient to ensure that privacy to adjoining residential properties would be safeguarded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal represents a security risk to local businesses and residential properties.</td>
<td>The application has been amended during consideration in response to the Council’s Design out Crime officer’s concerns over the original location of the main entrance door and the safety of the prospective residents of the development. The officer recommended details of a Student Management Plan and the installation of Secured by Design compliant external doors, refuse/cycle storage structures and lighting, which are to be reserved by condition. It is considered that subject to these details, the proposal would meet community safety requirements under Policy 32 of the UDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of car parking would lead to parking stress on surrounding roads.</td>
<td>The site has ‘Excellent’ level public transport accessibility and as such, in the interests of promoting sustainable means of travel, it would be officers’ preference that the proposal is car-free. The loss of some car parking on site is therefore welcome. The site is located in a controlled parking zone and it is proposed that residents of this development would not be eligible to Council permits to park on surrounding roads and therefore the development would not increase parking stress on the local highway network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (July 2011), the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy (January 2011)’.

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

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

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

The London Plan

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

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

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

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the Strategic Vision and Objectives for London
- Policy 2.9 Inner London
- Policy 3.1 Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All
- Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
- Policy 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing developments
- Policy 3.8 Housing Choice
- Policy 4.1 Developing London’s Economy
- Policy 4.2 Offices
- Policy 4.12 Improving Opportunities for All
- 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 5.7 Renewable Energy
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- Policy 6.3 Assessing Effect of Development on Transport Capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.10 Walking
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.1 Building London’s Neighbourhoods and Communities
- Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- Policy 7.3 Designing Out Crime
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- Policy 7.13 Safety, Security and Resilence to Emergency
- Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
- Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes
- Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations
- Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy


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

- Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
- Policy 9 Transport Impact
- Policy 14 Parking and Traffic Restraint
- Policy 18 Shared Housing and Supported Housing
- Policy 21 Location and Loss of Offices
- Policy 23 Protection and Location of Other Employment Uses
- Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime
- Policy 33 Building Scale and Design
- Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy 36 Alterations and Extensions
- Policy 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
- Policy 47 Conservation Areas

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

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

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance
6.12 The Council has adopted the following Supplementary Planning Documents, which are considered to be of relevance to this application:

- SPD: Safer Built Environments
- SPD: Sustainable Design and Construction
- SPD: S106 Planning Obligations


7.0 Land Use and Principle of Change of Use

Loss of Class A2 employment floorspace

7.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for change of use and conversion to provide student accommodation. The proposed development would result in the loss of Class A2 ‘employment’ floor space. Saved Policy 21(b) of the UDP advises that the conversion to other uses of surplus office space outside Key Industrial and Business Areas is permitted. This policy provision is articulated in Saved Policy 23 (Protection and Location of other Employment Uses), which states that outside KIBAs, where land is or has last been in employment use, loss of floorspace (in particular B1 business use floorspace for small businesses) to non employment use will not be permitted unless the proposal accords with at least one of five cited criteria. Criterion (ii) relates to vacant building/sites and requires marketing evidence to demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect in the medium term of re-use or redevelopment to modern standards for an environmentally acceptable employment use.

7.2 The marketing evidence submitted in support of the application is contained in the report by commercial property agents Hooper Naylor Friend dated 13 July 2012. The report states that the building has been vacant since the Job Centre, which previously occupied the site, relocated in other premises in Brixton in 2009. The agents have actively marketed the building for alternative commercial/business since then, without success. The property was offered for sale and let through various marketing avenues including on-site marketing boards and the use of a range of on-line marketing resources including the South London Business website. It was also distributed via the Estate Agents Clearing House (EACH), which deals with over 400 South and Central London Agents.

7.3 The report states that the initial reaction to the marketing was muted, particularly because the property market in 2010 was extremely depressed. The first viewing took place in April 2010 but was for a non-office user (day nursery). Thereafter various viewings, although sporadic in nature, took place up until March 2012 with business firms including solicitors, a housing association, a transport company, a recruitment company a charity body and a television production company. No further expressions of interests have been effected to date since March 2012.

7.4 The report reviews reasons for the failure to secure a replacement commercial tenant and concludes that the property is too large for the average businesses that operate in the Brixton area and, due to its layout and structure does not lend its to conversion into smaller business units. The report has also demonstrated that the applicant has sought to market the building for employment use to a single tenant or for subdivision into smaller business
It is also argued that the recent squeeze on local and central Government funding of social and other enterprises, which dominate the market for office space in Brixton has diminished the demand for office accommodation. The marketing agent further advises that the limited parking accommodation on site for a property of this size, which is located in an area where on-street parking is restricted, has discouraged some potential tenants.

7.5 Officers consider the marketing evidence submitted in support of the proposal involving loss of employment floorspace on a site located outside a KIBA to be consistent with the requirements of Saved Policies 21 and 23 UDP and the Council’s Planning Guidance Note: Marketing of Employment Sites and Premises (September 2008). The premises have been vacant for well over the requisite 12 months period and there is sufficient evidence of an active marketing campaign, which shows a persistent lack of demand for continued employment generation use of the premises.

7.6 In view of the length of time that the premises have been on the market and limited prospects for growth in demand in the medium term for the use of the employment use of premises, the loss of this employment floorspace is considered acceptable. The loss must also be weighed against the benefits of the proposed change of use and conversion of the premises to provide student accommodation.

7.7 The proposed change of use and conversion of the building to provide student accommodation is consistent with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (Housing Choice) and Policy S2 (Housing) of the Lambeth Core Strategy, which provide strategic support for specific housing need including accommodation for students, hostels and other forms of specialised housing.

7.8 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan states that planning decisions should ensure that strategic and local requirements for student housing meeting a demonstrable need are addressed, without compromising capacity for conventional homes.

7.9 The London Plan identifies a potential requirement for 18,000-27,000 student accommodation places over the 10 years to 2021. The Plan recognises the contribution, which London universities make to the capital’s economy and labour market and supports the provision of new student accommodation to (i) enhance London’s attractiveness to university students and (ii) reduce pressure on other types of housing stock currently occupied by students.

7.10 Saved Policy 18 (b) of the UDP states that hostels should not lead to loss of permanent residential accommodation and that purpose-built student/worker hostels should be located at or close to the institution they service, or with easy public transport access to it; in or adjoining town centres; or in residential areas with easy access to local services and good public transport accessibility. In such locations, Council this policy provides that student accommodation or other supported housing should not result in over-development, taking into account the impact on parking stress, or in over-concentration of such accommodation, or in unacceptable pressure on services.

7.11 Having regard to these policy constraints, it is noted that the site has an excellent public transport accessibility level, with a TfL rating of 6 and is therefore within easy reach of universities and other student institutions in the Capital by public transport means. It is close to the range of town centre services within the Major Town Centres of Brixton and Streatham and the
district centres of Clapham, Herne Hill and Tulse Hill/West Norwood. Accordingly, the site is well suited to providing further student accommodation within the Borough and would therefore be a welcome contribution to an identified London-wide demand for this type of housing.

7.12 This site is not protected for permanent/conventional housing or for other uses within the local development plan and, the proposal would not lead to a loss permanent housing. As such there is no land use objection to the proposed change of use of the premises to provide student accommodation. It is officers’ consideration that the proposal would not compromise the Council’s capacity to meet the demand for conventional dwellings, especially affordable family dwellings. The proposal would therefore contribute to meeting the over-arching housing policy objective of securing mixed and balanced communities in the borough.

7.13 Consistent with Saved Policy 18 (b) of the UDP, paragraph 3.53 of the London Plan advises that student accommodation should be secured as such by planning agreement or condition relating to the use of the land or to its occupation by members of specified educational institutions. If accommodation is not robustly secured for students, it will normally be subject to the requirements for affordable housing policy. Accordingly, although a change of use the premises from student accommodation to other uses is not permitted under the Use Classes Order and as such would require the express consent from the Council, a condition to secure the use of the premises solely as student accommodation is recommended.

7.14 In support of the proposal, the applicant’s Design and Access statement refers to research, which shows that universities and the private sector combined currently only provide around 55,000 purpose-built students studios/beds with 22,000 studios/beds in the various stages of development and delivery in the pipeline. Within more than 285,000 students in full time education in London, the current provision would leave a significant shortfall in student accommodation. The statement estimates that there are about 785 purpose built student accommodation studios/beds in Lambeth with approximately 7,673 students living in Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) or staying at home. The statement concludes that the pressure on students trying to find suitable accommodation is on the increase and cannot be met by current provision, in the often expensive HMO/private residential market.

7.15 In conclusion, it is officers’ consideration that the proposed change of use and conversion of the property to provide student accommodation is acceptable in land use terms. The proposal would comply with the relevant Council’s policies and would meet an acknowledged demand for student accommodation in the Capital noting the Council’s recent approval of similar schemes elsewhere in the Borough including at 2-16 Tinworth Street (11/04510/FUL), 36-60 South Lambeth Road (11/04181/FUL) and 128 Herne Hill.

The standard of proposed accommodation

7.16 There are no room size or amenity space standards currently in place for student accommodation. All the accommodation comprises self-contained units, ranging in size between approximately 17sqm-25sqm. These room sizes compare favourably with those recently approved in other schemes, where an average studio measures about 19sqm.

7.17 Associated student welfare and communal facilities, including a 40sqm Common room, a laundry and study room would be provided at ground floor
level. It is considered that the standard of accommodation would be fit for purpose and is similar in scope to that provided on university campuses or other purpose-built student accommodation.

7.18 The proposal does not include any provision for external amenity space. The section of the site that could be laid out to provide external amenity space is to be retained as car parking space. It is moreover considered that the use of this space as outdoor amenity space would be likely to cause unacceptable noise nuisance and general disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring properties in Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road, whose rear gardens abut the existing car parking area, as well as the residents of the flats in Hermes Court. Instead, it is recommended that a financial contribution towards improvements to Brockwell Park should be sought as it is located within a short walking distance of the site and as such is likely to be patronised by the future residents of this development.

7.19 The London Plan Supplementary Planning Document: “Accessible London: Achieving an inclusive environment”, supports the objectives of London Plan Policy 7.2 and Lambeth Core Strategy Plan S2 (d), which require new all new housing including, student housing, to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair use. The London Plan requires 10% of new housing to be designed for this purpose. The proposal has been amended to include 5 wheelchair accessible units, which equates to more than 10% of the 43 units proposed.

8.0 Conservation and Design Considerations

8.1 The proposed external alterations to the building have been assessed having regard Saved Policies 33, 36 and 47 of the UDP and Policy S9 of the Core Strategy, which seek to ensure that new developments and/or alterations to existing buildings are of a high standard of design.

Site Context

8.2 The application site is located in Josephine Avenue, which forms part of the eastern section of the Rush Common & Brixton Hill Conservation Area. This Conservation Area includes much of Brixton Hill and the surrounding area and, is characterised by layers of development from different historical periods – especially the 19th century, with commercial properties and public buildings to Brixton Hill and residential development in the adjoining side streets.

8.3 Josephine Avenue is one the side streets and, is described in the Conservation Area Statement as a broad tree lined avenue with communal gardens lining the central avenue and properties fronting onto access roads. It is characterised by terraces of large three storey houses with two storey bay windows incorporating Corinthian capitals, which support recessed front porches. Hermes House is a contemporary building constructed in the 1990s, which in officers’ opinion makes only a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

Proposed Alterations

8.4 Saved Policy 47 (d) of the UDP, states that alterations to elevations of buildings in conservation areas, including window designs, should preserve or enhance features of the original buildings having regard to the constraints of Policy 36. Policy 36 provides that alterations to windows and doors should ensure that they are in keeping with the design and materials of the original building so that a consistent architectural composition appropriate to the
historic character of the building is maintained.

8.5 The proposal does not include extensions to the building. The external alterations to the fabric of the building would involve the replacement of existing fire exit double doors in the northwest and southeast side elevations of the building at ground, first and second floor levels with metal doors and windows to service the new residential units. The windows in the Josephine Avenue frontage would be reconfigured by adding openable window panes at ground and first floors only. No changes are proposed to the second floor windows on the front elevation of the building and, the existing entrance door would be retained.

8.6 It is considered that the proposed elevational alterations would not comprise the architectural integrity of the existing building; with the new windows designed to match the existing. As such the proposal would preserve the fenestral features of the existing building and thereby preserving the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

9 Residential Amenity Impacts

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

9.2 The proposal would utilise the existing building envelope and footprint with no changes to its massing, height or size. External alterations would be limited to changes to doors and windows to facilitate its conversion to residential use. The proposal would therefore not affect in anyway the levels of natural light received at neighbouring residential properties in Hermes Court, Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road. Neither would the proposals result in a loss of outlook for these properties or create a sense of enclosure for existing residents.

9.3 However, given the proposed change of use to residential and the alterations to door and window openings, there is potential for adverse impacts on residential amenity as a consequence of increased opportunities for overlooking and loss of privacy. In addition, the student accommodation could give rise to noise and general disturbance associated with the intensification of use of the site.

Privacy for adjoining residential properties

9.4 There would be new windows and doors introduced into the northwest and southeast flank elevations of the existing building at first and second floor levels, which would face onto neighbouring residential properties on Brixton Hill and Josephine Avenue. These windows would replace existing fire doors and/or glazed panels, which service the existing office space. The new openings would service living areas within the new residential units and would open onto the existing terraces/walkways, situated behind metal balustrades.

9.5 The separation distance between the windows/doors and the neighbouring properties would be a minimum of 20m. In both situations, the occupiers of the student accommodation would overlook neighbouring gardens/properties across the driveway to Hermes Court and the car park within the application site. Notwithstanding the potential intensification of use external
terraces/walkways, it is considered the separation distance is sufficient to ensure that privacy to adjoining residential properties would be safeguarded. The new windows/doors at ground floor level would sit behind the existing wall that runs the length of the southeast boundary of the site. It is noted that the residential flats within the upper floors of Hermes Court overlook these same neighbouring properties in a similar way. In these circumstances officers consider that neighbouring residents would not suffer a loss of privacy.

**Noise and disturbance**

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

9.7 The application site adjoins residential properties in Josephine Avenue and Brixton Hill. In addition, Hermes Court to the rear of the site is attached to application building. The proposed development is for residential purposes in self-contained units and as such the use of the site would not be different from that of purpose built flats or house conversions in the area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature with commercial activity largely confined to the local centre in Brixton Hill and as such the proposed use of the building is compatible with the nature of the area.

9.8 It should be noted that there is no communal outdoor space is proposed, with the only outdoor space afforded to a few of the studio units on the upper floors of the building, by way of balconies/terraces. All communal activity, which has potential to generate noise and general disturbance would be contained within the building, and in a section of the building fronting onto the street where there is ambient noise associated with the adjacent local centre on Brixton Hill. Part of the existing car park at the rear of the site and adjacent to No. 57 Josephine Avenue would be used to provide a secure cycle storage area and as such noise associated with its use as a car park would be reduced.

9.9 Nevertheless, in order to ensure that the student accommodation is managed in manner that has regard to the amenities neighbouring residents including their safety as well as the safety of the application building and its residents, it is recommended that that any consent should be subject to the submission of a detailed Student Management Plan.

**10 Traffic and Parking**

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

**Site & Accessibility**

10.2 The site is well served by public transport with Brixton Overland and Underground stations located within a short bus ride away. There are several bus routes on Brixton Hill, within a short walking distance of the site. This gives the site an Excellent public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 6a, the
second highest possible on the PTAL scale. At such locations car-free development are encouraged by the development plan, in the interests of sustainable development.

**Car Parking**

10.3 In this case, although the Council’s Transport officers have expressed a preference to remove all on-site parking accommodation, the applicant proposes to retain 7 out of the existing 10 car parking space. It should be noted that there are no parking standards in the London Plan in relation to student accommodation and as such any reduction in car parking accommodation is welcome in interests of sustainable development. In order to further minimise car-based journeys to the site and the demand for on-street parking consequent upon the intensification of use of the site, the Council’s Transport planners have recommended that any consent should be subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure the development as “permit-free”. This means residents of the site would not be eligible for Council car parking permits to park on surrounding roads.

**Cycle Parking**

10.4 Parking/storage for 24 cycles is proposed on part of the existing car parking area in a covered shelter for use by the residents of the site. This is equivalent to one parking space per two bed spaces, which is consistent with the London Plan standards for a 1 or 2 persons dwelling unit. Details of the size and appearance of the cycle storage unit are reserved by condition.

10.5 In conclusion, officers are satisfied that the controls, which would be placed upon on-street car parking through a permit-free s106 agreement, the reduction in car parking provision on site and the location of the site in an area of excellent public transport accessibility would ensure that the development does increase parking stress on surrounding streets or unacceptably impact upon either the function or safety of the surrounding highway network.

11 **Sustainability Issues**

11.1 The London Plan requires developments to make the fullest contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions, adopting sustainable design and construction measures and prioritising decentralised energy, including renewable technologies. Policy 5.2 sets out a minimum target reduction for carbon dioxide emissions in buildings of 25% over the Target Emissions Rates outlined in the national Building Regulations. This policy advises that development proposals should contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy (Be lean – use less energy; Be clean – use energy efficiently and; Be green – use renewable energy).

11.2 London Plan Policy 5.4 requires boroughs to develop policies and proposals within their LDFs regarding the sustainable retrofitting of existing buildings, and is therefore applicable in this instance. Policy 5.7 of the London Plan 2011 states that major development proposal should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions through the use of on-site renewable energy generation, where feasible. Core Strategy Policy S7 states that all major development should achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in line with London Plan targets and promotes improvements in energy efficiency of existing buildings as part of their refurbishment and maintenance.

11.3 The applicant’s Design and Assess Statement contains an outline of
measures, which the applicant proposes to undertake during the refit of the existing building order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy. The range of energy efficiency measures proposed include the following: the replacement of all glazing units with modern glazing specification units which would reduce heat loss in winter months and heat gain in the summer months; upgrading the building fabric insulation and air tightness; new energy use heating and lighting installations to maximise energy efficient and reduce energy; the use of grey water and low water usage WCs, showers and taps and; the installation of a solar thermal hot water system.

11.4 The application has not explored the use on-site renewable energy generation and, has not quantified the reduction in regulated carbon dioxide, which the proposed measures would achieve. However, the application acknowledges that there are significant opportunities in this scheme for reducing energy consumption within the building design through upgrading its fabric and the use of efficient building services. Therefore in the event of approval, it is recommended that a detailed Energy Statement, should be submitted showing the savings in carbon dioxide emissions, which the sustainable retrofitting of the existing building would achieve in line with Policies 5.4 and/or 5.7 of the London Plan.

11.5 Saved Policy 35 of the UDP and Policy S7 of the Core Strategy require all development proposals to show how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles into the design of new or the refurbishment of existing buildings. The Council’s SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction advises applicants to use the British Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) system to measure the environmental performance of new and existing buildings to ensure that sustainable design and construction principles inform the design and construction of the building.

11.6 Buildings are assessed and awarded credits according to the level of performance within a range of 9 environmental categories, comprising management, energy use, health and well being, pollution, transport, land use, ecology, materials and water. The credits are then added together using a set of environmental weightings to produce a single overall score. The building is then rated on a scale of PASS, GOOD, VERY GOOD, EXCELLENT and OUTSTANDING and a certificate award.

11.7 The applicant has used the BREEAM Multi-Residential system, which is typically used for student halls of residence, key worker accommodation and sheltered housing. The pre-assessment has established that the existing building could achieve a Very Good rating, which would comply with the above development plan policies. In the event of approval it is recommended that a condition is attached requiring the submission of a final Code Certificate confirming that a BREEAM ‘Very Good’ rating has been achieved.

12 Refuse and Recycling

12.1 Policy S8 of the Core Strategy places a requirement on developments to contribute to the sustainable management of waste. Specific guidance is set out within the Council’s ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements’ guidance (2006). In addition, Policies 9 and 14 of the UDP and Policy S4 of the Core Strategy (January 2011) seek to ensure that proposals for waste collection and servicing strategies have a minimal impact on the performance and safety of the highway network.
12.2 The existing arrangements for refuse storage and the storage of recyclable materials would be maintained. The waste would be stored in the existing storage area within the fabric of the building at ground floor level. The refuse storage rooms and chutes on the upper floors would be refurbished and brought back into use in tandem with the main storage bins at ground floor level. Refuse collection and servicing would be undertaken from Josephine Avenue.

12.3 If planning permission is granted it is recommended that conditions be imposed to meet the Council’s Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements as well as the submission of a waste management plan to ensure that adequate provision is made for the management of waste, litter and refuse from the premises, in the interests of the residential amenities of the area.

13 Crime Prevention

13.1 Saved Policy 32 of the UDP requires that development should enhance community safety. Development will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder. Policy S9(f) of the Core Strategy requires the Council to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and its liveability by creating safe and secure environments that reduce the opportunities for crime, the fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, having regard to Secured by Design standards.

13.2 The Council’s Design Out Crime officer was consulted during consideration of the proposal. Upon her advice, amendments were made to the internal layout of the building including the retention of the main entrance on Josephine Avenue and the relocation of the communal areas to the frontage of the building. All entrance doors on the northwest elevation of the building at ground floor level would be used for emergency purposes only as they could otherwise be vulnerable to casual entry.

13.3 The Design out Crime officer considers that if Secure By Design minimum standards for new windows, doors, lighting, refuse and cycle storage and controlled of the gated entrances into the site are incorporated into the scheme, most of the crime risks should be mitigated. A condition requiring the development to comply with Secure by Design minimum standards is recommended. In addition a Student Management Plan, which would include measures to prevent unauthorised access within the buildings/or site as well as details of the prospective residents including the institutions attended should be secured as a condition of consent.

14 S106 Obligations & Mayoral CIL

14.1 Policy S10 of the Core Strategy aims to secure planning obligations, which will be sought to mitigate the direct impact of the development within the locality. A planning obligation should be (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document for S106 Planning Obligations has been used to facilitate the calculation of contributions for this application.

14.2 The development would deliver the following s.106 obligations:
• Local labour in construction contribution of £2,701.00
• Cultural activities contribution (public art and libraries) of £10,804.01
• General employment and training contribution of £17,885.63
• Parks, open spaces and/or play space contribution of £27,004.00
• Revenue contributions £2,700.40
• S106 monitoring fee of £3,054.75

14.3 The total financial contribution for the proposed scheme would amount to £64,149.79

14.4 The development would also be secured as ‘permit-free’ by an appropriately worded clause in the s106 agreement, so that residents would not be eligible to apply for residents’ car parking permits, which are in operation on surrounding streets.

14.5 It is advised that the scheme will also be liable to the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Level (CIL). This will amount to £45,395.00 and is in addition to the S106 package set out above. This contribution does form part of the Lambeth development plan policy obligations and, is to be secured and monitored by the Council on behalf of the Mayor.

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

15 Conclusions

15.1 The proposed change of use and conversion of the existing office building to provide student accommodation is considered acceptable in land use terms and, represents an effective and efficient use of a vacant building. The proposal complies with current national and local development plan policies, which provide strategic support for specific housing need including accommodation for students, hostels and other forms of specialised housing.

15.2 The proposal is acceptable on all other material planning consideration as it would it would involve appropriate and limited alterations to the external fabric of the building and as such would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area; it would not prejudice the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties; it would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety and; it would not increase risk of public disorder or give rise to increased opportunities for crime.

15.3 Furthermore, provisions are to be secured under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to minimise the impact of the development on the local environment and the highway network.

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

16 Recommendation
16.1 Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed below and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

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

17 Summary of the Reasons

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

17.2 In reaching this decision the following policies were relevant:

**Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011):**
- Policy S1 (Delivering the Vision and Objectives)
- Policy S2 (Housing)
- Policy S4 (Transport)
- Policy S7 (Sustainable Design and Construction)
- Policy S8 (Sustainable Waste Management)
- Policy S9 (Quality of the Built Environment)
- Policy S10 (Planning Obligations)
- Policy PN3 (Brixton)

**London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007):** Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011

- Policy 7 (Protection of Residential Amenity)
- Policy 9 (Transport Impact)
- Policy 14 (Parking and Traffic Restraint)
- Policy 18 (Shared Housing and Supported Housing)
- Policy 21 (Location and Loss of Offices)
- Policy 23 (Protection and Location of Other Employment Uses)
- Policy 32 (Community Safety/Designing out Crime)
- Policy 33 (Building Scale and Design)
- Policy 35 (Sustainable Design and Construction)
- Policy 36 (Alterations and Extensions)
- Policy 39 (Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design)
- Policy 47 (Conservation Areas)

18.0 Conditions

**Standard Conditions**

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

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

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

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

**Design & Heritage**

3 Typical door and window details, drawn to a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to
the commencement of the development. The development shall thereafter be
carried out solely in accordance with the approved details unless the prior
written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained for any
variation.

Reason: To ensure a high standard of design, to safeguard the visual
amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the
Conservation Area (Policies 33, 36 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth
UDP: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and Policies S9 and PN3 of the
Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

4 No plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed to the external
faces of the buildings, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning
Authority.

Reason: To ensure a high standard of design, to safeguard the visual
amenities of the locality and to preserve or enhance the character of the
Conservation Area (Policies 33, 36 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth
UDP: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and Policies S9 and PN3 of the
Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

**Landscaping**

5 Prior to the first occupation of the building as student accommodation, a
detailed scheme of soft and/or hard landscaping showing the treatment of all
parts of the site not covered by the building shall be submitted to and approved
in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposals shall include the
planting of specified trees, hedges, grass, shrubs and ground flora or climbers
together with an indication of how the planting would integrate with the
proposal in the long term with regard to anticipated routine maintenance and
protection. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above
and current Arboricultural best practice.

Reasons: To ensure satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of
visual amenity and in order to preserve or enhance the character and
appearance of the conservation area in accordance (Policies 39 and 47 of the
Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and
not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)
and Policies S1 and S9 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 5.3 of
the London Plan (July 2011)).

**Sustainability**

6 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve a minimum
criterion of ‘Very Good’ for the BREEAM Multi-Residential standard (or
subsequent superseding equivalent scheme). Evidence confirming that the
development achieves a BREEAM New Construction (or such equivalent
national measure of sustainability which replaces that scheme) rating of no
less than 'Very Good' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local
planning authority. The evidence shall be provided in the following formats and
at the following stages:

a) A design stage assessment, supported by relevant BRE interim certificate(s)
(or, if this is not available, evidence that the development is registered with a
BREEAM certification body and a pre-assessment report), to be submitted at
pre-construction stage prior to commencement of works on site; and
b) A post-construction assessment, supported by a relevant BRE accreditation certificate (or other verification process agreed with the local planning authority), to be submitted following the practical completion of the development and prior to the first occupation of the development.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and achieve the agreed rating. The development shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of securing a more sustainable development (Policy 35 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011, Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)

The development shall be constructed so as to make the fullest possible contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy and, to at least meet the Target Emissions Rate (TER) outlined in the national Building Regulations. Prior to the commence of the development a detailed Energy Statement, showing the savings in carbon dioxide emissions, which the sustainable retrofitting of the existing building would achieve shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions and adopted sustainable design and construction measures (Policies 5.4 and 5.7 of the London Plan and Policies S1 and S7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

**Transport**

Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans, detailed drawings of the proposed cycle storage shelter including the layout, elevational treatment and manufacturer’s specification of cycle stands shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before first occupation of the development. Secure and sheltered provision shall be provided for a minimum of 38 cycles. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the duration of the use.

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

**Refuse/Waste Management**

Refuse and recycling storage facilities for the development hereby permitted shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the London Borough of Lambeth's 'Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers' (May 2006) prior to the residential occupation of the building and shall thereafter be retained as such for the duration of the permitted use, unless the prior written approval is obtained from the Local Planning Authority for any variations.
The approved development shall not be occupied as student accommodation until a Waste Management Strategy outlining the operation and management of waste storage and collection has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Community Safety/Design out Crime

The approved development shall be constructed and operated in accordance with ‘Secured by Design’ standards including the external lighting at entrances and gates and pedestrian routes within the site and the cycle and refuse storage enclosures unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the safety and security of future occupiers and to prevent crime and disorder occurring within and in the immediate vicinity of the site, in the interest of public safety in accordance with saved Policy 32 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5 August 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

Prior to the initial occupation of the approved development, a Student Management Plan outlining the operational use of the building including details on the prospective residents including the institutions attended and measures to protect community safety and prevent crime within the building and the surrounding area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved Student Management Plan.

Reason: To ensure the safety and security of future occupiers and to prevent crime and disorder occurring within and in the immediate vicinity of the site, in the interest of public safety in accordance with saved Policy 32 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5 August 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

The doors situated in the northwest elevation of the building at ground floor level shall only be used in the case of an emergency and, shall be kept shut at all times other than in an emergency.

Reason: To safeguard the safety of residents within the development and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers (Policies 7 and 32 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011).
Others

14 The student accommodation hereby approved shall be constructed to include at least 5 of the units as wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users and permanently retained as such for the duration of the use.

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

15 The conversion and change of use of the building hereby approved shall be solely for providing student accommodation (Use Class Sui Generis); any change of use of the building shall require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended, which prohibits uses classified as Sui Generis from changing to other uses without the prior planning approval of a local planning authority, and to ensure that an appropriate proportion of affordable housing is secured from an alternative residential use of the site in accordance with Policies 3.8, 3.10-3.13 of the London Plan and Policies 16 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) S10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).

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 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.

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

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

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

7 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council’s Streetcare team within the Public Protection Division with regard to the provision of refuse storage and collection facilities. The London Borough of Lambeth’s Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers’ (May 2006) is available on the planning pages of the Council’s website: www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning

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

This will ensure that any changes are agreed with Lambeth Council before use, in accordance with the London Buildings Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 and the Local Government Act 1985. Although it is not essential, we also advise you to contact the Street Naming and Numbering Officer before applying new names or numbers to internal flats or units. Contact details are listed below.
Street Naming and Numbering Officer
e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283