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**Proposition:** Demolition of the existing buildings and the re-development of the site incorporating the erection of six buildings comprised of basement and lower ground floor levels, ranging from four to 10 storeys above ground, landscaped gardens, public square (587sqm), car parking and associated works; for a mixed use scheme comprised of a waste transfer facility (1,164 sqm GIA) at basement level, B1 office accommodation (3,696sqm GIA) and ancillary café (117sqm GIA); and the provision of up to 297 residential units.
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**Documents:**

- Air Quality Assessment, prepared by AECOM dated January 2017;
- Archaeological Desktop Assessment, prepared by Mills Whipp Projects dated December 2015 (Revised April, July 2016 and Jan 2017);
- Basement Impact Assessment (Ref. 112995 R7 Final), prepared by Fairhurst Consulting Engineers dated 23 January 2017; Addendum letter (ref. CB/AS/112995/LAResponse) prepared by Fairhurst dated 23 May 2017;
- Basement Waste Facility Assessment (ref. 70024401) prepared by WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff dated January 2017;
- Bat Survey Report, prepared by AECOM dated January 2017;
- Construction Management Plan (Issue 05), prepared by Construction Planning Associates dated May 2017;
- Daylight and Sunlight Study (Neighbouring Properties) dated 28 February 2017; Addendum Letter (and supporting documents), prepared by Right of Light Consulting dated 24 April 2017 and 28 June 2017, ALL prepared by prepared by Right of Light Consulting;
- Daylight and Sunlight Study (Within Development) dated 1 March 2017; Addendum Letter (and supporting documents), dated 24 April 2017 and 28 June 2017; ALL prepared by Right of Light Consulting;
- Energy and Sustainability Strategy (Issue No.P07) dated May 2017, Energy and Sustainability Strategy Addendum Report (P07.3); ALL prepared by Building Services Design Consulting Engineers;
- Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by AECOM dated January 2017;
- Framework Travel Plan, prepared by Caneparo Associates dated January 2017;
- Landscape Statement, prepared by tree:fabric dated January 2017
- Noise and Vibration Assessment, prepared by AECOM dated January 2017;
- Geo-Environmental and Geotechnical Desk Study Report (ref. 108666/R1.0) prepared by Fairhurst dated March 2015; Addendum letter (ref. CB/AS/112995/LAResponse) prepared by Fairhurst dated 23 May 2017;
- Phase II Ground Investigation Report ref. 108666 Rev 2.1) prepared by Fairhurst dated 02 December 2015; Addendum letter (ref. CB/AS/112995/LAResponse) prepared by Fairhurst dated 23 May 2017;
- Letter prepared by Geotechnical Consulting Group dated 12 June 2017;
- Planning Statement prepared by Rolfe Judd dated 27 October 2016;
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Initial Bat Roost Inspection Report, prepared by AECOM dated May 2017;
- Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Cascade dated November 2016;
- Townscape and Heritage Statement, prepared by RMA Heritage and Neil Williamson Associates dated January 2017;
- Transport Assessment, dated January 2017; Transport Assessment Addendum (ref. N05-CC-Transport Assessment Addendum (170426) issued), dated 26th April 2017; Further Response to LBL Consultation Comments Note (ref. 2015-2673, N07-SM-Further Response to LBL Comments (170626)), dated 26 June 2017; Further Response to TFL Comments Note (ref. 2015-2673, N06-SM-Further Response to TFL Comments (170526) ALL prepared by Caneparo Associates. Transport Comment response (including illustrative diagram of access way to front of site) received 05/07/17.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Resolve to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, completion of a Section 106 agreement and any direction as may be received following further referral to the Mayor of London.

2. Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Development and Transport to:
a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report
b. Negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in this report pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act.

3. That if the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of this committee the Director of Planning, Development and Transport be given delegated powers to consider refusing the application in the absence of a legal agreement.

4. In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers, having regard to the heads of terms set out in the report, to negotiate and complete a Section 106 agreement in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector.

Applicant: C/O Agent
Agent: Rolfe Judd Planning
Old Church Court, Claylands Road, London, SW8 1NZ

SITE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant site designations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>Safeguarded Waste Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke</td>
<td>Smoke Control Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Tree Preservation Order (TPO) – 3 x trees on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Priority Area</td>
<td>Roman Road (Stane Street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND USE DETAILS

| Site area | 1.70 hectares |

NON-RESIDENTIAL DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Floorspace (Gross Internal Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B1(a)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>2,304sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B8</td>
<td>Storage or Distribution</td>
<td>1,368sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui Generis</td>
<td>Waste Transfer Unit</td>
<td>2,335sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B1(a)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>3,696sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui Generis</td>
<td>Waste Transfer Unit</td>
<td>1,117sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A3</td>
<td>Café</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Residential Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Type</th>
<th>No. of bedrooms per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Houses/Flats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented Houses/Flats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Units</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alternative mix (Fast Track Route) |        |   |   |   |   |       |
| Private Units | 23     | 93 | 81 | 9 | 0 | 206 |
| Affordable Rent | 0      | 22 | 17 | 16 | 4 | 59  |
| Intermediate | 0      | 5  | 23 | 0 | 0 | 28  |
| Total | 23     | 120 | 121 | 25 | 4 | 293 |

## Parking Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (general)</th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (Disabled)</th>
<th>Bicycle Spaces</th>
<th>Motorbike Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

44 Clapham Common Southside (known hereafter as ‘The Site’) is located on the southern side of Clapham Common Southside opposite Clapham Common. The Site is an irregular shape and the land levels across the site fall gently from the northwest and part of the site to the southeast.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to include the erection of six buildings comprising basement and lower ground floor levels, ranging from 4 to 10 storeys above ground, landscaped gardens, public square (587sqm), car parking and associated works; for a mixed use scheme comprised of a waste transfer facility (1,164 sqm GIA) at basement level, B1 office accommodation (3,696 sqm GIA) and ancillary café (117sqm GIA); the provision of up to 297 residential units.

The principle of a residential led mixed use development is supported, although it is noted that the existing site is in employment use and part of the site is safeguarded as a Waste Transfer Unit. The redevelopment of the site would protect the employment provision and retain space for a Waste Transfer Unit.

The scheme proposes two options with regards to delivery of affordable housing on-site. Both provide 35% affordable housing by habitable room, one with a tenure split of 50/50 (option A) and the other 70:30 (in favour of affordable rent - option B). Option A is based on 297 dwellings (748 habitable rooms): 206 market dwellings (488 habitable rooms) and 91 affordable dwellings (260 habitable rooms). This gives a total of 31% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 40 affordable rented and 51 intermediate units (44:56 split). By habitable room this equates to 129 affordable rent and 131 affordable intermediate (50:50 split).

Option B seeks to comply with the ‘Fast Track Route’ set out in the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG. This option is based on 293 dwellings (751 habitable rooms): 206 market dwellings (488 by habitable room) and 87 affordable (263 by habitable room). A total of 30% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 59 affordable rent and 28 affordable intermediate (68:32 split). By habitable room this equates to 184 affordable rent and 79 affordable intermediate (70:30 split).

Both options have been independently assessed and are considered to exceed the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing viable on this site based on current values. Therefore officers have no objection in principle to either option or both options being included within the s106. However, Option B is the preferred option for the applicant and the Council as it complies with the Council’s 70:30 tenure split. It would only be if the applicant was unable to secure a Registered Provider (RP) to take on the affordable rented units within Building B that a fall-back position would be the implementation of option A. This would be secured within the s106 along with relevant review mechanisms.

In design terms the provision of taller buildings on this site, within the context of strategic and local views is considered acceptable by officers. The proposed scale and mass and architectural appearance of Building A, B, C, D, E and F would be acceptable within the surrounding context. The proposals fulfil many of the key design principles and reflect key development considerations as set out in the Lambeth Local Plan (2015). The development would provide a good quality residential environment for all future occupiers. The majority of the proposed units will achieve a dual aspect, giving appropriate levels of outlook and reasonable daylight and sunlight given the site constraints. In this regard the long and linear irregular shaped site, difference in land levels and the sites north west south east orientation, have shaped the design and layout of the proposal. The scheme has been
designed to effectively maximise the distances between the blocks and minimise any harm upon adjoining residential occupiers.

The development would be suitably mitigated in terms of its impact upon local infrastructure. In addition, the development would not impact unacceptably upon the function and safety of the highway network (both pedestrian and vehicular). All reasonable reductions in total carbon dioxide emissions from the development would be achieved within the framework of the Mayor’s energy hierarchy in accordance with Development Plan policy requirements. This will be achieved by conditions and through planning obligations.

Overall the scheme would deliver a number of planning benefits, by way of a better employment provision, retention of space for a Waste Transfer Unit, provision of additional housing that includes a good affordable offer, a new public square 595sqm, the opening up of the front of the site (length of 210m approx.) with the adjacent Notre Dame Estate and the creation of links between the two sites.

Officers have assessed the proposals in relation to national, strategic and local policies contained within the NPPF, London Plan and the Lambeth Local Plan and the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
Reason for referral to PAC: The application is reported to the Planning Applications Committee in accordance with (1)(a)(i) (ii) and 1(b) of the Committee’s terms of reference as they relate to the provision of dwelling houses where the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more, on a site having more than 0.5 hectares and development carried out where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more.

1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1 44 Clapham Common Southside (known hereafter as ‘The Site’) is located on the southern side of Clapham Common Southside opposite Clapham Common. The Site is an irregular shape and the land levels across the site fall gently from the northwest and part of the site to the southeast.

1.2 The Site has a depth of 450m and width of 14m approx. at the site access located to the front, increasing to 21m approx. beyond the access way and 75m approx. at its widest point towards the rear of the site. The site is currently occupied by 4 buildings of 1-2 storeys in height that are of no architectural merit. The buildings are currently in employment use and comprise of office (shaded blue in figure 2 below) and warehouse (shaded yellow in figure 2 below) and a Waste Transfer Unit (WTU) (located within building 3 see figure 2 below). The building to the front of the site is in use as a small gatehouse/security/reception.

1.3 The site is bounded to the northeast by the Notre Dame Estate, comprising of Bourne, Grove, Westbrook, Hewer, Mandeville and Batten House which range in height from 8-9 storeys and Comins House, Mantell and Brady House which range in height from 4-5 storeys faced in red brick. The ‘Orangery’ a Grade II Listed Building is located within the boundaries of the Notre Dame Estate.

1.4 Lambeth College and Lambeth Academy bounds the site to the southwest. Lambeth College comprises of a 5 storey building located to the front, a 3-4 storey buildings located towards the centre of the site. Lambeth Academy a 3-4 storey building is located towards the rear and is clad in render and timber.

1.5 The scale of development drops noticeably towards the south of the site along Abbeville Road. Abbeville Road comprises mainly two storey terraced houses with stock brick elevations and white stone dressed windows. See figure 1 below which illustrates the site and its surroundings, whilst figure 4 below illustrates the surrounding heights of the buildings.
1.6 Figure 1: site location outlined in red.

1.7 Figure 2: existing ground floor plan

1.8 Figure 3: existing first floor plan
1.9 Figure 4 above illustrates the heights of the surrounding buildings.

1.10 The Site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level that varies across the site from 6a which represents an ‘excellent’ level of accessibility at the front of the site. The centre of the site has a rating of 4-5 which represents a good to very good level of accessibility and a level of 3 towards the rear of the site near the boundary with Abbeville Road residents.

1.11 A number of bus stops are located within a short walking distance from the site with stops located on Clapham Common South Side (A24) and Rookery Road (B303). Buses are within 500m (6-minute walk) from the site. Clapham Common Underground Station is located 500m (7-minute walk) from the site frontage to the north-east and provides access to the Northern Line underground services. The site is also a short walking distance from Clapham High Street railway station (12-minutes / 1kilometre) which provides London Overground Services between Clapham Junction and Highbury and Islington. A single service also operates between London Victoria and Bromley South each day. Clapham Junction rail station can be accessed by rail services from Clapham High Street and bus services.

1.12 Pedestrian and vehicular access to the Site is directly from A24 Clapham Common Southside. It forms part of the Transport for London Road Network. The Site is located within ‘Clapham L’ Controlled Parking Zone, where local parking is restricted between 09:00am and 18:00pm Monday to Friday. There are several existing car club vehicles within the vicinity of the site, the closest is operated by Zipcar and is located on Windmill Drive 250m away from the site. The other three locations are Crescent Lane 600m away, Narbonne Avenue 700m away and Park Hill 850m away.
1.13 The site does not fall within a conservation area but it is noted that there is a Grade II listed Orangery at the adjacent Notre Dame Estate and that Clapham Conservation Area (CA1) (encompassing part of Clapham Common) lies to the north and west of the site. The rear part of the site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area. Part of the site (0.11 ha or 1,100sqm) is safeguarded as a Waste Transfer Facility.

2 PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings and the re-development of the site to include the erection of six buildings comprised of basement and lower ground floor levels, ranging from four to 10 storeys above ground, landscaped gardens, public square (587sqm), car parking and associated works; for a mixed use scheme comprised of a waste transfer facility (1,164 sqm GIA) at basement level, B1 office accommodation (3,696 sqm GIA) and ancillary café (117sqm GIA); the provision of up to 297 residential units.

2.2 The six buildings are orientated perpendicular across the length of the site, parallel to the Abbeville Road terrace houses located to the rear of the site. The tallest building reaches a height of 10 storeys and is located within the centre of the site. The height drops to 4 storeys towards the rear of the site. Building F & E (5 to 9 Storeys above ground) are located to the front of the site, building D (part 7/10 storeys above ground), building C (part 6/ part 8 storeys above ground) and building B (part 5/part 7 storeys above ground) are located within the centre of the site and building A (4 storeys above ground) is located towards the rear of the site. Each block is illustrated in Figures 5, 6, and 7 below.

2.3 Figure 5 proposed site plan

2.4 Figure 6 proposed southwest elevation

2.5 Figure 7 above proposed northeast elevation
2.6 In total the development would provide up to 297 residential units (748 habitable rooms). In terms of affordable housing. The scheme proposes two options with regards to delivery of affordable housing on-site. Both provide 35% affordable housing by habitable room, one with a tenure split of 50/50 (option A) and the other 70:30 (in favour of affordable rent - option B). Option B an alternative mix has been offered to align with the Mayor's ‘Fast Track’ approach to viability. The Route B alternative results in a reduction of 4 residential units, but more habitable rooms. The two proposals are set out below:

- **Proposal A** based on 297 dwellings (748 habitable room): 206 market dwellings (488 habitable rooms) and 91 affordable dwellings (260 habitable rooms). A total of 31% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 40 affordable rented and 51 intermediate units (44:56 split). By habitable room this equates to 129 affordable rent and 131 affordable intermediate (50:50 split).

- **Alternative (Fast Track Route)** based on 293 dwellings (751 habitable rooms): 206 market dwellings (488 by habitable room) and 87 affordable (263 by habitable room). A total of 30% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 59 affordable rent and 28 affordable intermediate (68:32 split). By habitable room this equates to 184 affordable rent and 79 affordable intermediate (70:30 split).

2.7 All the residential units would have some form of private amenity space by way of a small courtyard on the lower level and balcony/terraces on the upper floors. Communal open space would be in the form of three courtyards between buildings A and B (650sqm), B and C (870sqm), C and D (640). A rear garden area of 875sqm is proposed to the rear of building A. The proposal also provides for a new public realm, a 595sqm public square is to be located between building D & E as illustrated in the drawing below (figure 8).

2.8 Figure 8 illustrates proposed public square and communal amenity spaces
2.9 Access into the site would be via the existing point off Clapham Common Southside, adjacent to Lambeth College. Figure 9 below provides an illustrative view of the access arrangements proposed. The access road leading into the site has been redesigned to include pedestrian provision with a new footway provided along the northern side of the carriageway. The access road between Clapham Common Southside and building F would accommodate all site traffic. The road would split at the entrance to building F with separate access to the Waste Transfer Unit provided to the south and access to the commercial and residential areas to the north. The commercial and residential access road would be provided as a shared surface. A vehicular gated control would be provided on the access road adjacent to Building D.

2.10 Figure 9 indicative illustration of the site wide pedestrian and vehicular access

2.11 In terms of the Waste Transfer Unit, figures 10 and 11 below illustrate its access arrangements at ground level and lower ground level (basement -01). Access will be via a segregated ramp located adjacent to building F. A 10m layby is provided at the top of the ramp to allow egressing vehicles to pass. Within the basement at lower ground level there is a turning head, loading bays and parking spaces.

2.12 Figure 10 indicative illustration of access to waste transfer unit at ground level
2.13 Figure 11 indicative illustration of access to waste transfer unit at lower ground level (basement -01)

2.14 In terms of delivery and servicing of the commercial and residential elements, this is illustrated in figure 12 below. A turning loop and pick up/drop off area would be located adjacent Block E which would allow delivery and servicing vehicles to manoeuvre and set down. All deliveries for the commercial and residential elements would be picked up and dropped at Building E and managed by a concierge (see green line in diagram below). Beyond that point (red line in diagram below) limited access will be permitted only for the delivery of groceries and bulky goods and access gated. Access to this area would be restricted by a boom access gate and access given by a concierge who would operate the gate.

2.15 Figure 12 indicative illustration of delivery and servicing of site

2.16 A further basement level (-2) is proposed to extend across the whole length of the site. As illustrated in figure 13 below it would principally be a car park that would accommodate 74 car parking spaces comprising of 30 disabled spaces and 44 standard spaces. 4 car parking spaces (including 1 disabled space) would be provided for the office (B1a) use. A car club space would also be provided. Figure 14 below illustrates the cycle parking provision located at this level. A total of 598 cycle parking spaces are proposed to be located within the basement level. Dedicated cycle parking areas are situated adjacent each residential core (A, B, C&D). 58 of the bikes would be dedicated for commercial use. This store would be located adjacent to the commercial core (building F) on the lower ground floor, basement level -01.
2.17 Figure 13 illustration of proposed car parking layout at basement level -02

2.18 Figure 14 illustration of proposed cycle parking layout at basement level -02

2.19 Access into the basement car park would be via a ramped access located under building C see Figure 15 below. This access would accommodate a 3.6m vehicle lane and 1.3m cycle lane, 0.3m outside kerb area. Traffic accessing the one way ramp would be controlled using traffic signals and gates operated electronically.

2.20 Figure 15 illustrates car and cycle access route into basement level -02
2.21 With regards to waste stores, all waste associated with the Waste Transfer Unit would be kept stored within the Waste Transfer Unit Facility. With regards to the residential waste stores one would be provided for each building (A, B, C, D and E). As illustrated in figure 16 and 17 below they would all be located within the basement level (-2) and brought up to a central holding area on the lower ground floor (-1) for collection. There is a lift between basement levels for the waste to be moved to the central holding area when required. The commercial waste store is located on the lower ground floor (-1) adjacent the central holding refuse area. A bulky household storage area is also proposed on the lower ground floor (-1).

2.22 Figure 16 indicative illustration of waste store locations (basement level -02) and path of travel to access lift linking the basement levels.

2.23 Figure 17 indicative illustration of central refuse store on the lower ground floor (-1)

2.24 Amendments

2.25 During the course of the assessment amendments were received in response to issues raised by officers. These amendments are generally internal with no changes made to the footprint, bulk, and scale or massing of the buildings. They include:

Building A
- 2 of the lower ground floor units changed from single to dual aspect
- Addition of 2 affordable-rent units on ground floor and internal reconfiguration of units to accommodate additional habitable rooms
Building B

- Duplex units created at lower and ground levels of Building B along the North-westerly facing elevation, in conjunction with lowering the associated courtyard by 1m.
- Revised Core to separate lifts between Private-Intermediate and Affordable Rent units
- Ground floor amended to include a second lobby with access to separate lift
- Upper floors reconfigured to include three tenures (affordable rent, intermediate and private tenure)

Building E-F:

- The narrow end of the commercial building has been amended and a PARKSIDE HOUSE sign added.
- Detail of commercial layout added on 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor, reception and café area revised. Café area reduced in size.

3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 There are no planning applications on this site considered to be material to this application.

3.2 The development has been subject to an EIA Screening Opinion (ref. 15/04032/EIAFUL). The development would fall within the definition of Schedule 2 (10b) development; being an urban development project with the provision of more than 150 dwellings. The Local Planning Authority has therefore assessed the proposals in light of Schedule 3 of the EIA regulations. In considering the proposals the development would not have significant environment effects given the nature of the development proposed within the existing urban context and the characteristics of the development's impact and therefore was considered not subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.3 Surrounding Sites (Wider Context)

3.4 Thornton’s Orangery, Worsopp Drive

3.5 The applicants of this application have also submitted the following applications to repair and refurbish the Grade II listed Orangery at the adjacent Notre Dame Estate. It is noted that it has been on the Heritage at Risk register for a number of years due to its slow decay.

3.6 17/02586/LB - Restoration of late eighteenth-century orangery to include repairs to external terrace and steps, new internal floor and new double-hung sash windows in existing openings between columns amongst many minor repairs. Re-ordering of the landscape in front of the building to create a formal garden courtyard and the addition of three rooms to the rear elevation so as to allow the restored building to accommodate many different community and other uses. Pending Consideration

3.7 17/02585/FUL – Restoration of late eighteenth-century orangery to include repairs to external terrace and steps, new internal floor and new double-hung sash windows in existing openings between columns amongst many minor repairs. Re-ordering of the landscape in front of the building to create a formal garden courtyard and the addition of three rooms to the rear elevation so as to allow the restored building to accommodate many different community and other uses. Pending Consideration
3.8 **Planning Performance Agreement, Strategic Panel and Members Technical Briefing**

3.9 This application is the subject of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA), setting out an agreement between the Agent/Applicant and the Council on how the pre-application and application processes would be managed, thereby ensuring all relevant issues are ‘front-loaded’ prior to the planning application submission. In entering into a PPA by no way means that a subsequent application will be automatically approved, PPAs are used by Lambeth on schemes of this nature to proactively and positively engage with developers to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area; in accordance with the expectations conferred upon LPAs by the NPPF.

3.10 The application was subject to a Strategic Sites Panel Meeting in July 2016 and Technical Briefing session with the current Planning Applications Committee Members on 10th July 2017.
4 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Statutory Consultees

4.1.1 Greater London Authority - Advise that the scheme is broadly acceptable in strategic planning terms. The principle of a mixed use residential-led development, including a replacement waste transfer facility and employment uses, is supported on this underused but safeguarded waste site. The maximum capacity of the proposed waste transfer unit, and its contribution towards waste apportionment, should be secured, in addition to the provision of affordable workspace. In terms of Housing - All options explored to increase affordable housing provision. Early and late review mechanisms in accordance with the Mayor's draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG should be secured. Design - The height of the development provides an appropriate townscape response. Further information on the boundary treatments proposed between the blocks and along the north eastern boundary should be provided to ensure that the development provides a suitable pedestrian realm. Climate Change - The shortfall in carbon savings for the residential element should be offset. Further information on overheating and cooling, savings from the CHP unit and future connection to a district heating network should be provided. The applicant has responded directly to the GLA on this point. Transport - The applicant should aim to further reduce the on-site car parking. A contribution towards cycle hire facilities is required in the event that the cycle hire network is extended to the site before occupation.

4.1.2 Environment Agency – no objection subject to conditions regarding groundwater and land contamination and information/informative regarding environmental permitting.

4.1.3 Transport for London (TfL) - Recommend a reduction in the level of residential car parking but would not consider there are sufficient grounds to object. TfL expect the commercial element to be car free, except for Blue Badge parking. TfL require the following to be secured by s106/conditions:
   - Contribution of £50,000 towards cycle docking station should the network be extended prior to occupation.
   - Final Framework Travel Plan submitted
   - Final Delivery and Servicing Management Plan (DSMP) and Final Construction Management Plan (CMP) submitted Enter into s278 agreement with TfL for any highway works on TfL’s highway associated with the development.
   - The double red lines which currently extend half way along the site access are incorrect. These will need to be reverted back to double yellow lines.
   - Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) provision for residential and commercial along with passive provision.
   - Shower and locker facilities for members of staff wishing to cycle to work

4.1.4 Natural England – Advises that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites. Natural England encourages the incorporation of enhanced green infrastructure (GI). This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.
4.1.5 London Underground Infrastructure – No comment

4.1.6 Historic England (Archaeological) – No objection subject to conditions regarding archaeological investigation and informative.

4.1.7 Historic England – This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

4.1.8 Thames Water – No objection subject to conditions regarding water supply infrastructure and informative regarding surface water drainage.

4.1.9 London Fire Brigade – No comment

4.2 Internal and Other Consultees

4.2.1 Conservation and Design – No objection subject to conditions

4.2.2 Transport and Highways – No objection subject to conditions and S106 agreement to secure Car Club package (including membership and bay in basement), parking permit free designation, Travel Plan monitoring payment of £3000

4.2.3 Parks and Open Space – No objection subject to conditions

4.2.4 Arboricultural Officer – No objection subject to conditions

4.2.5 Sustainability – No objection subject to conditions

4.2.6 Planning Policy – No objection

4.2.7 Metropolitan Police (Design out Crime) - No objection subject to conditions

4.2.8 Housing - The greatest need is for affordable rent, and this locality is ideally situated for family housing for rent. Housing Dept’s preference would be a policy compliant scheme based on a 70 / 30 split, The Developer would have to evidence univocally that RPs were not keen on taking this split on.

4.2.9 Council Estate Housing – Supportive of securing contributions to installing lighting fixtures on the Notre Dame Estate, contributions towards improving the playspace on the Notre Dame Estate, and conditions securing art/street art being erected by the Notre Dame Estate residents onto the boundary fence or hoarding that may replace the boundary fence between the two sites during construction works and CCTV cameras being installed on the proposed buildings at 44 Clapham Common Southside facing towards the Notre Dame Estate.

4.2.10 Regeneration – No comment received to date

4.2.11 Implementation Team – No comment received to date.

4.2.12 Building Control - No objection to basement method statement submitted

4.2.13 Flooding (SUDs) – No objection subject to conditions
4.2.14 Waste - The Delivery and Service Plan (DSP) and the Operational Waste & Recycling Strategy is sound. Access and Egress into and out of the development is well thought out.

4.2.15 Clapham Society – supportive of aspects of the scheme, considered that the consultation process has been extensive and that is to be welcomed. In terms of concerns they consider the development to be too dense; concerned about the public square and whether it will have the prominence needed to become a well-used public space; concerns about sufficient sunlight and daylight into proposed dwellings; loss of daylight and sunlight to spaces between buildings; loss of sunlight and daylight to the Notre Dame Estate; impact on views towards the conservation area from roads such as Caldervale Road; no proposals in this application for the repair/re-use of the Orangery, along with the proposed links; Blocks A and B are one storey too high, concern how loaders and delivery vehicles during construction will access the site; The two plane trees outside the site boundary on Common land should be protected during construction works; The pedestrian refuge near the site entrance would need to be re-positioned to enable large vehicles to turn left out of the site heading south.

4.2.16 Friends of Clapham Common – No comment received to date

4.2.17 Clapham Southside Residents Association – No comment received to date

4.2.18 Clapham Business Improvement District – No comment received to date

4.2.19 Notre Dame Tenants Association - support the proposals for the regeneration of the former Southside Business Park and the plans for the restoration of the Orangery building on the Notre Dame Estate. Removal of the surrounding concrete wall and new private and affordable homes are welcomed and feel the proposals will greatly improve the local area.

4.3 Adjoining owners/occupiers

4.3.1 Neighbouring residents were notified of the application. The application was advertised in the local paper on 01.03.2017. The formal consultation period ended on 22.03.2017. In response to consultation 17 letters of representation have been submitted.

4.3.2 14 letters of objections were received from the occupiers of Abbeville Road (residents to the rear of the site). The remaining letters of objection were received from an Occupier of Worsopp Drive (adjacent Notre Dame Estate) and objections from an occupier in Elms Road (located adjacent Lambeth Academy), and from Lambeth Academy/College a summary of the concerns raised is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of objections</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing provision should be 50%</td>
<td>Local Plan Policy H2 seeks to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in the borough. On sites capable of accommodating 10 or more units, at least 50 per cent of housing should be affordable where public subsidy is available, or 40 per cent without public subsidy. In this regard no public subsidy is proposed. Policy H2(d) states that a financial appraisal would be required if the affordable housing provision is less than the specified policy requirements or where the proportions of social / affordable rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>and/or intermediate housing are not in accordance with policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The height of proposed building parallel to the boundary adjacent Abbeville Road should be reduced/no more than three storeys.</td>
<td>This building is a part two to four storey block (above ground level) is proposed to the south east end of the site, backing onto the rear gardens of Abbeville Road. The lower scale terraced nature of the Victorian terrace properties along Abbeville Road is reflected in the scale and massing of this block. The proposed variation in height breaks up the massing of the buildings creating two X 4 storey elements above ground level and a recessed middle element at 2 storeys, and is a sensitive approach to providing a development that sits comfortably with the existing properties along Abbeville Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of façade of building A should be minimised to reduce overlooking</td>
<td>There would be a 39-41m gap between this building and the rear returns of the Abbeville Road to align with the separation distance between Brady House (adjacent Notre Dame Estate) and the Abbeville terrace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views should not be compromised by the tower element. Building A would impact on the view of skyline when viewed from Abbeville Road properties.</td>
<td>In terms of the impact of the proposed development on strategic or local views, designated heritage assets (Former Orangery (Grade II Listed) and nearby conservation areas, it is considered that the proposal would not harm the character of the area. Officers accept that some views will change from the immediate and wider area however, the change to these views would not adversely impact the appreciation of these views or any landmark buildings. As such the setting of designated assets will not be unduly affected by the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding the removal of high concrete boundary wall along boundary with Abbeville Road occupiers. The Fence in front of existing wall – raises question as to how this wall will be maintained.</td>
<td>See Figure 4 below which illustrates the proposed boundary treatment. Area 4 relates to the boundary treatment to the rear of the site (Abbeville Road Properties) and illustrates that the existing wall would be retained with a new timber fence added on the inside face. In terms of the specific details of the boundary treatment and its maintenance this can be imposed by condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees/Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees T17 and T19 (Norway Maples) to be removed – form an important part of the existing boundary with Abbeville Road – evergreen and/or semi evergreen trees should be planted/maintained along the boundary.</td>
<td>Provision is made within the landscape strategy for approximately 157 new trees that includes ornamental and significant tree planting within areas of natural soft ground. Within these areas, some trees are indicated to be of parkland species and located to allow full maturity to be attained. The submitted Arboricultural Report is comprehensive and tree loss highlighted is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no guarantee that the tree screening along the boundary with Abbeville Road will be up-kept in the future</td>
<td>Conditions are recommended regarding detailed design and planting specifications (to be supported by maintenance schedules) are submitted for approval, including a condition regarding the replacement of dead/damaged planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation works will disrupt tree roots adjacent the boundary with Abbeville Road Residents (No.95)</td>
<td>The Arboricultural Report has provided a detailed and considered assessment of the impact on third party trees (neighbouring) through detailed assessment of the changes in surface treatment within likely Root Protection Areas (RPAs). This provides reassurance that the Arboricultural Method Statement (to be conditioned), informed by this Arboricultural Impact Assessment will be comprehensive and thorough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amenity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased noise pollution from demolition and heavy machinery</td>
<td>Noise, disturbance and inconvenience during the construction period can be mitigated and where possible through the provision of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan, which is to be conditioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased air pollution from the demolition of buildings</td>
<td>The draft Construction Management Plan prepared by Construction Planning Associates and the Noise and Vibration Assessment Report prepared by AECOM both make detailed recommendations with respect to the control of noise. The Construction Management Plan and the Air Quality Assessment prepared by AECOM also consider dust impacts and recommendations are made to ensue any impacts are mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust and sound monitoring at the rear of Abbeville Road – does not appear to be present in the submitted CMP plan.</td>
<td>The Council’s Environmental Health Consultant has reviewed the documents and considered that these reports have identified the risks and proposed appropriate mitigation measures. However further details are needed with respect to some matters (outlined in informative) which can be addressed as part of the Final Construction and Environmental Management Plan to be imposed by condition. It is also noted that the applicant has agreed to ensure that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan include reference to a community forum that is set up and engages with the residents of the Notre Dame Estate and surrounding residents. This can be imposed by condition that a Final Construction and Environmental Management Plan be submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of light to classrooms at Lambeth Academy/College</td>
<td>It is considered that whilst there are isolated adverse effects to Lambeth College in terms of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

considered acceptable in view of the mitigation planting and retention of the one of the TPO trees.
daylight reduction, on balance, is considered reasonable.

In consideration of Lambeth Academy, there is a much greater effect in the extent and of daylight reduction to this building with quite an adverse impact to 22% of rooms reviewed for daylight distribution and 43% of rooms reviewed for ADF. Whilst we appreciate the building is non-domestic and with a greater expectation of reliance on supplementary electric lighting, the impact is still quite significant. However, in equitable consideration, it is noted that Lambeth Academy have a significant number of windows along the north-east facing elevation which are close to the boundary / their position will inherently result in some significant daylight reductions to the rooms they serve for any meaningful development on the proposed site area. Given this juxtaposition, it is considered the issue is a ‘shared’ issue in origin i.e. windows too close to the boundary of a development site, with massing being proposed upon the adjacent site which is not unreasonable as discussed within the design section of this report.

See paras 6.195.30 to 6.195.38 for full discussion.

| Building A is located too close to the boundary with properties along Abbeville Road it would overlook bedrooms/living rooms of these properties and lead to a loss of privacy to these nearby occupiers. | With regards to the Abbeville Road residents the separation distance between building A and the residential dwellings is 39m at its closest point whilst the central element of the building is setback 41m approximately. It is noted that Building A is setback slightly from the adjacent Brady House (part of the Notre Dame Estate – located to the rear) which is located 34m from the rear of the buildings fronting Abbeville Road. Given these separation distances it is considered that the privacy of adjoining residential occupiers would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development nor would it create a sense of enclosure. There are generous separation distances between the proposed buildings and the Notre Dame Estate buildings ranging from 17.5m at its closest point to 35m. It is considered that the privacy of adjoining residential occupiers would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development nor would it create a sense of enclosure. |
| --- |
| Building A’s close proximity to Abbeville Road boundary would create a sense of enclosure. |
| Loss of privacy to properties located on Worsopp Drive (Notre Dame Estate) |
| Proposals indicate that roof terraces are proposed on Building A lead to |
| There are some private roof terraces which serve some of the residential units within Buildings B, C |
### Loss of Privacy

Loss of privacy to residential gardens/rear of dwellings fronting Abbeville Road and D. It is noted that there are no roof terraces over Building A. Given the location of most of the roof terraces within the centre of the buildings, the use of privacy screening and the separation distances with residential neighbours it is considered that this would not lead to a loss of privacy or overlooking to neighbouring residents. A condition is recommended that all other roof top areas as shown on the roof plan the access is restricted for maintenance purposes only.

### Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

The Council’s daylight consultant considered that the extent of review was originally insufficient, especially given daylight distribution had not been considered at the outset and limited self-testing of sunlight undertaken (this had been addressed by the applicant and further details provided). In terms of the extent of analysis, officers concur with the extent of neighbouring residential properties for analysis as reported by Right of Light Consulting.

With regards to VSC for the Abbeville Road properties (with rear elevations facing the site), no reductions in VSC would exceed 20% therefore they would all meet BRE Target criteria.

In terms of reductions in daylight distribution they do not exceed 20% therefore they would all meet BRE target criteria with the one isolated exception of a room to 91 Abbeville Road (served by window 146) which would have a ‘moderate adverse** impact. It is difficult to determine the likely arrangement of this room and given that properties which are also on Abbeville Road but positioned closer to the proposal are not adversely affected, it is considered that this room would not be adversely affected.

With regards to sunlight to amenity areas BRE Guidance states that external amenity areas should receive 2 hours or more of sunlight across 50% of its area at the equinox. Right of Light consulting have reviewed 41 neighbouring amenity areas and from this analysis there was found to be no reductions that exceed 20% reduction on this basis the amenity areas meet the BRE Guide target criteria.

It is noted that a reasonable proportion of the analysis related to the rear amenity areas to the properties along Abbeville Road and Elms Road and given that these amenity areas are in the main

| Daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken is incomplete – data omissions for several of the tests, conclusions are misleading and incorrect Building A would impact on daylight/sunlight received by some of the properties fronting Abbeville Road. | There is a contradiction within the daylight and sunlight assessment – garden of 103B Abbeville Road will receive the same amount of sun when windows in neighbouring properties will be affected |
| Sunlight availability – numerous windows were excluded from this calculation for 89-125 Abbeville inclusive – ground level rooms most likely to be impacted. | Overshadowing of gardens to the rear of properties fronting Abbeville Road. |

### Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

Daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken is incomplete – data omissions for several of the tests, conclusions are misleading and incorrect Building A would impact on daylight/sunlight received by some of the properties fronting Abbeville Road.

There is a contradiction within the daylight and sunlight assessment – garden of 103B Abbeville Road will receive the same amount of sun when windows in neighbouring properties will be affected.

Sunlight availability – numerous windows were excluded from this calculation for 89-125 Abbeville inclusive – ground level rooms most likely to be impacted.

Overshadowing of gardens to the rear of properties fronting Abbeville Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transport</strong></th>
<th><strong>Table 2 of the addendum to the transport statement dated 26 June 2017 demonstrates that the site could generate an additional 48 vehicular trips per day, compared to the analysis in the Transport Assessment which had predicted a reduction of -23 daily trips (Table 6.11 of the Transport Assessment). This is a 19% increase in the number of trips generated by the site compared to the existing scenario (as surveyed in Nov 2015). The applicant was asked to clarify the additional trips to the site. Within their comments received 05 July 2017 the Transport Consultant advises that the additional trips would comprise a small element of cars and the residential servicing traffic. TfL have reviewed the proposal and consider that the overall trip generation assessment is reasonable and that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the operation of the strategic highway network. It is noted that there is only one access to the site, from Clapham Common South Side, which it is thought is also used to service the neighbouring college. No changes are proposed to the access arrangements at Clapham Common South Side. The diagram (figure 29) below illustrates the proposed indicative access arrangements immediately into the site. The existing footway alongside Lambeth College on the southern side of the access road (outside of the red line) will remain and provide a safe access route for pedestrians.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase traffic generation on main road within area/within proximity of Lambeth Academy – safety risk to students coming in and out of gates/entrances. Increased traffic impact from proposed development.</td>
<td>A draft Construction Management Plan has been submitted, which appears to be broadly acceptable. A detailed Construction Management Plan should be submitted to the council prior to construction. This will include detailed Site logistics arrangements; details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage; details of the hours of works and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and safety of the highway network; and communication procedures with the LBL and local community regarding key construction issues – newsletters, fliers etc. and details of a community forum that is set up and comprises of and engages with the **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
residents of the Notre Dame Estate and surrounding residents.
This would help to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and to safeguard residential amenity from the start of the construction process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The pedestrian refuge near the site entrance would need to be repositioned to enable large vehicles to turn left out of the site heading south</th>
<th>This is not the case; the access is used by large vehicles at present and there are no restrictions on turning left out of the site. Since there are no proposed changes to the layout of the access at Clapham Common Southside officers don’t expect any changes to the existing arrangements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not clear from the documents how the proposed development would impact on transport infrastructure</td>
<td>The Transport Assessment states that the proposed development is predicted to generate 28 additional bus trips in the AM peak hour and 32 in the PM peak hour. TfL considered that the increase in bus trips can be accommodated within the existing bus network capacity. It is noted that London Underground Infrastructure protection were also consulted and had no comment to make regarding this application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Phase – residents advised that Building A works commence first - the CMP suggests building A would be the final building being built – this should be reconsidered by the developer</td>
<td>A revised CMP has been submitted which amends this error and confirms that Building A would be constructed first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure by Design</td>
<td>Secure by Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased risk of theft and vandalism within immediate area. Access and security re semi-public of semi-public garden between Building A and Abbeville Road) this area should be limited to maintenance and security – should be monitored by CCT. Opening site to general public would increase risk of crime. Security to residents along Abbeville Road is threatened as the general public and residents can gain access to the site via the boundary wall</td>
<td>The Design out Crime Officer has reviewed the proposal and in particular areas that would be open and accessible to the public and considered the scheme to be acceptable. The officer has raised no objections subject to conditions that the development follows the principles and physical security requirements of Secured by Design and a community safety/crime management and maintenance plan be submitted. See Figure 8 below for illustration of the amenity spaces. The amenity space between Building A and the rear boundary of the properties fronting Abbeville Road is private amenity space for the future occupiers of this building. It would be gated and accessible only to occupants. See Figure 4 below which illustrates the proposed boundary treatment. Area 4 relates to the boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
treatment to the rear of the site (Abbeville Road Properties) and illustrates that the existing wall would be retained with a new timber fence added on the inside face. Where tree coverage is thinner, section of trellis (approximately 1.5m high) would be added to the top of the fence and climbers grown. Given the above the proposed development is unlikely to give rise to unauthorised access to the rear gardens of the properties fronting Abbeville Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flooding/Drainage/Sewage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential impact from surface water flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA does not include additional measures required to manage the increased sewage and potential for sewage backup and flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing sewage/drainage facilities under strain and potential impact not adequately addressed by developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No proposals to manage drainage/sewage to ensure properties along Abbeville Road do not flood as a result of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report identifies that the Site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding from surface water. A conceptual surface water management strategy detailing how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed post development has been submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environment Agency has raised no objection and the Council's Flooding (SUD's) officer has advised that the submitted details are fine and that the quality of information submitted is very high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With regards to sewerage infrastructure capacity, Thames Water have assessed the proposal and they have raised no objections. They advise that when it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| With regards to groundwater flooding. The size and scale of the basement is such that a risk 'medium' has been identified that it could intersect groundwater and there is a possibility that this could give rise to surface flooding. The applicant has appointed Geotechnical Consulting Group as their specialist advisor regarding hydrogeology. The letter of comfort dated 12th June provided confirms that in their (Geotechnical Consulting Group) opinion they are confident the site conceptual model should not change following proper investigation of the site and that an appropriate scheme of protection can be developed. A pre commencement condition has been recommended that no development shall take place until a scheme of detailed investigation of the
hydrogeological environment written by a suitably qualified scientific and authoritative person (which is what the statutory guidance states) and a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the hydrogeological setting of the site and the proposed development be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

**Other Matters**

| With regards to the construction of basement, the excavation/pile driving would impact on impact on adjacent properties building foundations (Abbeville Road). Request developer indemnify against damages Abbeville Road residents re structural damage. | The Council’s Environmental Health Consultant has advised that the planning authority are advised to get their own authoritative advisor (Structural Engineer) to ensure that the risk of movement from the excavation of the basement is controlled. The report prepared by Fairhurst advises that a movement monitoring scheme needs to be developed including trigger levels. This would need to be reviewed by an agreed third party structural engineering. This will be secured via a s106 with details to be submitted prior to commencement. The submitted Basement impact Assessment was referred to Building Control who advised from a Building Control view that the report is very detailed and takes into consideration boreholes and tests in respect of ground type, water levels and potential movement of adjoining structures. As you would expect there are currently no detailed drawings or structural calculations in respect of the buildings as this will be undertaken at Building Regulation stage. The Building control Officer advised that they are content with the information provided to date from a building control perspective. In terms of indemnity insurance etc. this is not a planning matter and a civil matter between the neighbours and developer. |
| No provision has been made by the developer to record the condition of properties prior to works commencing. | This is not a planning matter and a civil matter between the neighbours and developer. |
| Construction works will be undertaken on Saturdays lead to increased noise disturbance to residents during weekends. Construction works should be restricted to weekday working. | Construction work can take place between Monday and Friday between 8am-6pm and on Saturday from 8am-1pm. This is controlled by separate legislation. |
| Financial contributions should be provided for infrastructure in | The development would be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy and subject to a range of section 106 obligations that would |
particular primary and secondary schools in the area. reasonably mitigate the otherwise unacceptable impacts of the development upon local infrastructure.

The proposed development would lead to a loss of private views and devalue property Neither of these are a planning matter, private views are not protected views.

Some residents within Abbeville Road were not notified of the proposal All the Abbeville Road residential properties adjoining the boundary with 44 Clapham Common Southside were notified of the application. The application was advertised in the local paper on 01.03.2017.

Community consultation undertaken by the developer was poor – inconsistent and patchy. Claims in statement of community involvement – only one objection lodged residents in Abbeville Road made multiple formal objections. Pre consultation is not a statutory requirement. The Council encourages the applicant to carry out extensive public consultation within the local area prior to submission of any application. It is noted that the Clapham Society considered that the ‘consultation process had been extensive and that is to be welcomed’

Condition that leases contain causing restricting anti-social behaviour – noisy music from windows, parties in communal area. This is not a planning matter.

5  POLICIES

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

5.2 The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (2016), and the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)

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 (2016)
Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
Policy 2.9 Inner London
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 recreation facilities
Policy 3.7 Large residential developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
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 4.3: Mixed use development and offices
Policy 4.4: Managing industrial land and premises
Policy 4.9: Small shops
Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.8 Innovative energy technologies
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste net self-sufficiency
Policy 5.17 Waste Capacity
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.10 Walking
Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
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 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings
Policy 7.8: Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy 7.21: Trees and woodlands
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy
Lambeth Local Plan (2015)
Policy D1 Delivery and monitoring
Policy D2 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy D3 Infrastructure
Policy D4 Planning obligations
Policy H1 Maximising housing growth
Policy H2 Delivering affordable housing
Policy H4 Housing mix in new developments
Policy H5 Housing standards
Policy ED2 Business, industrial and storage uses outside KIBAs
Policy ED9 A2 uses
Policy ED10 Local centres and dispersed local shops
Policy ED14 Employment and training
Policy T1 Sustainable travel
Policy T2 Walking
Policy T3 Cycling
Policy T6 Assessing impacts of development on transport capacity and infrastructure
Policy T7 Parking
Policy T8 Servicing
Policy EN1 Open space and biodiversity
Policy EN3 Decentralised Energy
Policy EN4 Sustainable design and construction
Policy EN5 Flood Risk
Policy EN6 Sustainable drainage systems and water management
Policy EN7 Sustainable waste management
Policy Q1 Inclusive environments
Policy Q2 Amenity
Policy Q3 Community safety
Policy Q5 Local distinctiveness
Policy Q6 Urban design: public realm
Policy Q7 Urban design: new development
Policy Q8 Design quality: construction detailing
Policy Q9 Landscaping
Policy Q10 Trees
Policy Q12 Refuse/recycling storage
Policy Q13 Cycle Storage
Policy Q15 Boundary Treatments
Policy Q21 Registered parks and gardens
Policy Q26 Tall and large buildings

Other Guidance
The following other guidance is also considered relevant to the application proposal:

Regional
- Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail, and the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (April 2012);
- Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation (September 2012);
- Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016);
- Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance (April 2014);
- The control of dust and emission during construction and demolition (July 2014);
- Planning for Equality and Diversity in London (October 2007);
- Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (October 2014); and
- Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (August 2017)

Lambeth
- Refuse and Recycling Storage Design Guide (July 2013);
- Waste and Recycling storage and collection requirements – Technical specification for Architects and Developers (October 2013);
- Approved CIL Charging Schedule (1st October 2014);
- Lambeth Regulation 123 List (1st October 2014); and
- Draft Development Viability SPG (April 2017)
6 ASSESSMENT

6.1 Land Use

6.1.1 The principle of the development

6.1.2 The proposed scheme is for the redevelopment of the site for a mixed use residential led scheme comprised of a waste transfer facility (1,164 sqm GIA) at basement level, B1(a) office accommodation (3,696 sqm GIA) and ancillary café (117 sqm GIA - A3 Use Class); and the provision of 297 residential units. Whilst the principle of a residential led mixed use development is supported, it is noted that the existing site is in employment use and part of the site is safeguarded as a Waste Transfer Unit. The redevelopment of the site would protect the employment provision and retain space for a Waste Transfer Unit. Each of the proposed uses is considered further below.

6.1.3 Waste Transfer Unit

6.1.4 London Plan Policy 5.17H states that if, for any reason, an existing waste management site is lost to a non-waste use, an additional compensatory site provision will be required that normally meets the maximum throughput that the site could have achieved. Policy EN7(a)(iii) of the Lambeth Local Plan Policy (2015) is consistent with this approach. It seeks to safeguard existing waste transfer and management sites for waste management use unless appropriate compensatory provision is made in appropriate locations elsewhere in the borough. It is noted that under the Council’s old Development Plan the site in its entirety was a safeguarded waste facility. However, following the adoption of the new Local Plan in 2015, based on the Waste Evidence Study carried out only a portion of the site, 0.11ha or 1,100sqm has been safeguarded as a waste facility.

6.1.5 The existing Waste Transfer Unit (Sui Generis use) on site was approximately 2,335sqm which was operated by Cannon Hygiene. The applicant’s supporting documents indicate that Cannon Hygiene vacated the site in the summer of 2016 as their operations were relocated to new facilities in Barking and Mitcham. The supporting documents indicate that the Site has a licence (Environmental Permit) to dispose of 4,999 tonnes per annum and that the existing facility processed in the region of 1,200 tonnes per annum. The premises was permitted to receive waste and operate between 0800-1900 hours on weekdays and 0900-1300 hours on Saturdays.
6.1.6 The proposal includes a new waste transfer unit located within the basement of the proposed development as illustrated in Figure 18 below. It would comprise of 1,164sqm of floorspace and provide a potential throughput of 1,200 tonnes per annum (tpa). The supporting documents submitted indicate that the proposed facility would be able to cope with the necessary throughput identified by previous waste operators Canon Hygiene which was in the region of 1,200 tonnes per annum. Compensatory capacity for waste facilities can be assessed by recent maximum throughput rather than licenced capacity. The Council’s emerging updated evidence base on waste states that the maximum throughput for the clinical waste transfer facility at 44 Clapham Common South Side is 1,181 tonnes per annum, based on recent maximum throughput (notwithstanding that its maximum licenced capacity is 4,999 tonnes per annum). Therefore the applicant's proposal to retain space for a throughput of 1,200tpa is acceptable and in line with London Plan policy 5.17H and Local Plan policy EN7. The proposed 0.11ha is adequate to achieve a throughput of 1,200tpa.

6.1.7 Figure 18 illustration of Proposed Waste Transfer Unit located within Proposed Basement

6.1.8 No end user has been identified at this stage; as such the waste facility would be built to shell and core and a condition to this effect is recommended. The applicant in their supporting documentation have identified three types of waste management activities that could be undertaken within the basement unit. These are:

(i) Healthcare waste including clinical (currently occurs on site). This type of waste is mainly produced by organisations providing health and social care or in a person’s own home where health or social care is provided. It can include bandages, swabs, sharps, blood, and medicines. A sub set of this waste is clinical also classed as hazardous waste, usually classified as such because it carries a risk of infection and/or contains active pharmaceutical products or is contaminated with such material.

(ii) Processing specified types of Waste Electronic and Electrical Equipment (WEEE – Category 3 Information Technology and Telecommunications Equipment) mainly covers consumer and business information and telecommunication technology equipment.
(iii) Undertaking furniture dismantling and refurbishment as part of the Furniture Reuse Network (FRN). The furniture reuse option would offer the potential for a social enterprise to meet the needs of the local community in terms of waste processing capacity and the supply of reusable household items.

6.1.9 The supporting documents suggests that the demand side research undertaken for the waste review suggests that all three options considered could provide a valuable waste management asset to the locality as discussed in turn below.

6.1.10 With regards to clinical waste the supporting documents indicate that there are two permitted clinical waste transfer facilities within 5 km of the Site (LBL at Wanless Road and PHS group in Camberwell) and one small-scale clinical waste treatment operation (Pyropure at Imperial College). In 2014 (most recent available data from the EA), over 3,000 tonnes of infection risk waste arose in Lambeth with only 4% of this being processed within London (ratio 65% incineration to 35% transfer).

6.1.11 With regards to WEEE, the supporting documents indicate there are no permitted waste facilities within 5 km of the Site undertaking WEEE dismantling operations. Environment Agency data suggests there is a demand for this type of activity within London. In 2014 (most recent available data) over 2,000 tonnes of WEEE containing hazardous components arose in London, with only 14% of this being processed within London (mainly in Havering).

6.1.12 With regards to the furniture reuse network the applicant's supporting documentation indicates that there is limited information regarding demand. However it makes reference to the Local Government Association (LGA) who consider there is a growing opportunity to develop and maintain refurbishment/reuse facilities. They have estimated that reusing an additional 660,000 tonnes of goods and materials could save councils more than £60 million a year in Landfill Tax as well as realise an economic value of around £375 million – a total of up to £435 million of value available each year from diverting this additional material to reuse.

6.1.13 The applicant has provided examples of instances where waste transfer facilities have been integrated into mixed use developments. These are Cringle Dock and Battersea Power Station and Newport Sandringham Building in Charing Cross which are illustrated in figures 19 and 20 below.

6.1.14 The Cringle Dock scheme designed its new waste transfer station in a self-contained, enclosed box at lower ground level with new homes built above.
6.1.15 Figure 19 illustration of Cringle Dock

6.1.16 The Newport Sandringham Building in Charing Cross has been designed with the waste transfer unit located in the basement below the building.

6.1.17 Figure 20 illustration of Newport Sandringham Building

6.1.18 Overall the Site would continue to retain space (0.11ha) for a throughput of 1,200tpa of Waste which accords with London Plan and Local Plan Policy. Officers are comfortable that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the proposed basement would be sufficient to operate a waste transfer facility and that there is a demand for its use.

6.1.19 Employment Use

6.1.20 Policy ED2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) seeks to maintain a stock of sites and premises in business use across the borough. Part (c) supports mixed use developments including housing where the existing quantity of B class floorspace is replaced or increased. Policy ED3 (a) supports proposals for offices over 1000sqm in Central Activities Zone, Vauxhall and Waterloo London Plan Opportunity Areas, Brixton and Streatham Major Town Centres. Elsewhere, large office development will be supported only where the scale of the proposal is appropriate to its location and the PTAL level is 4 or above. Policy ED3(c) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) states that the redevelopment of large offices for a mix of uses will be supported if the quantity of original B1 floorspace is replaced or increased as part of the development or reprovided elsewhere within the immediate area. No marketing evidence would be required in this circumstance.
6.1.21 The site is currently in use for industrial/commercial purposes (B1(a) offices and B8 storage and distribution) which equates to approximately 3,672sqm of industrial/commercial employment floorspace. The activity on this site from these uses generates approximately 216 jobs. It is noted that a number of the existing buildings on the site have been vacant for a period of 2-4 years (Buildings 1 and 2, totalling 2,500sqm of floorspace and approximately 134 jobs).

6.1.22 The proposal includes the provision of 3,696sqm of high quality office space (Use Class B1 (a)) within a dedicated building (building F/Part E). The proposal would replace the existing quantum of employment floorspace and would provide an additional 24sqm of employment floorspace. It would accommodate up to 317 employees (an increase of 101 jobs approx.). The applicant has advised that the office floorspace has been designed with flexibility in mind and the floor plates designed for the ability to allow all floors to be let separately or broken down into smaller units to be let out to small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs). Illustrative drawings have been submitted to show how the floorspace could be subdivided into smaller spaces (studios to small offices) that would allow SME’s to locate here. The applicant’s addendum design and access statement states that these unit sizes are based on similar projects done with one particular workspace provider operator. The floor to ceiling height would be 2.7m minimum clear height.

6.1.23 It is considered that the proposed office floorspace, both in terms of quantity and quality would result in an intensification of employment provision on the site and create a significant uplift in the number of jobs created on the site, particularly given that some of the current buildings have been vacant for some 2-4 years. The proposed employment element is considered to be acceptable in light of the wider planning policy context. To ensure the office element is completed and delivered a condition is recommended that the shell and core be completed prior to occupation of the residential units.

6.1.24 Ancillary Café (Use Class A3)

6.1.25 Policy ED6 of the Lambeth local Plan (2015) states that proposals for town centre uses in edge of centre and out of centre locations will be assessed against the sequential test set out in the NPPF. Policy ED7 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) states that evening and food and drink uses should be primarily located in town centres and Central Activities Zone (CAZ) frontage.

6.1.26 Policy ED7 (d) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and paragraph 26 of the NPPF requires that evidence should be submitted to demonstrate that a sequential test has been undertaken to justify the out of centre locations. It is noted that paragraph 26 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sqm).

6.1.27 The proposal includes 117sqm of A3 café that would have no commercial kitchen associated with it. The café is positioned on the ground floor of building E that would face the public square. The proposed design incorporates areas of glazing with entrances fronting the public square. It is envisaged that the proposed café use would help create activity and animation within this part of the site where the public square is proposed.
6.1.28 Whilst outside a designated town centre (Clapham High Street District Town Centre), it is noted that the size of the café is well below the default threshold of 2,500sqm and therefore no sequential test is required. Given its use is effectively ancillary to the commercial building and has the benefit of providing an active frontage onto the public square it is considered by officers that the proposal would not undermine the vitality and viability of the Clapham High Street District Town Centre. To ensure the ancillary café element is completed and delivered a condition is recommended that the shell and core be completed prior to occupation of the commercial and residential units.

6.1.29 **Residential Use**

6.1.30 The delivery of new homes is considered a priority for Lambeth, as such the principle of residential use on this site is considered acceptable by virtue of London Plan Policies 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply) and 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential) and Policy H1 of the Lambeth Local plan (2015) (Maximising Housing Growth).

6.1.31 Local Plan Policy H1 seeks to maximise delivery of new housing in Lambeth over the next 10 years. The London Plan sets a target for Lambeth to deliver a minimum of 15,594 new homes in this period, equating to 1,559 new homes a year between 2015 and 2025. This scheme would provide up to 297 residential units. Residential use on the site as part of a mixed use development is therefore considered acceptable in principle. The acceptability of residential use is subject to detailed design, quality of residential accommodation, and all other relevant policies being satisfied which is discussed below.

6.1.32 London Plan Policy 3.4 supported by Local Plan Policy H1 which seek to optimise development densities based on local context, character and accessibility. The site is located within an ‘urban’ location where the density matrix sets a guideline of 70-260 units or 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare, with a PTAL of 4-6; however these should not be applied mechanistically. Where proposals are made for development above the density ranges they must be tested on the different aspects of the liveability of the scheme related to the proposed dwelling mix, design and quality, access to services and long term management of communal areas and the wider context of the proposal.

6.1.33 The 297 unit scheme achieves a density of 201 dwellings per hectare (dph) or 507 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph). The alternative scheme of 293 units achieves 199 dph or 509 hrph. The scheme would therefore have a density within the London Plan density range. A further assessment on the other relevant matters such as quality of accommodation, play and amenity space and design quality is required in order to determine the appropriateness of the density of the proposed residential use, which is discussed below.

6.2 **Affordable housing**

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy H2 seeks to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in the borough. On sites capable of accommodating 10 or more units, at least 50 per cent of housing should be affordable where public subsidy is available, or 40 per cent without public subsidy. Furthermore, the mix of affordable housing should achieve a 70:30 tenure split between social rent or affordable rent and intermediate.
6.2.2 London Plan Policies 3.8 to 3.13 asserts the need for mixed and balanced communities and in this context seeks to maximise affordable housing provision. In order to give impetus to a strong and diverse intermediate housing sector, the London Plan advises that 60 per cent of the affordable housing provision should be for social/affordable rent and 40 per cent for intermediate rent or sale and that priority should be accorded to provision of affordable family housing.

6.2.3 The Mayors Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (published August 2017) supersedes section 3.3 (Build to Rent) and Part 5 (Viability) of the March 2016 Housing SPG. The Affordable Housing and Viability SPG introduces a “threshold approach”, whereby schemes meeting or exceeding 35 per cent affordable housing (measured by habitable rooms) without public subsidy are not required to submit viability information (Fast Track Route). Where the level of affordable housing offered meets this threshold, it should normally be considered the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing which can be delivered through the planning system (subject to an early stage review mechanism to help ensure delivery). Under the provisions of the SPG the preferred tenure split would be 30% Affordable/ Social rent, 30% intermediate and 40% at the discretion of the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

6.2.4 The Council’s emerging Draft Development Viability SPD to be adopted following publication of the Mayors Affordable Housing and Viability SPG proposes to align with the approach set out in the Mayor’s SPG with respect to the threshold approach. The Council’s policy position regarding tenure split remains as set out in Policy H2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015), a 70% (affordable rent) to 30% (intermediate) split and applies to Fast Track schemes.

6.2.5 Initial position at submission
The initial affordable housing position at submission was based on 296 residential units (744 habitable rooms). A total of 79 affordable units (220 hr), equating to 27% by unit and 30% based on habitable room was proposed. This achieved a tenure split of 48 (affordable rented): 52 (intermediate) by units or 56 (affordable): 44 (intermediate) by habitable room.

6.2.6 In accordance with Local Plan Policy H2 (d) the applicant submitted a financial viability appraisal that was independently assessed by BNP Paribas. The assessment, following verification and amendments demonstrated that the development as initially proposed generates a residual land value of £13.27 million, which is £3.98 million lower than the benchmark land value of £17.25 million and unviable. However, the sensitivity analysis (showing the impact of changes in values and costs in 2% increments) indicates that the scheme could become viable with increases in sales values of 4% and cost reduction of 2%, neither of which are inconceivable over the life of the planning permission. On the basis of a 17.5% profit on the private housing, the residual land value would increase to £15.9 million, albeit still lower than but closer to the benchmark land value of £17.25 million. On the basis of this lower profit (blended to 18.5% by the applicant), the prospects for the scheme being delivered are enhanced. On this basis it is considered that the tenure mix as set out above would maximise the provision of affordable housing on a present day basis.

6.2.7 Whilst officers are in agreement with the conclusions of the viability assessment, it was suggested that the applicant consider increasing the affordable housing provision to 35% by habitable room in line with the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and the Council’s Draft Development Viability SPD.
6.2.8 On this basis the applicant has subsequently increased the affordable housing provision by unit and by habitable room to 35%, which is supported. However, in order to fully achieve the Fast Track Route approach, the tenure mix must also conform to the mix set out in Policy H2 (70 affordable/social: 30 intermediate).

6.2.9 The applicant has proposed two options, both of which provide 35% affordable housing by habitable room. One has a tenure split of 50:50 and the other 70:30 (in favour of affordable rent). The latter would fully comply with the Fast Track Route in the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and Policy H2.

6.2.10 The Fast Track Route (70:30 tenure split) requires three different tenures to share a single block (Block B). While this can be achieved in design terms, there are concerns that a Registered Provider (RP) may not want to manage the units in this configuration. The option A approach (50:50 tenure split) would alleviate this by retaining Block B with only two tenures. However, option A would trigger a late stage review as it does not satisfy Policy H2 both in terms of overall provision and tenure mix. The applicant has advised that their funders have concerns at the imposition of a late stage review. The Fast Track Route removes the need for a late stage review of the scheme in line with the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and would comply with Policy H2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) in terms of tenure split. The Fast Track Route is officers (and the applicant's) preferred option and it would only be if the applicant was unable to secure a Registered Provider (RP) that would manage Block B in this configuration that the fall back position would be the implementation of option A. Officers therefore have no objection to both options being included within the Section 106 Agreement. Each option is discussed in turn below:

6.2.11 Option A based on 297 dwellings (748 habitable room): 206 market dwellings (488 habitable room) and 91 affordable dwellings (260 by habitable room). A total of 31% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 40 affordable rented and 51 intermediate units (44:56 split). By habitable room this equates to 129 affordable rent and 131 affordable intermediate (50:50 split) as illustrated in table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Units (Habitable Rooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.12 Table 2 Affordable Housing Tenure Option A
6.2.13 The tenure split is skewed in favour of intermediate rather than affordable rent based on residential unit numbers but an equal split based on habitable rooms. In either case whilst this does not meet the 70:30 tenure split it is considered acceptable in this instance given the viability appraisal, and that the applicant is providing more affordable housing (12 additional units). There is also a reasonable level of affordable rent units provided as family sized accommodation. In this regard 17 (68 HR) of the 91 (260 HR) units (one more family sized unit above that originally offered) would be family sized accommodation, defined as having three or more bedrooms. There is a clear need for larger family social/affordable rented properties in the borough to which the provision of 16 affordable units would help to meet.

6.2.14 In terms of affordable housing mix, policy H4 of the Lambeth local Plan (2015) sets a preferred mix, in which not more than 20% of dwellings should be 1 bedroom units, 20% - 50% should be 2 bedroom units and 40% should be 3 bedroom or more units. The proposed affordable housing mix is 37% 1bed, 44% 2 bed and 19% 3-4 bed. Whilst it is slightly skewed towards 1 bed dwellings when the affordable rented units mix is considered on its own it would comply, 30% 1 bed, 27.5% 2bed and 42.5% 3-4bed.

6.2.15 Building A would be exclusively for affordable rent. It would provide an independent access and allow the level of services and the cost of services to be controlled by the RP. With regards to the intermediate provision, the intermediate units would be located within Building B along with private units. The intermediate units would share the access into the building. There is one shared core with two lift/stair cores within the building one at either end. The intermediate units would be located on the lower ground, ground, first and second floors. At the third floor both intermediate and private units would be located at this level. In accordance with the Mayor’s Housing Strategy these larger affordable rent units would be offered at levels consistent with Social Target Rents excluding service charge.

6.2.16 An early review mechanism would be triggered if an agreed level of progress on implementation is not made within two years of the permission being granted and a late stage review mechanism upon the sale of 75% of the market units. This would be secured by section 106 agreement, such provisions would then secure any uplift on site where possible or further financial contributions should, at the time of the re-appraisals, it be demonstrated that the development could viably deliver a greater affordable housing offer (up to 40%). Any surplus would be split 60:40 with the greater proportion in favour of the Council (broadly in line with the Council’s Draft Development Viability SPD) for the provision of new affordable housing elsewhere in the borough. In this instance the suggested 80:20 split is not considered appropriate on the basis that the scheme is delivering a significant level of affordable housing on-site and that the scheme is going beyond what is currently viable.

6.2.17 Option B based on 293 dwellings (751 habitable rooms): 206 market dwellings (488 by habitable room) and 87 affordable (263 by habitable room). A total of 30% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 59 affordable rent and 28 affordable intermediate (68:32 split). By habitable room this equates to 184 affordable rent and 79 affordable intermediate (70:30 split) as illustrated in table 3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4 bed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(488)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(184)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>(363)</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(751)</td>
<td>(165)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.18 Table 3 Affordable Housing Tenure Option B

6.2.19 The tenure split is 68:32 in favour of affordable rent based on residential unit numbers whilst this falls slightly short of the 70:30 split it meets the requirement based on habitable rooms (70/30 split). Similar to option A above, the applicant is providing 8 additional affordable housing units than previously offered. There is also a good level of affordable rent units provided as family sized accommodation. In this regard 20 (68 HR) of the 87 (260 HR) units (four above that originally proposed) would be family sized accommodation that would help to meet the identified need in the borough.

6.2.20 In terms of affordable housing mix, the proposed mix would be 31% 1 bed, 46% 2 bed and 23% 3-4 bed. When considered as affordable rented units on their own the mix would be 37% 1bed, 29% 2 bed and 34% 3-4 bed. Whilst it is slightly skewed towards 1 bed dwellings which have increased as part of the proposed option A (by 10 units) this scheme provides an additional 4 family sized dwellings and the mix of intermediate units is better as it is proposes less 1 bed units and more 2 bed units than that originally offered which is welcomed.

6.2.21 An early review mechanism would be triggered if an agreed level of progress on implementation is not made within two years of the permission being granted and no late stage review would be required. The early stage review mechanism would be secured by s106 agreement, such provisions would then secure a financial contribution should, at the time of the re-appraisals, it be demonstrated that the development could viably deliver a greater affordable housing offer (up to 40%). Any surplus would be split with the greater proportion in favour of the Council (in line with the Council’s Draft Development Viability SPD) for the provision of new affordable housing elsewhere in the borough. The final split is subject to discussion and will be confirmed via addendum and/or to the Committee.
Building A would be exclusively for affordable rent whilst Building B would comprise of all three tenures. Within Building B the affordable rent units would be located on the lower ground and ground floors, and part of the first, second and third floors. They would be separated from the intermediate tenure units located on the first and second floors and the private units on the third floor. The remaining upper floors (4th, 5th and 6th) would be private tenure. There would be a separate entrance with separate lift access for the affordable rent tenure. It would provide an independent access and allow the level of services and the cost of services to be controlled by the RP. Whilst there is no RP confirmed to take on the units at the moment the Council’s Housing officer has indicated that this proposal could be taken on by an RP. In the event that the applicant is unable to secure an RP to manage the units within Building B in this configuration then the fall back position would be that they implement option A. The applicant would need to clearly demonstrate to the Council that every endeavour has been undertaken to secure an RP for these units. This would be secured by s106. In accordance with the Mayor’s Housing Strategy these larger affordable rent units would be offered at levels consistent with Social/Target Rents excluding service charge.

6.3 Design and Conservation

6.3.1 Policies Q5 and Q7 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) support visually interesting, well detailed and proportioned new development which reinforces or enhances local distinctiveness and character. Proposals will be supported where the design responds to the positive aspects of the surrounding urban grain, including relationships between spaces and buildings, townscapes, the adjacent built forms; siting, orientation and layout; and materials and detailing.

6.3.2 Policy Q6 of Lambeth Local Plan (2015) considers the impacts of new buildings on the public realm and supports development which provides the most effective use of the site; good legibility; convenient access; avoiding visual clutter, and respects existing building lines.

6.3.3 Policy Q22 (a) (ii) seeks to protect the setting of conservation areas (including views in and out of the area).

6.3.4 Bulk/Scale/Massing

6.3.5 The site is long, narrow, landlocked and flanked on both of the longitudinal boundaries by the buildings on the Notre Dame Estate to the northeast and Lambeth College and Lambeth Academy to the southwest. The main massing elements are orientated perpendicular to the length of the site, and parallel with the Abbeville Road terraced houses. The buildings are spaced apart and separated by a series of landscaped courtyard spaces. The centre of the site has the greater scale with the building heights then sloping down towards the southeastern and northwestern boundaries which allows the scheme as a whole to sit comfortably within its surrounding context.

6.3.6 Heritage
6.3.7 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the LPA shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of the Act contains similar requirements with respect to buildings or land in a conservation area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states ‘when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification…’ Paragraph 134 goes on to state ‘where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.’

6.3.8 Policy Q22 (a) of the Local Plan (2015) considers that development proposals affecting conservation areas will be permitted where they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas by i) respecting and reinforcing the established, positive characteristics of the area in terms of the building line, siting, design, height, forms, materials joinery, window detailing etc.; (ii) protecting the setting (including views in and out of the area). In additional, Policy Q22 (b) (ii) supports development if a suitable replacement has been granted planning permission.

6.3.9 Policy Q20 of the Local Plan (2015) considers that development affecting listed buildings will be supported where it would: i) conserve and harm the significance/special interest; (ii) not harm the significance/setting (including views to and from; and (iii) not diminish its ability to remain viable in use in the long term.

6.3.10 Officers have considered the proposal in accordance within the legislative and policy context set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990, the NPPF and local planning policy. In light of this assessment, officers do not consider that the proposal would cause ‘harm’ to the setting of the adjacent listed building within the Notre Dame Estate or the adjacent Clapham conservation area to the south and listed buildings primarily dwellings adjacent to Lambeth College (No’s 48, 53, 54 and 78 Clapham Common Southside) and Notre Dame Estate (No’s 54, 26-27, 28-29, 32-33, 34-34(A), 35, 36, 37-38 Clapham Common Southside and No’s 1-35 and 2-32 Crescent Grove, also locally designated as a Garden Square) respectively and Clapham Common bandstand a Grade II listed building located within Clapham Common.

6.3.11 The Clapham Conservation Area is adjacent the site to the north east and is Lambeth’s largest. It comprises three distinct character areas – (1) Clapham’s historic centre (focused around Old Town), (2) the Common and the development around its perimeter, and (3) the housing built during the 19th Century expansion of London.
6.3.12 The application site adjoins the south side of Clapham Common which is characterised by low rise (2/3 – 4 storey) early-mid 19th Century buildings facing onto the common. These buildings enclose the common side and provide a setting for the common itself. Whilst the majority of historic buildings are of modest scale it should be noted that the post-war Notre Dame Estate blocks are noticeably larger and so too is the relatively modern Lambeth College campus building. These larger developments flank the Site when viewed from Clapham Common and provide the existing context for the application site.

6.3.13 The Grade II Orangery is a late 18th or early 19th Century hexastyle ionic portico which is Grade II listed and situated in an incongruous location tucked away within open space within the Notre Dame housing estate. There are also some listed buildings adjacent to Lambeth College and the Notre Dame Housing Estate on Clapham Common Southside which are located a considerable distance from the Site. Clapham Conservation area is adjacent the site to the north east. Being mindful of the statutory obligation to pay ‘special regard’ to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of conservation areas, including their setting, and to protect the setting of Listed Buildings, considerable care has been taken in developing the scheme and officers are of the opinion that no harm will result to the setting of the adjacent listed building and conservation area as explained below (see paras 6.74 – 6.102).

6.3.14 Building A

6.3.15 A part two to four storey block (above ground level) is proposed to the south east end of the site, backing onto the rear gardens of Abbeville Road. The lower scale terraced nature of the Victorian terrace properties along Abbeville Road is reflected in the scale and massing of this block. The proposed variation in height breaks up the massing of the buildings creating two X 4 storey elements above ground level and a recessed middle element at 2 storeys, and is a sensitive approach to providing a development that sits comfortably with the existing properties along Abbeville Road. There would be a 39-41m gap between this building and the rear returns of the Abbeville Road to align with the separation distance between Brady House (adjacent Notre Dame Estate) and the Abbeville terrace. The spatial relationship between existing development and Building A combined with the modest scale and massing sits comfortably within this context. There would be no adverse impact on significance of strategic or local views or heritage assets including their settings is considered to be appropriate

6.3.16 Building B

6.3.17 This is a part five to seven storey block (above ground level) sitting parallel to Building A. A 20-22 m gap between the Buildings (A & B) reduces to 6.5m at the north east end to announce the entrance into the lowered courtyard. The cumulative impact of the 6.5m gap and the modest massing at the north east end of the blocks at 4 storeys demarcates the entrance, whilst retaining a comfortable spatial relationship between the Buildings A and B widening to 22m. The tallest element of the block is located to the north west at seven storeys above ground level with a recessed top which steps down in height to five storeys above ground. Resulting in the building being principally perceived as a six storey building when viewed from the street and the five storey part of this block perceived as a four storey building. The scale and mass of which would successfully respond to the adjoining 4-5 storey development of the Lambeth College and Notre Dame estate. There would be no adverse impact on significance of strategic or local views or heritage assets including their settings is considered to be appropriate.
6.3.18 Building C

6.3.19 This is the third block sitting north west of Building B. The height of Building C transitions from eight storeys along the south west boundary to six storeys along the north east elevation (above ground). The top element of the block would be setback from the street elevation along the pedestrian route to reduce the visual dominance of the scale and massing from the street. The taller elements along the south west elevation would be sufficiently set back from Lambeth College. The spatial gap between Building C and B of 17-23m creates spatial openness characteristic of the area. The cumulative result of this approach ensures that the lower scale, bulk and massing of the blocks is consistently setback along the pedestrian route with the increase in scale/mass maintained to the south west to ensure building C sits comfortably within its context. There would be no adverse impact on significance of strategic or local views or heritage assets including their settings is considered to be appropriate

6.3.20 Building D

6.3.21 Building D is the fourth building parallel to Building C to the north west ranging in height from five to seven to ten storeys (above ground level). The spatial gap between Buildings C and D of 17-23m is consistent with the spatial relationship of buildings C and B. Whilst the 10 storey block is visibly taller than the rest of the development and buildings in the wider area it is not uncommon to find tall buildings comfortably sited adjacent to lower scale buildings and heritage assets throughout the borough. The well-considered slender building profile and the carefully considered selection of materials also help articulate the top element as a refined, subordinate top, to ensure the building sits comfortably within its context at the centre of the development. In addition the overall design meets design excellence particularly in terms of form, silhouette, materials, detailing. There would be no adverse impact on significance of strategic or local views or heritage assets including their settings is considered to be appropriate.

6.3.22 Building E and F

6.3.23 Building F fronts the site and reaches a height of five storeys above ground and is linked to building E which reaches a height of seven to nine storeys above ground. The approach, to create lower scale development at the south east end rising gently to the north west is considered to be acceptable in this context of moderate scale development between four and eight storeys. Whilst the nine storey element would be taller than buildings within its contexts, the overall design meets design excellence particularly in terms of form, silhouette, materials, detailing. Overall siting of the taller elements of the development within the centre of the site where there would be no adverse impact on significance of strategic or local views or heritage assets including their settings is considered to be appropriate.

6.3.24 Views

6.3.25 Officers have considered the proposal’s impact on strategic and local views. A Townscape, Visual and Heritage Impact Report (TVHIR) has been submitted, and provides a thorough evaluation of the impact of the proposal in terms of its siting, height and form on strategic views, the surrounding context and heritage assets. It should be noted that the site does not fall within any Protected Vistas or Protected Silhouettes as defined in the London View Management Framework (LVMF).
6.3.26 In terms of the impact of the proposed development on strategic or local views, designated heritage assets (Former Orangery (Grade II Listed) and nearby conservation areas, it is considered that the proposal would not harm the character of the area. Officers accept that some views will change from the immediate and wider area however, the change to these views would not adversely impact the appreciation of these views or any landmark buildings. As such the setting of designated assets will not be unduly affected by the proposal.

6.3.27 The TVHIR demonstrates that the tallest building within the scheme would be partially visible in the foreground from the Orangery (View 4 – Former Orangery, Worsopp Drive) above the north western end of Comins House but at considerably lower perceived height than Mandeville House. As such it is considered that the proposal would not affect the setting of this building given the presence of the existing buildings within the Notre Dame Estate (Comins House and Mandeville House) in this view.

6.3.28 View 6 (6 Crescent Grove – outside No.25) of the TVHIR is outside no.25 Crescent Grove which is a row of Grade II listed buildings, located within Clapham Conservation Area (CA1) and within a locally designated Garden Square illustrates that part of the proposed scheme would be seen within existing gaps in the foreground during winter months and screened by vegetation during summer. The height would be similar to existing buildings within the surrounding and existing skyline views, as such officers consider this to be acceptable.

6.3.29 The TVHIR demonstrates that the view along Caldervale Road from Elms Crescent (View 9 Elms Crescent, junction with Caldervale Road) is where the proposal is most visible and is visibly much greater in scale and mass than the Notre Dame Housing Blocks. However, the stepped form of the development provides variation in the rooftops when seen in views which helps the development sit comfortably within its context.

6.3.30 Views 18 and 19 from Clapham Common bandstand Grade II listed building and 100m NE of the bandstand show that the proposal would be screened by intervening trees in winter and summer months. Glimpses of parts of the proposed building would be visible in the distance from this part of the common alongside glimpses of Notre Dame Estate and Lambeth College and the wider area.
6.3.31 Architectural Quality: Appearance and Materials

Building A & B

The modern interpretation and use of materials proposed in cream brickwork and decorative bronze metal work is influenced by the yellow stock brick treatment of the terraced properties of Abbeville Road and mansion blocks of Crescent Grove. Building A also incorporates red brick with dark accents to reflect the subtle use of red brick also found along Abbeville Road and used more widely in the surrounding area and the brickwork of Notre Dame Estate. Buildings A and B have a simple modern aesthetic with residential lobby entrances at street level and balconies overlooking the new route providing natural surveillance and reinforcing the residential character of the blocks. The building facades have a regular fenestration pattern of large portrait window openings accentuated with decorative bronze infill panels, off white reconstituted stone cornices, lintels, cills and recessed horizontal brick cladding to create visual interest. Deep window reveals and balconies with decorative metal balustrades are an attractive defining characteristic feature of each block and ties in with the design approach to the boundary treatment of the feature gardens. Off white reconstituted stone defines the lower ground elevations creating light bright spaces used as private and communal gardens for residents. The use of reconstituted stone also helps break up the disciplined brick frame of Building B along the south east elevation. Top elements of the building are recessed in contrasting mid to dark coloured bronze metal panels with obscurely glazed balustrades for the balconies.

Building C

The materials applied to this block take inspiration from the purpose built residential blocks and mansion blocks in the local area. The proposed red brown multi-coloured brickwork with yellow accents reflects the warmer red brown multi-coloured brick tones of the Notre Dame Estate and the red brick and white stone of Clapham South station whilst yellow accents respond to the yellow stock brick and white stone of Clapham southside mansion blocks. The simple contemporary design of this block expresses the architectural language of the mansion blocks at a larger scale whilst retaining the characteristic disciplined brick frame of Building A & B. The decorative gates to the vehicular access within the base of the building respond well to the decorative treatment of the balconies on the north east elevation and again reflect the unique characteristic treatment of the boundary treatment of the feature gardens. Block facades have a regular fenestration pattern of large portrait window openings accentuated with white horizontal cornices, lintels and sill. A similar approach to Building A and B is used to define the base and top elements of Building C. The use of off white reconstituted stone defines the base of the building and breaks up the visual mass of the block. Top elements of the building are recessed in contrasting mid to dark coloured bronze metal panels with obscurely glazed balustrades for the balconies.
**Building D**

6.3.34 The darker red brown brick tone of this building reflects the red brickwork of the Sweets Factory building and contrasts well with the bronze metal for the top elements, and horizontal elements below balconies and window cills. Reconstituted stone is applied to the base corner elevations facing Building E to correspond with the base treatment of Building E which defines the commercial uses at ground and first floor and the use of the public square. Generously proportioned punched portrait window openings with a regular fenestration pattern are consistently applied to the facades. The use of materials and creation of recessed elements within the building start to break down the massing and scale of this building which is visually larger in scale and mass than the other buildings, resulting in elegant vertically proportioned elevations. The setbacks and contrasting use of materials applied to the residential units at the upper levels provides a playful juxtaposition to the well-structured elevations denoting a change in scale and results in an interesting roof profile.

**Building E and F**

6.3.35 These buildings continue the architectural language of Buildings A-D however, the corner elevation of Block E facing Block D transitions from white constituted stone at its base to define the commercial uses at ground and first floor and the disciplined brick frame of the upper levels with bronze clad top element to a simpler more robust commercial appearance. Buildings E & F have a clearly defined base, middle and top fronting the new pedestrian route (North East elevation). The base is distinguished by a two storey commercial base with generous floor to ceiling heights with a high proportion of glazing within the façade. The highly glazed treatment of the non residential uses within Building F contrasts with the predominantly residential brick frame façades helping to differentiate visually the different uses within the building. It is noted that some of the articulation shown in the north west and south west elevations is bland and has not been identified on the materials key. Officers will require further details be submitted by way of condition. The level of detail provided should be similar to the level of detail shown in the CGI’s submitted an informative to this effect is recommended.

6.3.36 The materiality of the balustrades will need to be light weight and obscurely glazed where appropriate and sufficiently set back to ensure these elements do not visually clutter the roof tops. This can be imposed by condition.

6.3.37 The use of white cladding to the lower ground elevations will reflect light, resulting in light amenity spaces this is a good approach. It will be important to secure high quality detailing of elements at the build stage and as such a detail construction condition is recommended. Elevations of bays, entrances, windows, balconies, access gates, balustrades, soffits, lightwells, brick details etc. will be required at scale 1:20 to ensure the design of the scheme is of a high standard.

6.3.38 The predominant use of brick throughout the development relates well to its context. The proposed palette of materials provides variation in tone and texture to differentiate the buildings and also provides some individuality to blocks creating an attractive and interesting unique identity for the development as a whole.
6.3.39 **Boundary Treatment**

The boundary treatment surrounding the site (illustrated in figure 21) below varies in treatment and height from 2m to 3m. The treatment comprises of iron railings, brick walls, brick walls/wire mesh, concrete plank/wire mesh, concrete planks and concrete planks/metal gate.

6.3.40 Figure 21 existing boundary treatment

6.3.41 The diagram below (figure 21) illustrates the type of boundary treatments proposed. The boundary area identified as 1, 2 and 3 would be the northeastern boundary adjacent the Notre Dame Estate, Area 4 would be the rear boundary adjacent the rear gardens of the dwellings fronting Abeville Road. No’s 5 and 6 would be the southeastern boundary adjacent Lambeth Academy and boundary type 7 would be the southwestern boundary adjacent to Lambeth College.

6.3.42 Area 1 would be an open and permeable area adjacent the Notre Dame Estate. It would comprise of low level feature planting beds reaching a maximum height of 0.5m. Area 2 would comprise of some physical barriers but with clear visual openness and connections to the adjacent Notre Dame Estate. Low level linear planting beds reaching a maximum height of 0.75m and benches are proposed. The changes in level at this part of the site would be addressed using generous, wide steps between trees. Area 3 residential boundary would include a pedestrian link between the site and Notre Dame Estate and comprise of a combination of brick dwarf walls with laurel hedges and sections of wrought iron railings reaching a maximum height of 1.8m.
6.3.43 Area 4, the existing wall would be retained with a new timber fence added on the inside face. Where tree cover is thinner, section of trellis (approximately 1.5m high) would be added to the top of the fence and climbers grown. Area 5 and 6 the existing concrete wall would remain and a 1.8m high Timber fence would be added on the inside face. Within Area 7 the existing brick and timber walls would be kept.

6.3.44 The aspiration for the development to be a catalyst for the opening up of the site by removing physical barriers and creating a better relationship with the site and Notre Dame Estate is welcomed. Overall the proposed treatment is appropriate and would be an improvement upon the existing. In terms of the specific details of the boundary treatment and its maintenance this can be imposed by condition.

6.3.45 It is noted that the applicant has also agreed to art/street art being erected by the Notre Dame Estate residents along the boundary fence or onto hoarding that may replace the boundary fence between the two sites during construction. This can be imposed by condition.

Public Art

6.3.46 Policy Q4 (c) (ii) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) encourages the provision of new public art within large-scale redevelopment schemes. Whilst no details have been provided regarding any public art inclusion, given the nature of scheme and the public square being proposed the scheme should be inclusive of some form of public art. This can be secured by s106 and a condition regarding the details of the public art are submitted to the Local Planning authority for approval.

Public Realm/Landscaping/ Trees

6.3.47 Lambeth Local Plan Policy Q9 supports development where the landscaping is fit for purpose, accommodates pedestrian desire lines, avoids piecemeal or leftover spaces, includes sustainable drainage and is attractive and well designed. Local Plan Policy Q10 (Trees) makes clear that new development should be designed positively to protect existing trees and, as part of a wider soft landscaping scheme to include new trees where appropriate.

6.3.48 The proposal provides extensive new and linked public realm and a 595sqm public square to be located between building D & E which is welcomed and considered acceptable. It is imperative that the quality of this new public space is of the highest standard, and that there is a sensible balance between hard and soft landscaping materials so as to ensure the public space is sensitive, welcoming and blends into its surroundings, as well as having ecological and visual amenity value. This should be considered as part of the detailed soft and hard landscaping scheme to be secured by condition and drawing the applicant’s attention to this detail.
Furthermore, this scheme also proposes to open up the front of the site for (for the length of 210m approx.) with the adjacent Notre Dame Estate (see figure 23 below illustrated as blue arrows). It would have a link (shown as thick green arrow below) between the public open space located on the site directly to the adjacent Notre Dame estate and the Listed Orangery. A further secondary link (shown as thinner green arrow below) is proposed approx. 155m from the first link which will be open from dawn to dusk (with aspirations to keep open 24hours). This is welcomed by officers as it would go towards integrating the proposed development within the wider community and promoting community cohesion. Given that the Notre Dame Estate is private land (owned by the Council) the Council's housing estate team have agreed in principle to the opening up of the estate and the links created between the two sites. To ensure openness, links and that the relevant spaces including the public square remain accessible open to the public and are maintained further agreement will need to be secured between the two parties this will be secured by a s106 that these agreements be secured prior to the commencement of development.

Figure 23 illustration of public realm

The proposal would result in the direct loss of eleven trees and three groups as part of the redevelopment of the site. This loss would include two of the three trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (T4 Ash and & T7 lime) the tree survey indicates that these trees are of poor quality following loss of a co-dominant stem (T4) and upper trunk decay (T7). This has resulted in a limited future life-expectancy and poor quality and condition. To the rear of the site, the existing tree line is retained (with the exception of two Norway Maple Trees which are to be removed) to maintain screening and separation to the rear gardens of properties fronting Abbeville Road. Provision is made within the landscape strategy for approximately 157 new trees that includes ornamental and significant tree planting within areas of natural soft ground. Within these areas, some trees are indicated to be of parkland species and located to allow full maturity to be attained. The submitted Arboricultural Report is comprehensive and tree loss highlighted is considered acceptable in view of the mitigation planting and retention of the one of the TPO trees.
6.3.52 The Arboricultural Report has provided a detailed and considered assessment of the impact on third party trees (neighbouring) through detailed assessment of the changes in surface treatment within likely Root Protection Areas (RPAs). This provides reassurance that the Arboricultural Method Statement (to be conditioned), informed by this Arboricultural Impact Assessment will be comprehensive and thorough. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer has raised no objection to the scheme subject to conditions that a tree protection plan, arboricultural method statement, schedule of supervision and monitoring for the arboricultural protection measures are submitted for approval.

6.3.53 The landscaping plan below (figure 24) illustrates both hard and soft landscaping. There is a move from arrival spaces and formal gardens near Clapham Common at the front of the site, to informal woodland gardens towards the rear of the site. The overall Landscape Plan is a good starting point, officers will be expecting that all soft and hard landscaping is of a high quality and its maintenance is sufficiently robust, conditions are recommended regarding detailed design and planting specifications (to be supported by maintenance schedules) are submitted for approval. This is particularly important in terms of the proposed planting at ground level, the various roof terraces and formal planting in the form of trees and planters, which whilst being welcoming as to ‘softening up' the structure and providing access to green space for residents and visitors, needs careful design, creation and maintenance to ensure its success.

6.3.54 Figure 24 proposed Landscaping Plan

6.3.55 The proposal includes a shared vehicular and pedestrian street, and a hardstanding layout throughout the scheme that has been well considered. In terms of details such as materials used this can be imposed by condition.

Ecology and Biodiversity
6.3.56 Policy EN1 relates to open space requirements within the borough and in relation to new development it seeks to ensure the protection of valuable existing habitats and to maximise opportunities for creating or adding to biodiversity. The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Initial Bat Roost Inspection Report and Bat Survey, prepared by AECOM. This has been reviewed by the Council’s parks and open space officer.

6.3.57 The site is not a Local Wildlife Site (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation or SINC) or isn't immediately adjacent to one.
6.3.58 The Ecological Appraisal includes information as to potential ecological impacts of the application, in the form of desk based exercises and field investigations. These studies provide sufficient detail on existing habitats and species to inform decisions as to future use, development and management of the site to protect any ecological value. The assessment concludes impacts of the development will be low in that the habitats and species found on site are not of high ecological status and no legally protected species or sensitive ecological receptors were identified as being at particular risk. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that removal of any existing habitat from the site would not have a significant ecological effect, in that this habitat exists near to the site, and that habitat or equal if not better value can be created as part of the development through appropriate mitigation measures, such as biodiverse brown roofs and suitable external soft landscaping.

6.3.59 However, it is advised if there is any substantial delay between when the ecological assessments included in the application were undertaken, and when actual site clearance works begin, that a final site may need to be carried out by a competent surveyor to ensure that no new habitats or protected species, e.g. bats and nesting birds, have occupied the site or any structures in the intervening period. If any such protected habitats/species are found then it may be necessary to take action to avoid disturbance or loss of protected species/habitats, or additional mitigation measures may be incorporated into any development. A condition to this effect is recommended to draw the applicant’s attention to this detail.

6.3.60 The ecological assessment, and landscaping proposals for the development, make reference to ecological enhancements including ensuring tree and shrub plantings which have ecological benefit. This is to be encouraged, and imposed by condition to be included as part of the detail landscaping plans and schedules for the development. It is also considered that there is an opportunity for the development to enhance biodiversity by including bird and bat boxes and green and brown roof this should be secured by condition.

6.4 Standard of residential accommodation

Housing standards

6.4.1 London Plan Policy 3.5 provides residential standards to be applied to new residential development. The proposed development meets and in places exceeds all relevant standards, including internal minimum space standards and floor to ceiling heights for all residential dwellings.

6.4.2 It is noted that whilst each of the residential units would have storage space, there are six large residential storage areas (two within buildings C and D and one each for building A and B) located at lower ground floor. The provision of private residential amenity storage is good, however there are no details illustrating how the spaces will be used or made secure. A condition is recommended that details be submitted showing how each of the stores would be made secure for individual residents by providing lockers or cupboards within these spaces.
Accessible Dwellings

6.4.3 London Plan Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) requires that 90% of new dwellings will need to be ‘accessible and adaptable’ (this is defined by building regulations – Part M4 (2)); and 10% of new dwellings will need to be ‘wheelchair user dwellings’ (this is defined by building regulations – Part M4 (3)).

6.4.4 The applicant has confirmed that the scheme has been designed to deliver 10% of units to be capable of easy adaption to wheelchair user dwellings to be located within Buildings A and B, drawings illustrating typical wheelchair layout units have been provided. The dwellings would be accessible and adaptable in-accordance with part M. The provision for wheelchair and accessible and adaptable dwellings will be secured through an appropriate condition.

Amenity Space

6.4.5 Local Plan Policy H5 sets out requirements in respect of external amenity space and children’s play space. For new flatted developments, communal amenity space of at least 50m², plus a further 10m² per flat provided either as a balcony/terrace/private garden or consolidated within the communal amenity space. The London Plan Housing SPG states that a minimum of 5m² of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1m² should be provided for each additional occupant. The scheme should provide a minimum of 3,220sqm of private and communal amenity space.

6.4.6 In terms of private amenity space, each dwelling has at least 5m² sqm (plus 1m² for each additional occupant as required by the London Plan) of private amenity space in the form of a courtyard, balcony or terrace area that would be provided. In total 3,489sqm of private amenity space will be provided. It is noted that the lower ground floor units within Buildings A, B, C and D have generous private areas that are over 10sqm (Building A ranging from 19.50sqm – 53.50sqm; Building B 11sqm to 33.5sqm; Building C 14.5sqm to 33sqm; Building D 19sqm to 39.50sqm).

6.4.7 3,035sqm of semi-private communal areas would be provided in the form of four separate courtyard areas. See Figure 8 above for illustration of the space, they are generously sized and would receive natural light; be gated and accessible only to occupants. The spaces would be overlooked by upper floor windows from the facing flats within the development and as such would be safe to use.

6.4.8 In terms of sunlight the BRE Guide test is whether at least 50% of the amenity area has the ability to receive 2 hours or more of sunlight at the equinox. The daylight and sunlight analysis prepared by Right of Light Consulting was independently reviewed by Schroeder’s Begg. The analysis indicate that the percentage of the area of each amenity area able to receive to 2 hours of sunlight or more at the equinox are; Amenity between buildings A-B- 94%; Building B-C - 81%; Building C - D 45%; Amenity A4 - 60%

6.4.9 All the amenity areas with the exception of the area between Buildings C – D readily meet the BRE guide target criteria above target criteria with very good ability to receive direct sunlight. Whilst the area between Buildings C – D is slightly short of the target value. Given this is only a slight shortfall it is still considered acceptable. On balance, sunlight to amenity areas is satisfactory.

6.4.10 Overall officers consider that the provision of both communal and private amenity space is adequate, has been well located and integrated into the development.
Children's Playspace

6.4.11 Policy H5 also states that, "for developments of 10 or more units with at least one family-sized dwelling, children’s play space should be provided where appropriate to at least the levels set out in the London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation’ 2012. Paragraph 4.40 of the London Plan Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation’ 2012 SPG states that off-site play provision including the creation of new provision, improvements to existing play facilities and/or an appropriate financial contribution secured by legal agreement towards this provision may be acceptable in accordance with Policy 3.6 where it can be demonstrated that there are planning constraints and that it fully satisfies the needs of the development whilst continuing to meet the needs of existing residents. If there is existing provision within an acceptable distance of a proposed development, boroughs should consider the option of off-site.

6.4.12 Using the SPG methodology it has been calculated for Option A (up to 297 residential units) that approximately 68 children (29 under 5, 23 children aged 5-11 years and 17 children 12+) and are predicted to live in the development. This gives rise to a total child playspace requirement of 682sqm. This breaks down to Under 5's total provided is 286.44sqm for under 5's, 225.06sqm for 5-11 year olds and 163.68sqm for 12+.

6.4.13 Using the SPG methodology it has been calculated for Option B (293 residential units) that approximately 81 children (36 under 5, 27 children aged 5-11 years and 19 children 12+) and are predicted to live in the development. This is a result of the greater number of large units. This gives rise to a total child playspace requirement of 814.2sqm. This breaks down to Under 5's total provided is 358.2sqm for under 5's, 268.68sqm for 5-11 year olds and 187.26sqm for 12+.

6.4.14 The diagram below (figure 25) illustrates the dedicated play provision for under 5’s. This is provided as 200sqm of dedicated doorstep play space within the communal space between Buildings B & C, 40sqm within the communal space between buildings C & D and 40sqm within the communal space between Building C and D. This brings the total to 280sqm just under the 286.44sqm (for Option A) and 268.68sqm (for option B), however officers consider there is sufficient space for this to be incorporated within the communal spaces. A condition is recommended that details including size, calculations (using the SPG methodology) and location is submitted for approval.

6.4.15 The applicant’s supporting document indicates that the playable space will include a variety of landscape features such as contours and turf mounds, step elements and level change for balancing, stepping stones and bridges through soft landscape, open expanses of grass for self-directed and unstructured play, feature sculptural play element and integrated tunnels and slides in play mounds. It is noted that no commentary has been provided regarding the type of play equipment proposed, officers consider there is sufficient space for such equipment to be provided within the designated areas. It is also recommended that a condition is imposed that the details of the play equipment be submitted for approval.
6.4.16 Figure 25 illustrates the indicative dedicated play provision on site.

6.4.17 There is an on-site deficiency with respect to playable spaces for 5-11 and 12+ year olds, however it is noted, that the development is within 200m of Clapham Common and that there is an existing play area at the Notre Dame Estate located adjacent to the boundary with the Site shown hatched in purple in figure 25 above. There are two links (see figure 23 above for illustration) proposed linking the Site through to the Notre Dame Estate, the secondary link through would be adjacent the playspace area within the Notre Dame Estate this is considered acceptable. Given that the Notre Dame Estate is private land (owned by the Council) the Council’s housing estate team have agreed in principle to the opening up of the estate and the links created between the two sites and the use of the playspace by the future occupiers of 44 Clapham Common Southside. To ensure openness, links and the use of the playspace by future occupiers are maintained further agreements will need to be secured between the two parties (Lambeth and the owners of the Site). This will be secured by a s106 agreement that these agreements be secured prior to the commencement of development. In this regard the proposed scheme would be inclusive of financial contributions secured by s106 towards improving local off-site children’s play space at the Notre Dame Estate. This would satisfy the needs of the development whilst continuing to meet the needs of existing residents at the Notre Dame Estate. Furthermore, this approach is supported by the Council’s Estate Housing Team.

6.4.18 Policy H5 of the Lambeth Local Plan seeks to ensure that new dwellings are provided with dual-aspect accommodation and a level of external amenity space for all residents. Policy Q2 seeks to ensure that the amenity of future occupiers is protected with regards to daylight, sunlight, adequate outlooks are provided and avoiding wherever possible any undue sense of enclosure, noise disturbance.

**Dual Aspect/Outlook**

6.4.19 Of the 297 units proposed 197 (66.4%) units are proposed to be dual aspect, 66 units (22.2%) dual with aspect over access deck/courtyard and 34 (11.4%) single aspect. The 34 (11.4%) single aspect units would generally be located at the lower ground level, across all the blocks with some on the upper floors. It is considered that the outlook from the single aspect units would not be compromised particularly at lower ground level.
6.4.20 With regards to Building A the depth of the lightwell courtyards (for the two single aspect dwellings fronting the rear boundary with Abbeville Road) are 3m to 3.5m enclosed by a low boundary wall with planting above (see figure 26 below for illustration). In terms of the other lower ground floor single aspect unit that faces within the site towards Building B it would have a depth of 2.6m and not sunken but at a level that would be similar to the courtyard level terraces (see figure 26 below for illustration).

![Figure 26 illustrating Courtyard Section of Building A and Abbeville Gardens and Building A (right hand side) that faces towards Building B](image)

6.4.21 Figure 26 illustrating Courtyard Section of Building A and Abbeville Gardens and Building A (right hand side) that faces towards Building B

6.4.22 Within Building B, four of the five south westerly facing lower ground floor units facing Building A are single aspect. It is considered that the outlook from these units would not be compromised as the courtyard lightwell depth would be 2.6m and not sunken but at a level similar to the courtyard level terraces (see figure 26 above for illustration). With regards to the northwest facing flats within building B (facing building C) these have been amended during the course of the application to include 7 duplex units (of the 8 units within this row). This would provide a better quality outlook for the future occupiers of these units.

6.4.23 With regards to Building C all five lower ground floor units would be single aspect. Building D has two units at lower ground floor that would be single aspect. All these lower ground floor units would have an outlook towards a courtyard lightwell bounded by a 2.8m retaining wall. The depth of each of the courtyard lightwells for Buildings C and D is 2.6m. Upon officers advice the applicant has lowered the courtyard by 1m to facilitate a decrease in the height of the lightwell retaining walls between Buildings B and C and buildings C and D as illustrated in figure 27 below. Officers welcome this as it would provide an adequate outlook for the future occupiers from these residential units.

![Figure 27 illustrating Courtyard Between Buildings B & C and Courtyard Between Buildings C & D](image)
6.4.24 Figure 27 illustrating before and after of courtyard levels between Buildings B and C; C and D.

6.4.25 Given the amendments made by the applicant to improve the outlook to the lower ground and ground floor units, the nature of the site (its irregular shape and differing land levels which has dictated the layout of the blocks), it is considered that a small number, 34 single aspect units (11.4%) in a scheme of 297 units is considered acceptable in this instance.

**Daylight and Sunlight**

6.4.26 The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment prepared by Right of Light Consulting. The Council sought an independent review of the report’s findings in respect of possible impacts within the development itself. This review was undertaken by Schroeder’s Begg.

6.4.27 In terms of the self-testing for daylight the primary review is the consideration on the Average Daylight Factor (ADFs). Right of Light Consulting have provided analysis results for the lowest floor of habitable rooms within each block. From review of this analysis, all habitable rooms meet the benchmark minimal criteria for ADF being not less than 1% for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2.0% for kitchens / open plan kitchen/dining/living room (i.e. taking the higher ADF target value when the room is of shared use). It is reasonable to consider that ADFs will improve with storey height and so on this basis, ADF is considered acceptable.

6.4.28 Further daylight tests considered namely room depth ratio and daylight distribution. For the same rooms considered for ADFs (i.e. the lowest floors), almost all rooms pass the room depth ratio test. Although for daylight distribution, the results are quite low with rooms typically not having a good daylight distribution at this level (the exception being the rooms in the south-east elevation of Building A). Such daylight distribution levels should increase with storey height and given the ADF results, it is considered that reasonable levels of daylight are acceptable overall with results not uncommon in an urban development such as this.

6.4.29 With regards to sunlight to living rooms, Right of Light consulting submitted a full sunlight analysis to all applicable living rooms (those having a window that faces within 90 degrees of south).

6.4.30 196 No. living rooms have been sampled as applicable (i.e. with at least one window facing within 90 degrees of south). Given that the proposal is for 297 residential units, this confirms that only 66% of the living rooms are applicable for assessment i.e. 34% of living rooms do not have at least one window facing within 90 degrees of south / sunlight levels will be minimal.

6.4.31 In reference to the 66% of living rooms that have been reviewed which equates to 196 living rooms, only 93 meet the BRE Guide target criteria for 25% Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) with 5% in winter months. This equates to 47% meeting target criteria from those living rooms applicable for review. However, in consideration of the development as a whole, only 31% of all living room windows meet target levels for sunlight to living rooms.

6.4.32 Given the above, if each aspect of APSH and winter hours is analysed separately, it is noted that the APSH is similar to the overall result i.e. 28% of all living rooms meeting target, albeit the living rooms perform better for the winter hours – for the winter element, this would be just below 50% of all living rooms meeting target.
6.4.33 Whilst the sunlight availability may be poor, daylight is reasonable to these rooms in consideration of the main daylight BRE Guide test of the average daylight factor. As noted above all habitable rooms tested meet the bench-line minimal criteria for ADF. This needs to be considered in terms of the site constraints, long and linear irregular shaped site, and change in land levels sites north west south east orientation which have dictated the layout of the blocks. For sunlight the orientation of the site means north west south east orientation that securing the optimum sunlight to rooms is more challenging however the scheme deliver very good results for an urban site and by having dual aspect units and leaving space between the blocks improves the amount of sunlight being received in all units. Given this and taking account of the site constraints (long and linear irregular shaped site, difference in land levels) on balance it is considered that poor sunlight levels on their own would not justify a refusal of this application.

Privacy

6.4.34 There are sufficient separation distances between the buildings within the Site ranging from 17m to 23.5m as illustrated in figure 28 below. This proximity is considered acceptable by officers.

6.4.35 Figure 28 illustrating distances between buildings within the site and neighbouring buildings.

6.4.36 To address concerns raised regarding the privacy of some of the residential corner units. The applicant has proposed one way glass fitted to some windows within approximately 30 of the units. The drawings submitted clearly indicate which windows are proposed to be one way glass and where privacy screens would be installed between the residential units. A condition is recommended that the one way glass be installed to the units as illustrated on the drawings prior to occupation of the residential units and details of the privacy screens be submitted.

6.4.37 The applicants supporting document (DAS) indicates that the courtyard level terraces would be enclosed by railing balustrades and screened with soft landscaping. In order to protect the privacy of the lower ground floor and ground floor units with courtyards and terraces adjacent to the communal gardens being overlooked, raised beds and planting landscape screening should be incorporated within this areas which can be imposed by condition.
6.4.38 It is noted that there are a number (7) of units that face the street. These units would help activate this street. In terms of privacy each of these units would have their own gated entrance with a front courtyard that would be screened by planting which would limit direct views into these units. A condition requiring details of the screening is recommended to ensure privacy to these residential units is maintained.

6.4.39 There are generous separation distances between the proposed buildings and the Notre Dame Estate buildings ranging from 17.5m at its closest point to 35m. With regards to the Abbeville Road residents the separation distance between building A and the residential dwellings is 39m as illustrated in figure 28 above.

6.4.40 With regards to Lambeth College and Lambeth Academy the separation distances range from 6m at its closest point to 13.5m between buildings illustrated in figure 28 above. Building E has a separation distance of 9m -13.5m from Lambeth Academy. Within Building E, there is a residential component on the upper floors. Floors 3-8 have windows within the south-western elevation overlooking Lambeth Academy extension. Given the separation distances between the buildings and that the residential element sits above the window/roof level of Lambeth Academy it is considered that privacy to either occupants within the proposed development or adjoining site would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development.

6.4.41 Building D has a separation distance of 8m from Lambeth Academy. Whilst there are some windows within the elevation of building D that face towards Lambeth Academy, they serve bedrooms (all secondary windows), bathrooms and corridors all non-habitable rooms. To ensure no overlooking one way glass would be applied to all secondary windows facing Lambeth Academy from lower ground to 4th floor (the Lambeth Academy building (roof) ends below the 4th floor of Building D). Whilst one way glass would protect the occupier of the residential units, these occupiers would still be able to look out towards Lambeth Academy. Given this perception of loss of privacy/overlooking it is recommended that a condition is imposed that the windows within the south-western elevation of Building D (1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors (unit reference – G05, G06, 105, 106, 205,206,405, 406) facing Lambeth Academy are obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m from finished floor level.

6.4.42 Building C has a separation distance of 10m from Lambeth Academy. Whilst there are some windows within the elevation of building D that face towards Lambeth Academy, these windows (serve bedrooms (all secondary windows), bathrooms and corridors all non-habitable rooms) either look out towards a blank wall or over the roof of Lambeth Academy. In this regard it is not considered that privacy to either building would be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development.

6.4.43 Overall in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight and privacy provided for the future residential occupiers of this proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this instance on balance given the site constraints. In this regard the long and linear irregular shaped site with only one access route, difference in land levels and the sites north west south east orientation, have shaped the design and layout of the proposal. The scheme has been designed to effectively maximise the distances between the blocks and minimise any harm upon adjoining residential occupiers (discussed below). Furthermore when weighed against the planning benefits of the scheme (employment provision, retention of space for a Waste Transfer Unit, provision of additional housing that includes a good affordable offer, a new public square 595sqm, the opening up of the front of the site (length of 210m approx.) with the adjacent Notre Dame Estate and the creation of links between the two sites it would not justify refusal.
Noise and Disturbance

6.4.44 London Plan Policy 4A.20 requires that noise sensitive development should be separated from major sources of noise wherever practicable. Local Plan Policy Q2 (Amenity) makes clear that proposals should ensure that any adverse impact in terms of noise should be reduced and minimised as far as possible to ensure the amenity of existing and future occupants is protected. The application is accompanied by a noise and vibration assessment prepared by Aecom and reviewed by the Council’s Environmental Health Consultants.

6.4.45 The noise and vibration assessment includes details of the environmental noise survey undertaken at the site and recommendations with respect to noise mitigation. The Council’s Environmental Health Consultant considers that these recommendations are satisfactory subject to conditions.

6.4.46 The report advises that standard double glazing units would be required to achieve suitable internal noise levels within the proposed development. To ensure suitable levels of noise are achieved conditions are recommended including a scheme of noise and vibration attenuation shall be submitted, and a further verification noise and vibration assessment to confirm noise targets have been achieved within habitable rooms. To ensure that the amenity spaces proposed affords a good level of amenity for the future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance a condition is recommended that a scheme of measures is submitted to ensure that all residential units have access to amenity space within the development where noise levels do not exceed 55dB LAEQ (16 hour).

6.4.47 In order to mitigate any potential noise and vibration impacts caused by the proposed waste transfer unit a number of measures are proposed, including, restricting the heavy vehicle movements during night-time hours (23:00 to 07:00); doors to the waste transfer unit to be closed unless vehicles are entering or exiting; and the waste transfer unit should be suitably designed to minimise breakout of noise and vibration through the building fabric and transmission of noise through walls into adjoining units. This can be secured by s106 for approval by an authoritative advisor appointed by the LPA to review (cost of independent consultant review to be covered by applicant). It is recommended that these details along with a further noise and vibration assessment are submitted prior to commencement to ensure the waste transfer unit has been suitably designed to minimise breakout of noise and vibration.

6.4.48 The noise and vibration assessment indicates that a management strategy would be submitted before occupation of the proposed waste transfer unit, which will incorporate mitigation measures identified to control noise impacts to an appropriate level. This would be imposed by conditioned.

6.4.49 The noise and vibration assessment concludes that taking the above mitigation measures into account, it is expected that no significant noise and vibration effects are expected as a result of the operation of the Waste Transfer Unit. The Waste Transfer Unit would be subject to an environmental permit (from the Environment Agency) however the hours of operation should be restricted by condition to 08:00 hours to 18:00 Hours – Monday through to Friday. 08:00 Hours to 13:00 Hours – Saturdays. No operation is permitted on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays to protect the amenity of both adjacent and on-site residential occupiers. This would be controlled by conditioned.
6.4.50 The other mixed-use elements of the application comprises a proposed A3 café and B1 (a) office space. It is considered that these uses are unlikely to be significant sources of noise and any potentially adverse impacts can be controlled by condition. Conditions recommended include details of the plant equipment, an acoustic impact assessment submitted for approval and limiting the operational hours for both uses to 08:00 Hours to 18:00 Hours – Monday through to Friday. 08:00 Hours to 18:00 Hours – Saturdays. 10:00 Hours to 16:00 Hours on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.

6.4.51 In terms of odours and fumes from the ancillary café use, this is not likely to have an impact as no commercial kitchen and only a preparation area is proposed. The applicant has indicated that it would only serve beverages and light food only. Notwithstanding this a condition is recommended that details of any extract exhaust or ducting including design, installation and ongoing maintenance of any extract exhaust or ducting be submitted for approval. An informative is recommended that the design would need to take account of low level discharge and impact on amenity.

Air Quality

6.4.52 Local Plan Policy Q2 (Amenity) makes clear that proposals should ensure that any adverse impact in terms of air quality should be reduced and minimised as far as possible to ensure the amenity of existing and future occupants is protected. The whole of Lambeth is designated as an Air Quality Management Area. The application has therefore been accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited and reviewed by the Council’s Environmental Health Consultants.

6.4.53 The Air Quality Assessment has demonstrated that that there should not be any significant exposure to poor air quality as result of the development. The Air Quality Neutral assessment also confirms that the development be air quality neutral as required under the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance issued by the GLA. A condition has been recommended that the development be undertaken in-accordance with the Air Quality Assessment prepared.

6.4.54 To ensure the conclusions of the report remain valid it’s recommended that no variation or alteration of the proposed development is permitted unless accompanied by supporting evidence that demonstrates any changes will not invalidate the conclusions of the Air Quality Assessment. To be imposed by condition.

Wind and Microclimate

6.4.55 A Pedestrian Level Wind Microclimate Assessment prepared by RWDI was submitted and reviewed by the Council’s Environmental Health Consultants.

6.4.56 The assessment considered in this report has assumed that no planting or landscaping was present around or within the Proposed Development, so that the assessment undertaken could be based upon a conservative (i.e. windier) scenario. The presence of planting and other landscape enhancements would generally be expected to increase shelter within the Proposed Development compared to the wind conditions accounted for in this assessment, particularly when the trees and plants are established and in full leaf.

6.4.57 Overall the wind microclimate in and around the Site is expected to be suitable in most areas for its intended use, with the exception of isolated areas with windier than desired conditions; however, it is anticipated that these areas can be readily mitigated with the measures identified.
6.4.58 Windier than desired conditions occur at the entrance to Buildings A and E and B. They are caused by the down-washed south-westerly winds being accelerated around the building corners (A & E). In terms of Building B, caused by the channelling of the south-westerly winds along the passage way between Buildings. This can be mitigated through the addition of canopies over the entrances (A & E) or recessing of the entrances, adding soft landscaping elements such as small trees and shrubs in planters.

6.4.59 The seating area to the south-east of Building E (outdoor seating to café area) is likely to have one category windier than required standing wind conditions. From the prevailing south-westerly winds being down-washed and accelerating around the Building corner. Measures to mitigate could be in the form of localised sheltering around seating areas such as the addition of free standing pergolas or canopies along the south-east façade of Building E, additionally, soft landscaping elements such as trees or shrubs in planters.

6.4.60 The upper private roof terraces are expected to have one category windier than desired standing wind conditions due to the absence of sheltering from the surrounding buildings from prevailing winds. Mitigation measures for these terraces could include the addition of landscaping i.e. 2 to 3m high trees in planters along the periphery of the terrace in combination with low level landscaping such as shrubs in planters, porous screens or sculptures further within the terrace.

6.4.61 The Council’s Environmental Health Consultant has raised no objection to this subject to further more detailed modelling be carried out to develop detailed mitigation measures for the areas that are adversely effected. To be imposed by condition.

**Lighting**

6.4.62 An indicative lighting strategy has been submitted which indicates light columns along the access path, and other lights throughout the development such as tree, ground, low path, planter wall lights, seat with inset light and sculptural light. A condition is recommended that a lighting plan be submitted showing location and luminance levels to protect the residential amenity of future occupiers or of the area generally and ensure a high quality standard of development.

6.5 **Surrounding Amenity Considerations**

**Daylight and Sunlight**

6.5.1 The proposal has been accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight report prepared by Right of Light Consulting. The development has been assessed against the Building Research Establishment (BRE) publication “Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight; a guide to good practice (2011) that sets out the methodology for assessing impacts of new development in respect of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing.

6.5.2 The BRE guidelines are not mandatory; they do however act as a guide to help understand the impact of a development upon neighbouring properties, while acknowledging that in some circumstances, such as that of an urban environment (such as this) some impact may be unavoidable.

6.5.3 The Council has sought the independent review of the report’s findings in respect of possible impacts of the new development on surrounding sites. This review was undertaken by Schroeders Begg.
6.5.4 The impact of the development has been assessed by first measuring the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) (amount of daylight falling on the outside of a window. In terms of Daylight Distribution/No Sky Line (DD/NSL) (the proportion of a room that cannot see the sky) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF) (distribution of light within a room). The ADF has been considered in relation to Lambeth College/Lambeth Academy in consideration of natural daylighting levels within such areas as classrooms.

6.5.5 The report focusses on the residential properties along Elms Road and Abbeville Road, Notre Dame Estate properties (Langham, Mantell, Comins, Mandeville and Hewer House and Brady House) and Lambeth Academy and Lambeth College. For those windows that do not meet the BRE Guide criteria, the Council’s consultant has sought to categorise the extent of ‘adverse impact’ using a typical Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for reductions that exceed 20% (i.e. minor, moderate, major adverse) as follows:

- *Minor Adverse: Reductions in VSC of 20% to 29.9%
- **Moderate Adverse: Reductions VSC 30% to 39.9%
- ***Major Adverse: Reduction is VSC equal / greater than 40%

Residential properties on Elms Road and Abbeville Road

6.5.6 With regards to VSC for these properties (with rear elevations facing the site), no reductions in VSC would exceed 20% therefore they would all meet BRE target criteria.

6.5.7 In terms of reductions in daylight distribution these do not exceed 20% therefore they would all meet BRE target criteria with the one isolated exception of a room to 91 Abbeville Road (served by window 146) which would have a ‘moderate adverse’** impact. It is difficult to determine the likely arrangement of this room and given that properties which are also on Abbeville Road but positioned closer to the proposal are not adversely affected, it is considered that this room would not be adversely affected.

Residential properties – Brady House (Notre Dame Estate - end elevation) and 51-61 Worsopp Drive

6.5.8 With regards to VSC for these properties no reductions in VSC exceed 20% and therefore they would all meet BRE target criteria. In terms of reductions in daylight distribution the rooms analysed do not exceed 20% reduction and therefore they all would meet BRE target criteria.

Langham House

6.5.9 Of the 89 windows analysed 17 windows (anticipated to serve living rooms or bedrooms) would not meet BRE target criteria with regards to VSC. The VSC analysis was re-run without balconies / soffits above these windows as applicable (**on the basis to gauge the inherent obstruction / sensitivity of daylight flow to such applicable windows in reference to the BRE Guide clause 2.2.11). Of these 17 windows, 15 windows would now meet BRE target criteria. However, for 2 of these windows (392 & 397) there appears no soffit / balcony above these windows, however it is considered that these windows still remain in the proposed scenario of a VSC of 26.7% and 26.5% respectively thus still considered acceptable given the urban environment.
6.5.10 In terms of reductions in DD, 88 of the 89 rooms analysed would not exceed 20% reductions and therefore would all readily meet BRE target criteria with one exception. This window would have a ‘minor adverse’* reduction which is only marginally below the recommended BRE target criteria.

**Mantell House**

6.5.11 Of the 66 windows analysed, 8 windows (anticipated to serve living rooms or bedrooms) would not meet BRE target criteria with regards to VSC, all ‘minor adverse’* impact. The VSC analysis was re-run without balconies / soffits** above for 7 of these windows. It is noted that for one of these windows (no.498) there appears no soffit / balcony above this window, none the less the analysis for this window illustrates it would meet the BRE target criteria. For the remaining 7 windows, 5 of these windows would all meet BRE target criteria. Of the two remaining windows one relates to window 499 does not have a balcony / soffit above and should be considered but wasn’t. Given the other windows all pass the expectation would be the same of this window 499 that it would meet BRE target Criteria. The other window appears to be serving a staircase (no. 533) which is non habitable room.

6.5.12 In terms of reductions in daylight distribution all the rooms analysed would not exceed 20% reduction therefore they would all meet the BRE target criteria.

**Comins House**

6.5.13 Of the 67 windows analysed, 43 would meet the BRE target criteria with regards to VSC. For the 24 windows (anticipated to serve living rooms or bedrooms) that did not meet target criteria, 11 windows were rerun without balconies / soffits above windows**. All of these windows would now meet target criteria with the exception of window no would have a VSC of 26% proposed (without balcony) but 22% (with balcony) which is considered a ‘minor adverse’* impact which is marginally below the BRE target criteria. There are still 13 windows (where balconies where not applicable) that do not meet the target criteria. 6 of these windows are considered a ‘minor adverse’* impact whilst the remaining 7 windows which could be considered as ‘moderate’** in terms of adversity of impact. Following the reductions for all of these windows, the lowest proposed remaining VSC would be 23.5% which is still considered reasonable for an urban context.

6.5.14 In terms of DD reductions to this neighbouring property, 67 rooms were analysed, of these 51 rooms would meet the BRE target criteria. 10 windows (are anticipated to serve bedrooms or living rooms) have a loss of between 20.1-29.9%, a minor adverse impact which is still considered acceptable for an urban context. The 6 rooms with reductions that could be considered ‘moderate’** adverse impact (windows 593, 594, 596, 597, 598 and 600), it would appear that rooms served by windows 593 and 594 relate to a communal staircase and so are considered ‘non-habitable’. For the remaining rooms; room served by window 596 (anticipated living room) has an existing daylight distribution of 99% that would reduce to 60% (39% reduction). The room served by window 597 (anticipated bedroom) has an existing daylight distribution of 94% that would reduce to 62% (37% reduction). The room served by window 598 (living room) has an existing daylight distribution of 99% that would reduce to 68% (31% reduction). The room served by window 600 (bedroom) has an existing daylight distribution of 99% that would reduce to 67% (32% reduction). Thus it is apparent that the above habitable rooms have very high levels of daylight distribution as existing and despite some ‘moderately adverse’** reductions, all rooms still have a residual daylight distribution (in the proposed scenario) of 60% or greater which would still be considered reasonable for an urban environment.
Mandeville House

6.5.15 Of the 216 windows analysed, 187 windows would meet the BRE target criteria (not exceed 20%) with regards to VSC. For the 29 (anticipated to serve bedrooms or living rooms) windows that would not meet target criteria, 10 windows were applicable for rerun without balconies / soffits above windows*. Of these 10 windows, all would meet BRE target criteria with the exception of 3 windows (730, 731, and 738). With regards to these windows it is considered that the balcony overhang is having the impact. Window 730 has a 23% reduction and a residual VSC ‘without balcony’ of 25% but in real terms ‘with balcony’ 10%; Window 731 there is 21% reduction and a residual VSC ‘without balcony’ of 26.6% but in real terms ‘with balcony’ 25.7% thus considered acceptable. Window 738 there is a 21% reduction and a residual VSC ‘without balcony’ of 25.1% but in real terms ‘with balcony’ 10.1%.

6.5.16 Of the other 24 windows (which serve either bedrooms or living rooms) that would not meet BRE target criteria with regards to VSC, of these 16 would be have a ‘minor adverse’* impact and 6 a ‘moderate adverse’** impact. However, the residual VSCs in the proposed scenario are not less than a VSC of 22% with the exception of windows 730 & 738. The lowest values for all those windows is 22%which is considered reasonable for an urban context.

6.5.17 Whilst the above is noted, in terms of DD all 216 rooms analysed would not exceed 20% reduction therefore they would all readily meet the BRE target criteria.

Hewer House

6.5.18 Of the 293 windows analysed, 272 windows would meet the BRE target criteria (would not exceed 20%) with regards to VSC for the 21 windows that would not meet target criteria. 6 No windows were applicable for rerun without balconies / soffits above windows*. From these 6 No windows, all would now meet target criteria with the exception of windows 1017 and 1013 (which are anticipated to serve primarily bedrooms or secondary windows (to either living rooms or bedrooms). Window 1017 would have a 28% reduction and a residual VSC ‘without balcony’ of 25.6% but in real terms ‘with balcony’ 16.2% thus it can be considered the balcony overhang is having a major impact. Window 1031, would have a 25% reduction and a residual VSC ‘without balcony’ of 26.4% but in real terms ‘with balcony’ 17.2% thus it can be considered the balcony overhang is having a major impact.

6.5.19 Of the 17 windows (which are anticipated to serve primarily bedrooms or secondary windows (to either living rooms or bedrooms) that do not meet target criteria, 7 of these windows would have a ‘minor adverse’* impact which is still considered reasonable for an urban context. 7 a ‘moderate adverse’** impact and 3 ‘major adverse’*** impact. 10 windows (which are anticipated to serve primarily bedrooms or secondary windows (to either living rooms or bedrooms) would have a ‘moderate adverse’** impact However, the residual VSCs in the proposed scenario are not less than a VSC of 20% which is considered reasonable for an urban context.
In terms of DD reductions to this neighbouring property, of the 293 rooms analysed 284 would not exceed 20% reduction and would all meet the BRE target criteria. Of the 9 rooms that do not meet target criteria 4 of these rooms (which are anticipated to serve primarily bedrooms or secondary windows to either living rooms or bedrooms) would have a ‘minor adverse’ impact which is still considered acceptable for an urban context. 2 rooms (which are anticipated to serve primarily bedrooms or secondary windows to either living rooms or bedrooms) would have a ‘major adverse’ impact (relating to windows 1009, 1013). It would appear that rooms served by windows 1009 and 1013 serve a communal staircase and are considered non-habitable. 3 of the rooms have reductions that could be considered ‘moderate adverse’ impact (rooms served by windows 1030, 1031, 1038). In this regard the room served by window 1030 (serves a living room) has an existing daylight distribution of 98% which would reduce to 62% (37% reduction). The room served by window 1031 (a bedroom) has an existing daylight distribution of 98% which would reduce to 66% (33% reduction). The room served by window 1038 (a living room) has an existing daylight distribution of 98% that would reduce to 65% (34% reduction). It is considered that these habitable rooms have very high levels of daylight distribution as existing and despite some moderately adverse reductions, all rooms would still have a residual daylight distribution (i.e. in the proposed scenario) of 62% or greater which would be considered reasonable for an urban environment.

In terms of neighbouring residential properties the majority of VSC and daylight distribution reductions meet the BRE Guide target criteria. In consideration of those VSC reductions that exceed target criteria and where there is a balcony soffit or similar above the analysed window, when analysis is undertaken ‘without balconies’, in the majority of cases, the reduction then meets the BRE Guide target criteria which suggests it is more the inherent arrangement of the analysed window (balcony / soffit above reducing daylight flow), rather than an adverse impact from the massing of the proposal.

On balance and in consideration of the urban context, it is considered that reductions to neighbouring residential properties in the main meet the BRE Guide target criteria and for the isolated instances that fall outside of this, the residential values (i.e. those in the proposed scenario) are typically still reasonable for an urban context (as seen for the review especially for daylight distribution).

Lambeth College and Lambeth Academy

Both of these buildings are an educational building with associated classroom, the effect of the proposal should be considered in terms of daylight, the effect upon average daylight received and daylight distribution.

In terms of DD for Lambeth College, of the 117 rooms analysed 97 would meet the BRE target criteria. Of the 20 windows that would not meet target criteria 17 windows would have a ‘minor adverse impact’, 1 window would have a ‘moderate adverse impact’ and 2 windows would have a ‘major adverse impact’.

In terms of ADF for Lambeth College, of the 78 rooms analysed 68 (87%) would have no or minor loses (22 rooms no loss (28%)). 10 rooms would have some impact, of these 10 rooms, 6 rooms (8%) would have a ‘minor adverse** impact, 2 rooms (2.5%) would have a ‘moderate adverse*** impact and 2 rooms (2.5%) a ‘major adverse’*** impact.

It is considered that whilst there are isolated adverse effects to Lambeth College in terms of daylight reduction, on balance, is consider reasonable.
6.5.27 With regards to Lambeth Academy and DD, of the 202 rooms analysed 157 rooms would meet the BRE target criteria. Of the 45 rooms that would not meet criteria, 8 of these rooms would have a 'minor adverse' impact, 11 windows would have a 'moderate adverse' impact, whilst 26 windows would have a 'major adverse' impact.

6.5.28 In terms of ADF for Lambeth Academy, of the 60 rooms analysed 34 (57%) would have no or minor loses (22 rooms no loss (37%)). 26 rooms would have some impact, of these rooms, 2 rooms (8%) would have a 'minor adverse' impact, 6 rooms (10%) would have a 'moderate adverse' impact and 18 rooms (30%) a 'major adverse' impact.

6.5.29 In consideration of Lambeth Academy, there is a much greater effect than Lambeth College in the extent of daylight reduction to this building with an adverse impact to 22% of rooms reviewed for daylight distribution and 43% of rooms reviewed for ADF. Whilst officers appreciate the building is non-domestic and with a greater expectation of reliance on supplementary electric lighting, the impact is still significant. However, consideration, needs to be given to the fact that Lambeth Academy have a significant number of windows along the north-east facing elevation which are close to the boundary / their position will inherently result in some significant daylight reductions to the rooms they serve for any meaningful development on the proposed site area. Given this juxtaposition, it is considered the issue is a 'shared' issue in origin i.e. windows too close to the boundary of a development site, with massing being proposed upon the adjacent site which is not unreasonable as discussed within the design section of this report.

6.5.30 Right of Light consulting have reviewed sunlight to neighbouring habitable rooms as per the BRE Guide, for assessment of windows that face within 90 degrees of south. In summary, all neighbouring residential properties applicable for analysis would meet the BRE Guide target criteria with the exception of some reductions to windows serving Mandeville House and Hewer House which is considered in further detail below.

6.5.31 In terms of Mandeville House, of the 192 windows analysed 168 would meet the BRE target criteria. Of the remaining 24 windows, 6 windows (that serve either bedrooms or living rooms) would fail to meet both APSH and winter sun, 3 windows (that serve either bedrooms or living rooms) would fail to meet the APSH only and 15 windows (that serve either bedrooms or living rooms) would fail to meet winter sun only.

6.5.32 For the 10 windows (which included the 6 windows that did not meet both APSH and winter hours) of the 24 windows that do not meet target criteria, these window positions were re-analysed without balconies / soffits above windows as applicable (to gauge the inherent obstruction / sensitivity of sunlight to such applicable windows and in reference to the BRE Guide clause 3.2.9). All 10 windows would meet target criteria with regards to APSH, albeit 7 of those windows still do not meet target criteria for winter sun. Hence, the issue is the winter sun aspect rather than the APSH since for those windows that did not meet target criteria for APSH under standard review, they do meet the BRE target criteria with balcony/soffit removed thus suggesting it is the presence of the balcony rather than the size of the obstruction being the main factor in the relative sunlight loss. However, in terms of winter sun, there are still 15 windows (which includes 3 windows after the removal of the balcony/soffit) that would fail, however the majority would still receive 4% winter sun which is acceptable given it is considered relatively close to the target value of 5% in winter which is reasonable for an urban context.
6.5.33 In terms of Hewer House, of the 133 windows analysed 117 windows meet the BRE target criteria for sunlight. Of the 16 windows that do not meet BRE target criteria, 7 windows (that either serve bedrooms or living rooms) would fail both APSH and winter sun. Whilst 9 windows (that serve either bedrooms or living room) would fail for winter sun only. It is considered that half these windows do not serve living rooms, and in consideration of this aspect, this would lessen the impact to some degree. On balance this is considered to be reasonable for an urban context.

6.5.34 The proposal is to the north-east of the Lambeth Academy building and therefore not applicable for review (closest windows facing site / along site boundary are not facing within 90 degrees of south).

6.5.35 With regards to sunlight to amenity areas BRE Guidance states that external amenity areas should receive 2 hours or more of sunlight across 50% of its area at the equinox. Right of Light consulting have reviewed 41 neighbouring amenity areas and from this analysis there was found to be no reductions that exceed 20% reduction on this basis the amenity areas meet the BRE Guide target criteria.

6.5.36 It is noted that a reasonable proportion of the analysis related to the rear amenity areas to the properties along Abbeville Road and Elms Road and given that these amenity areas are in the main south (south-east / south-west) of the proposal, there could only be relatively negligible effect in any event. Whilst a number of amenity areas have been reviewed to the Notre Dame Estate, we note that the individual gardens to the rear of Comins House have not been reviewed fully. It can be interpreted that there is unlikely to be any adverse effect to these garden areas as these gardens extend along the full length of the rear elevation.

6.5.37 On balance, considering all aspects in terms of daylight and sunlight, the proposed development is not considered an adverse / detrimental neighbouring proposal given the urban context. Whilst there are some isolated properties that may experience some ‘noticeable reduction’ in reference to the BRE Guide, such reductions are not considered excessive in extent given the urban context. Overall it is considered that the impact on these properties is reasonable and that the resulting values would be appropriate within an urban context.

Privacy/Outlook/Sense of Enclosure

6.5.38 As illustrated in figure 28 above there are generous separation distances between the proposed buildings and the Notre Dame Estate buildings ranging from 17.5m at its closest point to 35m. With regards to the Abbeville Road residents the separation distance between building A and the residential dwellings is 39m at its closest point whilst the central element of the building is setback 41m approximately. It is noted that Building A is setback slightly from the adjacent Brady House (part of the Notre Dame Estate – located to the rear) which is located 34m from the rear of the buildings fronting Abbeville Road. Given these separation distances it is considered that the privacy of adjoining residential occupiers would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development nor would it create a sense of enclosure.

6.5.39 With regards to Lambeth College and Lambeth Academy the separation distances range from 6m at its closest point to 13.5m between buildings illustrated above. It is considered that their privacy or outlook would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development nor would it create a sense of enclosure.
6.5.40 Building F would be sited the closest to Lambeth College with a separation distance of 6m from the Lambeth College extension. Building F (G + 4 levels) accommodates commercial office space. The windows within the elevation of Building F overlook the Lambeth College extension, they face a blank wall with the exception of two windows which serve a stair core and a set of glazed access doors within the Lambeth College extension. In this regard there would be no adverse overlooking/loss of privacy to the occupiers of either the proposed building or adjacent Lambeth College extension.

6.5.41 Building E has a separation distance of 9m -13.5m from Lambeth Academy. Building E (G+ 2 levels) accommodates commercial office space. At first and second floor level there would be some overlooking between the proposed office levels and classrooms within Lambeth Academy. Given that all the windows within Building E (Ground to second floor) serve the office element, these windows would be fitted with one way glass. However given that the occupiers of the office element would still be able to see out of these windows, it is recommended that a condition is imposed that the windows within the south-western elevation of Building E (Ground, 1st and 2nd floors) facing Lambeth Academy are obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m from finished floor level.

6.5.42 There are some private roof terraces which serve some of the residential units within Buildings B, C and D, it is noted that there are no roof terraces over Building A. Given the location of most of the roof terraces within the centre of the buildings, the use of privacy screening and the separation distances with residential neighbours it is considered that this would not lead to a loss of privacy or overlooking to neighbouring residents. A condition is recommended that all other roof top areas as shown on the roof plan the access is restricted for maintenance purposes only.

**Noise and Disturbance**

6.5.43 The proposal would re-provide a Waste Transfer Unit on part of the site at basement level, and employment uses -B1 (a) offices which is more compatible to a residential environment that the existing poor quality office and warehouse units on site. The addition of residential units on the site would also contribute to providing a better environment given the immediate area is generally residential in nature. It is considered that the living conditions of existing nearby residents in terms of noise and any disturbance would not be materially harmed by the proposed development.

6.5.44 The draft Construction Management Plan prepared by Construction Planning Associates and the Noise and Vibration Assessment Report prepared by AECOM both make detailed recommendations with respect to the control of noise from the construction phase. The Construction Management Plan and the Air Quality Assessment prepared by AECOM also consider dust impacts from the construction phase and recommendations are made to ensue any impacts are mitigated.

6.5.45 The Council’s Environmental Health Consultant has reviewed the documents and considered that these reports have identified the risks and proposed appropriate mitigation measures. However further details are needed with respect to some matters (outlined in informative) which can be addressed as part of the Final Construction and Environmental Management Plan to be imposed by condition. It is also noted that the applicant has agreed to ensure that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan include reference to a community forum that is set up and engages with the residents of the Notre Dame Estate and surrounding residents. This can be imposed by condition that a Final Construction and Environmental Management Plan be submitted.
The applicant is also expected to operate and be registered under the Considerate Constructors Scheme which would be secured by s106.

6.6 **Transport**

6.6.1 Policy T6 seeks to ensure that the development does not have an unacceptable impact upon transport capacity and infrastructure. Policies T7 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan relate to car parking and servicing. Policies T1, T2 and T3 promote sustainable travel, walking and cycling. These policies require developments not to cause unacceptable harm to either public or private transport networks or have an adverse impact on transport safety. Walking and cycling are encouraged.

**Accessibility**

6.6.2 The PTAL across the site ranges from 2-6a (or ‘low’ to ‘excellent’), from the back of the site to the access road at the front. The site is some 360m long, meaning it would take 4.5 minutes to walk from the back of the site to Clapham Common South Side (assuming an average walking speed of 80m/min).

6.6.3 There is only one access to the site, from Clapham Common Southside, which appears to be used to service the neighbouring college. No changes are proposed to the access arrangements at Clapham Common Southside. This access will be shared by vehicles and pedestrians associated with the waste transfer station, commercial units and the residential elements of the scheme. A minimum 1.8m wide segregated footway is provided within the applicant’s ownership, along the north side of the access road, as far as the WTU entrance. Here it is proposed that the nature of the access road will change to become a shared surface, with a minimum 1.5m pedestrian zone provided to the south, alongside the buildings. A shared surface approach can be supported where vehicle movements will be low (see trip generation analysis below). The proposed improvements to permeability by opening up access to the neighbouring Notre Dame Estate are welcomed.

6.6.4 The diagram below (figure 29) illustrates the proposed indicative access arrangements immediately into the site. The new segregated footway to the north of the access is welcomed, and the existing footway alongside Lambeth College on the southern side of the access road (outside of the red line) will provide a safe access route for pedestrians to some extent on the opposite side of the road, but will end at the Lambeth College service access. Pedestrians using the southern side will be directed onto the footway to the north at this point via a raised table pedestrian priority crossing point. While some pedestrians may use the southern footway and cross in front of the WTU entrance rather than diverting to cross the road and back again to reach the buildings on site, it is accepted that the limited width of the access road means options are limited in terms of pedestrian provision here, and the proposed traffic calming measures will improve pedestrian safety. The indicative plan provided below is supported in principle subject to securing a more detailed design which can be imposed by condition.
6.6.5 The requested visibility splays at the WTU entrance have also been provided, which
demonstrate that a maximum splay of 2.4m x 14.5m can be achieved to the west. Given the
low speeds that would need to be achieved to make this entrance safe, the applicant has
provided raised traffic calming measures in the form of speed humps instead of rumble strips
which are considered more appropriate.

6.6.6 The supporting addendum to the Transport Assessment states that the proposed footway
across the northern side of the road would be for pedestrian use only and cyclists would be
required to use the segregated vehicular access. Cyclists will enter the site on carriageway
from the Cycle Superhighway on Clapham Common South Side, therefore the proposal to
keep cyclists sharing vehicular access allows continuity and the approach will be easier for
cyclists (and pedestrians) to interpret. These proposed cycle access details are considered
appropriate.

6.6.7 Swept paths have been included in the Transport Assessment demonstrating that emergency
vehicles can access the whole of the site, and that refuse collection vehicles can access the
proposed waste transfer unit. The largest delivery vehicle to access the site, a 10m rigid
would have to use the hammerhead at the rear of the site, rather than the turnaround facility
proposed next to the drop off facility that could be used by anything up to an 8m rigid vehicle.
Access would be managed by the concierge.

6.6.8 In terms of access for larger vehicles, given the constraints of the site it is proposed to restrict
access to the site to maximum 10m vehicles (apart from larger vehicles accessing the waste
transfer unit only). This is appropriately set out in the submitted Delivery and Servicing
Management Plan. A condition imposing this restriction is recommended. The access into the
basement car parking area will be via a ramp 1:100, which is appropriate. Further details of
visibility and access control associated with the proposed ramp should be provided. This can
be imposed by condition.

6.6.9 TfL have advised that should any of the access improvements alter the public highway, the
applicant will need to enter into a s278 agreement with TfL for any highway works on TfL’s
highway associated with the development. This will be secured by a s106. An informative to
this affect is recommended and note that the double red lines which currently extend half way
along the site access are incorrect. These will need to be reverted back to double yellow
lines.
Trip Generation

6.6.10 The Transport Statement submitted includes trip generation analysis for the existing and proposed uses on the site. Traffic surveys conducted at the site entrance in November 2015 found 109 vehicle arrivals and 109 departures per day. However, it is understood that this level of activity is a reduction on previous levels of activity at the site, and surveys from June 2005 found 222 vehicle arrivals and 323 departures per day.

6.6.11 The sites selected from TRICs for the proposed uses trip generation are considered appropriate, and Table 6.9 of the Transport Assessment summarises the proposed trip numbers by mode, with 83 car arrivals and 94 departures per day.

6.6.12 At the request of Transport officers, a revised trip generation analysis has been undertaken to account for a higher potential level of trips to the Waste Transfer Unit given that the end user is not known. Table 2 of the addendum to the transport statement dated 26 June 2017 demonstrates that the site could generate an additional 48 vehicular trips per day, compared to the analysis in the Transport Assessment which had predicted a reduction of -23 daily trips (Table 6.11 of the Transport Assessment). This is a 19% increase in the number of trips generated by the site compared to the existing scenario (as surveyed in Nov 2015). The applicant was asked to clarify the additional trips to the site. Within their comments received 05 July 2017 the Transport Consultant advises that the additional trips would comprise a small element of cars and the residential servicing traffic.

6.6.13 In terms of WTU parking/loading bays, the Transport Consultant advises in their comments received 05/07/2017 that they have undertaken a parking accumulation assessment based on the number of LGV, MGV and HGVs identified within the November 2015 survey. The survey shows that the maximum number of vehicles on site at any one time was 10 vehicles (6 x LGV and 4 x MGV). The proposal includes for a total of 8 loading/parking bays (5 x LGV bays and 3 x MGV). The Delivery and Servicing Management Plan, will contain measures to manage the profile of vehicles arriving/leaving the site, such that all movements will be comfortably accommodated within the bays proposed. The Council’s Transport Officer considers this acceptable. It is noted that a condition requiring a final delivery and servicing management plan will be imposed.

6.6.14 With regards to the drop-off facility usage the drop-off facility will be used by all deliveries and servicing vehicles associated with the commercial and residential site elements. The area will also be available for residents and their visitors for dropping-off and picking up. The WTU will not be serviced by the drop-off bay with all vehicles accommodated within the servicing area provided in the Lower Ground Floor. The addendum transport assessment dated 26 April 2017 provides an analysis on the usage of the 50m drop off facility. This has been reviewed and considered to be a sufficiently robust as it provides worst case scenario in terms of residential servicing trips generated, vehicle size and dwell times. The Council’s Transport Officer is satisfied with the assessment.

6.6.15 TfL have also reviewed the proposal and consider that the overall trip generation assessment is reasonable and that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the operation of the strategic highway network.
Car Parking

6.6.16 There are 74 residential basement parking spaces proposed which includes 30 spaces for the wheelchair units. This equates to a ratio of 0.25 which is a reduction on previously proposed levels of parking (90 spaces including disabled at planning application submission stage). TfL and Lambeth Transport officers have accepted this level of parking. The site falls within controlled parking zone Clapham 'L' which is in operation within periods Monday – Friday 9am to 6pm / 9am to 08.30pm. Therefore the application can be supported as permit free development, which should be secured via S106.

6.6.17 Two operational parking spaces for residential waste management vehicles, and 8 operational spaces are proposed as part of the Waste Transfer Unit. In line with officers advice the applicant has reduced the number of commercial car parking spaces from 6 spaces to 4 spaces (includes 1 disabled space). This is considered acceptable. Electrical charging points should be included for all car parking areas in accordance with the London Plan policy that 20% of its spaces with electric charging points, with a further 20% capable of being upgraded. This can be secured by condition.

Car Club

6.6.18 A car club space is proposed within the basement and a car club package proposed by Enterprise Car Club has been submitted. It would provide membership for all residential households for 3 years. The car club package proposed by Enterprise is appropriate, the nearest alternative Enterprise vehicles are located at, St Lukes Avenue SW4 7LG (1.0km from site) Hazelbourne Road SW12 9NS (1.2km from site) and Branksome Road SW2 5TN (1.6km from site). Car club membership that residential units would be provided with a minimum of three years free membership, and one year for the commercial units would be secured by s106.

Cycle Parking

6.6.19 A total of 598 long term and short term cycle parking are provided across the site, which exceeds London Plan standards. There are 21 Sheffield stands proposed across 5 visitor cycle parking areas close to entrances, providing 42 visitor spaces. The location of the residential cycle stores adjacent to cores is also appropriate. 45% of the total number of spaces are proposed as Sheffield stands or single tier cycle parking which is welcomed. There are no details regarding showers and changing facilities for the commercial element. Notwithstanding this, details of the cycle parking stands, how the cycle stores will be secured and shower/changing facilities (for the commercial units) will be secured via condition.

6.6.20 The TfL Santander Cycle Hire scheme does not currently extend to this area, and the nearest docking stations are over a kilometre from the site. However, TfL request a TfL accept the £50,000 contribution towards cycle hire should the network be extended to this area prior to occupation. This will be secured via s106.

Public Transport

6.6.21 The Transport Assessment states that the proposed development is predicted to generate 28 additional bus trips in the AM peak hour and 32 in the PM peak hour. TfL considered that the increase in bus trips can be accommodated within the existing bus network capacity
Travel Plan

6.6.22 A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted with the application. This has been reviewed and considered that it is appropriate. This will be secured via condition, with a monitoring payment of £3000 secured via S106.

Delivery and Servicing Management Plan

6.6.23 A draft Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted. It includes access details, swept paths and turning areas for the service vehicles. The types of service vehicles likely to be visiting the offices, the WTU and refuse collection has been submitted.

6.6.24 The Delivery and Servicing Plan includes details of the proposed servicing strategies for all uses on the site, including the WTU. It outlines how the proposed concierge and 50m drop off facility adjacent to Building E would operate. Officers consider that adequate provisions would be made on site for servicing and delivery. To ensure this a condition is recommended requiring a final Delivery and Servicing Management Plan should be submitted.

Construction Management Plan

6.6.25 A draft Construction Management Plan has been submitted, which appears to be broadly acceptable. A detailed Construction Management Plan should be submitted to the council prior to construction.

Refuse and Recycling

6.6.26 Policy Q12 states that adequate refuse and recycling storage should be provided for all development, ensuring that this should be well designed, of adequate size and easy to access in order to ensure that visual and residential amenity are protected. The council’s Guidance for ‘Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection requirements’ provides a more comprehensive guide to waste storage development.

6.6.27 Figures 16 and 17 above illustrate the provision of refuse bin stores for the proposed development. Officers consider that adequate provision would be made on site for the storage of refuse and recycling. A condition is recommended requiring details of the waste stores to be submitted and a final waste and recycling management strategy be submitted. The council’s Waste consultant has reviewed the proposal and advised that the delivery and servicing management plan and operational waste & recycling strategy is sound in terms of refuse and recycling.

7 Other Planning Issues

7.1 Sustainability

7.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions

7.3 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan relates to minimising CO2 emissions and requires any application to be supported by an energy statement that illustrates the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in line with the London Plan energy hierarchy (Lean – Clean-Green). This is expressed in terms of the 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with an improvement of 35% from 2014-2016 (October) and zero carbon thereafter.
7.4 An energy strategy has been submitted and is in accordance with the energy hierarchy ‘Lean, Clean, and Green’. Lean through high performance building fabric, Clean through base energy demand (DHW and heating) met by Combined Heat and Power unit; a high efficiency communal heating network using high efficiency boilers as secondary heating system; Low-energy demand lighting system; and high efficiency heat recovery units; Green through 155 kWp Photovoltaic panels (PV) (no.462 335W panels) located on the roof of some of the buildings.

7.5 The energy statement submitted identifies that the residential buildings achieve a 46.5% reduction in Carbon emissions over Part L (2013). The remaining regulated carbon dioxide emissions reduction, 53.5% is to be off-set through a cash in lieu contribution to be ring fenced to secure delivery of carbon dioxide savings elsewhere in line with London Plan Policy 5.2E. The contribution would be in the region of £519,000 carbon tax in order to reach carbon neutrality. The non-residential buildings achieve a 50% reduction in Carbon emissions over Part L (2013).

7.6 With regards to overheating, the submission includes future climate scenarios run using TM49 Design Summer years for London which illustrates how the units will not overheat in the future. A final energy strategy would be secured by s106.

7.7 Decentralised Energy

7.8 Policy EN 3 requires all major developments to connect to, and where appropriate extend existing decentralised heating, cooling or power networks in the vicinity of the site unless a feasibility assessment demonstrates otherwise. Where networks do not currently exist, developments should make provision to connect to any planned future decentralised energy network in the vicinity of the site, having regard to opportunities identified through the London Heat Map and area specific energy plans.

7.9 There are no existing District Heating networks are within connection distance of the proposed site. The Clapham Park area earmarked as feasible for potential decentralised energy is within 200m of the proposed development site. For this reason the development will be future proofed with the potential to connect into this district heating network. This would be secured via s106.

7.10 The scale of the proposed residential development indicates that the site is feasible for installation of communal CHP and should be sized to cover the baseload heating demands throughout the year. Any CHP system utilised on-site should be designed to be extended in the future to deliver heat to the local housing area within Clapham Park and would be secured via s106. As a ‘heat supplier’ the development would be able to sell excess heat produced to the network.

7.11 Sustainable Design and Construction

7.12 Lambeth Local Plan Policy EN 4 requires development meet high standards of sustainable design and construction feasible, relating to the scale, nature and form of the proposal which should be demonstrated in a supporting statement as part of any planning application. Furthermore, all new non-residential development should meet at least BREEAM ‘Excellent’ unless it is demonstrated that it is not technically feasible or viable to do so, in which case proposals should demonstrate a ‘Very Good’ rating with a minimum score of 63 per cent.
7.13 A BREEAM Pre-assessment has been undertaken by BSD Energy. The development proposals achieve 'Very Good' with a score of 64.6%. The commercial building F targeted an ‘Excellent’ rating. The design has attained as many potential credits as possible from passive design features, the building fabric specified, plant and technologies selected to achieve a ‘Very Good’ rating. Because all of the onsite electricity generation from CHP and photovoltaic panels are supplying the residential buildings, there is no further gain to be achieved by the commercial building on the singular development. The orientation, location on site, plant space allocation and over shading by the adjoining Building E, has the consequence that the roof space of commercial building F has no benefit from any photovoltaic panel installations. Conditions requiring Post-Construction Review Certificate and summary score sheet for the office areas must be submitted, to demonstrate that a 'Very Good' rating has been achieved.

7.14 For the residential aspect of the development, the applicant must ensure that the new build dwellings should have an internal water use below 105l/person/day. A condition to this effect is recommended.

7.15 **Secured by Design**

Policy Q3 requires development to be designed in a manner that does not engender opportunities for crime or anti-social behaviour or create a hostile environment that would produce fear of crime. Therefore development should not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder.

7.16 Figure 23 above illustrates the proposed permeability of the site and delineates between public, semi-public and private spaces. The blue hatched arrows indicate the public space fully open to the public and the adjacent Notre Dame Estate. The solid blue line indicates the main entrance to the residential element it would be open to pedestrians but restricted to vehicles (residents only) by a raised arm vehicular barrier to be controlled by the concierge. Beyond this point there is a boundary wall between the Site and Notre Dame Estate, and link created between the two sites. The link between the Notre Dame Estate and the Site is to be open from dusk to dawn. The area to the rear of Building A and between Buildings A and B, B and C and C and D are private communal areas secured and accessed by residents only.

7.17 The Design out Crime Officer has reviewed the proposal and in particular areas that would be open and accessible to the public and considered the scheme to be acceptable. The officer has raised no objections subject to conditions that the development follows the principles and physical security requirements of Secured by Design and a community safety/crime management and maintenance plan be submitted.

7.18 To promote community cohesion and create safe liveable neighbourhoods the applicant has agreed in principle to contribute towards lighting fixtures to the buildings on the adjacent Notre Dame estate and that CCTV cameras are installed on the proposed buildings at 44 Clapham Common Southside facing towards the Notre Dame Estate – where field of vision includes some surveillance of the Notre Dame Estate. This would secured by s106 and imposed by condition respectively.

7.19 **Management of Surface Water/Flood Risk**

7.20 Policy EN5 seeks to minimise the impact of flooding within the borough; permitting appropriate development in Flood Zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b subject to meeting the criteria in annex 5.
Policy EN6 relates to sustainable drainage systems and water management and states that
development should seek to ensure that the layout and design of development does not have a
detrimental impact on floodwater flow across the site.

The site is located in Flood Zone 1 which is defined as having a ‘low probability’ of river and
sea flooding. The applicant has the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) prepared by
AECOM.

The report identifies that the Site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding from surface
water. A conceptual surface water management strategy detailing how surface water runoff
from the Site will be managed post development has been submitted. The conceptual drainage
strategy for the Site is based on providing surface water attenuation storage up to and including
the 1% AEP storm event with a 40% allowance for climate change; attenuation structures (a
pre-cast concrete tank, oversized pipes and green roofs) will be contained within the Site and
will include a flow control hydrobrake and pre-packaged pumping station to restrict the flow rate
to the combined Thames Water sewer system; surface water from the Site will drain at a
restricted rate (5 l/s) to the surrounding Thames Water sewer system.

The Environment Agency has raised no objection and the Council’s Flooding (SUD’s) officer
has advised that the submitted details are fine and that the quality of information submitted is
very high. The officer raised no objection subject to conditions regarding management and
maintenance details to be submitted of the SUDs.

In terms of water management, Thames Water has raised no objection subject to an
informative relating to groundwater discharge. With regards to water supply infrastructure
Thames Water advise the existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet
the additional demands for the proposed development. A pre commencement condition is
recommended that impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been
submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with
Thames Water). With regards to sewerage infrastructure capacity, they have no objection to the
proposal.

Groundwater/Land Contamination/Ground Stability

In accordance with Local Plan Policy EN4 (Sustainable Design and Construction) proposals
should include an assessment of existing ground conditions and identify appropriate remedial
measures for any contaminated land prior to development commencing. The application has
been accompanied by a geo-environmental and geotechnical desk study report’ by Fairhurst.
And a supplementary letter of comfort from the applicants appointed expert Dr Apollonia
Gasparre Geotechnical Consulting Group dated 12th June 2017. This was reviewed by the

The Environment Agency and the Council’s Environmental Health Consultant advise that the
study indicates that there is a potential for ground contamination to be present that requires
further intrusive investigation. A site investigation scheme is recommended to assess this and a
pre commencement condition to this effect is recommended. Conditions regarding piling and
surface water infiltration are recommended to minimise any potential pollution to groundwater
from contamination.
The size and scale of the basement is such that a risk ‘medium’ has been identified that it could intersect ground water and there is a possibility that this could give rise to surface flooding. The applicant has appointed Geotechnical Consulting Group as their specialist advisor regarding hydrogeology. The letter of comfort dated 12th June provided confirms that in their (Geotechnical Consulting Group) opinion they are confident the site conceptual model should not change following proper investigation of the site and that an appropriate scheme of protection can be developed. A pre commencement condition has been recommended that no development shall take place until a scheme of detailed investigation of the hydrogeological environment written by a suitably qualified scientific and authoritative person (which is what the statutory guidance states) and a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the hydrogeological setting of the site and the proposed development be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

The Council's Environmental Health Consultant has advised that the planning authority are advised to get their own authoritative advisor (Structural Engineer) to ensure that the risk of movement from the excavation is controlled. The report prepared by Fairhurst advises that a movement monitoring scheme needs to be developed including trigger levels. This would need to be reviewed by an agreed third party structural engineering. This will be secured via a s106.

The submitted Basement impact Assessment was referred to Building Control who advised from a Building Control view that the report is very detailed and takes into consideration boreholes and tests in respect of ground type, water levels and potential movement of adjoining structures. As you would expect there are currently no detailed drawings or structural calculations in respect of the buildings as this will be undertaken at Building Regulation stage. The Building control Officer advised that they are content with the information provided to date from a building control perspective.

Environmental Permit

The Environment Agency authorised waste permits for this site were surrendered in August 2016. Whilst Local Authority planning approval for waste activity on this site may still be in place, there is currently no authorisation from the Environment Agency for such activity for this site. Accordingly, the operator is likely to need to apply to the Environment Agency for an environmental permit. Due regard for environmental risk to air, land and water, and vicinity to sensitive receptors – such as groundwater aquifers and proximity to human population – would be considered in any such application. An informative to this effect is recommended.

Archaeology

The Site is located within an archaeological priority area and an archaeological desk based assessment prepared by Mills Whipp has been submitted. English Heritage (Archaeology) has reviewed the report and is satisfied that the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such a condition could provide an acceptable safeguard to archaeological interests. A condition is therefore recommended to require a two-stage process of archaeological investigation comprising: first, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation.
7.36 **Site Management Measures**

7.37 Given the scale of the proposed development, it is clear that once developed and fully occupied there will be a number of different operations with different operators undertaking them. Discussions will need to take place as to who will manage the new non-residential spaces and communal amenity spaces. Whilst these discussions are not a planning consideration it is nonetheless important to ensure the scheme is delivered, operated and maintained successfully. As such it is appropriate to attach conditions securing management strategies for the residential dwellings – including all communal amenity spaces, the office, café and Waste Transfer Unit uses.

8 **Planning Obligations and CIL**

8.1 The Local Plan (Policy D4 and Annex 10) sets out the Council’s policy in relation to seeking planning obligations and the charging approaches for various types of obligation. For contributions that are not covered by Annex 10, the Council’s approach to calculating contributions is guided by its July 2013 revised draft S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) produced for consultation.

8.2 The following planning obligations are considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in kind and in scale to the development. They are therefore compliant with the requirements of regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

8.3 **Affordable Housing**

- Securing Option B (Mayor’s Fast Track Route) subject to an RP taking all the affordable and intermediate rent units within Buildings A and B. In the event that the applicant is unable to secure an RP that will take on Building B then the fall back position is they implement option A. First the applicant would need to demonstrate to the Council that every reasonable endeavour has been undertaken to secure an RP for these units.
- Securing number of affordable units and habitable rooms
- Provision of rent levels for the Affordable Rented units
- Management by an RP and nominations agreement
- Income levels for the Intermediate units in accordance with London Plan eligibility criteria (£90k)
- Review mechanism

8.4 **Transport, Highways and Public Realm**

- Permit free development to restrict residents and businesses from applying for permits to park cars
- Car Club package: Each household would be provided with a minimum of three years free membership and one year for the commercial units. Secure Car Club Bay in basement
- Financial contribution of £50,000 towards Cycle Docking Station should the network be extended to this area prior to occupation
- Site owners to provide, maintain and afford public access to/over the proposed public realm (595sqm public square to be located between building D & E). The Site owners enter into any further agreements that maybe required to keep open the site boundary between the Site (44 Clapham Common Southside) and the Notre Dame Estate and the two links between the Site (44 Clapham Common Southside) and Notre Dame Estate. These agreements be secured prior to the commencement of development.
- Financial contribution of £6891.52 to provide improved lighting at the Notre Dame Estate
• Enter into s278 agreement with TfL for any highway works on TfL's highway associated with the development.
• Travel Plan and Travel Plan monitoring fee £3000.00

8.5 Public Art

• A provision (equivalent to contribution) on site or contribution (1% of Construction cost)

8.6 Children and Young People Playspace

• The Site owners enter into any further agreements that maybe required to secure the use of the playspace at the Notre Dame Estate by future occupiers of 44 Clapham Common Southside. This to be secured prior to commencement of works.
• Option A – 38,485.26 (to upgrade existing playspace at Notre Dame Estate)
• Option B – 45,138.06 (to upgrade existing playspace at Notre Dame Estate)

8.7 Local Labour in Construction

• A contribution of £279,588.29 towards local labour in construction
• Employment and Skills Plan shall be submitted for the construction phase and for the end-use phase of the development. A range of potential outcomes for both construction and end-use phases will be expected and agreed within the Employment and Skills plans. These will include, but not be limited to: work placements; jobs for local people; apprenticeships for local people; development of customised pre-employment routeways into roles for local people (including guaranteed interviews). Worksmart Plan
• Considerate Constructors Scheme

8.8 Sustainability

• Final Energy Strategy submitted
• Connection to district heat networks
• Zero carbon homes contribution payment – indicative figure of £519,000 carbon tax (based on current assessment)

8.9 Basement Construction/Excavation

• An engineering/movement assessment is undertaken and submitted to LPA for approval by an authoritative advisor (Structural Engineer) appointed by the LPA to review. Cost of independent consultant review to be covered by applicant.
• Details shall be submitted to LPA for approval by an authoritative advisor appointed by the LPA to review (cost of independent consultant review to be covered by applicant) showing how the waste transfer unit has been suitably designed to minimise the breakout of noise and vibration through the building fabric and transmission of noise and vibration through walls into adjoining units. These details shall be accompanied by a noise and vibration assessment.

8.10 Monitoring fee

• Capped at 5% of total value of financial contributions

8.11 Community Infrastructure Levy

8.12 If the application is approved and the development is implemented, a liability to pay the Lambeth Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will arise.
8.13 The current CIL estimate on a without prejudice basis is as follows:

**Option A**
- Mayoral - £1,177,505.00 (minus social housing relief - £880,975.68)
- Lambeth – £4,301,637.00 (minus social housing relief - £3,030,797.07)

**Option B**
- Mayoral - £1,177,505.00 (minus social housing relief - £850,535.77)
- Lambeth - £4,301,637.00 (minus social housing relief - £2,900,340.29)

8.14 It should be noted that these figures do not have index applied and are subject to change, with the final CIL liability being calculated at the time it becomes payable i.e. at commencement of the development.

8.15 Allocation of CIL monies to particular infrastructure projects is not a matter for consideration in the determination of planning applications. Separate governance arrangements are being put in place for Borough Infrastructure needs, and locally through the Cooperative Local Investment Plan initiative.
9 CONCLUSION

9.1 The scheme would deliver a number of planning benefits, by way of a better employment provision, retention of space for a Waste Transfer Unit, provision of additional housing that includes a good affordable housing offer, a new public square of 595sqm, the opening up of the front of the site (length of 210m approx.) with the adjacent Notre Dame Estate and the creation of links between the two sites.

9.2 The Site would continue to retain space (0.11ha) for a throughput of 1,200tpa of Waste which accords with London Plan and Local Plan Policy. Officers are comfortable that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the proposed basement would be sufficient to operate a waste transfer facility and that there is a demand for its use.

9.3 The proposed scheme would deliver a better quality and quantity of employment accommodation that would clearly result in an intensification of employment provision and a significant uplift in the number of jobs, particularly given that some of the current buildings have been vacant for some 2-4 years.

9.4 The development would provide a good quality residential environment for all future occupiers. The majority of the proposed units will achieve a dual aspect, giving appropriate levels of outlook and reasonable daylight and sunlight given the site constraints. In this regard the long and linear irregular shaped site, difference in land levels and the sites north west south east orientation, have shaped the design and layout of the proposal. The scheme has been designed to effectively maximise the distances between the blocks and minimise any harm upon adjoining residential occupiers. All of the new dwellings have been designed to meet the national standards in terms of size and layout. In addition, the development is inclusive of on-site amenity and play space provision with the delivery of public realm and facilitates a future route through the railway viaduct.

9.5 The proposal would deliver based on Option B, 293 dwellings (751 habitable rooms): 206 market dwellings (488 by habitable room) and 87 affordable (263 by habitable room). A total of 30% by unit which equates to 35% by habitable room. The tenure split by unit would be 59 affordable rent and 28 intermediate (68:32 split). By habitable room this equates to 184 affordable rent and 79 affordable intermediate (70:30 split). This meets the ‘Fast Track Approach’ outlined in Mayors Affordable Housing and Viability SPG whilst also complying with the Council’s 70:30 tenure split. It would only be if the applicant was unable to secure a Registered Provider (RP) to take on the affordable rented and intermediate units within Building B that the fall back position would be the implementation of option A. This would be secured within the s106 along with relevant review mechanisms.

9.6 In design terms the provision of a taller building on this site, within the context of strategic and local views and nearby conservation area is considered acceptable by officers. In design terms officers consider the proposed scale and mass and architectural appearance of Building A, B, C, D E and F would be acceptable within the surrounding context.

9.7 The impact of the development on the surrounding residential amenity is acceptable in terms of Privacy, outlook, and sense of enclosure. With regards to daylight and sunlight, on balance, and in consideration of the urban context, it is considered that reductions to neighbouring residential properties in the main meet the BRE Guide target criteria and for the isolated instances that fall outside of this, the residential values (i.e. those in the proposed scenario) are typically still reasonable for an urban context (as seen for the review especially for daylight distribution).
Sufficient commitment is made to sustainable design and construction, reducing carbon emissions and the use of renewable energy technologies. The development would be suitably mitigated in terms of its impact upon local infrastructure. In addition, the development would not impact unacceptably upon the function and safety of the highway network (both pedestrian and vehicular).

The development would be subject to a range of section 106 obligations that would reasonably mitigate the otherwise unacceptable impacts of the development. The package of section 106 contributions has been negotiated having full regard to the nature of the development, to the normal expectations conferred upon developers by the various planning policy documents, and to the statutory tests for section 106 obligations set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

Officers consider that the development would be in general compliance with the Development Plan for the Borough and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should otherwise be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme, subject 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).

RECOMMENDATION

Resolve to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, completion of a Section 106 agreement and any direction as may be received following further referral to the Mayor of London.

Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Development and Transport to:

I. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report

II. Negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in this report pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act.

That if the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of this committee the Director of Planning, Development and Transport be given delegated powers to consider refusing the application in the absence of a legal agreement.

In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers, having regard to the heads of terms set out in the report, to negotiate and complete a Section 106 agreement in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector.
Conditions(s) and Reasons(s)

**Time Period**
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).

**In accordance with approved plans**
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

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

**Environmental Management**

**Non road-mobile machinery (NRMM)**

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

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

**Construction and Environmental Management Plan**

4. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall observe the requirements of the statutory guidance and other relevant guidance and shall include details of the following measures:

   i. An introduction consisting of construction phase environmental management plan, definitions and abbreviations and project description and location;
   ii. A description of management responsibilities;
   iii. A description of the construction programme which identifies activities likely to cause high levels of noise or dust;
   iv. Site working hours and a named person for residents to contact;
   v. Advance notification of road closures
   vi. Details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway
vii. Detailed Site logistics arrangements;
viii. Details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage;
viii. Details regarding dust and noise mitigation measures to be deployed including identification of sensitive receptors and ongoing monitoring;
ixi. Details of the hours of works and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and safety of the highway network; and
ixi. Communication procedures with the LBL and local community regarding key construction issues – newsletters, fliers etc.
ixi. Details of a community forum that is set up and comprises of and engages with the residents of the Notre Dame Estate and surrounding residents.

The construction shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details and measures approved in the CEMP for the related phase, unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is received for any variation.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and to safeguard residential amenity from the start of the construction process (policies 7.14 of the London Plan (2016); and policies T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Contamination

5. No development other than demolition shall commence until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

   i) A site investigation scheme, based on previous findings to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site;
   ii) The site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment resulting from a);
   iii) An options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken;
   iv) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in iii) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to safeguard for the protection of controlled waters. The site is located over a Secondary Aquifer. To safeguard future users or occupiers of this site and the wider environment from irreversible risks associated with the contaminants which are present by ensuring that the contaminated land is properly treated and made safe before development. Depending on the outcome of any ground investigation and subsequent risk assessment, it may be necessary for remediation to be carried out. If this is the case, it will be necessary to demonstrate that any work has been carried out effectively and the environmental risks have been satisfactorily managed. (Policies 5.21 of the London Plan (2016) and EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

6. Prior to occupation of any part of the development, a verification report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of
the remediation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a “long-term monitoring and maintenance plan”) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan, and for the reporting of this to the local planning authority.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to safeguard future users or occupiers of this site and the wider environment from irreversible risks associated with the contaminants which are present by ensuring that the contaminated land is properly treated and made safe before development. Depending on the outcome of any ground investigation and subsequent risk assessment, it may be necessary for remediation to be carried out. If this is the case, it will be necessary to demonstrate that any work has been carried out effectively and the environmental risks have been satisfactorily managed (policies 5.21 of the London Plan (2016) and EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

7. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination will be dealt with.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to safeguard future users or occupiers of this site and the wider environment from irreversible risks associated with the contaminants which are present by ensuring that the contaminated land is properly treated and made safe before development. Depending on the outcome of any ground investigation and subsequent risk assessment, it may be necessary for remediation to be carried out. If this is the case, it will be necessary to demonstrate that any work has been carried out effectively and the environmental risks have been satisfactorily managed (policies 5.21 of the London Plan (2016) and EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

8. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The developer should be aware of the potential risks associated with the use of piling where contamination is an issue. Piling or other penetrative methods of foundation design on contaminated sites can potentially result in unacceptable risks to underlying groundwaters. We recommend that where soil contamination is present, a risk assessment is carried out in accordance with guidance ‘Piling into contaminated sites’. Piling activities will not be permitted on parts of a site where an unacceptable risk is posed to controlled waters.
Basement - Hydrogeology

9. No development shall take place until a scheme of detailed investigation of the hydrogeological environment written by a scientific and authoritative person has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:

i) A detailed conceptual model including cross sectional drawings for each face of the basement(s) to be constructed

ii) A site investigation scheme, to specifically assess the ground water environment and provide data to predict and assess the potential impacts of the proposed basement construction hereby approved.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to avoid hazard in relation to land instability and increased flood risk caused by the basement excavation (Paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy EN5 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

10. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority no development other than demolition shall commence until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the hydrogeological setting of the site and the proposed development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

iii) a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site

iv) An options appraisal of the potential impacts and the remedies that might be available including estimated cost

v) full details of the hydrogeological mitigation measures required and how they are to be undertaken;

vi) Demonstration of how cumulative and reasonable worse case effects have been considered;

vii) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in v) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

All work shall be supervised by the agreed scientific and authoritative person in accordance with the mechanisms and procedures specified in the approved verification plan and a comprehensive non-technical summary document of the assessments provided and information submitted against (iii) to (vii) of this condition. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and mitigation measures, and they shall be permanently retained and maintained in working order for the duration of the use and their operation.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to avoid hazard in relation to land instability and increased flood risk caused by the basement excavation (Paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy EN5 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Ensuring Provision of the Commercial Uses/Waste Transfer Unit

11. Prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby permitted, or in accordance with an alternative timetable that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the Class B1(a), ancillary A3 use and Waste Transfer Unit (Sui Generis) elements of the development shall be completed including the external façade and fitted out to a standard where toilets are operational, the décor is neutral and the units are provided with
central heating, ventilation, suspended ceilings, perimeter trunking to the floor and Lighting Guide LG3 compliant lighting.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory delivery of commercial floorspace and Waste Transfer Unit on the site (policies 5.17H London Plan (2016) and EN7, ED2 ED3, ED6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Site Management
12. Prior to the occupation of the relevant part of the development, Management and Maintenance Plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management and Maintenance Plans should set out how each aspect of the development will be maintained and managed upon occupation. The following uses will require plans:

- Residential dwellings – including all communal amenity spaces specific to the residential;
- Office building (including ancillary café);
- Waste Transfer Unit
- A detailed landscape management plan for those areas of shared or communal open space. The Landscape management plan shall cover a period of not less than five years and the areas of shared or communal open space where the landscape management plan shall apply shall be clearly indicated on a scaled plan. The management plan shall accord with current Landscaping best practice.

The site thereafter shall only be operated in accordance with the approved Management and Maintenance Plans, unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is received for any variation.

Reason: To ensure an on-going quality of development and in order to ensure successful establishment of soft landscaping in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policies S2, EN1, EN4, Q2, Q6 and Q9 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).
Controlling Uses

13. The A3 element shall be used for a café ancillary to the commercial B1(a) floorspace and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class A3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended).

Reason: To ensure a balance of uses and the satisfactory delivery of commercial floorspace on the site (policies ED2 ED3, ED6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Hours of operation – Non Residential Uses

14. The use of the premises hereby permitted shall not operate other than within the following times:

- [08:00] Hours to [18:00] Hours – Monday to Friday
- [08:00] Hours to [18:00] Hours – Saturdays
- No operations is permitted on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of the area generally (policies Q2 and ED7 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

15. The use of the Waste Transfer Unit premises hereby permitted shall not operate other than within the following times:

- [08:00] Hours to [18:00] Hours – Monday to Friday
- [08:00] Hours to [13:00] Hours – Saturdays
- No operation is permitted on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of the area generally (policies Q2 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

16. There shall be no heavy vehicle movements to and from the site during night-time hours (23:00 to 07:00). The doors to the waste transfer unity shall be closed at all times unless vehicles are entering or exiting the waste transfer unit.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of the area generally (policies Q2 and T6 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Design

Materials

17. Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings or supporting information hereby approved, above ground works shall not commence until a schedule of all materials to be used in the external elevations, including samples and the invitation to view a brick sample panel with pointing on site, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The
development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory ((Policies Q6, Q7, and Q8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Detailed Design

18. Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings or supporting information hereby approved, above ground works shall not commence until drawings showing all external construction detailing of all development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drawings shall include details of:

I. Detailed elevations
II. Details of windows (including technical details, elevations, reveal depths, plans and cross sections)
III. Details of lightwell enclosures (to include cross section)
IV. Details of terraces and balconies (including soffits), balustrades and privacy screens
V. Details of entrances, canopies and doors (including technical details, elevations, surrounds, reveal depths, plans and sections)
VI. Details of roof treatments, cills and parapets
VII. Details of rainwater goods (including locations and fixings)
VIII. Details of external furniture and ramps
IX. Vents, extracts, flues and ducts
X. Section of glazed stairwells
XI. Residential amenity storage (within basement)

The details set out above shall be provided at 1:10 scale (including sections) or at another scale agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details and drawings thus approved.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and does not detract from the character and visual amenity of the area. (Policies Q6, Q7, Q8 and Q25 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

No External Pipes

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

Reason: To ensure an appropriate standard of design (Policies Q6, Q8 and PN2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Signage
20. Prior to the use of any of the B1 (a) units, full details of the building fascia and signage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to prevent visual clutter, and to ensure a satisfactory external appearance to the design of the building. (Policies Q6 and Q8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

Details of boundary treatments

21. Before the uses hereby permitted commences, a scheme for the siting and design of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the uses hereby permitted commences and retained for the duration of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure high quality landscaping for the boundaries of the site in the interests of visual amenity (policy Q15 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

22. Art/street art shall be erected by the Notre Dame Estate residents along the existing boundary fence or onto the hoarding that may replace the boundary fence between the two sites during the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity (policy Q15 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Public Art

23. Before the uses hereby permitted commences, a scheme for the siting and design of all Public Art shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved Public Art shall be fully implemented before the uses hereby permitted commences and retained for the duration of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure high quality installation of Public Art in the interests of visual amenity (Policy Q4 (c), Q6, Q7 and Q8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Telecommunications Equipment

24. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no aerials, antennae, satellite dishes or related telecommunications equipment shall be erected on any part of the development hereby permitted, without planning permission first being granted.

Reason: To ensure that the visual impact of telecommunication equipment upon the surrounding area can be considered. (Policies 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 and Policies T10, Q6 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Adaptable Housing

25. All residential units, communal areas and accesses hereby permitted shall be constructed to comply with Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations.

Reason: To secure appropriate access for disabled people, older people and others with mobility constraints (policies 3.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Q1 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and the guidance in the London Plan Housing SPG (2012)).

26. Adaptable and wheelchair accessible housing (Parts M4(2) and M4(3) compliant). At least 10% of the residential units hereby permitted (within Building A and Building B) hereby permitted
shall be wheelchair adaptable/accessible units constructed to comply with Part M4 (3) of the Building Regulations. Any communal areas and accesses serving the M4 (3) compliant Wheelchair User Dwellings should also comply with Part M4 (3). All other residential units, communal areas and accesses hereby permitted shall be constructed to comply with Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations.

Reason: To secure appropriate access for disabled people, older people and others with mobility constraints (policies 3.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Q1 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and the guidance in the London Plan Housing SPG (2012)).

Playspace
27. Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans, no occupation of the development shall commence until full details of the children's play space provisions for under 5’s (provided to the levels set out in the London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation’ 2012; including the layout, equipment specification) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for children’s play on site. (Policy 3.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy H5 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Trees/Landscaping/Public Realm/Ecology and Biodiversity

Trees
28. No trees other than those shown to be removed within the submitted Tree Fabrik Arboricultural impact Assessment report shall be felled, pruned, uprooted, damaged or otherwise disturbed without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. All approved tree removal and tree work shall be carried out in accordance with current best practice BS3998:2010.

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 Q2 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

29. 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 Q2 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

30. 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 and third party 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 Q2 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

31. 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 Q2 and Q10 Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

32. The completed schedule of supervision and monitoring for the arboricultural protection measures as agreed under condition 27 above shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 28 days from completion of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In order to ensure compliance with the tree protection details submitted under condition 27 above. 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 Q2 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Hard and Soft Landscaping**

33. Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby approved, prior to the commencement of the development above ground level, a specification of all proposed soft landscaping and tree planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above specification shall accord with BS3936:1992, BS4043:1989, BS4428:1989, BS8545:2014 and current Arboricultural best practice. The submitted details shall demonstrate the following:

I. The treatment of all parts of the site not covered by buildings including
II. The details of the quantity, size, species, position and the proposed time of planting of all trees and shrubs to be planted;
III. An indication of how all trees and shrubs integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to their mature size and anticipated routine maintenance and protection.
IV. All shrubs and hedges to be planted that are intended to achieve a significant size and presence in the landscape shall be similarly specified.
V. Landscaping schedules should endeavour to include, within reason, measures to promote biodiversity including use of native species typical of locality and ground conditions or naturalised areas.
VI. Use of vertical planting and other means to maximise use of vegetation in areas of limited open ground are to be considered and included in the landscape plan.
VII. All hard landscaping including all ground surfaces, street furniture, refuse disposal points, cycle parking facilities, bollards, vehicle crossovers/access points, any ramps or stairs plus wheelchair access (including how the needs of all ambulant and disabled
persons have been taken into consideration) together with finished ground levels and site wide topographical levels.

The approved Landscaping Scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within 6 months of the date of occupation of the residential phase and maintained thereafter, unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is received for any variation.

Reason: In order to introduce high quality soft landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policies EN1, EN4, Q6, Q9 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Planting**

34. 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.

Reasons: In order to introduce high quality soft landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policies EN4, Q6, Q9 and Q10 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Replacement of dead/damaged planting**

35. Any trees, shrubs or hedges included in the landscaping scheme for the development hereby permitted that die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased, within five years of planting, shall be replaced within six months of death, removal, damage or disease.

Reason: In order to ensure long term retention of the landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and in the interests of visual amenity (policies Q6, Q9 and Q10 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Wildlife Habitat**

36. If there is a delay of 24 Months between the original surveys (Bat Survey Report, prepared by AECOM dated January 2017; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Initial Bat Roost Inspection Report, prepared by AECOM dated May) and when actual site clearance and demolition works commence the applicant is required to undertake a further assessment of the site before demolition or clearance works commence. This shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This is in order to ensure no features have been occupied by protected species or habitats in the intervening period.

Reason: In order to secure appropriate features to conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity measures within the development (Policy EN1 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

**Bird and Bat Boxes**

37. Prior to the commencement of the development above ground level, details of bird and bat boxes locations and types and indication of species to be accommodated shall be submitted to
and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained and maintained unless prior written approval is given by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to secure appropriate features to conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity measures within the development (Policy EN1 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

Amenity

Privacy

38. Notwithstanding the details on the drawings and supporting documents hereby approved, prior to the commencement of the development above ground level, detailed drawings (at scale 1:20, 1:5 and 1:100) of how the residential units at ground and lower ground level located within Buildings A, B, C, D adjacent to the accessway/street, communal gardens and/or play areas will be screened (incorporates planted screening/raised beds) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the details thus approved.

If any planting forming part of the privacy screening shall die, be removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, then either this planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with planting of a similar size and species or alternatives to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority and thereafter maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development and protect residential amenity of future occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

39. Prior to occupation of the residential use hereby approved, the windows as illustrated to be fitted with one way glass on drawings TAB (20)P00(B) Rev P1, (or TAB(20)P00 Rev P3; TAB (20)P01(B) Rev P1 (or TAB(20)P01 Rev P3); TAB(20)P02(B) Rev P1 (or TAB(20)P02 Rev P3); TAB(20)P03(B) Rev P1 (or TAB(20)P03 Rev P3); TC(20) P00 Rev P3; TC(20)P01 Rev P3; TC(20) P02 Rev P3; TC(20) P03 Rev P3; TD(20)P00 Rev P3; TD(20)P01 Rev P3; TD(20)P-1 Rev P3; TD(20)P02 Rev P3; TD(20)P04 Rev P3; TEF(20)P03 Rev P3; TEF(20)P04 Rev P3; TEF(20)P05 Rev P3 shall be fitted with one way glass. These windows as indicated shall thereafter be fitted with one way glass for the duration of the development.

Reason: To protect residential amenity of future occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

40. Prior to the occupation of the commercial use hereby approved, the window(s) within the south-western elevation of Building E (Ground, 1st and 2nd floors) facing Lambeth Academy are obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m from finished floor level. The windows shall thereafter be obscure glazed for the duration of the development.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future and adjoining occupiers (policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

41. Prior to the occupation of the commercial use hereby approved, the window(s) within the south-western elevation of Building E (Ground, 1st and 2nd floors) facing Lambeth Academy are obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m from finished floor level. The windows shall thereafter be obscure glazed for the duration of the development.
Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (policy Q2 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

No use of specific roof as terrace

42. The flat roofs over Buildings A, B, C, D, E, F as non-accessible on Page 25 (section 7.0: Roof top amenity, accessibility and roof types) of the Addendum Design and Access Statement dated 30.06.2017 shall only be used for maintenance purposes only. It shall not be used as a roof terrace, sitting out area or other amenity space.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future and adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Lighting

43. Notwithstanding the details on the drawings and documents hereby approved prior to the occupation of any part of the buildings, full details of the lighting strategy for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professional’s Guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light. The scheme must be designed by a suitably qualified person in accordance with the recommendations for environmental zone E3 in the ILP document “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011.

The details shall include a specification of the lighting, location, lux values, hours of operation, details of light spillage, and details of shielding to neighbouring properties. All luminaries shall be orientated and designed in such a way to minimise light spillage beyond the boundary of the site and to prevent glare into the window of residential properties. The approved lighting shall be installed in the relevant parts of the development before the relevant parts of the development is first occupied, or in accordance with an agreed implementation strategy, and retained hereafter for the duration of the development in accordance with the approved details.

Before commencement of operation of the approved lighting scheme the applicant shall appoint a suitably qualified member of the institute of lighting professionals (ILP) to validate that the lighting scheme as installed conforms to the recommendations for environmental zone E3 in the ILP document “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011.

Reason: To ensure a high quality standard of development, to safeguard the character and appearance of the site and the local area and protect residential amenity of future occupiers (Policies Q2, Q6, Q7, Q8 and Q3 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

Wind Microclimate Assessment

44. Notwithstanding the details on the drawings and documents hereby approved prior to the commencement of above ground works a scheme of additional detailed modelling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to identify the additional mitigation measures to improve the comfort levels of the amenity spaces, to an acceptable standard, in accordance with Sections 7 and 8 of the Pedestrian Level Wind Microclimate Assessment desk study ref.1601091, prepared by RWDI, dated 2nd February.

Details of the agreed mitigation measures (including elevational drawings) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the agreed mitigation measures
be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the use commencing on site and shall thereafter be maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason: Policy Q2 (v) of the Lambeth Local Plan adopted in 2015 requires that adequate outdoor amenity space is provided free from excessive noise or disturbance, pollution or odour, oppressive enclosure, wind/downdraught and overshadowing.

Air Quality Assessment
45. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the Air Quality Assessment prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited, dated January 2017. No variation or amendment of the development shall be permitted until a report is provided that demonstrates the conclusions of the Air Quality Assessment will remain valid. The report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where Air Quality Neutral benchmarks cannot be met a scheme of mitigation must be submitted which includes on site mitigation that is part of the proposed development and may also include off-site offsetting. The details as approved shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained for the duration of the development.

Reason: To minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within AQMAs) (policy 7.14 of the London Plan 2016.)

Noise and Vibration
46. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme of noise and vibration attenuation to protect against environmental noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall achieve the habitable and commercial room standards as detailed in BS8233:2014 with no relaxation for exceptional circumstances and must include details of post construction validation. The approved noise and vibration attenuation measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained in working order for the duration of the use in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers (Policy Q2 of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

47. Within 3 months of the date of commencement of the uses hereby permitted, a noise and vibration assessment shall be carried out to confirm the noise and vibration targets have been met for both day and night time operation. Any additional steps required to mitigate noise shall be detailed and implemented, as necessary, in a post installation assessment which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details as approved shall thereafter be permanently retained for the duration of the development.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Noise Levels Amenity Space
48. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme of measures to ensure that all residential units have access to amenity space within the development where noise levels do not exceed 55dB LAEQ(16 hour) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning
Authority. The scheme shall include details of post construction validation. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and a separate validation report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 3 months prior to occupation of the residential use.

Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers (Policy Q2, Amenity - Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

Internal and External Plant

49. Prior to the commencement of construction works above ground of the relevant part of the development hereby approved, full details of internal and external plant equipment and trunking, including building services plant, ventilation and filtration equipment and commercial kitchen exhaust ducting / ventilation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All flues, ducting and other equipment shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the use commencing on site and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

50. The uses hereby permitted, or the operation of any building services plant, shall not commence until an assessment of the acoustic impact arising from the operation of all internally and externally located plant has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The assessment of the acoustic impact shall be undertaken in accordance with BS 4142: 2014 (or subsequent superseding equivalent) and current best practice, and shall include a scheme of attenuation measures to ensure the rating level of noise emitted from the proposed building services plant does not exceed less than background.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

51. Within 1 month of the date of commissioning all equipment and plant hereby approved a noise assessment shall be carried out in accordance with BS 4142: 2014 (or subsequent superseding equivalent) to confirm the noise target has been met for both day and night time operation. Any additional steps required to mitigate noise shall be detailed and implemented, as necessary. The post installation noise assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details as approved shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future residential occupiers and the surrounding area (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Transport

New Vehicular and Pedestrian Access

52. Prior to the commencement of the above ground works hereby permitted, details of the new vehicular and pedestrian access road to and within the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The new vehicular and pedestrian access road shall
be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the uses hereby permitted.

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway (policies T1, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Visibility Splays
53. Prior to the commencement of the above ground works hereby permitted, details of the visibility splays from the Waste Transfer Unit access onto the proposed access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The new vehicular and pedestrian access road access shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the uses hereby permitted.

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway (policies T1, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Parking Management Plan
54. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Parking Management Plan for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include full details of the access arrangements into the basement; including details of visibility splays and access control associated with the proposed ramp; full details of enforcement; full details of the operational management of the Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) (including location) and Car Club Bay; and a mechanism to ensure that the supply and demand of the blue badge bays (30 residential and 1 commercial) are regularly monitored and the provision reviewed to ensure that provision equates to the demand from disabled residents and visitors. Thereafter, the approved parking management plan shall be implemented and operated for the duration of the permitted use.

Reason: To prevent the parking areas becoming obstructed, to maximise use of the parking bays and to ensure that pedestrian and vehicular safety is not prejudiced (policies T1 and T6 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Parking, Manoeuvring, Loading and Unloading
55. The scheme for parking, garaging, manoeuvring, and the loading and unloading of vehicles shown on the submitted plans shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose, or obstructed in any way.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway, minimising danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway and to minimise impact on amenity (policies T1, T6, T7, T8 and Q2 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Delivery and Servicing Management Strategy
56. A Delivery and Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the use of the development commencing. The measures
approved in the Plan shall be implemented prior to the relevant uses commencing and shall be so maintained for the duration of the relevant uses.

Reason: To ensure that the delivery arrangements to the building as a whole are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements (Policies T1, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015)

No loading or unloading other than on site

57. No loading or unloading of goods, including fuel, by vehicles arriving at or departing from the site shall be carried out other than within the curtilage of the site. Access for larger vehicles to the site is restricted to maximum 10m vehicles (apart from larger vehicles accessing the waste transfer unit only).

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway, and to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties (policies T1, T6, T8 and Q2 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Electrical Vehicle Charging Points

58. At least 20% of the vehicular parking spaces shall be provided with active electrical vehicle charging points and 20% passive electrical vehicle charging points for electric vehicles.

Reason: To encourage the uptake of electric vehicles in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13 (2016).

Enter and exit in forward direction only

59. No vehicles shall enter or leave the site other than in a forward direction.

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway (policies T1, T6 and T8 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Cycle Storage

60. Notwithstanding the details on the drawings and documents hereby approved, prior to above ground works commencing of the development hereby approved, details of the provision to be made for cycle parking (including floor plans, specifications for cycle parking (including changing room/shower facilities to be provided for the commercial building)) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details before the uses hereby permitted commences and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport (policies T1, T3 and Q13 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Waste and Recycling Storage

61. Notwithstanding the details on the drawings and documents hereby approved, prior to above ground works commencing of the development hereby permitted, details of waste and recycling storage for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The waste and recycling storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use. The waste and recycling storage areas/facilities should comply
with the Lambeth’s Refuse & Recycling Storage Design Guide (2013), unless it is demonstrated in the submissions that such provision is inappropriate for this specific development.

Reason: To ensure suitable provision for the occupiers of the development, to encourage the sustainable management of waste and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area (policies Q2 and Q12 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Waste Management Strategy**

62. Prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, a Waste Management Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The uses hereby permitted shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved Waste Management Strategy. The Waste Management Strategy will align with the guide for architects and developers on waste and recycling storage and collection requirements submitted details and will include the following:

Reason: To ensure suitable provision for the occupiers of the development, to encourage the sustainable management of waste and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area (policies Q2 and Q12 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Travel Plan**

63. Prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, a Travel plan for the commercial and residential uses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures approved in the Travel Plan shall be implemented prior to development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning authority is obtained for any variation.

Reason: To ensure that the travel arrangements to the site are appropriate and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements (Policy 6.3 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies T1 and T6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

**Sustainability**

**Carbon Dioxide Emissions Reduction**

64. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, plans and details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which demonstrate that the development will achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of 35% over that required by Part L of the Building Regulations 2013. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The details are required ahead of work commencing to ensure that construction is undertaken in a way which does not preclude incorporation of energy efficiency measures. The condition is necessary to ensure that the achievement of the objectives of sustainable development identified in London Plan (2016) Policies 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

65. Prior to first occupation of the building(s) evidence (e.g. photographs, installation contracts and as-built certificates under the Standard Assessment Procedure/National Calculation Method) should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing to show that the
development has been constructed in accordance with approved Energy Strategy and achieved a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy EN3 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

Residential Internal Water Use
66. Prior to first occupation of the building(s) evidence (schedule of fittings and manufacturer's literature) should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing to show that the residential areas of the development have been constructed in accordance with the approved internal water use calculations and achieved an internal water use below 105L/person/day.

Reason: to reduce the consumption of potable water in the home from all sources, including borehole well water, through the use of water efficient fittings, appliances and water recycling systems in accordance with Policy 5.15 of the London Plan (2016).

Green/Brown Roofs
67. No development shall take place until full details of the green roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall demonstrate the following:

   I. Details on materials used in the design, construction and installation of the green or brown roof based on the Green Roof Code and the use of biodiversity based extensive/semi-intensive soils;
   II. Details on substrate and plants used in the green or brown roof, based on a commercial brick-based aggregate or equivalent with a varied substrate depth of 80 -150mm planted with 50% locally native herbs/wildflowers in addition to a variety of sedum species;
   III. Details on additional features to the proposed green roof, such as areas of bare shingle, areas of sand for burrowing invertebrates and individual logs or log piles.
   IV. An ecological management and maintenance plan including landscape features and a cross section of the green or brown roof.
   V. Consideration should be given to providing green or brown roof on the flat roof of the single storey building located between the adjacent 5 storey Building C and the adjacent eastern boundary facing the school site.
   VI. Details of how the roof is compliant with GRO Green Roof Code 2011.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no alterations to the approved scheme shall be permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Evidence that the green or brown roof has been installed in accordance with the details above should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability (Policies EN4 and Q9 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Green roof – to be maintained
68. If within 5 years of the installation of the green roofs, any planting forming part of the green roof shall die, be removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, then either this planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with planting of a similar size and species or alternatives
to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority and thereafter maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area (policies EN4, Q2 and Q9 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

BREEAM - Offices

69. Within three months of work starting on site a BREEAM UK New Construction 2014 (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) Shell and Core Design Stage Certificate and summary score sheet for the office areas must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to show that an Excellent rating will be achieved.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability (Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan September 2015).

70. Prior to first occupation of the building(s) a BREEAM UK New Construction 2014 (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) Shell and Core Post Construction Review Certificate and summary score sheet for the office areas must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that a Very Good rating has been achieved. All the measures integrated shall be retained for as long as the development is in existence.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability (Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

71. Prior to commencement of the fit-out of the office building, unless otherwise agreed in writing, a BREEAM Refurbishment and Fit-out (Parts 3 and 4) 2014 (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) Design Stage Certificate, and summary score sheet for the office areas must be submitted, by the fit-out contractor, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to show that an Excellent rating will be achieved.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability (Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

72. Within 3 months of first occupation a BREEAM Refurbishment and Fit-out (Parts 3 and 4) 2014 (or such equivalent standard that replaces this) Post-Construction Review Certificate and summary score sheet for the office areas must be submitted, by the fit-out contractor, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that a Very Good rating has been achieved. All the measures integrated shall be retained for as long as the development is in existence.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability (Policy EN4 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Photovoltaic

73. Prior to first occupation of the development a scheme showing the siting, size, number and design of the photovoltaic array including roof plans and cross sections of the roof of each building showing the panels in-situ shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment shall be sited so as to minimise its visual impact upon the
external appearance of the buildings. The development shall thereafter be completed in strict accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such for the duration of use.

Reason: To ensure that the development has an acceptable level of sustainability and to ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and does not detract from the character and visual amenity of the area (Policy EN4, Q6, Q7, Q8 and Q25 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015))

Flooding/Surface and Ground Water
Sustainable Drainage System – approved with management and maintenance details

74. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

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

Infiltrating Water

75. No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground are permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reason: Infiltrating water has the potential to cause remobilisation of contaminants present in shallow soil or made ground which could ultimately cause pollution of groundwater.

Study of existing water supply infrastructure

76. Prior to the commencement of the development (with the exception of demolition works) detailed impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand.

Archaeology

77. No demolition or development below ground level shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development below ground level shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no
demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works

B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason: Heritage assets of archaeological interest may survive on the site. The planning authority wishes to secure the provision of appropriate archaeological investigation, including the publication of results, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF.

Secured by Design

Accreditation to Secured by Design Standards

78. The development shall be constructed and operated thereafter to ‘Secured by Design Standards’. A certificate of accreditation to Secured by Design Standards shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing prior to the residential occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development maintains and enhances community safety (policy Q3 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).

Crime Prevention Strategy

79. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Crime Prevention Strategy including a security Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Metropolitan Police. The submitted details will include the following:

a) A summary of known crime risks in the area;
b) Details of how the development, including any landscaping and public art installations, has mitigated known crime risks in the area;
c) Details of management of the potential conflicts created by having a number of differing uses within the same development, including commercial and residential buildings and the associated public realm/streets within the development; and
d) Detail of how the development seeks to achieve ‘Secured by Design Standards’, a CCTV scheme (CCTV cameras installed on the proposed buildings at 44 Clapham Common Southside facing towards the Notre Dame Estate – where field of vision includes some surveillance of the Notre Dame Estate), external security, street lighting and landscaping.

The use shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved details, unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is received for any variation.

Reason: To ensure that the development maintains and enhances community safety. (Policy Q3 of the Lambeth Local Plan, adopted September 2015).
Electromagnetic interference

80. Prior to occupation of development, a report prepared by an appropriately qualified consultant shall be submitted for approval in writing investigating the possible impact to television, radio, and mobile phone broadcasting and reception as well as proposing any mitigation measures.

Any mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to occupation and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To avoid any irremediable interference to broadcasting and telecommunications in the surrounding area in accordance with NPPF para 44.

Informatives(s)

1. This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council's Building Control Officer.
3. Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 concerning construction site noise and in this respect you are advised to contact the Council's Environmental Health Division.
4. You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council's Highways team prior to the commencement of construction at drw@lambeth.gov.uk in order to obtain necessary approvals and licences prior to undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffolding, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections, Hoarding, Excavations (including adjacent to the highway such as basements, etc), Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licences etc.
5. You are advised of the necessity to consult the Council's Highway Team at drw@lambeth.gov.uk, with regard to any alterations affecting the public footway. It is current Council policy for the Council's contractor to construct new vehicular accesses and to reinstate the footway across redundant accesses. The developer is to contact the Council's Highways team at drw@lambeth.gov.uk, prior to the commencement of construction, to arrange for any such work to be done. If the developer wishes to undertake this work the Council will require a deposit and the developer will need to cover all the Council's costs (including supervision of the works). If the works are of a significant nature, a Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) will be required and the works must be carried out to the Council's specification.
6. 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:
   1. name a new street
   2. name a new or existing building
   3. 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
Design

7. With regards to Condition 18 above the level of detail provided should be similar to the level of detail shown in the CGI's submitted.

8. With regards to Condition 18 (XI) above the residential amenity storage at basement level should include details as to how the stores would be made secure for individual residents by providing lockers or cupboards within these spaces.

Landscaping

9. With regards to condition no. 35 (hard/soft landscaping plan) it is imperative that the quality of this new public space is of the highest standard, and that there is a sensible balance between hard and soft landscaping materials so as to ensure the public space is sensitive, welcoming and blends into its surrounds, as well as having some ecological and visual value.

Waste

10. With regards to condition no’s 63 and 64, the Refuse & Recycling Storage Design Guide (2013) can be viewed on the planning policy pages of the council’s website

NRMM

11. In relation to condition 3, for information on the NRMM Low Emission Zone requirements and to register NRMM, please visit http://nrmm.london/

Archaeology

12. In relation to condition 79 the written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified archaeological practice in accordance with English Heritage Greater London Archaeology guidelines. They must be approved by the planning authority before any on-site development related activity occurs. It is envisaged that the first stage of archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

Geotechnical Monitoring

If geotechnical works are to be undertaken by the applicant these should be archaeologically monitored under watching brief conditions. Archaeological monitoring of geotechnical pits and boreholes can provide a cost-effective means of establishing the potential for archaeological remains to survive on previously developed land or where deep deposits are anticipated. It is usually used as part of a desk-based assessment or field evaluation.

And:

Evaluation

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

Further information on archaeology and planning in Greater London including Archaeological Priority Areas is available on the Historic England website.

Environment Agency

13. Please be aware that the Environment Agency authorised waste permits for this site were surrendered in August 2016. Whilst Local Authority planning approval for waste activity on this site may still be in place, there is currently no authorisation from the Environment Agency for such activity for this site. Accordingly, the operator is likely to need to apply to the Environment Agency...
for an environmental permit. Please be aware that due regard for environmental risk to air, land and water, and vicinity to sensitive receptors – such as groundwater aquifers and proximity to human population – would be considered in any such application.

14. TfL

TfL have advised that should any of the access improvements alter the public highway, the applicant will need to enter into a s278 agreement with TfL for any highway works on TfL’s highway associated with the development. They also advise that the double red lines which currently extend half way along the site access are incorrect. These will need to be reverted back to double yellow lines.

Thames Water

15. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.