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**ADDRESS:** MHT House, Crescent Lane, London, SW4 9RS  
**Application Number:** 14/06885/FUL  
**Case Officer:** Mr Nicholas Linford  
**Ward:** Clapham Common  
**Date Received:** 19 December 2014

**Proposal:** Demolition of central section of existing building, rebuilding over a larger footprint including a new lower ground floor level and two additional residential units at roof level to create a total of 18 residential units, demolition of the outbuildings and external staircase of the east wing, external alterations to the rest of the building and an extension to the rear of the east wing at ground floor level

**Drawing numbers:** 053_SITO1; 053_EXE01; 053_EXE02; 053_PL005; 053_PL010; 053_PL011; 053_PL012; 053_PL013; 053_PL014; 053_PL015; 053_PL020; 053_PL030; 053_PL031; 053_PL040

**Documents:** Planning Statement (CGMS Ltd) Construction, Demolition and Method Statement (Galliard) Design and Access Statement (OSEL) Ecological Assessment (REC) Existing first floor survey Existing ground floor survey Existing second floor survey Heritage Appraisal (Martin O'Rourke) Location plan Archaeological Watching Brief (CGMS) Transport Statement (TPP) Arboricultural Implications Report (Broad Oak)

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant Conditional Permission subject to S106 Agreement

**Applicant:** Mr Peter Hadjidakis  
GHL (Crescent Lane) Ltd  
3rd Floor  
Sterling House  
Langston Road  
Loughton  
Essex  
IG10 3TS

**Agent:** None

**SITE DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant site designations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Hierarchy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Clapham Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This application constitutes a further proposal for the change of use of MHT House in Crescent Lane from employment (B1) to residential providing 18 self contained flats. This has arisen from the acquisition of the site by Galliard Homes from the previous owners who already benefited from planning permission for 29 units at the site.

This application principally relates to the central section and northern wing of the site only and involves the demolition of the northern wing and its subsequent rebuild over up to five storeys (including lower ground floor and a new roof extension). The application would provide eleven x 1 bed flats and seven x 2 bed flats.

This application was submitted in parallel with an application for Prior Approval for 18 units within the eastern and western wings which was approved in February 2015 and this current application also features alterations, amendments and extensions to the building to support the Prior Approval development.

Officers have assessed the proposals in relation to national, strategic and local design policy guidance contained within the NPPF, London Plan, Core Strategy, saved UDP and the emerging Local Plan.

The key planning issues relating to this case are:

- Acceptability of the change of use from employment to residential
- The quantum of affordable housing that would be achievable as a result of this development and whether this is the optimum amount possible in accordance with the London Plan.
- The acceptability of the proposed extensions and alterations to the building and whether they would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Whether the proposed development would protect existing amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring development.
- Whether the development would make an appropriate contribution to sustainability objectives set out in the London Plan.
- Whether the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the highway network.

The proposed development has triggered the requirement for evaluation of the site’s ability to deliver on affordable housing. The proposal is not able to provide on site affordable housing but following negotiations between the Council, the applicants and their respective consultants, a commuted payment in lieu of affordable housing of £633,000 has been agreed. This would equate to three affordable housing units.

The proposed development is considered to respect and respond to the existing appearance, form and materials of the development and would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The use of the site for residential has now been established by a number of planning applications which have been approved by the Planning Applications Committee (14/00377/FUL) and by Prior Approval (14/06809/P3JPA) (being the latest) with the previous planning application setting out the evidence for marketing relating to the likelihood of the site retaining a viable employment use.
The proposal is considered to preserve and respect of the amenity of neighbouring properties in Crescent Lane and St Alphonsus Road with adequate distances between properties mitigating both overlooking and daylighting/sunlighting conditions.

In addition to the commuted payment for affordable housing, the proposed development will also secure contributions to training in construction as well as general employment and training in light of the loss of employment floorspace. Furthermore, a contribution of £30,000 is also being sought in respect of public realm works to stimulate improvements to pedestrian and cycling connections in the area.

Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme, subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon Local Planning Authorities by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICERS REPORT

Reason for referral to PAC: The applications are reported to the Planning Applications Committee in accordance with 1(ii) of the Committee’s terms of reference as they relate to the provision of more than 10 self contained residential dwellings.

1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1 The site is located on the northern side of Crescent Lane. The site is a slightly irregular rectangle shape and accommodates an existing three storey Tudor revival style building constructed in 1937. The building is oriented in a crescent shape on the site and there is a range of single storey pitched roof outbuildings adjacent to the boundary on the eastern side of the property. The site features generous landscaped areas as well as mature tree plantings that contribute to the landscaped amenity of the surrounding area.

![Figure 1: Context and locality](image_url)
1.2 The principal elevation of the building facing towards Crescent Lane has a distinctive architectural character and is constructed of stock brickwork at ground and first floor levels. Stone has been used for emphasis and detail work in and around the main entrance and projecting first floor bay window on the street elevation of the western wing. The building is three storeys in height and the second floor presents as a mansard extension with dormer windows. The second floor mansard roof level is slightly setback from the floors below. The lawful use of the building is for offices (Use Class B1) and was last occupied by Metropolitan Housing Trust. It is currently vacant.

Figure 2: Front elevation

1.3 The site has three vehicle crossovers to Crescent Lane. One in the western corner of the property leading to hard stand parking area in the northern part of the site and two further crossovers that facilitate access to the primary curved driveway to the front entrance of the building. Adjoining development to the north and east of the site consists of semi-detached and attached single dwelling houses fronting St Alphonsus Road. A three storey residential flat building known as Henry Twinning Court is located on the adjacent site to the south. The property to the north on Crescent Grove comprises a Grade II listed attached dwelling house. Opposite Crescent Lane is the Notre Dame housing estate which is a residential flat development which is predominantly two storeys in height.

1.4 The building is not a Listed or locally listed building however the architectural composition of the building is considered to be high quality. The site is situated in the Clapham Conservation Area (CA 1) which is centred on Clapham Common and features many historic buildings dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. There is also a great deal of mid-late 19th century residential development beyond the common's edges which is deemed to be of interest. The semi-detached and terrace housing in Crescent Grove to the north of the site consist of Grade II Listed Buildings.

1.5 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. St Mary's Primary is situated to the west of the site along Crescent Lane. Clapham High Street District Centre with underground and bus services are located to the north as well as Clapham Common.

1 PROPOSAL
1.1 The application principally relates to the central section and ‘north’ wing of this building and proposes the partial demolition of this two storey part of the building and the erection of a replacement five storey structure (including lower ground floor level) to accommodate 18 self contained residential units by way of a change of use from the previous office (B1) use. The application also proposes additional ancillary works to the remainder of the building to take forward and implement previous planning permissions for the change of use of the building from office to residential.

1.2 The residential accommodation would comprise seven one-bed units and eleven two-bed units. All units would be for private market sale and no affordable units will be provided on site. Effectively, this application is a resubmission of the previous full planning application for this site (14/00377/FUL) with the exception with the removal of the eight dwelling houses.

2.3 At its highest point the building would raise approximately 15.7 metres above the adjoining ground level where the building would terminate with a mansard roof with access to a roof terrace. The extension would project from the retained rear building line by 18.4m and would have a width of 12.8m.

2.4 The proposal seeks to use matching external materials including slate to the new mansard roof, the re use of the existing bricks and where this is not possible, the use of existing stock bricks (including using a Flemish bond to the brickwork), new stone to replicate parapet copings, bands and window surrounds. The fenestration would be new powder coated aluminium windows to match the colour of the existing.

2.5 Other external alterations to the building include a single storey rear extension to the east wing to enlarge the space that would eventually be occupied by the units that will come forward following the implementation of the most recent Prior Approval application at the premises. In addition, changes will be made to fenestration across the building.

2.6 The main access to the building would be from Stewart’s Place and some of the basement/ground floor studios would also benefit from a direct access from either Stewart’s Place (Studios 6 and 7) or Weld Work Mews (Studios 4 and 5).

2.7 The application form identifies that there are 27 car parking spaces provided on site. There would be a reduction of 5 to 22 spaces. The application would also provide 38 covered cycle parking spaces. Access from the highway to the site will be as existing through gates which will be retained. The existing ground levels have been modified to facilitate level entry into the main entrances therefore, providing level access into the main entrance area and lift lobby area. A new lift will be installed with level access from the lift to each of the proposed flat entrance doors.

2.8 The application proposes new landscaping within the site as well as along the boundaries to enhance the site and its integration into the residential character and streetscene of this part of the Borough.

2.9 The scheme as proposed is illustrated in the following elevations:
Figure 3: Proposed site plan
Figure 4: Proposed front elevation

Figure 5: Proposed rear elevation of the North wing
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 20 November 2002 - planning permission was granted for the erection of a rear single storey ground floor conservatory along with associated alterations (ref: 02/02667/FUL).

3.2 9 November 2006 - planning permission was refused for the erection of portakabin to provide additional office space within the existing rear car park with associated stepped and ramped access and canopy (ref: 06/02494/FUL)

3.3 Pre-application advice (ref: 12/03647/PREAPP) was provided on 1 November 2012 regarding a proposal to demolish the existing building and construct a part 4/part 5 storey building comprising 55 residential dwellings and associated basement level car parking. The advice confirmed the existing lawful use of the building as office (Use Class B1) and did not support the demolition of the building from a conservation perspective. In addition, general transport advice was provided as well as indicating that affordable housing would need to be provided.

3.4 The scheme was redesigned to retain the existing building and further pre-application advice (ref: 13/00204/PREAPP) was provided on 4 March 2013.

3.5 Following on from the March 2013 pre-application advice, the design was modified to present a historicist approach and officers indicated informally that this had been achieved.

3.6 23 August 2013 - planning permission ref 13/02369/FUL was refused for the demolition of mansard roof, north wing and ground floor eastern extension, construction of a new roof extension and north wing with part basement and part third floor over central block, change of use of the building from office (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3) providing eight dwelling houses and 18 self-contained flats.
with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking, refuse storage and ancillary works for the following reason:

1) The proposal provides no provision for affordable housing, argued on the basis of viability. However, the viability information received fails to demonstrate that the scheme can not viably provide affordable housing either in the form of an on or off site contribution and therefore fails to meet the housing needs of the Borough contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy 3.14 of The London Plan (2011) and Policy S2 of the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

3.7 Pre-application advice submission (ref: 13/05016/PREAPP) was made on 29/10/2013 to discuss the viability and affordable housing contribution of the refused scheme ref: 13/02369/FUL. As part of the pre-application process, the applicant's viability report was independently verified by BNP Paribas and the Council's Housing Team was involved in the discussions. On 15 January 2014 officers indicated to the applicant that the proposed development is capable to provide 4 shared ownership units (3 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom unit) on site and a payment in lieu contribution of £31,659. The officers acknowledged that the small number of units to be provided on site may impact on the viability of delivering the units on site. It was indicated that if the applicant demonstrated that this is the case then the scheme could deliver a payment in lieu contribution of £486,745.

3.8 29 January 2014 - Prior Approval ref: 13/05785/P3JPA was issued for the change of use of property from Office use (Class B1) to Residential use to 27 self contained flats on the ground, first, and second floors (Class C3) under Class J of Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) 1995.

3.9 10 February 2014 - Prior Approval ref: 13/06019/P3JPA was issued for the change of use of the existing offices (Use Class B1) to provide 9 houses and 9 flats (Use Class C3) on the ground, first and second floors under Class J of Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) 1995.

3.10 13 February 2014 - Planning permission ref: 13/05896/FUL was granted for alterations to elevations to install additional external doors and windows, the enlargement, adjustment and repositioning of existing windows; blocking up of existing window openings; installation of new dormer windows and alterations to existing dormers; new entrance steps and adjacent low walls; removal of an existing lift shaft and erection of a replacement chimney stack and associated works of demolition.

3.11 24 April 2014 – Prior Approval application ref: 14/01280/P3JPA was granted for the change of use of the existing offices (Use Class B1) to provide 28 self contained flats (Use Class C3) on the ground, first and second floors.

3.12 25 April 2014 – Planning permission ref: 14/00377/FUL was granted for Change of use from offices (Use Class B1) to residential use (Use Class C3) to provide eight houses and 18 flats. Partial demolition including a lift shaft, chimney stack, north
wing, and range of outbuildings, alterations and extensions including creation of a part basement; provision of external roof terraces; alterations to the roof form; alterations to the elevations to provide new entrance doors and windows; the enlargement, adjustment and re-positioning of existing openings; blocking up of existing window openings; addition of dormer windows; new entrance steps and adjacent low walls; replacement chimney stack; reconfiguration of existing car parking; hard and soft landscaping proposals including provision of a children's play area; construction of refuse, recycling and cycle stores; and other associated works.

3.13 22 July 2014 – Planning permission ref: 14/01826/FUL was granted for the erection of a single storey extension at second floor level to the north-west wing to provide one residential unit.

3.14 10 February 2015 – Planning application ref: 15/00778/FUL was received for the Provision of roof terraces to provide private amenity space to first floor apartments, along with external alterations to facilitate access.

3.14 12 February 2015 – Prior Approval application ref: 14/06809/P3JPA was granted for the change of use of the existing offices (Use Class B1a) to provide 18 self contained flats (Use Class C3) on the ground, first and second floors.

4 CONSULTATIONS AND RESPONSES

4.1 Statutory Consultees:
TfL Road Network – No response received to date.

4.2 Other Consultees:
Clapham Society - No response received to date.
Friends of Clapham Common - No response received to date.
Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee and Group - No response received to date.
Crescent Grove Trustees - No response received to date.

4.3 Adjoining owners/occupiers

4.3.1 Consultation letters were sent to 411 adjacent properties. A site notice was displayed in the vicinity of the site and the application was advertised in the local paper on 06.02.2015

4.3.2 In response to public consultation one letter of objection has been received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of objections</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of development will affect quality of life</td>
<td>See para. 6.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on privacy</td>
<td>See para. 6.3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Internal consultees
4.4.1 Conservation and urban design: No objection in principle to the demolition and reconstruction of this part of the building or the extensions to the eastern wing. However, objection has been raised against window and dormer detailing and the lack of sufficient information concerning construction detailing of the roof top extension.

4.4.2 Response: Appropriate conditions can be imposed on the permission to secure additional detailing for fenestration on the proposed elevations and the roof top extension.

4.4.3 Transport: No objection in principle although the Transport Assessment is lacking in some detail pertaining to crossovers, cycle parking arrangements and delivery and servicing plans. However, reference is made to comments made by Transport Planners in 2014 in relation to a Prior Approval application (13/05785/P3JPA). At that time, the Transport Planner stated that the impact on on-street parking levels is a key consideration. The site is contained within CPZ L which means that Crescent Lane and all surrounding streets are subject to permit controlled parking. To assess the available spare capacity existing within these streets the applicant undertook parking surveys on 26th & 28th March 2013. The results of which are included with the application and demonstrate that there is significant spare capacity within the closest streets, namely Crescent Lane, Tabeer Avenue, Allnutt Avenue and Worsopp Drive, such that any overspill parking from the development not accommodated by the 41 off-street spaces would not adversely impact on the safe operation of the highway or the amenity of existing residents. It should be noted that based on 2011 Census data for car ownership within the Clapham Common ward it is anticipated that these 27 units would generate 18 cars meaning that even taking in to account some level of visitor parking very little or no displacement on to the surrounding streets should occur'.

4.4.4 Crime prevention: No objection subject to imposition of a Secured by Design and safe illumination condition.

4.4.5 Ecology: No objection subject to the imposition of a condition.

4.4.6 Arboriculture: No objection subject to conditions relating to tree protection.

5 POLICIES

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

5.2 The London Plan 2011 (now Further Alterations to the London Plan 2014), the Core Strategy and the Saved UDP comprise the development plan for Lambeth. The Lambeth Local Plan currently has only minimal weight in decision making as it is still not finalised and the council hasn’t yet had the benefit of the Inspector’s report. It is recognised (as set out in paragraph 216 of the NPPF) that some weight can be given to emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the degree of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency with the NPPF so policies in the Local Plan may be considered a material consideration. However, development plan policy is subject to formal examination by the Planning Inspectorate and that examination is against four ‘tests of soundness’ set out in the NPPF. Until a Planning Inspector
rules that the plan is “sound” via her report, the weight to be given to the Lambeth Local Plan is minimal.

5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2012. This document sets out the Government’s planning policies for England including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is a material consideration in the determination of all applications.

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

5.5 The London Plan (2011) (as amended)

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.6 Children and young people’s play and informal play facilities
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balance communities
Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing
Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets
Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
Policy 4.1 Developing London’s Economy;
Policy 4.2 Offices;
Policy 4.4 Managing Industrial Land and Premises;
Policy 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation;
Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions;
Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction;
Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy;
Policy 6.3 Assessing effect of Development on Transport Capacity;
Policy 6.9 Cycling;
Policy 6.13 Parking;
Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment;
Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime;
Policy 7.4 Local Character;
Policy 7.5 Public Realm;
Policy 7.6 Architecture;
Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes;
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure Levy

5.6 Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

Policy S1 Delivering the Vision and Objectives;
Policy S2 Housing
Policy S3 Economic Development;
Policy S4 Transport;
Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction;
Policy S8 Sustainable Waste Management;
Policy S9 Quality of the Built Environment;
Policy S10 Planning Obligations;
5.7 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 15 Additional housing  
Policy 16 Affordable housing  
Policy 21 Location and Loss of Offices;  
Policy 31 Streets, Character and Layout;  
Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime;  
Policy 33 Building Scale and Design;  
Policy 36 Extensions and alterations  
Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction;  
Policy 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design;  
Policy 47 Conservation areas

5.8 Supplementary Planning Documents

SPD: Safer Built Environments (2008);  
SPD: Sustainable Design and Construction (2008);  
SPD: S106 Planning Obligations (2012);  

Refuse and Recycling Storage Design Guide (July 2013); and  

6 ASSESSMENT

6.1 Land Use

6.1.1 The lawful use of the existing building is for offices (Use Class B1). Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) seeks to maintain a stock of other sites and premises (not in Key Industrial and Business Areas (KIBAs)) in commercial use across the Borough subject to the suitability of the site and location. Policy 23 of the UDP (2007) supports the operation of Policy S3 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) however outlines criteria and circumstances in which a change in use from employment to non-employment uses may be permitted. One of these criteria allows the change in use where the building is vacant and it is demonstrated through a marketing report that there is no prospect in the medium term for its re-use for employment purposes.

6.1.2 In the case of MHT House, however, the principle of the change of use from office to residential has been established by a number of planning applications and Planning Applications Committee resolved to grant planning permission for a change of use from office to residential on 1 April 2014. That application was granted permission partly on the basis of the evidence of a marketing campaign establishing that there was no long term opportunity for the site to be brought back into use for employment purposes. The principle of the change of use was further reinforced by a number of applications for a Prior Approval for a change of use from office to residential which have been allowed on three occasions, with the latest coming in February 2015. This means that the developer can change the use of the property to provide up to 29 self contained residential units and that there are four extant permission for a change of use to residential. The result of these applications are a material consideration when
determining this application for planning permission and on this basis, the use of the premises as residential would be supported.

6.1.3 The application proposes the provision of 18 units of residential accommodation, which would contribute to the Borough’s target of providing 13950 units during the forthcoming 10 year period as set out in the GLA’s Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015). The premises have been acquired in its entirety by Galliard Homes and it is their intention to implement the 18 units within this application in conjunction with the 18 units that have already been allowed through the Prior Approval process (15/06809/P3JPA). This would create 36 units and an uplift in 7 units from the maximum 29 units already approved on the site. The development density for the site is 94 dwellings per hectare on a site of 0.38ha. The site has a PTAL rating of 5 which equates to very good and given this the development density falls within the prescribed development density range set out in the development density matrix in table 3.2 of the GLA London Plan Housing SPG (2011).

6.1.4 As the number of dwellings to be provided on the site exceeds 10 and that the site size also exceeds 0.1ha, the development triggers the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing. For a development to be policy compliant, the applicants need to consider the viability of the scheme to provide 40% of units as affordable units. In this case, 40% of units would equate to 7 units being provided within an affordable tenure.

6.1.5 A report setting out an appraisal of the viability of the scheme to provided affordable housing was submitted to the Council during the lifetime of this application. The report was prepared by Strutt and Parker and established that physical provision of affordable housing units within the development would not generate a sufficient Site Value Benchmark to make affordable housing a viable proposition for the developers. Strutt and Parker have advised that the Site Value Benchmark must be exceeded by the Residual Land Value if the scheme were to be viable. The applicants tested three affordable housing scenarios and then compared the Residual Land Value against the Site Benchmark Value. This included an option with four intermediate units, an options with two social rented units and a further options with two intermediate units. The applicants’ consultants also tested the option of a commuted payment and determined that this would also eliminate the viability of the scheme. In parallel, the developers approached the RSLs on the Council’s preferred list and established that none would bid for any affordable housing units that would be provided on the site. In addition, none would make an approach for the four units secured through the Section 106 legal agreement associated with the previous planning permission 14/00377/FUL.

6.1.6 However, the developer has indicated its willingness to make a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing within the London Borough of Lambeth. The developer’s initial offer was approximately £381000.

6.1.7 Officers sought the advice of BNP Paribas to provide an appraisal of the applicants’ evaluation of the site’s ability to provide affordable housing on the site. They were instructed to consider the ability of the scheme to provide affordable housing taking into account a number of factors. These included whether the previous planning history for the site which establishes the use of the site for residential reduces the risk and therefore the costs that would be borne by the developers and fundamentally, whether the applicants’ chosen consent route of securing Prior Approval for part of the site for 18 units and full planning permission for the remaining parts of the building (this application) generates any influence on the scheme. Officers initially considered that as the development in this application would form
part of a larger more comprehensive development owned by the same applicants and then brought forward for sale and disposal, the scheme would be able to generate a more significant profit than if the scheme of 18 units was considered in isolation. However, BNP Paribas rejected this hypothesis and considered that instead the ability of the scheme to provide for affordable housing should only be based on the difference between the overall dwelling provision and the existing extant dwelling numbers that have secured planning permission from the Council. Galliard Homes aim to provide 36 units on site through a mixture of consents but benefit from permission so far for 29 units which could realistically and lawfully be implemented. As such, BNP Paribas agreed to assess and evaluate a viable commuted payment based on 40% of the surplus 7 units. BNP Paribas in conjunction with Strutt and Parker then agreed that 40% of the 7 units (to make a policy compliant scheme) would result in approximately 3 units. Given earlier conclusions made by all parties that the scheme cannot realistically provide on site affordable housing, BNP Paribas sought to arrive at a commuted payment that would be reasonable (and viable) in this instance. On this basis, BNP Paribas raised their expectations to approximately £633,000.

6.1.8 Officers advised that they considered that the provision at this level would be unsatisfactory given that the previous planning application for the site was capable of delivering four intermediate units as well as a nominal commuted payment of approximately £750,000. BNP Paribas was then requested to reconsider the commuted payment that could be achieved given officer’s concern that the proposal would not reflect what had been achieved by the previous scheme on the site. BNP Paribas were able to re-evaluate the commuted payment and provide a figure of approximately £634,000 which was put to Galliard Homes. This figure was then found to be agreeable.

6.1.9 This commuted payment is considered to be comparable to the provision (pro-rata) to the 2014 scheme in respect of relative provision as a proportion of the overall units (at approximately 16%). Officers feel that they cannot exhaust any further discussions between the applicants and their advisors to the extent the applicants decide to implement a 100% Prior Approval approach where quality of accommodation, affordable housing, quality of amenity and building performance cannot be managed in such a way as to achieve high quality sustainable development as promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework.

6.1.10 It is often possible where affordable housing provision on site is below policy compliant threshold to impose a review mechanism that would seek to secure further contributions following a re-appraisal of the scheme viability. This process is frequently used. However, BNP Paribas have recommended that the scheme would not be applicable to this development. This relates to the provision set out earlier that affordable housing should only be sought as a proportion of the uplift from 29 units to 36 units. As such, the development should achieve 40% of 7 units which would be approximately 3 units. The commuted payment that has been agreed is comparable to 40% provision and in the view of BNP Paribas, the scheme is policy compliant and in such cases, it would not be appropriate to seek the imposition of a review mechanism.

6.1.11 With regards to dwelling mix, the requirement of Policy S2 (d) is for a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures to meet the needs of different sections of the community. The policy does not prescribe a mix of units; rather it is informed by the priority and strategic housing market needs identified in regular housing assessments undertaken by the Council. Provision has regard to the particular location and nature of the individual site concerned.
6.1.12 In this case the proposed dwelling mix of 11 x one bed units and 7 x 2 bed units would provide an acceptable proportion of family sized units on the site suited to 2 person and 3 person households for which there a continuing demand in the borough. Officers consider the proposed dwelling mix acceptable and consistent with the objectives of Policy S2 of the Core Strategy.

6.2 Design

6.2.1 Policy S9 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) calls for the highest quality in all new buildings and the public realm. Saved Policies 31, 33 and 39 of the UDP (2007) establish specific provisions for ensuring that development is of a high quality design, is appropriately designed having regard to access, existing development, residential density, amenity and scale and landscape design and public realm amongst others. Policy 36 governs alterations and extensions and requires new work to be subordinate to the host building and respectful of the amenity of existing residential neighbours.

6.2.2 The proposal involves alterations and extensions to accommodate the change in use from office to residential. The design of the proposed alterations and extensions has been informed by two rounds of pre-application advice with Council’s officers. The initial proposal to demolish the existing building was revised to re-use the existing building with some partial demolition and reconstruction works in recognition of the aesthetic quality and significance of the building despite not being a listed or locally listed building but contributing to the Conservation Area.

6.2.3 The existing building is a fine inter-war example of Tudor revival style that is rare in Lambeth. The sympathetic alteration of the building is welcomed, would reinforce key characteristics and removes the harm caused in the 1970s with the unsympathetic mansard roof extension. The proposed demolition and reconstruction of the north wing generally located to the rear of the site would remain subordinate to the host building and match the existing building footprint. The same palette of brick, stone and clay tile roofing in an ordered composition with fenestration reflecting the rhythms and proportions of the front elevation are to be used in the reconstruction. The existing building is centred to the rear northern corner of the site thereby featuring a large open space that contributes to the landscaped setting and aesthetic of the Clapham Conservation Area and the site. The increased height from the reconstructed mansard roof and additional centrally located third floor is appropriately designed and positioned so as to appear subordinate to the host building and recessive in the landscaped setting of the site.

6.2.4 The design preserves the original front elevations at ground and first floor level. The distinctive and well detailed main entrance and surrounding bay window is retained unaltered and provides an access to the apartments. The existing pattern of fenestration is largely retained. These have been designed to be set within Bath stone door surrounds echoing the detailing of the existing main building entrance and ensuring that entrance doors are clearly discernable in the building elevation.
6.2.6 The layout of the site by the original architect has created a large open area to the south which has developed and accommodates mature planting and a landscaped amenity that contributes to the character and appearance of the site and Conservation Area. The extensive drive and parking areas to the rear are proposed to be removed and replaced with a discrete parking area for 10 cars located behind the cultivated hedge that defines the street boundary of the site. Soft landscaped areas will be extended and contribute to the maintenance of the landscaped character of the site and area. All hard surfacing at the rear of the site is replaced with soft landscaping.

6.2.7 The Council's Conservation officer was consulted on the proposals and raised no objections to the principle of the development including the scale, form, size and massing of the development, but did do in relation to the detailed design relating to fenestration (transoms and mullions) and dormers as well as coping, rainwater goods and pipes to the rooftop extension. However, it is considered that the NPPF supports the use of a planning condition to secure these details rather than refuse and as a result the decision is subject to conditions relating to construction detailing, materials, refuse storage and hard landscaping details. The Conservation officer raised concerns with regards to the proposed cycle storage which should be built in brick and detailed to complement the Tudor character of the site and a revised design can be secured by a condition.

6.2.8 Overall, the proposed design of the alterations and extensions are of high quality, relate satisfactorily to surrounding development and would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy S9 of the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011) and Policies 31, 33, 36 and 47 of the UDP (2007).

Trees

6.2.9 Saved Policy 39 of the UDP and Policy S5 of the Core Strategy set out that as much attention should be paid to the design of the areas between buildings as to buildings themselves. Development should provide or enhance an uncluttered, consistent, simple, accessible and co-ordinated public realm, with robust and appropriate materials and landscape design which enhances the setting, connections and spaces between buildings. Trees of high amenity value will be protected.

6.2.10 The proposal has been accompanied by an arboricultural assessment which investigates the impact of the proposed development on existing mature trees in and around the site. A total of 20 trees have been assessed. Two of the trees inspected are dying or dead and recommended for removal whether works commence or not. Two further trees are recommended to be removed in order to accommodate the new access and parking areas. These are considered acceptable and unlikely to impact the existing high quality landscaped amenity of the site and surrounds. Many of the existing trees would be retained on the site. In the event that permission is granted, conditions could be imposed to ensure that all works are undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the arboricultural assessment.
6.3 Amenity

6.3.1 Saved Policies 7 and 33 (c and d) of the UDP and Policy S2 of the Core Strategy deal with amenity and seek to ensure that the development does not unacceptably harm the amenity in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and noise.

Table 1: Schedule of accommodation (unit floor areas).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat no</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>GIA m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 The unit and internal room size standards comply with the London Plan (2011) and Lambeth's Supplementary Planning Document for the Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008). In many cases the minimum unit sizes have been comfortably exceeded and indicate that an acceptable standard of accommodation would be provided to future occupants.

Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Accessible Housing

6.3.3 All units proposed have been designed to comply with Lifetime Home standards. Four units have been designed to be wheelchair accessible which represents 15% of all units. A condition of consent would be attached to secure this commitment.

Daylight/Sunlight, Privacy and Outlook

6.3.4 89% of the units would benefit from at least dual aspect. Two flats would have a single aspect, however these would be south facing therefore would also benefit from good levels of daylight and sunlight. It is considered that all flats would also benefit from good outlook. The layout of the development is such that there would be no direct overlooking between habitable windows within the development.

Amenity Space
6.3.5 The SPD for Housing Development and House Standards requires the provision of private and communal amenity spaces in new residential development. New flats should receive 10m² balcony, terrace or private garden and a communal shared amenity space of 50m² for the scheme.

6.3.6 Lower ground floor and ground floor units all have access to functional external private space which exceeds the standards set out in the London Plan Housing SPG. In addition, the two flats on the third floor also have external space by way of a roof terrace. However, the flats on the first and second floor do not benefit from either communal or private external space. Nevertheless, the London Plan Housing SPG advises that space which could be provided externally could be provided internally with an equivalent uplift in internal floorspace. It is considered that this would be provided in this case, and on balance the scheme is acceptable.

Children and Young Peoples Play Space

6.3.7 Policy 50 of the UDP (2007) requires the provision of suitable play areas for school and junior children in major developments. The scheme proposes to provide 123m² of children's play area based on a child yield of 12 and having regard to Greater London Authority standards.

6.3.8 The scheme exceeds the requirement of 123sq.m of children's playspace. The space provided is appropriate for all age groups including 0 – 11 years and 12 – 15 year olds.

Residential Amenity

6.3.9 Saved Policies 33 and 38 of the UDP are relevant with regards to the impact of the development upon residential amenity. Saved Policy 33 of the UDP sets out that building scale and design should protect the residential amenity of existing and future residents by having an acceptable standard of privacy; having an acceptable impact on levels of, daylight and sunlight; not creating unacceptable overlooking; not creating an undue sense of enclosure; and where appropriate, having sufficient outdoor amenity space. Policy 38 of the UDP states that proposal to intensify existing residential/mixed use areas are welcomed where this can be achieved through good design and without harm local amenities.

Daylight/Sunlight

6.3.10 A daylight and sunlight assessment has not been submitted with the application. However, reference has been made to the daylight and sunlight assessment submitted to support a previous planning application (14/00377/FUL), based on the British Research Establishments (BRE) Guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice'. This guide is widely referenced by Planning Authorities nationally as a benchmark against which to assess the likely impact of development on these matters. However, this remains a guide that should be
administered flexibly and having regard to site constraints and the different nature of development under assessment. Notwithstanding, an assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the BRE guide to ascertain the impact (if any) on the nearest affected residential neighbours to the site. It should be noted that given the similarities between the size, scale, bulk and form of the development of the previously consented scheme and the current scheme as well as the footprint and layout, it is recommended that the evaluation and conclusions should be relevant considerations for the current application. As a result, the approximations set out below, relating to Crescent Lane and St Alphonsus Road are pertinent to the current application. It should be noted that the reduced scale of the scheme for the east wing and the relationship to Henry Twining Court, this impact has been discounted.

6.3.11 The daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken aims to assess the impact of the development on existing daylight and sunlight levels received by neighbouring properties at 35 Crescent Grove, 114 to 124 St Alphonsus Road and Henry Twinning Court. The BRE guide outlines a series of tests for determining whether there is any likely impact by way of daylight reduction on existing neighbouring development. The first test is to ascertain whether the new development is more than 3 times its height above the lowest affected window. Where this is the case, the distance of separation is sufficient in mitigating against an unacceptable impact on existing daylight and sunlight levels. For the subject application, this distance is not achieved however it is quite close. The next step is to apply a 25 degree line from the middle of existing neighbouring windows. If the proposal protrudes above this line, then a more detailed review of the amount of daylight received by the window is required to determine whether the loss (if any) is acceptable. It is noted that the proposal however does not extend above this line when applied to neighbouring properties on St Alphonsus Road and there would not be an unacceptable impact to these properties. Whilst further analysis is not required, the daylight and sunlight study has gone on to assess the individual Vertical Sky Component (VSC) of each potentially affected window (the next step). The VSC is a calculation of the ratio of the direct sky illuminance falling on the outside window to the simultaneous illuminance under an unobstructed sky. The BRE guide suggests that the maximum possible VSC is 40% and that a VSC of 27% or higher would indicate that sufficient daylight is provided to the subject window. Where there is a reduction in existing VSC, it should not be less than 0.8 times its former VSC value to minimise impact.

6.3.12 The assessment undertaken to the nominated properties has revealed that although there may be some reductions to existing VSC levels, that these reductions are not less than 0.8 times the former value and therefore the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact by way of daylight on neighbouring properties. The worst affected property is 35 Crescent Grove which has two windows that would result in losses of 3.9% and 3.2% however as these reductions are not less than 0.8 times the former values, the impact is not unacceptable and unlikely to be perceptible. In terms of the residential properties along St Alphonsus Road, the reductions are in the range of 0.4-1.4%; none of which are less than 0.8 times the former value. The losses to daylight levels to existing windows in properties on St Alphonsus Road are minimal.
6.3.13 In addition to the level of daylight received by neighbouring properties, the amount of direct sunlight has also been assessed. The BRE guide suggests that sunlight tests should be applied to all main living rooms and conservatories which have windows facing within 90 degrees of due south. The BRE guide indicates that although kitchens and bedrooms are less important, care should be taken to not block too much sunlight to these rooms. Sunlight availability may be adversely affected if the centre of the subject window receives less than 25% of annual probable sunlight hours or less than 5% of annual probable sunlight hours between 21 September and 21 March; receive less than 0.8 times the former value of sunlight hours during either of these periods; and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year greater than 4% of annual probable sunlight hours.

6.3.14 All windows in 35 Crescent Grove and the rear elevations of the nominated properties on St Alphonsus Road have been tested for direct sunlight. The north facing windows of Henry Twinning Court have not been tested as they are not within 90 degree of south. The findings reveal that the worst affected window is the roof light in the rear extension at 35 Crescent Grove which would experience a loss of 5%. However, this loss is not less than 0.8 times the former value and the BRE guide indicates that this is within an acceptable range. It is also noted that no other windows in the existing building at 35 Crescent Grove are affected and that on balance, the amenity of the residents in this property would not be unacceptably affected by way of daylight or sunlight. The windows in the rear elevations of the properties fronting St Alphonsus Road have also been tested. Although some loss is identified, it is within a range of 1-3% and not less than 0.8 times the former value. Accordingly, based on the daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken, there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents by way of daylight and/or sunlight.

6.3.15 Furthermore, an analysis of the amount of overshadowing caused by the proposed development on the gardens and open spaces of neighbouring properties has been undertaken. The BRE guide recommends that at least 50% of the area of each amenity space should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. Any loss should not be less than 0.8 times the former value. The worst affected property is 35 Crescent Grove with a loss of approximately 14%. However, this is not less than 0.8 times the former value and the BRE guide indicates that this is not an unacceptable loss. There are small losses to nos. 118, 120, 122 and 124 St Alphonsus Road ranging from 3-8% however these are not less than 0.8 times the former values and would still receive between 75-96% sunlight to the area of rear gardens.

6.3.16 The daylight and sunlight assessment has confirmed that the most affected property is 35 Crescent Grove. This property is situated to the north of the site and it is therefore potentially likely that any increase in height may result in a loss to existing daylight and sunlight levels to 35 Crescent Grove due to the positioning of the sun in the southern sky throughout the morning, day and evening hours. Notwithstanding, when further analysis is undertaken, it is evident that all windows would still receive sufficient levels of daylight despite some experiencing small losses, only one window (different to those that experience a loss in daylight level) would experience a decrease in sunlight however this is within an acceptable limit and that 78% of the
rear garden would still receive at least two hours sunlight on 21 March with the loss not less than 0.8 times the former value. Accordingly, the amenity of the most affected property would not be unacceptably impacted by way of daylight, sunlight or overshadowing as a result of the proposed development. The proposal would therefore not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential properties by way of daylight, sunlight or overshadowing.

Privacy

6.3.17 The proposed alterations and extensions generally preserve the privacy of adjoining and nearby residents in accordance with Policies 7 and 36 of the UDP (2007). There is no adverse impact on 35 Crescent Grove as the design and positioning of the windows is such that they do not afford direct opportunities for overlooking. Windows will either face the south elevation of the existing building at 35 Crescent Grove which does not contain windows or face north and therefore not allow direct views into the rear yard of Crescent Grove. It is also noted that this boundary features some mature trees which contribute further screening between the properties.

6.3.18 The alterations and extensions on the ground and first floor levels would retain all existing window positions on the rear elevation facing the rear of properties on St Alphonsus Road. There is an existing tall boundary wall that prevents overlooking on the ground floor level and this will be retained. The reconstructed roof extension will see a reduction in the number of existing windows at second floor level by thereby improving the relationship between the site and adjoining properties on St Alphonsus Road. There is a distance of separation of approximately 42-52m between the windows on the first floor and second floor level of the proposed development and the rear elevations of buildings fronting St Alphonsus Road. In addition, rooms on the rear of the development are bedrooms and do not consist of living rooms. This in conjunction with the distance of separation would preserve the amenity of adjoining residents as the windows are not conducive to direct overlooking due to the nature of the rooms that they serve.

Sense of Enclosure/Outlook

6.3.20 The proposed development would result in a roof extension that is higher than the existing mansard roof. Despite the increase in height from the proposed new roof extension, the development would not result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure or outlook on neighbouring properties. The bulk and scale of the roof is reduced through its design with sloping pitches. Section drawings have been produced which illustrate the impact of the proposed roof extension on views from the ground floor (living areas) of properties fronting St Alphonsus Road. These drawings demonstrate that although this would be noticeable from the properties on St Alphonsus Road, it would not result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure as:

- The separation distance between the proposed and existing building is large enough to allow a sense of openness and good outlook;
It would still be possible to enjoy good views of the sky and long views across the open space formed by the gardens of adjoining properties;

The mansard roof is largely obscured by the screen to the rear terrace;

Although the proposed extension would be more visible from the upper floors of 114-120 St Alphonsus Road, the accommodation to these levels comprises bedrooms and bathrooms and does not provide the principle living space to these properties; and

The principle living space is located at ground floor level and from here, a good sense of openness would be retained and good levels of amenity will continue to be experienced by these properties.

6.3.22 There is no impact on the views and outlook from 35 Crescent Grove despite the increase in height of the north wing as the orientation of windows from 35 Crescent Grove faces east and not into the site. An increased mass may be noticeable from the rear of the rear garden at 35 Crescent Grove, however the existing single storey ground floor extension on this property which is higher than the existing ground level on the site is likely to screen much of the development.

6.3.23 Overall, the amenity of adjoining and nearby residential properties is not unacceptably impacted by way of daylight, sunlight, sense of enclosure, outlook or privacy. The proposal therefore satisfies Policies 7, 33 and 36 of the UDP (2007).

6.4 Transport

6.4.1 The site is located in an area of 'very good' public transport accessibility and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 5. Clapham Common underground is located to the north of the site along with local bus services. Clapham High Street overground station is situated at the other end of the High Street but is accessible via existing footways. Increased housing density is encouraged in areas of good public transport accessibility under saved Policy 33 of the UDP (2007).

Access

6.4.2 The proposal would retain the existing southern vehicle access while the other two vehicle access points would be removed and become pedestrian and cycle entrances to the site. A condition would be necessary to require the redundant accesses to be reinstated as footway at these points. This would allow existing on-street parking bays to be extended and require the replacement of existing single yellow lines on the roadway. As these works are related in kind and scale to the development and are necessary to make the scheme acceptable from a transport planning perspective, the applicant would be financially responsible for these works and any necessary amendments to traffic orders. This would be secured by obligation through a Section 106 Agreement subject to approval of the application.

Car Parking
6.4.3 The application proposes 22 car parking spaces at the site which constitutes a reduction from a total of 41. These car parking spaces would be shared with the 18 units that would be delivered through the permitted development (14/06809/P3JPA). The Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) published in March 2015 requires that in areas of good passenger transport accessibility parking should be provided at a ratio of less than one space per unit. The provision earmarked in the application form would enable the development to fall within an acceptable standard. It should be noted that the previous planning application for 26 units proposed just 12 units envisaging in parallel an overspill on to the local highway network of 5 additional vehicles to meet site demand. In the previous application, officers advised that the site is located in a Controlled Parking Zone and a parking survey was prepared in support. This established that parking stress in the locality would be 48% on average in local streets and 32% on Crescent Lane. It is therefore considered that were there to be overspill on to the highway, there would be no unduly harmful impact on the highway network. FALP (2015) requires the provision of 20% of parking spaces to be provided for electric vehicles with electric charging points and 20% more capable of being converted to that use (in conjunction with new permitted development rights introduced in April 2015). These will be sought by condition. In addition, a condition shall be imposed to require a policy compliant proportion to be made available for disabled drivers.

6.4.4 The scheme also makes provision for 36 cycle parking spaces. Under the same principle as the car parking on the site, this quantity will be allocated for the site as a whole. Although sufficient for the scheme under consideration. In the context of the site as a whole, the provision that would be made would be deficient in the context the FALP (2015). A condition will be imposed to secure an appropriate number of cycle parking spaces which should be covered and secure.

Waste


6.4.5 Separate refuse and recycling storage areas would be provided on the site. The location of these structures is acceptable in the setting of the building and wider site and would facilitate convenient access. In the event that permission is granted, a condition would be required for final design details of these areas to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works. Subject to this condition, the proposal would have acceptable refuse and recycling storage and collection arrangements.

6.5 Sustainability and renewables

6.5.1 Saved Policy 35 of the UDP states that all development proposals should show, by means of a Sustainability Assessment, how they incorporate sustainable design and
construction principles. LDF Core Strategy Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction requires all major development to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emission in line with the London Plan targets. The SPD for Sustainable Design and Construction (2008) sets out specific guidance for the assessment requirements for certain types of development.

6.5.2 As a minimum, all major development proposals should meet targets expressed in the London Plan for carbon dioxide emissions reductions in buildings. These targets are expressed as minimum improvements over the Target Emission Rate (TER) outlined in the national Building Regulations L1A leading to zero carbon residential buildings from 2016. The 40% improvement over Building Regulations has been revised in the London Plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (April 2014) which takes into account revised Building Regulations and therefore requires an updated 35% improvement target to account for the changes in calculations between Building Regulations 2010 and 2013.

6.5.3 The application proposes a reduction of 35% in dwelling emissions over the appropriate Building Regulation to accord with policy 5.2 of the London Plan (FALP) 2015. The applicants’ Sustainability and Energy Statement follows the London Plan’s ‘Be Lean, Be Clean and Be Green’ model. In respect of ‘Be Lean’, the scheme is proposed to utilise a number of energy conservation measures including passive solar design, construction in accordance with building performance standards, thermal bridging and the use of energy efficiency in the fit out and operation. It is considered that the proposal would generate a 10% reduction in CO\(_2\) emissions. In respect of ‘Be Clean’, the applicants have considered a number of renewable energy sources including combined heat and power (CHP), heat pump technology, air source heat pumps and ground source heat pumps. Heat pumps have been rejected on the grounds of technological and performance inefficiencies. CHP has been accepted as a means of providing renewable energy. In respect of ‘Be Green’, the applicants have proposed the installation of a photovoltaic array. Together with other building efficiencies, it is demonstrated that the development will deliver more than 35% (London Plan SPG) in CO2 savings and therefore comply with the adopted policy guidance.

6.6 Crime Prevention

6.6.1 New development should accord with the principles of Safer Built Environments and incorporate Secured by Design compliance wherever appropriate in order to comply with Saved policy 32 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan and the Council’s SPD.

6.6.2 The application has been assessed by the Crime Prevention Design Advisor who has advised that the scheme would accord with the design principles of Secured by Design subject to conditions securing compliance with this standard and that communal areas and routes are well let to British Standard (BS 5489:2013).

6.7 Planning obligations and CiL
6.7.1 The Council adopted an updated S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in April 2012. This document pre-dated the introduction of the Lambeth CIL and the preparation of a borough-wide local plan. During 2013 the Council consulted on a revised draft SPD, prepared as at July 2013. The revised draft SPD reflected the anticipated introduction of the Lambeth CIL in 2014. The revised draft SPD was prepared chiefly against the background of the Core Strategy and the Saved UDP, although it also acknowledged the emerging Lambeth Local Plan. Consideration of what, if any, planning obligations are appropriate in relation to the application has been guided by the approach set out in the July 2013 revised draft SPD. The final package of obligations put forward reflects current circumstances and the individual facts of the application.

6.7.2 The legal agreement would include the following Heads of Terms:

- Financial contribution of £633,580 towards the provision of affordable housing within the Borough.
- Financial contribution of £30,000 towards public realm improvements in the Borough relating to the improvement of cycle and pedestrian connections within the vicinity of the site.
- Financial contribution of £98,552 towards construction training.
- Financial contribution of £161,343.00 towards employment training in relation to the lost employment floorspace.
- Monitoring fee of £34,478.49.
- **TOTAL Obligations: £724,048.31**

6.7.3 If the application is approved and the development is implemented, the proposed uses will be liable for CiL through the Mayoral and Lambeth charging regimes. It is estimated that the Mayoral CiL will deliver a payment of £36,750.00 while the local Lambeth CiL would generate a payment of £157,500.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed change of use of the site is acceptable and the proposed external alterations would be of an appropriate design. The development would provide an acceptable living environment for future occupiers; it would not prejudice the amenity of neighbouring properties; it would not harm conditions of on-street parking or prejudice conditions of the free flow of traffic and highway safety; and, would not unacceptably impact upon local infrastructure.

7.2 The development shows sufficient commitment to sustainable design and construction, the provision of renewable energy technologies, promoting more sustainable modes of transport, the achievement of Lifetime Homes Standards and the achievement of ‘Designing Out Crime’ Standards. Provisions are to be secured under s.106 of the Act to secure contributions towards affordable housing, loss of employment, construction training and public realm improvements.

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

8 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 Grant Conditional Permission Subject to s106 and the conditions listed below.

Conditions

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

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

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

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

3 No development works shall take place until detailed drawings (scale of 1:20) including sections to confirm the detailed design and materials of the:

i) brick bonding, stone mullions, reveals and mouldings
ii) cills and parapet copings
iii) roof construction including roofing details, mansards and dormers
iv) rainwater goods (including material, colour and location)
v) balconies and terraces including balustrades and screens
vi) glazing, window and door systems (including plans, elevations, cross sections and reveal depths)

vii) steps
viii) external lighting
ix) handrails
x) intercoms, letter boxes and location of property numbers
xi) solar photovoltaic arrays to roofs (including sections)

are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and to prevent irreversible harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015).

4 No development works shall take place until a schedule and sample panels of all external materials (including pointing and brick bonding) to be used in the elevations within the scheme hereby permitted are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with saved Policies 31, 33, 38, 39 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth's Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2011 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and to prevent irreversible harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015).

5 Details of the siting and design of all boundary treatments (including internal) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before any part of the development hereby approved is first brought into use. Such boundary treatments shall be erected prior to first occupation unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority to any variation has been obtained and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory resultant appearance and standard of amenity of the site, to prevent unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and to minimise the opportunities for crime in accordance with policies 7, 32, 33 39, and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth's Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011) and to prevent irreversible harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015).
Prior to the commencement the development hereby approved, the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority:

a) a hard landscape strategy, to include, amongst other things, details at scale 1:20 of paving, roads and lighting, enclosures, curbs and steps

b) full details of soft and hard landscaping showing the treatment of all parts of the site not covered by buildings. The proposals shall include the planting of specified trees, hedges, grass, shrubs, ground flora or climbers, and areas of communal and private open space within the development, including boundary features. The landscaping scheme shall include an indication of how the planting would integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to anticipated routine maintenance and protection. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above specification shall accord with BS3936:1992, BS4043:1989 and BS4428:1989 and current Arboricultural best practice

c) full details of the children's play area, including play equipment and surfaces

The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the ecological value of the site, consistent treatment of the public realm, high quality soft and hard landscaping in and around the site, and to ensure a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers, particularly with regard to families and children (Policies 33, 39 and 50(i) of the Unitary Development Plan (2007): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies S1, S2 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 5.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and to prevent irreversible harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015).

Notwithstanding any indication given on the approved drawings, full details including plan and elevational drawings of the refuse and recycling storage facilities for the development hereby permitted, together with a waste management and collection plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of occupation. The details shall include a description and storage capacity of the facilities to be provided. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse on the site, in the interests of the amenities of the area (Policies 9, 33, 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S8 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011).
Notwithstanding the approved drawings and prior to first occupation of any of the residential units hereby permitted, details of the provision to be made for cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall demonstrate that 52 weatherproof, secure and easily accessible cycle spaces will be provided. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained and maintained solely for its designated use.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

Within 3 months of the development being brought into use all existing access points not incorporated in the development hereby permitted shall be stopped up by raising the existing dropped kerb/removing the existing bellmouth/and reinstating the footway verge and highway boundary to the same line, level and detail as the adjoining footway verge and highway boundary and the on-street parking bays shall be extended accordingly.

Reason: To limit the number of access points along the site boundary for the safety and convenience of the highway users in accordance with Policies 9 and 14 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

The development shall be constructed and thereafter operated so as to achieve 'Secured by Design; accreditation. Evidence of such shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 3 months from the occupation of any of the buildings hereby approved, or within any other timetable agreed by the Local Planning Authority.


All communal areas and routes through the site shall be illuminated using lighting which shall be installed to accord with BS: 5489:2013, details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the first occupation of the units hereby approved.

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a Tree Protection Plan that accords with BS5837:2012 and relates to all retained trees on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Tree Protection Plan shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details and put in place before any machinery, demolition, materials storage or development commences on the site. The tree protection measures shall only be dismantled, removed or altered following written authorisation from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)) and to prevent undue harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area that the damage to trees might otherwise cause in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015)

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement in accordance with BS5837:2012 relating to a) groundworks within the Root Protection Area of retained trees for any construction activity (including the installation of hard surfaces) b) all required Access Facilitation Pruning c) details of a pre-commencement meeting (to include the Tree Officer) together with a schedule of all confirmed site supervision and tree protection monitoring shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the respective Method Statements shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)) and to prevent undue harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area that the damage to trees might otherwise cause in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015)

A drawing showing the confirmed route of all service and drainage routes outside of all retained tree root protection areas (BS5837:2012) shall be submitted to and approved in writing before any part of the development commences. The development shall thereafter be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality (Policies 31, 33, 38 and 39 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy January 2011 and Policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2011)) and to prevent undue harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area that the damage to trees might otherwise cause in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order (2015).

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

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

16 No clearance works, demolition or development shall take place until an Ecological Assessment of the site has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect any protected species or habitats that may be present on site.

17 Prior to first occupation of any of the building(s) hereby approved, evidence (e.g. photographs, installation contracts and as-built certificates under the Standard Assessment Procedure and National Calculation Method) showing that the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved Energy Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

18 All windows in the south-east elevation of the eastern wing facing Henry Twinning Court which are annotated on the hereby approved floorplans as obscured glazed shall feature fixed (not back sheeted) obscure glazing to a minimum height of 1.76m on the ground and first floor levels with the new windows on the second floor levels featuring full height obscure glazing and remain as such for the duration of the development.


19 All residential units hereby approved shall be constructed to Lifetime Homes Standards, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, details of which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of any of the units. The approved details shall be implemented prior to first occupation and permanently retained.

Reason: In order that the development is made more accessible to all in accordance with Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010, Policy S2(d) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and the related Supplementary Planning Document: Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions (2008).

20 Provision for 4 parking spaces for electric vehicles with charging facilities and four further spaces with capability of being adapted for such use shall be made prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be retained for the duration of the development.


21 The residential accommodation hereby approved shall be constructed to include at least 2 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 in compliance with Policy 3A.4 of The London Plan, Policy 33 of the Unitary Development Plan: policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010, Policy S2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011), and the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions' (2008).

22 Details of all air conditioning units, ventilation and filtration equipment and any other plant, machinery or equipment (including rooftop plant), in addition to measures to control noise from such equipment, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the operational use of the relevant parts of the development hereby permitted. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details and shall be so retained for the duration of the permitted use unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers or of the area generally (Policy 7 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007) Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and policies S1 and S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

23 Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans, prior to the residential occupation of the development full details of Children's Playspace Provision, including a landscape, management and maintenance plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented and operated prior to the residential occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained for the duration of the permitted use.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers, particularly with regard to families and children, in accordance with Policy 50(i) of the London Borough of Lambeth's Unitary Development Plan (2007), the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: "Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions" (2008), and Policy 3D.13 of The London Plan and the Mayor of London's associated Supplementary Planning Guidance "Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation."

24 No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme for investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The
development shall only take place in accordance with the approved details. The archaeological works shall be carried out by a suitably qualified investigating body acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not damage archaeological remains (Policy S9 of Lambeth Core Strategy (January 2011) and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2011.).

25 No occupation shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailed schemes of soft landscaping for the application site, including selection of species, planting plans and programmes and schedules for management and maintenance of landscaped features. These proposals should include plantings of trees, hedges, grass, shrubs, ground flora or climbers, and cover areas of public and private open space within the development, including roofs, walls and boundary features.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory layout of the site in the interests of safety, visual amenity and biodiversity and to safeguard the character and appearance of the adjoining Conservation Area and the area in general (Policies 39 and 47 of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007) - Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Framework Core Strategy January 2011) refer

Informatives

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

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

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

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

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

Street Naming and Numbering Officer
e-mail: streetnn@lambeth.gov.uk
tel: 020 7926 2283
fax: 020 7926 9104

5 All construction detailing shall authentically replicate the Tudor style of this building or introduce appropriate detailing from the same style/period for new elements.

6 The cycle and refuse storage shall be built in brick and detailed to complement the Tudor character of the site.

7 With regards to hardstanding, the applicant is advised that loose gravel will not be supported. York stone and bound gravel are considered appropriate materials.

8 The landscaping scheme should endeavour to include measures to promote biodiversity including use of native species typical of locality and ground conditions or any naturalised areas. The applicant should act on good practice to maximise the site's landscape, visual and horticultural quality, ease of maintenance and to provide long term environment benefit. The applicant should also endeavour to include measures to encourage protected species to occupy the application site, such as installation of bat and bird boxes on buildings, or bat bricks within the buildings, or creation of naturalised areas within communal areas.

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