

Item No. 6.1	Classification OPEN	Decision Level PLANNING COMMITTEE	Date November 4 2008
From HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL		Title of Report DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
Proposal (08-AP-1563) Demolition of existing health centre and the construction of 212 new dwellings including affordable housing, in 2 part one, part four storey residential buildings with undercroft car park (Blocks A/B and G); 1 part one, part two, part four storey residential building with undercroft car park (Block C); 2 part one, part four storey residential buildings (Block D and F); 2 part one, part two and part three storey terraced housing buildings (Block H); 1 part one, part four storey health centre (1,513sqm), community centre (101sqm) and residential building (Block E), together with associated car parking, a new children's play area, landscaping and infrastructure works.		Address LAND AT DOWNTOWN ROAD AND SALTER ROAD, LONDON, SE16 6NP Ward Surrey Docks	

PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application which is for planning committee consideration due to the strategic nature of the proposals and a number of objections that have been received.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Subject to the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement (at no cost to the council), planning permission be granted subject to conditions and subject to referral to the GLA.

BACKGROUND

- 3 Site location and description
- 4 The application site is located to the western side of Salter Road, north west of the junction with Downtown Road. It is a near rectangular site of approximately 1.95 hectares. Downtown Road borders the site along the southern and western sides, Redriff Primary School is to the north and Salter Road is to the east and contains a collection of single storey buildings. To the west of the site is the Russia Dock Woodland.
- 5 The site is currently occupied by a part 1, part 2 storey health centre in the south western corner of the site that has a floor area of 858sq.m. Access roads to the

health centre come off Downtown Road from the west and to a car park in the centre of the site from the south. The remainder of the site is largely covered by trees and shrubs. Immediately to the south is a housing estate of 2 and 3 storey houses. Immediately to the east is terrace of 3 storey housing.

6 Details of proposal

7 The residential component of the scheme will comprise 10x studios, 74x one bed flats, 105x two bed flats, 12x three bed flats, 6x four bed houses and 5x five bed houses. In terms of affordable housing provision, the scheme provides 38 social rented units and 13 shared ownership units, including 12 affordable wheelchair flats. There will be 10 wheelchair flats for private sale.

8 The proposed development will be in the form of 8 blocks, 1 in the north west corner of the site, 4 across the middle and 3 on the southern border with Downtown Road. They are as follows:

1) Block A/B: in the North West corner, adjoining Russia Dock Woodland and Redriff Primary School will be 4 storeys high with three floors of 32 market flats above a ground level gym and undercroft car park for 36 cars - 40 bicycle parking spaces will also be provided in this area. The main wall of this building will be setback 11.6m from the western boundary that adjoins the Woodland, while the balconies on this elevation will be setback 10.2m. An 11.6m wide landscaped ecological buffer zone between Block A/B and the Russia Dock Woodland will be provided.

2) Block C: will be on the west side of the site fronting Downtown Road. It will be 4 storeys high and provide 18 market flats above a ground level undercroft car park for 23 cars – 20 bicycle parking spaces will also be provided in this area.

3) Block D: will be within the site, east of Block C, and will be 4 storeys high and comprise 51 market dwellings around a small central courtyard, 56 bicycle parking spaces will be provided at ground floor level within the building.

4) Block E: will be sited in the south east corner of the site and will be 4 storeys high. It will comprise a ground floor health centre and community centre with 29 market and shared ownership flats above, 19 health centre staff car parking spaces and 56 bicycle parking spaces will be provided for this building at ground floor level in the adjacent Block G. There will be 9 visitor car parking spaces on the street to the north and 10 cycle parking hoops will be provided for visitors at the entrance of the health centre. This block will be oval in shape.

5) Block F: will be a 4 storey block to the north of the site, east of Block D. It will comprise 44 market dwellings around a small central courtyard, 48 bicycle parking spaces will be provided at ground floor level within the building.

6) Block G: will be a 4 storey building located along the eastern boundary of the site fronting Salter Road. It will provide 27 (affordable) rented flats above a ground level undercroft car park for 11 cars and 38 bicycle parking spaces, which will be allocated to residents. A further 19 car parking spaces and 36 bicycle storage spaces will be provided for health centre staff.

7) Block H: will comprise two buildings, one building comprising two, 3 storey semi-detached (affordable) rented houses and one building comprising nine, 3 storey terraced (affordable) rented houses. The houses are located in the south west corner of the site, fronting Downtown Road.

9 Road access into the site is from Downtown Road from the south and the north west

corner. Within the site the roads circulate around all sides of Blocks D and F and there are car parking bays adjoining many of the blocks. 4 car club bays and 9 standard bays adjoin Block A/B and the school. There are 10 bays between Blocks C and D, 12 bays between Blocks D and H, 8 bays adjoin Block D and the school, there are 8 bays between Blocks F and D. 8 bays are between Blocks D and E, 3 bays between Blocks H and E. 7 bays adjoin Block F and the school; there are 15 bays between Blocks F and E, and 6 car parking bays between Blocks F and G. There will therefore be a total of 89 car parking bays in undercroft car parks and 90 bays on the street throughout the site.

- 10 The development would provide stands to allow for the storage of 297 cycles. The majority of the cycle stands would be covered within the buildings and undercroft car parking areas.
- 11 A 'homezone' layout will be provided throughout the site, that contains hard surfaced tree lined and landscaped areas with a focus on providing a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment amongst streets and car parking. There will be large areas of open space throughout the site including: an 11.6m wide landscaped ecological buffer zone between Block A/B and the western boundary that adjoins the Russia Dock Woodland that will function as a large area of communal amenity space; a children's play area and orchard area adjoining the school; a hedge and boulder garden between Blocks C and H; 2 areas of playspace between Blocks G and E; courtyard gardens in Blocks D and F; a landscaped deck on the first floor of Block A/B; and two strips of sloping embankment adjoining Salter Road and the eastern end of Downtown Road.
- 12 The new health centre at 1,513sqm in area will contain GP and dental practices and will be 695sq.m bigger than the existing health centre, which is an increase of approximately 70%. The health centre has been designed according to the Primary Care Trust and Doctors specifications. The health centre will operate between 07:00 to 20:00 hours daily, including Saturday and Sunday.
- 13 The proposed community centre at 101 sqm in area will be located in the ground floor of Block E next to the Health Centre and will be available for local community use between the hours of 08:00 to 23:00 Monday to Friday and between 09:00 to 19:00 hours on Saturday, Sunday and public holidays. The size of the community centre was enlarged, after the application was submitted, to 101sq.m from 40sq.m. The proposed community centre and operating hours would be secured in a Section 106 Agreement.
- 14 The buildings have a similar modern design to the previous proposals and will be constructed from render, vertical and horizontal brickwork, metal and timber panels, clay pantiles, glass and steel.
- 15 Revised plans were received during the application process, which comprised: a reduction in the number of proposed dwellings from 213 to 212; an increase in the size of the health centre to 1,513 sq ms from 1,425.5 sq ms; an increase in the size of the community centre to 101 sq ms from 40 sq ms; alterations to the elevations of the buildings; the provision of a Community Heat and Power (CHP) system located in the basement of Block G; a 4 car parking space reduction; a bicycle parking increase of 21 spaces; and the provision of photovoltaic panels on the roof of Blocks A/B and G.
- 16 This application is in effect a further revision to 2 previously submitted schemes both of which were refused.
- 17 **Planning history**

18 First Application – 04-AP-1721

19 The first planning application was submitted in September 2004 for 281 dwellings, a new health centre, a community centre and a commercial crèche. This scheme was amended in April 2005 following post application consultation to provide a scheme of 268 units, adjusting building heights and densities together with a slightly varied mix of units.

20 The planning application was considered at Planning Committee on 5 July 2005, but a decision was deferred. On 8th July 2005 the applicant submitted an appeal against failure to determine the application within the prescribed period, before the Committee were able to consider the application again.

21 On August 16 2005 the planning committee indicated that, had the applicant not appealed, planning permission would have been refused for two reasons (in summary):

- The proposed development by virtue of the height, scale and massing of Block A/B adjacent to the Russia Dock Woodland would be out of keeping with the local context and have an over-bearing impact detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area, contrary to Policies E.2.3 and E.3.1 of the adopted UDP.
- The proposed development provided an unacceptable mix of dwellings to meet the identified need for larger housing units in the borough, specifically only 4% of units were 3 bedroom units or larger, well below the policy requirement of 10%, contrary to Policy 4.3 of the Draft Southwark Plan.

22 Prior to the public inquiry, held on 25th to 28th April 2006, the appellant made a number of amendments to the scheme which increased the number of 3 bedroom units to over 10% thereby overcoming reason for refusal 2. In addition, the number of dwellings was reduced from 268 to 251.

23 On May 26 2006 the planning inspector recommended that the appeal be dismissed. However, on 8 August 2006, the Secretary of State overruled the inspector's recommendation and decided that the benefits of the proposal were material considerations sufficient enough to outweigh the conflicts with the development plan and justified granting planning permission.

24 In September 2006 the council lodged a challenge to the Secretary of State's decision under Section 228 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The outcome of this challenge is still pending.

25 Second Application – 07-AP-1898

26 The second application for 226 dwellings, a new health centre, a community centre and a commercial crèche was refused at Planning Committee in November 2007 for the following reasons (in summary):

1. The proposed development would result in a poor standard of residential accommodation in particular because of the lack of sufficient amenity space on site, contrary to Policy 4.2 of the adopted UDP, the 'Residential Standards, Guidance and Controls' SPG, and paragraph 17 of PPS3: 'Housing'.
2. The proposed development would have a poor standard of design and layout, particularly the extent of hard surfacing and dominance of roads and parking spaces, contrary to Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the UDP and paragraph 16 of PPS3: 'Housing'.

3. The proposed development by virtue of the height, scale and proximity of Block A/B to the Russia Dock Woodland Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, would have an adverse impact on the local environment and interests of nature conservation, contrary to Policies 3.13 and 3.28 of the UDP.
- 27 The applicant has appealed against this refusal, however at the applicant's request the Planning Inspectorate have agreed to a period of abeyance until 29 December 2008, pending the decision of the application under consideration in this report.
 - 28 Key changes from previous applications
 - 29 The applicant has sought to address the Planning Committee's concerns and have now lodged a third application (08-AP-1563) for 212 units of no more than 4 storeys in height. However, as a result of the setting back of Block A/B by 10.2m to 11.6m from the western boundary and the provision of a children's play ground adjoining Redriff Primary School, it is no longer possible to provide a crèche facility as originally intended. The impact of this is that the revenue funding source for a stand alone community centre building is lost and this building is no longer financially sustainable to provide and therefore cannot be provided. However, it is considered that the applicant has successfully mitigated the loss of this building by integrating the community centre within the new health centre.
 - 30 The latest application has provided a revised 'homezone' street layout. The proposed roads have been re-designed to be more than just places for cars and traffic. They will be well landscaped spaces, where vehicles travel slowly and people on foot and on cycles can use the whole of the street width. Furthermore, the decrease in dwellings to 212 dwellings has further reduced the number of car parking spaces required within the development. There will therefore be a total of 89 car parking bays in undercroft car parks and 90 bays on the street throughout the site.
 - 31 The latest application provides a level of amenity space that is in excess of the minimum required standards and provides 11% of the dwellings as 3 bedroom units or larger also in excess of the minimum required standards.
 - 32 Appeal considerations and decision of first application 04-AP-1721
 - 33 There was only one main consideration for the appeal and that was the height, scale and mass of Block A/B and whether it was in keeping with the character of the area and would have an overbearing impact on visual amenity.
 - 34 The planning inspector commented on a number of aspects of the application. On density she noted that the development would be 364hrh, which is not significantly above the density range and need not be harmful providing the particular design has in every important respect succeeded in accommodating the proposed dwellings without harm to the local context and amenity of existing and future occupiers. She found no harm from the density as a whole.
 - 35 On parking she found no reason to consider 0.64 car spaces per unit unreasonable. However, she was concerned that the length of the five and six storey element of Block A/B would be so close to the Russia Dock Woodland and the limited ground floor surveillance next to the undercroft parking. Block A/B was considered not to relate to the local context, be unacceptably harmful to the character of the local area and be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality. However, apart from Block A/B, she considered the proposed development capable of being accommodated into the area without harm. The Planning Inspector recommended that the appeal be dismissed and permission be refused.

36 The Secretary of State agreed with many of the Inspectors considerations, but not the eventual recommendation. The Secretary of State concluded that, apart from the height, scale and massing of Block A/B, the design of the development as a whole would be compatible with the area in general and provide community and health facilities for the benefit of the whole community. She considered that the benefits of the proposal in terms of the delivery of housing, particularly affordable housing, the community benefits and the overall design were all material considerations that were sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan arising from the adverse effects of the height, scale and mass of Block A/B and that justify granting planning permission.

37 It is considered that the current application has satisfactorily addressed the planning inspectors concerns by increasing the set back of Block A/B to between 10.2m and 11.6m from the western boundary and by proposing a maximum height of 4 storeys. In fact Block A/B is now set back further away from the Russia Dock Woodland than Block C (4 storeys) is to the south, which is located 8.4m from the western boundary. Given the fact that the Inspector was satisfied that Block C could be accommodated into the site without any harm on the locality. It is considered that Block A/B is now satisfactorily accommodated within the site and would not have any significant negative impact on the Woodland.

38 The surveillance of the undercroft parking of Block A/B is addressed by the location of habitable room windows in the dwellings to the south in Blocks C and D facing Block A/B. Furthermore, the ecological buffer zone between Block A/B and the Russia Dock Woodland to the west will be secured for access by the development's residents only.

39 **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION**

40 **Main Issues**

41 The main issues in this case are:

- Principle of Development;
- Density, Tenure and Mix;
- Design and Layout;
- Amenity Space Provision;
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Impact of Proposed Development on Amenity of Adjoining Occupiers and Surrounding Area;
- Impact on the Occupiers of the Development;
- Biodiversity, Ecology and Trees;
- Traffic Issues;
- Flood Risk; and
- Planning Obligations.

42 **Planning Policy**

43 The Southwark Plan July 2007 (UDP) was adopted on 28th July 2007. The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) and the UDP, therefore now comprise the Development Plan for Southwark.

44 Southwark Plan 2007

The site has the following UDP designations:

- Urban Density Zone;
- Air Quality Management Area; and
- Proposals Site – 7P – Uses Required: Residential (estimated capacity for 251 dwellings), Health Centre and Community Centre.

Land adjacent to the west of the site has the following UDP designations:

- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation; and
- Metropolitan Open Land.

45 The relevant policies of the UDP include:

Policy 1.1 Access to Employment Opportunities
Policy 2.1 Enhancement of Community Facilities
Policy 2.2 Provision of New community Facilities
Policy 2.5 Planning Obligations
Policy 3.1 Environment Effects
Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity
Policy 3.3 Sustainable Development
Policy 3.4 Energy Efficiency
Policy 3.5 Renewable Energy
Policy 3.6 Air Quality
Policy 3.7 Waste Reduction
Policy 3.8 Waste Management
Policy 3.9 Water
Policy 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
Policy 3.12 Quality in Design
Policy 3.13 Urban Design
Policy 3.14 Designing Out Crime
Policy 2.25 Metropolitan Open Land
Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
Policy 3.31 Flood Defences
Policy 4.1 Density of Residential Development
Policy 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
Policy 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
Policy 4.4 Affordable Housing
Policy 4.5 Wheelchair Affordable Housing
Policy 5.1 Locating Developments
Policy 5.2 Transport Impacts
Policy 5.3 Walking and Cycling
Policy 5.6 Car Parking
Policy 5.7 Parking Standards for Disabled People and the Mobility Impaired
Policy 5.8 Other Parking

46 The relevant Strategic Policies of the UDP include:

SP1 - Sustainability, Equality and Diversity
SP2 - Participation
SP3 - Quality and Accessibility
SP5 - Regeneration and Creating Employment
SP6 - Accessible Services
SP8 - Anti-Poverty
SP9 - Meeting Community Needs
SP10 - Development Impacts
SP11 - Amenity and Environmental Impact
SP12 - Pollution
SP13 - Design and Heritage
SP14 - Sustainable Buildings
SP15 - Open Space and Biodiversity
SP17 - Housing
SP18 - Sustainable Transport
SP19 - Minimising the Need to Travel
SP20 - Development Site Uses Site Designation Number – 7P – Uses Required:

Residential (estimated capacity for 251 dwellings), Health Centre and Community Centre.

47 London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations Since 2004)

The relevant policies of the London Plan include:

Policy 2A.1 - Sustainability Criteria
Policy 3A.1 - Increasing London's supply of housing
Policy 3A.2 - Borough Housing Targets
Policy 3A.3 - Maximising the potential of sites
Policy 3A.4 - Efficient Use of Stock
Policy 3A.5 - Housing choice
Policy 3A.6 - Quality of New Housing Provision
Policy 3A.9 - Affordable Housing Targets
Policy 3A.10 - Negotiating Affordable Housing in Individual Private Residential and Mixed-Use Schemes
Policy 3A.11 - Affordable Housing Thresholds
Policy 3A.13 - Special Needs and Specialist Housing
Policy 3A.17 - Addressing the Needs of London's Diverse Population
Policy 3A.18 - Protection and enhancement of Social Infrastructure and Community Facilities
Policy 3A.20 - Health Objectives
Policy 3A.22 - Medical Excellence
Policy 3C.1 - Integrating Transport and Development
Policy 3C.2 - Matching Development to Transport Capacity
Policy 3C.3 - Sustainable Transport in London
Policy 3C.17 - Tackling Congestion and Reducing Traffic
Policy 3C.21 - Improving Conditions for Walking
Policy 3C.22 - Improving Conditions for Cycling
Policy 3C.23 - Parking Strategy
Policy 3D.14 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation
Policy 3D.15 - Trees and Woodland
Policy 4A.1 - Tackling Climate Change
Policy 4A.2 - Mitigating Climate Change
Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 4A.4 - Energy Assessment
Policy 4A.7 - Renewable Energy
Policy 4A.9 - Adaptation to Climate Change
Policy 4A.11 - Living Roofs and Walls
Policy 4A.13 - Flood Risk Management
Policy 4A.14 - Sustainable Drainage
Policy 4A.16 - Water Supplies and Resources
Policy 4A.19 - Improving Air Quality
Policy 4A.20 - Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes
Policy 4B.1 - Design Principles for a Compact City
Policy 4B.2 - Promoting World-Class Architecture and Design
Policy 4B.3 - Maximising the Potential of Sites
Policy 4B.4 - Enhancing the Quality of the Public Realm
Policy 4B.5 - Creating an Inclusive Environment
Policy 4B.6 - Safety, Security and Fire Prevention and Protection
Policy 4B.8 - Respect Local Context and Communities
Policy 6A.5 - Planning Obligations

48 Planning Policy Guidance [PPG] and Planning Policy Statements [PPS]

The relevant PPG's and PPS's include:

PPS 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 3 - Housing
PPS 9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG 13 - Transport
PPG 15 - Planning and the Historic Environment
PPS 22 - Renewable Energy
PPS 23 - Planning and Pollution Control
PPG 24 - Planning and Noise
PPS 25 - Development and Flood Risk

Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG May 2006
Circular 6/98 Affordable Housing 1998
Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations 2005

The site falls within Flood Zone 3.

49 **Consultations**

50 Site Notice
3rd July 2008

51 Press Notice
3rd July 2008

52 Site Visit
The case officer visited the site by himself on the following dates: July 3 2008 and August 5 2008.

53 Internal Consultees
Design and Conservation Team; Access Officer; Transportation Group; Waste Management; Housing; Planning Policy; Pollution and Noise Control; Parks and Sports; Arboriculturalist; Ecology Officer; Archaeology Officer; Highways Infrastructure; Early Years and After School and Play Services; Street Scene and Public Protection; Director of Health and Community Services

54 Statutory and non-statutory consultees
Environment Agency; Transport for London; Thames Water; Metropolitan Police; Southwark Cyclists; London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority; Natural England; London Underground; GLA; Natural England.

55 Neighbour consultees
Approximately 1,124 local consultation notification letters were sent out which included properties at and within the following addresses:

1-31 Bryan House, Rotherhithe St; 5 Bryan Road; 1-66 Byfield Close;
Flats 1-5 of 14,16 and 49, plus 1-50 Capstan Way; 4 Chandlers Court;
1-14 Church Court; Holy Trinity Church and vicarage, Bryan Rd;
1-6 Defoe Close; 2 St Elmos Road; 1-21 Filigree Court; 1-30 Fir Trees Close;
1-24 Farrow Place; 1-15 Hamilton Close; 1a-f, 2-17a-17f Holyoake Close;
1-36 Howland Way; 1-17 Lovell Place; 1-25 Mahogany Close; Redwood Close;
1-19 Pattina Walk; 1-39 Russia Dock Road;
Redriff Junior and Infant School, Salter Rd; Redriff Community Centre, Downtown Road; Docklands Settlement; Surrey Docks Sports Centre, Salter Road; Tenants Hall, Downtown Rd.; Russia Dock Woodland; Stave Hill Nature Park; Surrey Docks Tavern; St. Johns Primary School; 122-130 Redriff Road;
311-351 (odds), 562, 564, 580-616(evens) Rotherhithe Street; 1-67 Reveley Square;
1-23 Sandpiper Close; 1-63 Shipwright Road; 1-88 Spence Close; 1-56 Somerford Way; 12a, 40-711 Stanton House, 620 Rotherhithe Street; 1-23 Steers Way;

1-27 Ropemaker Road; 1-30 Teak Close; 1-9 Tillet Square; 1-29 Timbrell Place; Bacons College, Timber Pond Rd; Time and Talents, St Marychurch Street; Alfred Salter Primary School, Quebec Way; 2,2a,4,24,28,Units A-C; Boots, Quebec Way; 1-24 Vaughan Street; 1-23 Victory Way;

56 Neighbour re-consultation

Upon receipt of the revised plans a re-consultation of the above neighbours was carried out on 4 September 2008.

57 Pre-application consultations:

Prior to the lodgement of all 3 planning applications, extensive pre-application consultations were conducted by the applicant with the local community, key stakeholders and Southwark Council. The consultations included the following:

- Numerous public exhibitions and letter drops for the local community and stakeholders.
- Meetings with the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor.
- Several pre-application meetings were also undertaken with Southwark Council.

58 **Consultation replies**

59 Internal Consultees

60 Access Officer – Scheme has been designed to meet Part M (Access to buildings) of the Build Regulations and Lifetimes Homes. Concerned about the streets proposed as these could be difficult for blind and partially sighted people. Need a condition requiring a drawing showing footway treatment to check that a safeguarded pedestrian route is provided.

61 Design and Conservation – No objection. There is no objection to the relationship that Block A/B has with the Russia Dock Woodland. The landscaping is much improved compared to the earlier applications and now has more detail that show a safer and clearer environment for pedestrians. Internally the flats are well laid out, if rather small and most are dual aspect. However, there are a significant number of single aspect flats, some of which face north or east north east and these could be quite dark. The development provides active ground floor elevations, with the use of green walls and vertical timber cladding to undercroft car parking. However, it is still unfortunate that so much space is given over to school drop off parking, though there is now more open space for play areas and greener landscaping in this area.

62 Amended plans were received to address the issues highlighted, in response the Design and Conservation Team outlined that the previous design concerns had been adequately addressed.

63 Prior to the lodgement of the second application 07-AP-1898, the proposal was presented to the Southwark Design Review Panel.

64 Planning Policy – No objection. The proposed health centre, community centre and residential use have been provided in accordance with the requirements of Proposals Site 7P. The community centre and health centre are being provided that would meet the requirements of UDP policies 2.1 'Enhancement of Community Facilities' and 2.2 'Provision of New community Facilities'. The scheme fits policies to meet housing targets and maximises the use of residential sites. The density at 337 hrh is within the range of 200 to 450 hrh applicable to a PTAL level of 2 in policy 4.1.

65 Housing – No objection. The proposed 80:20 affordable housing split between social rented and shared ownership is satisfactory.

- 66 Pollution and Noise Control – No objection, subject to conditions
- 67 Waste Management – No objection, subject to conditions.
- 68 Ecology Officer – No objection. There is an opportunity to develop linkage between the Russia Dock Woodland and the development through SUD's schemes that link to the ponds. Welcome the planting of native hedges and trees, but note that hedgerows require medium to high maintenance. The buffer between the Russia Dock Woodland and the development is on the thin side, there is some concern about light pollution.
- 69 Transport Group – No objection. The proposed parking is in line with UIDP policy 5.6 for a development in a low PTAL. However, given that 3 car clubs bays are being proposed then we would welcome a reduction in the overall number of residential parking bays proposed as the car club provision should mitigate against under provision of parking, which is not the case here. It will also mitigate against parking overspill and in turn facilitate a lower car ownership. A number of parking bays are sub standard in size and/or are unworkable and will need to be amended.
- 70 The cycle storage as proposed for block E should be incorporated within the main building, instead of block G in order to be 'convenient, secure and weatherproof' as set out in the UDP policy 5.3. All other cycle storage for both staff and visitors is consistent with the policy 5.3 and is acceptable; it is also line with TfL's Guidance for workplace travel planning for development.
- 71 The applicant has utilised the Multi Model Study (MMS) and the out puts do not show any problems at any of the junctions tested with the exception of Bestwood Street and Lower Road junction. However, it is considered that this junction is far removed from the site and is at near capacity already; furthermore any development generating vehicle trips will have an effect on this junction.
- 72 A S106 contribution of £20,000 to part fund an extension of a 20mph camera enforcement scheme in the area of Salter Road/Down should be provided to help increase pedestrian safety in the location of the school due to the increase of traffic as a result of the development. This contribution should be taken out of the Strategic Transport Contribution.
- 73 Statutory and non-statutory consultees
- 74 Natural England - No objection. Pleased to see that the proximity of the Russia Dock Woodland Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) has been taken in to consideration in the application and the potential impacts of noise, dust and general disturbance.
- 75 The 10 metre wide, 50 metre long buffer zone comprising native shrub and tree planting along the Western edge of the site adjacent to/bordering the Russia Dock Woodland is welcomed and supported.
- 76 Environment Agency – No objection subject to a condition relating to surface water management measures.
- 77 Greater London Authority – The redevelopment of this site is supported in strategic planning terms.
- 78
- Principle of development: the proposed development will contribute to the objectives of London Plan policies 3A.1 and 3A.21 and is therefore acceptable in principle.

- Housing: the proposed density of development complies with London Plan policy 3A.3. The applicant has not yet demonstrated that the application provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing at 50% of the housing proposed and further information is required to demonstrate compliance with London Plan policy 3A.10.
- Urban design: the scheme is of a high architectural quality and subject to detailed suggestions broadly complies with London Plan policies 4B.1-4B.4. There are, however, concerns with some of the access arrangements which do not currently comply with London Plan policy 4B.5. Blocks A/B, C, G and F require more active frontages and improved wheelchair access.
- Children's play space: the applicant needs to calculate the anticipated child occupancy within the development in order to demonstrate that the proposed amount and form of play space provision complies with London Plan policy 3D.13.
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation: revisions to the energy strategy are required before the scheme can be considered compliant with London Plan policies 4A.1-4A.11. The application fails to prioritise decentralised energy and apply the energy hierarchy set out in policy 4A.1. The potential for a communal heat network needs further investigation, the potential for CHP needs to be reconsidered, and the proposed renewable energy technologies need to be revisited.
- Biodiversity: an ecological assessment has been undertaken. The application complies with London Plan policy 3D.14.
- Transport: further work is needed on the transport aspects of the proposal in order to demonstrate compliance with London Plan policies 3C.21, 3C.22 and 3C.23.

79 These comments from the GLA were made prior to the amendments to the application being submitted. The amendments were submitted to resolve the issues that the GLA had raised. The GLA will be providing a written update on the amendments prior to committee, which will be included in the Addendum on the night.

80 Transport for London – No objection. £25,000 of the strategic transport contribution in the S106 should go towards a raised pedestrian crossing over Salter Road.

81 Thames Water – No objection subject to a condition relating to the provision of a drainage strategy and an impact study on existing water supply infrastructure prior to works commencing on site.

82 Southwark Cyclists – Please ensure that bike parking spaces are provided within the site for 130% of residents and 30% of employees. A further 10 spaces should be provided within 50 metres of the site.

83 London Underground – No objection, subject to conditions relating to details of foundation arrangements being provided prior to works commencing on site.

84 Southwark Health & Social Care – No objection. The PCT has been working in partnership with the occupiers of the existing health centre and the applicant to develop a new health centre that meets the modern day requirements for primary care. Southwark PCT fully supports the plans for the relocation of the centre to its new site which will enable a significant improvement in the quality of the patient environment. The PCT will work with the applicant to ensure the reprovided health centre building is designed and built in accordance with the latest NHS building standards for new health care buildings. However, as part of the planning condition, it should be a requirement on the developer that the facility is designed to the NHS standards and guidance as laid out in the latest health building notes, technical memorandums and associated guidance documents.

85 London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – No objection.

86 Metropolitan Police – No objection.

87 Valerie Shawcross, London Assembly Member for Lambeth & Southwark: Objects. Whilst welcoming the attempts to reduce the impact of the scheme, there is concern about the loss of the community hall, breakfast club and crèche. Concerned about a lack of active frontages within the development, that will encourage crime and vandalism, it is strongly urged that the metropolitan police are consulted. Homezone is undermined by school drop of and pick up traffic, which is directed through housing blocks along with health centre traffic. Excessive density and intensification of use, loss of visual amenity, negative impact on the existing openness of the site, out of keeping with the location and prevailing development in the area. The ecological buffer zone has not addressed the problems with the proposed development. Does not comply with UDP policies 3.1, 3.2 and 3.14.

88 Jenny Jones, London Assembly Member: Objects. The ecological buffer zone extension from the previous application is not enough given the enhancement of that particular area of Russia Dock Woodland (e.g. Downtown pond is now the home of a varied wildlife, some rare in inner London, such as Kingfishers) since the original proposals for development in 2003. The use of ‘homezones’ within the development to address poor urban design is proof that the infrastructure layout of the downtown site is fundamentally flawed. Homezones, i.e chicanes and traffic humps, are recommended mainly where there is existing housing that leads straight onto the roadside. There should be no need to use this traffic calming measure on a new well thought out development. The proposed amenity play space has been achieved at the expense of our community facilities, the community hall, breakfast club and crèche.

89 **Neighbour consultees**

90 Objectors:

91 142 identical letters of objection were received from 50 Winn Road, 34 Wolverton, 17 Sunray Ave, 12 Somerford Way, Salter Road, 17 Redwood Close, 48 Greenland Quay, 10 Thurland House, Camilla Rd, 12 Fisherman Dr, 8 Barnard House, 43 Brooklands Avenue, 89 Goodwin Cl, Yalding Rd, 9 Hamilton Close, 22 Steers Way, 1 Somerford Way, 14a Hamilton Close, 24 Howland Way, 17 Reveley Sq, 14 Hamilton Cl, 31 Somerford Way, 2 Victory Way, 5 Windrose Cl, 3 Stubbs Dr, Bermondsey, 2 Clifton Place, Brunel Rd, 33 Kaleigh Court, Clarence Mews, 13 Glencoe Mansions, Mowl St, Kingston, 145 Squirrels Heath Lane, 47 Oakwood Park Rd, 61 Kings Cross Rd, Flat 6, 65 Kensington Garden Sq, Bayswater, 4 Shipwright Rd, 19 Bucklers Rent, 6 Shipwright Rd, 12 Howland Way, 57 Howland Way, 61 Howland Way, 52 Howland Way, 4 Bryan House, 3 Brayn House, 31 Bucklers Rents, Salter Road, 31 Market Place, Rover Rd Est, 5 Bryan House, 26 Bryan House, Rotherhithe St, 21 Bryan House, Rotherhithe St, 5 Howland way, 71 Aveciy Way, 7 Neckinger Est, Enid St, Bastille Court, Herne Hill, 45 Tupman House, 41 Somerford Way, Salter Rd, 46 Somerford Way, Salter Rd, 30 Howland Way, Salter Rd, 2 Penrose House, Penrose St, 39 Thetford House, Abbey St, Herne Hill, 96b Burnt Ash Hill, 3 Hamilton Close, 8 Granville Court, Nynehead St, 18 Barnard House, 65 Towers View, 173 Wolverton, Aylesbury Est, 49 Shipwright Rd, 54 Dock Hill Ave, 39 Howland Way, 7 Vincent Close, 29 Somerford Way, 11 Fleet Ave, Upminster, 154 Oxwich Close, Essex, 16 Victory Way, 26 Reveley Sq, 27 Reveley Sq, 22 Victory Way, 11 Shipwright Rd, 55 Shipwright Rd, 23 Shipwright Rd, 24 Shipwright Rd, 28 Shipwright Rd, 29 Shipwritght Rd, 53 Shipwright Rd, 2 Kimmeridge Rd, 48 Dock Hill Ave, 23 Somerford Way, 34 Howland Way, 4 Vincent Close, 3 Victoria Way, Downtown Rd, 4 Victoria Way, Downtown Rd,

25 Reveley Sq, Downtown Rd, 16 Steers Way, 3 Park Lane, 26 Reveley, 24 Acorn Est, 11 Poolmans St, Fishermans Dr, 30 Rotherhithe Old Road, 73 Malyons Rd, 15 Ryecroft Rd, 1 St Georges Mansion, St Georges Rd, 59 Yorkland Ave, Welling, 125 Lower Rd, 30 Shipwright Rd, 6 Somerford Way, 152 Ellband Rd, SE9, 29 Owen House, Abby SE1, 104 Cadbury Way, Yalding Rd, 11 Vincent Close, 24 Somerford Way, 10 Steers Way, 24 Farrow Place, 6 Ropemaker Rd, 4 Lovell Place, Salter Rd, 6 Lovell Place, Redriff Rd, 5 Seth St, 6 Barnards House, 25 Barnards House, 60 Shipwright Rd, 59 Shipwright Rd, 7 Shipwright Rd, 18 Shipwright Rd, 17 Shipwright Rd, 44 Shipwright Rd, 2 Somerford Way, 5 Vaughan St, 18 Hull Close, 4 Somerford Way, 99

- 92 The letters raise objection on the same grounds as paragraph 88.
- 93 The Downtown Defence Campaign: Objects. The letter raises objection on the same grounds as paragraph 88. The grounds for Ruth Kelly's decision to override the recommendations of her own inspector were that the community benefits provided (i.e. community hall, breakfast club and crèche) far outweighed the Inspector's recommendations for the refusal of planning permission. We were told at a site meeting with the applicant the S106 money would be circa £1 million, up from a previous £450k. This is considerably less than the previous S106 which included £1,444,00 to be provided for a community centre and £525,000 for a crèche facility. We as a community have lost £1,969,000 to be replaced with a so-called enhancement of £550,000. The limited number of parking spaces (15) adjacent to the school together with the road humps, chicanes, i.e. homezone, will cause tailbacks through the development. Studies have shown that people have had concerns that encouraging children to play in roads, even specially adapted roads such as homezones, has introduced a danger which was not previously there. It has also been reported that the residents of homezones in other countries are actively campaigning to have the road alterations removed as they can no longer park near their houses.
- 94 Canada Water Consultative Forum: Objects. The proposal does not provide enough family units and is not in accord with the UDP. The community space has been reduced from 945sq.m to 40sq.m, which unacceptable. The crèche has gone and there is a well known need of the provision of this use in the area. Concern that the play area won't be open to all residents. The ecological buffer zone between the Russia Dock Woodland is not large enough. The loss of trees proposed will have a negative impact on air pollution. Planning permission should not be granted for a proposal that results in the loss or damage to a site of nature conservation importance. Undercroft parking is unattractive, results in light and air pollution on adjoining residents. The health centre is not big enough.
- 95 8 Reveley Sq: Objects. Additional pressure on already strained public services, will result in overcrowding of local public transport, health centre too small, negative impact on the environmental health of residents and the area, negative impact on the ageing water and sewage infrastructure in the area, more garbage on the streets, more cars, more pollution, potentially more traffic accidents, increase in car parking pressure, negative impact on Russia Dock Woodland, green areas and biodiversity.
- 96 22 Reveley Sq: Objects. Lack of family housing, too many flats.
- 97 25 Calder Court: Objects. Cause overcrowding of local buses and tube, result in litter and anti-social behaviour in Woodlands, too much affordable housing in the area. Too close to local wildlife. Area is already over-populated.
- 98 Anonymous: Objects. Results in overdevelopment, ruins landscape, bring down the area, more crime.

- 99 Flat 5, 49 Capstan Way: Objects. Negative impact on local landscape, too many new people, anti-social behaviour will result. Health centre is well placed.
- 100 53 Somerford Way: - Objects. The 8.5m buffer zone extension is not enough, the homezone layout is fundamentally flawed, proposed children's play has been achieved at the expense of the community facilities: the community hall, breakfast club and creche.
- 101 12 Russia Dock Rd: Objects. Will result in overcrowding of local public transport, increase in traffic and air pollution, increase in noise, increase in crime, shops should be built on this site instead.
- 102 6 Reveley Sq: Objects. Results in a strain on the new health centre to be provided as it will have more local residents who will need it, out of character with prevailing development, overcrowding of buses, loss of trees, lack of car parking proposed, negative impact on local wildlife and the Woodland, want houses not flats.
- 103 9 Reveley Rd: Objects. Too high, not in keeping with surrounding development, result in overcrowding of local transport system, houses not flats should be built.
- 104 47 Howland Way: Objects. Density too high, 4 storeys is out of keeping with prevailing development, social housing will lead to vandalism, loss of trees, density too high, buildings too high.
- 105 6 Reveley Sq: Objects. Results in a strain on the new health centre to be provided as it will have more local residents who will need it, out of character with prevailing development, overcrowding of buses, loss of trees, lack of car parking proposed, negative impact on local wildlife and the Woodland, increase in traffic, want houses not flats.
- 106 1 Capstan Way: Objects. Results in a loss of green space.
- 107 13 Reveley Sq: Objects. Results in a displacement of wildlife, loss of a tranquil peaceful environment, negative impact on sunlight and daylight, out of character with prevailing development, overcrowding of buses, too tall.
- 108 16 Barnards Hse: Objects. Loss of green open space.
- 109 21 Stanton House, 620 Rotherhithe St: Objects. Loss of green open space, the existing health centre would be out of action, increase in traffic and residents in the area, construction would bring noise and pollution, community amenity space is too small.
- 110 49 Ash Court, Acorn Walk: Objects. Spoils the outlook of the area, out of character with prevailing development, overcrowding of buses, increase in traffic, schools are oversubscribed currently, poor design, loss of green open space, negative impact on the Russia Dock Woodland.
- 111 3 Timbrell Place: Objects. Overcrowding of buses and local transport, result in overcrowding, loss of green open space.
- 112 1 Shipwright Rd: Objects. A larger health centre is needed, children's play area is a good idea and areas for teenagers to play sport would be useful.
- 113 21 Steers Way: Objects. Out of character with prevailing development, transport issues with school could be dangerous, lack of car parking proposed would result in increased parking pressure in the vicinity.

- 114 Anonymous: Objects. Not enough schools in the area, increase in traffic and noise, out of character with prevailing development, too tall.
- 115 8c Holyoake Crt, Bryan Road: Objects to the height and scale, out of character with prevailing development, negative impact on the Woodland, increase in traffic and parking problems adjacent school.
- 116 22 Mahogany Close: Objects to the loss of a health centre.
- 117 Anonymous: Objects. Concerned about the old health centre closing before the new health centre is built, overcrowding of buses, too many blocks of flats, increase in traffic will cause pollution.
- 118 Anonymous: Objects. Concern about pressure that will result on local infrastructure, would like affordable housing to go to key workers.
- 119 Anonymous: Objects. Objects. Inappropriate new dwellings in number and type.
- 120 12 Somerford Way: Objects. Loss of green open space, result in more vandalism, increase in traffic, overdevelopment.
- 121 Anonymous: Objects. Increase in traffic and crime, too close to Woodland, less doctors.
- 122 25 Admiral Place: Objects. The 8.5m buffer zone extension is not enough, the homezone layout is fundamentally flawed, proposed children's play has been achieved at the expense of the community facilities: the community hall, breakfast club and creche.
- 123 3 Reveley Square: Objects. Results in overdevelopment, out of character with prevailing development, too many new residents for the area to cope with.
- 124 19 Fir Tree Close: Objects. Loss of green open space, overdevelopment.
- 125 46 Shipwright Rd: Objects. Excessive density, overdevelopment, increase in traffic, noise and pollution, overcrowding of public transport, schools in the area are oversubscribed, loss of green open space, negative impact on woodland.
- 126 32 Somerford Way: Objects. Out of keeping with prevailing development, too close to the Woodland, negative impact on the well being of the neighbourhood.
- 127 15 Russia Dock Rd: Objects. Too tall, overdevelopment, overlooking, too close to Woodland and primary school. Concern that the health centre will be over several storeys.
- 128 29 Howland Way: Objects. Too tall and close to the Woodland resulting in a negative impact, increase in transport congestion the high density and tall buildings is out of character with prevailing development and the Russia Dock Woodland.
- 129 49 Shipwright Rd: Objects. The area is already overdeveloped, result in overcrowding on buses, increase in traffic congestion, negative impact on local ecology.
- 130 8 Farrow Place: Objects. Too high and out of character with prevailing development, loss of trees, negative impact on environment, overcrowding of buses, increase in traffic congestion.

- 131 1 Ropemaker Road: Objects. Overcrowding of buses, traffic problems, increase in noise and pollution.
- 132 4 Reveley Square: Objects. Concerned about noise during construction.
- 133 19 Filigree Court, Rotherhithe Street: Objects. Too tall, out of character with prevailing development, negative impact on the amenity of the area, increase in traffic, noise and air pollution, overcrowding of buses, concern about the loss of a health centre during construction.
- 134 9 Steers Way: Objects. Too tall, loss of green open space, increase in traffic congestion, parking problems, underground car parks encourage crime, negative impact on local infrastructure.
- 135 21 Bryan House, Rotherhithe Street: Objects. Overdevelopment, not enough community space, lack of youth and play centre facilities, too tall, the NHS should be building the health centre, out of character with prevailing development.
- 136 Howland Way: Objects. Too tall, out of character with prevailing development, undercroft parking is unnecessary, increase in traffic congestion, overcrowding of buses, concern about the loss of a health centre during construction.
- 137 48 Somerford Way: Objects. It is undemocratic that the public have not been consulted on the sale and development of publicly owned land, increase in traffic congestion, negative impact on the local environment, loss of trees, out of character with prevailing development, proposed buffer zone between Woodland is too small, negative impact on Woodland, insufficient car parking, not enough new GPs will be provided, failure to provide school places, undercroft car parking will have safety problems, lack of community benefits for the neighbourhood.
- 138 Friends of the Earth Southwark: Objects. Too close to the Russia Dock Woodlands, no children's play and recreation areas have been provided, does not comply with UDP strategic policies SP3, SP6, SP9, SP10, SP11, SP12, SP13, SP14, SP15 and SP17 and planning policy 3.13. The development is out of character with the height and scale of prevailing development in the area and the high density will create pressure on local facilities.
- 139 12 Vaughan Street: Objects. Flats are out of character with prevailing development, results in a loss of green space.
- 140 17 Sunray Ave: Objects.
- 141 11 Howland Way: Objects. Increased population density will have a negative impact on the ecological balance of the area. Increased cars and pollution will be dangerous for the children at the adjoining school. High rise nature of the proposal is out of character with prevailing development in the area.
- 142 4 Fardow Place: Objects. Too tall and concentrated, not in keeping with prevailing development, will result in the loss of many trees, is next to the woodlands so may affect wildlife, area is already over populated, parking is an issue.
- 143 16 Steers Way: Objects. The size of the development is too large for local infrastructure to cope, overdevelopment, insufficient parking.
- 144 57 Shipwright Road: Objects. Too many dwellings and buildings are too high, not enough public transport to cope, result in congestion.

- 145 22 Farrow Place: Objects. Will disrupt the natural habitat and environment of the existing site, more housing in this area is not needed.
- 146 7 Holyoake Court: Objects. The amendments are minor and insignificant and don't correct any of the flaws that the development has. The development does not respond to the Council's previous objections. Increase traffic problems, pollution and noise. Too tall, out of character with prevailing development, cause overshadowing.
- 147 Supporters:
- 148 Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum – We represent 14,034 tenants and residents in the Rotherhithe area and are in favour of this development. The Planning Committee should take into account that there is a great need for development in the area as we have a major problem with a shortage of rented and intermediate affordable housing. As Southwark Council can not build new properties the only way to provide affordable housing is to get the developers to build it so we get a percentage of the development registered as social housing. We the forum delegates have seen a breakdown in communities through families having to move out of the area the reason being the lack of rented, affordable accommodation; we fight hard to sustain our communities and need local development to provide what the Council can't. The large percentage of family accommodation proposed can only be an asset as we are so short of family accommodation in this area. The proposed children's playground will be an asset to the area as there is not enough child play area in this part of Rotherhithe. The new health centre, which is something that has been needed for years, as we have a shortage of medical provision in the area with doctors complaining about the number of people on there lists and also tenants/residents say that they have to travel too far for treatment. The S106 money that is proposed is a great asset, which allows further investment in the area, which can only be a good thing for local tenant/residents. The Forum delegates unanimously agreed that they would like to see this development go ahead.
- 149 3 Transom Close: The area will benefit from a new children's play facility and other areas of open space, a new health centre. Housing will provide surveillance of the Russia Dock Woodland making it feel safer and would make the journey to the primary school for parents and students more pleasant. There is a need for new homes of all types, increasing the supply is good.
- 150 21 Vaughan St: The development is essential for workers, they need somewhere to live, the health centre certainly needs demolishing and rebuilding. Not so sure about the underground parking.
- 151 9 Mahogany Close: The layout and design of the buildings, plus the finishing are good.
- 152 7 Mahogany Close: Letter of support.
- 153 7 Nijara Court: We need this development; we need more affordable housing in this area, plus the benefits that the S106 money brings in to the area. The development will help to build a better community with better community spirit.
- 154 14 Byfield Close: Letter of support.
- 155 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**
- 156 **Principle of development**
- 157 The application site is identified as Proposals Site 7P in the UDP and is designated for

residential use, a health centre and a community centre. The council's planning policy department have confirmed that the proposed health centre, community centre and residential use have been provided in accordance with the requirements of Proposals Site 7P. Planning policy have also confirmed that the community centre and health centre meet the requirements of UDP policies 2.1 'Enhancement of Community Facilities' and 2.2 'Provision of New community Facilities'. Although the previous applications proposed a breakfast club and creche, it should be noted that there is no policy requirement for the provision of these facilities within this site.

158 On August 8 2006 planning permission was granted, on appeal, for a very similar development. Although this decision has been successfully challenged, it indicates that the principle of this development on this site is likely to be acceptable. It is considered that the amended application has satisfactorily addressed the concerns that the council and the planning inspector previously had and is a significant improvement on the development, granted approval by the Secretary of State and still subject to challenge and the last application that was refused by the committee.

159 Overall, the principle of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Southwark Plan and London Plan policies.

160 **Density, tenure and mix**

161 PPS1 and PPS3 emphasise the benefits of creating mixed communities. PPS3 indicates that in order to achieve this, Local Planning Authorities should provide 'wider housing opportunity and choice and a better mix in the size, type and location of housing'. The site is located within an Urban Density Zone that has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2, which in accordance with UDP policy 4.1, attracts a density scale of 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare. The proposal consists of 10x studios, 74x one bed, 105x two bed, 12x three bed, 6x four bed and 5x five bed units. The density calculation requires that a percentage of the non-residential floorspace be included in the calculation which in this instance is 59 (1614sq.m/27.5 = 59). The overall habitable room figure is 657, which with an area of 1.95ha results in a density calculation of 337 habitable rooms per hectare, which is well within the range identified in policy 4.1.

162 In respect to the provision of residential units, the dwelling sizes range in size from 32.5-32.9sq.m for studios, 45-69.3sq.m for one bedroom flats, 60-79.5sq.m for 2 bed flats, 83-92.5sq.m for three bedroom flats, 139.2sq.m for the four bedroom houses and 141.5sq.m for the five bedroom houses, the majority of the units incorporate in-built storage space. The unit sizes proposed meet or exceed the minimum units sizes required and are therefore in compliance with policy requirements. The unit mix exceeds the requirements of policy 4.3 of the UDP, providing 11% 3 or more bed units, 60% 2 or more bed units, 4.7% studio units and 10% wheelchair accessible units.

163 London Plan policy 3A.7 (Affordable Housing Targets) states that boroughs should take account of the London wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision, and the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. UDP policy 4.4 requires an affordable housing provision of 35% with a 70:30 split between social rented and intermediate housing within the Urban Density Zone. The proposal provides a total of 38 social rented units (6x 1 bed, 15x 2 bed, 6x 3 bed, 6x 4 bed and 5x 5 bed) and 13 shared ownership units (3x 1 bed, 7x 2 bed and 3x 3 bed), resulting in 33% of the total habitable rooms being affordable with a 80:20 split between social rented and intermediate housing. Pursuant to policy 4.5 of the UDP, for every wheelchair affordable housing unit provided, one less affordable habitable room will be required than otherwise stated in policy 4.4. Therefore, taking into account the affordable wheelchair housing proposed, the affordable housing provision will meet

the required level of 35%. In terms of the 80:20 split of social rented and intermediate housing, the Housing Department outlined that this level would be satisfactory. The split will offer a higher percentage of rented accommodation in an area dominated by dwellings in private ownership. The scheme has provided a level of affordable housing that is considered acceptable.

164 9x 1 bedroom and 12x 2 bedroom wheelchair units have been provided which amounts to a 10% provision, which meets the 10% required by policy 4.3 of the UDP. 12 of the wheelchair units are affordable, meeting the chronic need for affordable dwellings suitable for wheelchairs as outlined within policy 4.5. Accordingly, the proposed density, mix and tenure are considered acceptable.

165 **Design and layout**

166 Policy 3.12 of the UDP seeks to ensure that a high standard of architecture and design are achieved in order to create high amenity environments. Policy 3.13 requires that the principles of good urban design are considered, in terms of context, height, scale, massing, layout, streetscape, landscaping and inclusive design. Policy 4.2 requires that residential development achieve good quality living conditions within the development.

167 This development has a well thought out approach to its detail treatment and architectural language, which would give the site a distinctive identity that is a sensible response to the local environment. The detailing of all the buildings within the complex gives it a novel relationship with the surrounding developments, being an intelligent parody of the suburban style that dominates so much of this part of Surrey Docks.

168 Each block on the development conforms to this consistent character while each is quite distinct from its neighbours, giving both continuity and distinction for each space within the site. This will provide interest as well as legibility within the development. The development will have a successful and diverse frontage onto Salter and Downtown Roads containing a variety of strong landmarks as seen from outside the site. The round health and community centre building in particular, with its strong vertical elements, will create an important corner view.

169 The design of the buildings successfully creates an intense development while managing to retain a semi-suburban character. The architecture remains contemporary, while using some traditional materials that are appropriate to the design concept. The effect on the development of the detailing, materials and the proposed 'homezones' will be to create a calm domestic environment that is peaceful and well landscaped.

170 The second application was refused on the grounds that the extent of hard surfacing and dominance of roads and parking spaces, would result in a poor standard of design and layout. The current application has successfully rectified this by providing an improved 'homezone' street layout, with reduced hard surfacing, narrower streets and a significant increase in landscaping. The proposed roads have been re-designed to be more than just places for cars and traffic. They will be a pedestrian friendly environment with well landscaped spaces, where vehicles travel slowly and where people on foot and on bicycles can use the whole of the street width without a feeling of intimidation from automobiles.

171 A 'homezone' is a residential street, or group of residential streets, designed for community use, that is, for pedestrians and cyclists rather than motorists. The aim is to balance the needs of road users and those living on the street, especially children and older people, to make the area safer, healthier and more enjoyable to live in. The

proven benefits of homezones include:

- Reduction in accidents, car fumes, congestion and noise;
- Improved physical health and independence of residents, particularly children who can play outdoors in a safer environment;
- A friendlier place to live with increased neighbourliness;
- Lessened social barriers, increased community awareness and participation;
- Improved quality of life;
- Greater use of the street by people, which leads to an increase in natural surveillance, which can act as a deterrent to crime.

172 The blocks containing undercroft car parking are designed to be naturally ventilated with air movement facilitated on all sides. Open boarded vertical timber cladding is used on the ground floor elevations to assist ventilation and to afford opportunities for planting to climb these surfaces to form a green wall to the ground floor perimeter elevations offering more appealing and active frontages.

173 Internally the majority of the dwellings proposed are of generous proportions and will maximise opportunities for south facing sunlight, including the incorporation of useable balconies.

174 The development will be constructed in a series of phases, which means that the existing health centre will not be demolished until the new health centre has been constructed. This ensures that there will be a health centre continually operating on site during the various phases of the development, the S106 agreement will also ensure that this occurs.

175 A "Building for Life" assessment (a method of assessment endorsed by CABE) was undertaken by the applicant and is often used as a national benchmark for well designed housing, these assessments are used to promote design excellence and best practice in the housing industry. The proposal achieved a Building for Life rating of 16.5 out of 20, which places the scheme within the 'very good' range.

176 Overall, the height, scale, massing and general design of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this location and will relate satisfactorily to the existing context. The proposal regenerates a brownfield site and is considered to maximise the potential of the site in line with London Plan Policy 4B.3. The design will provide good quality residential accommodation that respects its context, and is consistent with the requirements of Policies 3.11, 3.13 and 4.2 of the UDP.

177 **Amenity space provision**

178 Supplementary planning guidance for residential development advises that amenity space should be provided at around 50 square metres per block plus 10 square metres per unit and 10 square metres per child bed space. The total amenity space required for the development on this basis is 2,976sq.m. Every unit will have access to either private balconies or private gardens measuring between 3.3sq.m to 49.1sq.m. The total area of private amenity space that will be provided is 1,735sq.m. The overall amenity space is enhanced by the provision of two communal courtyard gardens in Blocks D and F, a children's play area, an ecological buffer zone between Block A/B and the western boundary, a communal roof terrace on the 1st floor of Block A/B adjoining the northern boundary and other smaller areas of communal amenity space spread throughout the development comprising a combined total of 2,134sq.m. Overall, the total amenity space provided within the scheme is 3,869sq.m, which exceeds the minimum guidance levels and is considered acceptable.

179 The site currently has 235 trees dotted around it, none of which have any Tree Preservation Orders attached. The tree survey submitted with the application outlines

that there will be a significant loss of trees on site, however it confirms that the trees scheduled for removal are of poor form and generally average condition with limited potential to contribute to the site's long term amenity. The majority of the mature trees on the Downtown and Salter Road boundaries will be retained and will provide a screen of the development. While a large group of mature trees to the north of the site in front of the Redriff Primary School will also be retained. The survey recommends that the opportunity to provide significant new tree planting as proposed offers the most sustainable approach to maintaining a good level of tree cover on the site. A condition of planning permission is recommended which requires details of the size and species of the proposed replacement trees to be submitted to the Council for approval prior to planting. This will ensure that the trees are of a sufficient size and quality to offset the loss of so many trees at one time. It is considered that the extensive tree planting proposed throughout the site will enhance the sites leafy character.

180 **Environmental impact assessment**

181 The two main impacts that have been of concern with the previous applications and appeal were the scale and close proximity of the new development, particularly Block A/B, to the Russia Dock Woodland, and the dominance of roads and parking surfaces.

182 Although the height of Block A/B was considered to be an issue justifying refusal of permission, this has now been addressed by a reduction in height from 6 to 4 storeys. The close proximity of Block A/B to the Russia Dock Woodland has also been addressed by increasing the western boundary setback from 0 to 2.5 metres to 10.2m to 11.6m. In fact Block A/B is now set back further away from the Russia Dock Woodland than Block C (4 storeys) is to the south, which is located 8.4m from the western boundary. Given the fact that the Inspector was satisfied that Block C could be accommodated into the site without any harm on the locality. It is considered that Block A/B is now satisfactorily accommodated into the site and would not have any significant negative impact on the Woodland.

183 The application was referred to Natural England who have no objections to the proposed development and were pleased to see that the proximity of the Russia Dock Woodland Site of Interest for Nature Conservation had been taken in to consideration in the application. Natural England welcomed and supported the 11.6m wide, 50 metre long ecological buffer zone comprising native shrub and tree planting along the western edge of the site adjacent to/bordering the Russia Dock Woodland. The council's ecology officer also has no objections to the proposed development, but did express some concern about possible light pollution onto the Woodland. However, it is considered that the increased separation and landscaping that the development now provides between the Woodland will ensure that there will not be any significant negative impacts in terms of light pollution.

184 The current application has rectified previous concerns about the dominance of roads and parking surfaces by providing an improved 'homezone' street layout. The proposed roads have been re-designed to be more than just places for cars and traffic. They will be a pedestrian friendly environment with well landscaped spaces, where vehicles travel slowly and where people on foot and on bicycles can use the whole of the street width without a feeling of intimidation from automobiles. Furthermore, the decrease in dwellings from 226 to 212 dwellings has further reduced the number of car parking spaces required within the development. There will be 89 car parking bays in undercroft car parks and 90 bays on the street throughout the site.

185 A 'homezone' is a residential street, or group of residential streets, designed for community use, that is, for pedestrians and cyclists rather than motorists. The aim is to balance the needs of road users and those living on the street, especially children

and older people, to make the area safer, healthier and more enjoyable to live in. The proven benefits of homezones include:

- Reduction in accidents, car fumes, congestion and noise;
- Improved physical health and independence of residents, particularly children who can play outdoors in a safer environment;
- A friendlier place to live with increased neighbourliness;
- Lessened social barriers, increased community awareness and participation;
- Improved quality of life;
- Greater use of the street by people, which leads to an increase in natural surveillance, which can act as a deterrent to crime.

186 Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

187 The key issues that have been raised previously were the higher density and change of character from neighbouring developments and particularly the height of Block A/B which was previously 6 storeys high. Only the height of Block A/B was given by the Council as a reason for refusal and this was supported by the appeal inspector, although this reason was outweighed by other considerations in the Secretary of State's decision to grant permission. Neither the Council nor the Planning Inspector could find grounds to support a refusal on density or the development being out of character with the area.

188 It is considered that this application has overcome the single reason for refusal at the appeal, which was the height of Block A/B. This block has now been reduced to 4 storeys and is setback 10.2m to 11.6m away from the boundary with the Russia Dock Woodland. In addition, although the density of development was not a ground for refusal, the number of proposed dwellings has been reduced to 212 (from 268 in the first application and 251 at the appeal and 228 in the second application) and therefore the density has been reduced from 405 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) to 337 hrh.

189 Government Guidance on housing (PPS 3) advises that design and layout of new development should be informed by the wider context and the surrounding townscape and landscape in the wider locality. This was an important consideration for both the original application and the appeal and found to be acceptable. This has been considered again for this application and whilst there would be some small differences of height between the development and the closest houses and flats, this would not amount to a material conflict in the character of the area. The houses along the southern boundary of the proposed development would be three storeys to match the tallest buildings in the existing housing area to the south. There are no objections to the relationship that this development will have with the existing residential character of the area and no grounds to believe there will be any significant loss of residential amenity to the area.

190 Impact on the occupiers of the development

191 The development provides a revised 'homezone' street layout with reduced hard surfacing, narrower streets and a significant increase in landscaping. Furthermore, it provides a substantial increase in amenity space that is in excess of Council's minimum requirement. All dwellings within the development have direct access to private amenity space, while all dwellings have access to numerous large areas of communal amenity space that are spread throughout. The proposed dwellings meet and in many instances exceed the Council's minimum flat size requirements and would provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupants.

192 In terms of sunlight and daylight impacts, due to the arrangement of the blocks and

the substantial setback distances between them, it is considered that the light levels within the development will be sufficiently protected.

193 In terms of overlooking, the majority of setback distances between the dwellings within the development are in excess of the Council's minimum setback distances. However, in Block H, 6 north facing habitable room windows will be treated with obscured glazing to prevent overlooking on to habitable room windows to the north in Blocks C and D. It is considered that there will be no significant overlooking impacts between any of the habitable rooms in any of the proposed dwellings. Furthermore, there will be no significant overlooking impacts from the development onto any existing adjoining residential property.

194 **Biodiversity, ecology and trees**

195 In terms of biodiversity, the site has been assessed to confirm whether it supports any rare or protected species of flora or fauna. The assessment found that the site has the potential to support bats in the existing building. However, the Bat Activity and Emergence Survey conducted by the applicant in October has indicated that although the features of the existing health centre have the potential to be utilised as bat roosts, at the time of the survey no roosts were present on site and no site features were used as flight lines by bat species.

196 In order to confirm the actual presence of any bats on the site a further survey is recommended prior to commencement of the development, including demolition. It is recommended that this survey be secured by a condition of any permission. Bat boxes, bat bricks, appropriate planting and sensitive lighting should be included and achieved by the design to encourage bat roosting and foraging on the site and this can be secured by a condition of any permission.

197 The biodiversity survey found that there is Japanese Knotweed, an invasive species of plant across the site. The treatment of the Japanese Knotweed should also be undertaken prior to development.

198 **Traffic issues**

199 This area is served by a few bus routes and is at some distance from the Canada Water public transport interchange. This means that the area has a PTAL rating of 2, which indicates moderate public transport accessibility. For this reason 179 car parking spaces (including 26 disabled car parking spaces and 297 bicycle parking spaces) have been provided within the development. The car parking includes 14 drop off spaces for the school, 19 spaces for health centre staff, 10 parking spaces for visitors to the health centre. This leaves 136 parking spaces for the residents of the 212 flats and houses, including 3 spaces, which will be for a car club – a provision of 64%. The council's Transport Group have advised that the proposed parking is in line with UDP policy 5.6 for a development in a low PTAL. However, the Transport Group have also advised that a number of parking bays are sub standard in size and/or are unworkable and will need to be amended. The applicant has outlined that they are in the process of amending these parking bays; a condition will be attached to address this.

200 There is main road loop through the site providing access to the school and the health centre. The intention is that vehicle speeds will be restricted by limited straight sections and the revised 'homezone' layout.

201 The second application was refused on the grounds that the extent of hard surfacing and dominance of roads and parking spaces would result in a poor standard of design and layout. The current application addresses previous concerns about the

dominance of roads and parking surfaces by providing an improved 'homezone' street layout. The proposed roads have been re-designed to be more than just places for cars and traffic. They will be a pedestrian friendly environment with well landscaped spaces, where vehicles travel slowly and where people on foot and on bicycles can use the whole of the street width without a feeling of intimidation from automobiles. The revised 'homezone' layout has been designed to reduce to a minimum the impact of traffic on the site. Though it may be necessary to have vehicle access, the impact this will have on the site is reduced, when compared to the previous applications. The landscaped environment of the site has been further improved by a design that encourages greater pedestrian activity and dominance.

- 202 A key part of the layout of this development is the arrangements for dropping off and picking up children, by cars, at Redriff Primary School. The current arrangement is that parents park at the end of Downtown Road, or stop in the Health Centre car park within the site, and walk from there. The new arrangement will be that cars will drive through the new housing scheme to get to or from the schools. Traffic will also be directed into the site for the staff and visitors parking to the health and community centre.
- 203 Clearer definition of vehicle and pedestrian areas has improved the amenity value of the site, releasing many areas for improved landscaping. More green landscape and less impermeable hard surfaces have contributed to the drainage of the site, reducing run-off.
- 204 The applicant has utilised the Multi Model Study (MMS) and the outputs do not show any problems at any of the junctions tested with the exception of Bestwood Street and Lower Road junction. However, the Transport Group consider that this junction is far removed from the site and is at near capacity already.
- 205 The scheme provides adequate refuse storage arrangements in accordance with policy 3.7 of the UDP. The proposed scheme has refuse stores spread throughout the development, which are all located within the maximum permitted walking distance from the relevant dwelling, health centre and community centre. The proposed houses fronting Downtown Road have their own dedicated space for waste and recycling bins. The bin stores have all been located at appropriate stopping / collection points for the refuse vehicles, which will collect the waste from within the site and from Downtown Road. Adequate turning space is provided for refuse vehicles. Servicing for the health and community centre is to take place on-site, the turning area provided for the refuse vehicles will accommodate the servicing vehicles. A condition will be attached requiring deliveries to the health and community centre to take place during the hours of 8am to 8pm in order to minimise disturbance to the adjoining residential occupiers.
- 206 Overall, the proposal is considered consistent with policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6 and 5.7 of the UDP. It would provide an acceptable level of car parking and bicycle storage, and suitable refuse and servicing arrangements.
- 207 **Flood risk**
- 208 The northern part of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, however the site is protected by the Thames Barrier and related defences. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application and confirms that the site is not located within an area that is at significant risk in the event of a flood defence breach.
- 209 The proposed scheme meets the Planning Policy Statement 25 sequential test. Within the London Plan, Southwark has a target of providing 16,300 new dwellings in the period 2007/8-2016/17 at rate of 1,630 dwellings per year. A total of 12,523 are

expected to be provided on sites designated within the UDP. The majority of these sites are located in Flood Zone 3a with a small minority in Flood Zone 2. On the sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2 which are currently available for development, there is capacity to provide approximately 1852 dwellings, but all of these sites either benefit from planning permission for redevelopment, or are currently subject to pre-application discussions. Southwark will only be able to meet its housing targets if sites in Flood Zone 3 are also developed. The development of brownfield sites such as this will be necessary if Southwark is to achieve its housing targets. The proposal site is located on previously developed land and there are strong sustainability reasons why the site should be redeveloped. It has moderate access to public transport and is capable of providing housing on a site which currently has none.

210 It is for the applicant to demonstrate that the development can be made safe through the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they have no objection (subject to a condition) to the proposal based on the Flood Risk Assessment submitted by the applicant. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with Planning Policy Statement 25.

211 Planning obligations [S.106 unilateral undertaking]

212 Planning obligations are intended to offset the negative impacts of a development. The Planning Obligations for this scheme are relatively similar to those negotiated and agreed previously for the appeal scheme and the second planning application. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for S106 contributions indicates that, in addition to on site affordable housing, a total contribution of £1,012,295 is required for this site. The following Heads of Terms is proposed for this development:

- Affordable Housing – The proposal provides affordable housing (51 units) at a 80:20 split between 38 social rented units (6x 1 bed, 15x 2 bed, 6x 3 bed, 6x 4 bed and 5x 5 bed) and 13 shared ownership units (3x 1 bed, 7x 2 bed and 3x 3 bed).
- Education Contribution - £317,475;
- Employment During Construction - £94,969
- Open Space, Sports Development, Children's Play Contribution - £157,482;
- Strategic Transport Contribution - £83,937;
- Rotherhithe Community Project Bank - £338,583 (of which £130,000 will go towards Redriff Primary School sports ground improvements); and
- Administration fee of 2% of total (£992,446) - £19,849.
- Total cash contribution of £1,012,295.

213 The Heads of Terms does not include the following contributions:

- Health – due to the fact that a new health centre is proposed;
- Public Realm – due to the fact that extensive public realm works within the site are proposed;
- Transport Site Specific – due to the fact that extensive 'homezone' works are proposed; and
- Community Facilities – due to the fact that a community centre is proposed.

The money calculated from the planning obligations SPD for the above contributions was pooled together to form the Rotherhithe Community Project Bank contribution.

214 In addition to the above Heads of Terms, the applicant is providing the following:

- A new health centre and community centre that will cost approximately £3,238,000 to build; and
- A new children's play area for the whole community costing approximately

£250,000 to construct.

215 The total benefits for this application would be worth approximately £4.5 million, which significantly exceeds the contributions required by the Planning Obligations SPD. However, as the health centre is an existing facility, which should be replaced by any development of this site, only the value of the 70% size increase should be considered a benefit. Nevertheless, the provision of affordable housing, a new health centre, community centre, children's play area and the cash contributions proposed, far exceed the standard contribution required.

216 The S106 will be in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking due to the fact that Southwark Council currently owns the site.

217 **Conclusion**

218 The application will see the redevelopment of a currently under-utilised brownfield site to provide both a new health and community centre and much needed private and affordable housing. The principle of the use is accepted. The height and general bulk of the buildings is considered acceptable within the context of the existing environment. The traffic impact, car and cycle parking provisions are also acceptable. Planning obligations will be secured to offset the impact of the development in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations. The scheme is in accordance with local and national policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

219 **COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

220 In line with the council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith / religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process. The impact on local people is set out above.

221 **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

222 Policy 3.3 of the Southwark Plan asserts that development will not be granted unless the economic, environmental and social impacts of a development have been addressed through a Sustainability Assessment. Policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the Southwark Plan seek energy efficient development and renewable energy technology in new development. Policy 3.6 seeks to maintain air quality, while policy 3.7 requires adequate provision for waste management facilities and how the waste management hierarchy will be applied during construction and after the development is completed. Policy 3.9 advises that all development should incorporate measures to reduce the demand for water supply and recycle grey water and rainwater. These policies are reinforced by the London Plan, Planning Policy Statement 1 'Creating Sustainable Communities, Planning Policy Statement 22 'Renewable Energy and the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Sustainable Design and Construction.

223 A sustainability statement was submitted with the application. Amongst other things, it sets out how low environmental impact development is to be achieved as part of this proposal.

224 The buildings have been designed to help maximise energy efficiency, to allow the internal spaces to benefit from good natural lighting and ventilation.

225 The residential element of the scheme will achieve Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, Code Level 3 falls between the old Eco Homes rating of Very

Good and Excellent. A Code Level 3 rating meets the requirements of the draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

- 226 The applicant has advised that in terms of BREEAM the health centre and community centre will have a 'good' to 'very good' rating. The draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD advises that a rating of 'excellent' should be achieved. However, at the moment this is only a draft SPD, which has limited weight. In this instance, a BREEAM rating of 'good' is considered to be acceptable, given that the health and community centre comprise such a small percentage of the floor space in the scheme as a whole.
- 227 In terms of renewable energy, the proposal is to incorporate a CHP and photovoltaic cells to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 14.1%, which is under the London Plan requirements of 20%. The CHP will be contained in the basement of the southern corner of Block G, while the photovoltaic cells will be provided on the roof of Blocks A and G. The proposed carbon emissions reduction does however exceed the 10% required by UDP policy 3.5. Furthermore, the GLA have outlined that considering the proposed energy strategy as a whole against the London Plan energy hierarchy, which prioritises supplying energy efficiently (in particular through decentralised energy generation) ahead of renewable energy. The provision of the proposed communal heat network and CHP is welcomed. The GLA acknowledged that this provision represents a substantial capital cost to the applicant. On this basis, taking into account overall scheme economics as set out in the Three Dragons toolkit appraisal. The GLA we're not inclined to push for additional photovoltaic cells, which would raise other issues relating to exporting electricity to the national grid and additional maintenance costs. In this instance, it considered that a 14.1% carbon emissions reduction is acceptable.

LEAD OFFICER	Gary Rice	Head of Development Control
REPORT AUTHOR	Brett Henderson	Planning Officer – Major Applications [tel. 020 7525 5521]
CASE FILE	TP/417-A	
Papers held at:	Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5403]	