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1. Executive Summary

1.1. The South Dock Marina site is a part of the Southwark Regeneration in Partnership Programme (SRPP). The SRPP has set ambitious targets to build 1500 Council homes by 2018 and 11,000 by 2043 to tackle an acute and growing housing crisis.

1.2. Adam Khan Architects and their multidisciplinary design team have been preparing proposals to develop the site. The proposals have been and continue to be subject to an ongoing process of public consultation.

1.3. There have been 4 public consultation events to date, where the community have provided their feedback on the proposals to the design team. The latest proposals were presented on 19th September 2016, consultation event 5. Notable improvements to the latest proposals presented include:

- Developed proposals for the boatyard to address questions raised about the compatibility of the boatyard with residential use;
- More ambitious proposals for the design of the public realm to include the nearby St George’s Square to provide a riverside urban park;
- Changes to the massing to reduce the impact of the development on views from the surrounding context, including a reduction in height of two towers and an increase in height to the main tower;
- Reduction in the total number of units. The proportion of affordable housing has also been reduced to be policy compliant.
- More detailed information on the tenure was provided including; (i) half of the council homes are to be allocated to local residents in housing need; (ii) the new Mayor’s ‘London Living Rent’ policy could provide intermediate housing to those who do not qualify for social housing; (iii) private homes to be marketed in the local area first.
- A number of potential improvements to the transport connections were proposed;

1.4. This report provides a description of the consultation event that took place on 19th September 2016 and summarises feedback captured on the evening.

1.5. The material presented at the evening is available online at:

http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/4683/south_dock_consultation_boards

Southwark council and the design team look forward to receiving further feedback from the community. Feedback on the proposals can be sent to housingregen@southwark.gov.uk
2. Introduction

2.1. Community consultation event number 5 took place on 19th September 2016 between 5.00pm and 9.00pm at the Canada Water Library, Southwark to present the latest proposals for the South Dock Marina site.

2.2. The format of the event comprised the following:

(i) 5.30pm – 7.00pm Drop in exhibition
The latest proposals were presented on 17 display boards and a 1:500 scaled, contextual model. To help explain the proposals, answer any queries and engage in informal discussions, a broad spectrum of the client team and design team were in attendance. This included key members from Adam Khan Architects and their multidisciplinary design team, Councillor Mark Williams (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and New Homes), Bruce Glockling (Head of Regeneration), Patrick Keating (Harbour Master for Southwark Council), Nnenna Urum-Eke (Housing Regeneration Programme Manager) and key members of the Housing Regeneration team from Southwark Council. The event was attended by 73 members of the public. Attendees were encouraged to write any unanswered questions on flash cards provided. A full list of attendees is provided in appendix 1. A link to the display boards and a copy of photographs of the model are provided in appendix 2.

(ii) 7.00pm – 9.00pm Presentation and Question and Answer (Q&A) session
Adam Khan of Adam Khan Architects and Councillor Mark Williams, gave a presentation on the latest proposals followed by a Q&A session. Bruce Glockling chaired the question and answer session. Other members of the client and design team were available to provide support in the Q+A session.

2.3. The display boards structured the proposals as follows:

(i) The Site – included:
   a. a map showing the location of the site and existing site photographs.

(ii) Update on Scheme Development – included:
   a. a summary of the main issues raised by the community previously;
   b. a timeline of past consultation events;
   c. the council’s vision and aims.

(iii) Boatyard – included:
   a. the latest plans for the boatyard and marina facilities;
   b. confirmation that the long-term future of the boatyard is secure;
   c. the outcome of investigations into the compatibility of the boatyard and residential use;

(iv) Public Realm – included:
   a. more ambitious plans to improve the public realm by incorporating St George’s Square to provide a new riverside urban park, following discussions with Lewisham;
   b. illustrations showing the active use of the ground floor;

(v) Housing and Architecture – included:
   a. Comparative illustrations showing the changes to the scale and massing of the development;
   b. Comparative, contextual visualisations showing how the changes to the scale and massing improved views from the surrounding context;
   c. Comparative, contextual visualisation from the riverside;
   d. Confirmation that half of the council homes will be allocated to local residents; the new Mayor’s ‘London Living Rent’ policy could provide intermediate housing to those who do not
qualify for social housing; private homes to be marketed in the local area first.
e. Comparison of changes to the tenure mix including the reduction of the proportion of affordable housing to be policy compliant.

(vi) Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing – included:
a. Overshadowing studies of the latest proposal;
b. Comparative overshadowing studies;
c. Summary of impact of daylight and sunlight, confirming that although reductions beyond the BRE guidelines will occur as a result of the proposed scheme, the design team are of the view that the daylight and sunlight impacts can be considered acceptable in the context of Southwark’s planning policy, when balancing all of the design/planning factors;

(vii) Wind and Microclimate – included:
a. An initial assessment of the effects of wind on the microclimate;
b. Proposed mitigation ideas;

(viii) Transport and Parking – included:
a. Potential improvements to the existing transport connections;
b. Responses to previous concerns raised;

2.4. The 1:500 scaled, contextual model showed the proposal and its relationship to the riverside, the dock, St George’s Square and the surrounding residential context.
3. Feedback captured at Drop in Exhibition

3.1. A total of 73 people attended the drop-in exhibition. Attendees were encouraged to have informal conversations with members of the client and design team to share their views and also seek answers to any queries.

3.2. A summary of the comments captured from the informal conversations are provided below, organised by topic. Southwark council and the design team continue to welcome feedback on the current proposals. The community are encouraged to visit http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/4683/south_dock_consultation_boards to view the proposals. Feedback on the proposals can be sent to housingregen@southwark.gov.uk.

3.3. Boatyard comments made

3.3.1. The boatyard feels closed and not open and inviting, as there is no indication of what the boundary walls and gates are to be made from. Could it feel like it is more a part of the public realm?

3.3.2. Could the boatyard be a free-standing building to be celebrated, next to the housing instead of below it?

3.3.3. The boatyard is a unique element of the neighbourhood. Could it become a prominent feature by giving it more presence?

3.3.4. The boatyard is symbolic of the area’s history. Can more of the existing boatyard be kept? There should not be a loss of the sense of history?

3.4. Public Realm feedback

3.4.1. The riverside park is a good idea as it will give somewhere for children to play.

3.4.2. The café at the base of the tower located on the park could work well.

3.4.3. The Dolphin (existing timber structure located within the shore of the river) could contribute to the park. For example, could it host an art project.

3.4.4. The arched openings at the base of the tower are good as it let’s you see into the café from the public realm.

3.5. Housing and Architecture feedback

3.5.1. The daylight and sunlight information is hard to understand. More information should be provided on this.

3.5.2. The massing has improved as it fits in better with the context and gives better views from the marina.

3.5.3. The location of the tall tower away from the existing houses and on the river is good.

3.5.4. The building on Calypso Way feels too close to the pavement. Could defensible space be added.

3.5.5. The new scheme looks more elegant than the last scheme.
3.5.6. How affordable is the affordable housing. What would be the cost of rent for the intermediate housing. The scheme needs to provide genuinely affordable housing.

3.6. General feedback

3.6.1. There is a worry that the council is selling off public land at high prices.

3.6.2. The scheme has improved. It looks more developed than the last consultation.
4. Presentation

4.1. Councillor Mark Williams and Adam Khan gave a short presentation to present the latest proposals, to explain the material exhibited at the drop-in session. A summary of the key points raised in the presentation is provided below.

4.2. Councillor Mark Williams started the presentation and raised the following points:

4.2.1. There is an urgent need to build new, affordable housing to address the housing crisis facing Southwark.

4.2.2. Many families are living in temporary accommodation, overcrowded accommodation and increasing numbers are struggling to get on to the housing ladder. The Council has set itself an ambitious target of building 11,000 new council homes by 2043, with the first 1,500 by 2018. The South Dock Marina scheme is a key part of the Council’s housebuilding programme.

4.2.3. South Dock Marina is a sensitive site. Councillor Mark Williams and Southwark Council attach great importance to working closely with the community, to develop a scheme that enjoys the support of local people, secures the future of the boatyard and provides high quality affordable homes, including new council homes and intermediate rented homes set at the London Living Rent, as well as for sale properties. All private sale properties are to be marketed in Southwark and London first.

4.3. Councillor Mark Williams handed the presentation over to Adam Khan of Adam Khan Architects. Adam Khan presented slides comprising of the material included on the display boards. A copy of the display boards is provided in appendix 2. A summary of the content of the display boards is provided in section 2.3. A copy of the presentation can be downloaded from [http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/4683/south_dock_consultation_boards](http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/4683/south_dock_consultation_boards). In addition, a summary of the explanatory points made in the presentation by Adam Khan are provided below:

4.3.1. The site is very complex site with several different needs to reconcile.

4.3.2. Local knowledge and community feedback is essential in the development of good design proposals. The design process is ongoing, with more consultation events to follow. The design team and the council welcome the views of the community.

4.3.3. The latest proposals for the boatyard, context and strategy, architecture and housing, public realm and transport and parking were presented.

4.3.4. The Boatyard

4.3.4.1. Retaining and improving the boatyard to secure its long-term future is integral to the proposal. The proposals aims to make the boatyard into a ‘marine centre of excellence’.

4.3.4.2. The proposal aims to invest in the community by creating a socially active space for berth holders.

4.3.4.3. A new local business hub offers opportunities to create employment, apprenticeships and training.

4.3.4.4. The design aims to secure the long-term future of the boatyard by making sure it can accommodate the boatyard activities without negatively impacting on the neighbours. Detailed investigations have taken place on acoustic and air quality issues in conjunction with Patrick Keating, the harbour master and specialist consultants, including the undertaking...
of acoustic tests. A meeting has also taken place with the Environmental Health Officer at Southwark Council.

4.3.5.   Context and Strategy

4.3.5.1. Following discussions with London Borough of Lewisham, it is now proposed to include improvements to St George’s Square to integrate into the scheme, by providing a new, active, riverside park. It is proposed that the park is true public space, with no gates.

4.3.5.2. A restaurant, café and a shop are proposed at ground floor level to activate the park.

4.3.6.   Architecture and Housing

4.3.6.1. Community concerns about views from around the site raised at the previous consultation event (30th January 2016) have been addressed by making changes to the massing. This includes reducing the height of the 16 and 10 storey towers to 7 storeys. The height of the 22 storey tower has been increased to 28 storeys. The tower has been sculpted to present a singular, slimmer profile. The roof profiles of the midrise blocks have been designed to create a more varied skyline. Comparative illustrations showing how the views of the proposal have changed from the previous scheme presented on 30th January 2016 show these improvements.

4.3.6.2. Since the previous consultation event, the number of dwellings has been reduced to 193. The tenure mix has also changed resulting in less affordable homes than previously proposed, but still policy compliant.

4.3.6.3. Investigations into daylight, sunlight and overshadowing demonstrate that reductions beyond the BRE guidelines will occur as a result of the proposed scheme. The design team are of the view that daylight and sunlight impacts on the neighbouring properties can be considered acceptable in the context of Southwark’s planning policy, when balancing all of the design/planning factors.

4.3.6.4. Initial assessments into the impact of the development on wind and the microclimate suggest that mitigation is required to specific locations on the site. Planting trees in those locations can mitigate the effects of wind. In addition, the façade design and entrance positions can be developed to reduce the impact of downward currents. More developed studies into the wind are now required to further develop specific solutions based on these principles.

4.3.7.   Public Realm

4.3.7.1. Proposals for the public realm have been developed in conjunction with East.

4.3.7.2. St George’s Square is extended and improved to become a lively, riverside, urban park. Improvements are made to the Plough Way roundabout and the Thames footpath to create a welcoming and attractive environment that makes the most of the riverside location.

4.3.7.3. At ground level, active frontages are proposed to improve the street level experience. The café, restaurant and shop activate the park. Entrances to the apartments are all designed to be generous, transparent and inviting, irrespective of tenure to avoid ‘poor doors’.

4.3.7.4. Where possible, existing, healthy trees are to be retained. Additional trees are to be planted, along with a range of flowers and fruit plants carefully chosen to enhance the
character of the new park. A variety of spaces are to be provided in the park to encourage
diverse uses and improve accessibility. This could include picnic areas, a play areas, scented
gardens and seating areas.

4.3.8. Transport and Parking

4.3.8.1. The site has a low PTAL rating of 1b. The Surrey Quays railway station is approximately
15 minute walking distance from the site, which is not counted under the PTAL rating as it is
more than 960m away. The PTAL does not consider the Clipper either, which is only a 3 minute
walk away from the site.

4.3.8.2. There are many potential improvements to the existing transport connections including
a cycle hire scheme, contributions to new buses and routes, car clubs, cycle lockers and stores
for the public and possible workshops to allow cyclist to maintain their bicycles.

4.3.8.3. There is also a basement car park which provides a car parking ratio of 0.4. This
equates to 78 car parking spaces. Census data on car ownership and parking survey data
have been collected and parking provision in nearby emerging developments has also been
considered.

4.3.9. Summary

4.3.9.1. Boatyard: The long-term future of the boatyard is secured with provision of new
facilities. The compatibility of the boatyard with existing and proposed residential development
has been investigated and shown to work in terms of air quality and acoustics.

4.3.9.2. Public Realm: Improvements to existing and new public realm are proposed.

4.3.9.3. Housing and Architecture: The scale of the development has been modified to address
concerns about the views of the development. The impact of the scheme on the daylight,
sunlight and overshadowing has also been investigated.

4.3.9.4. Quality Affordable Homes: Build more homes of every kind including truly affordable
intermediate homes (such as London Living Rent) for people who live and work in Southwark.

4.3.9.5. Transport and Parking: Car parking provision and impact on existing transport
infrastructure has been investigated.

4.3.10. Question and Answer: Bruce Glockling thanked Adam Khan and Councillor Williams
for the presentation and commenced the chairing of the question and answer session.
5. Question and Answer Session

Bruce Glockling invited attendees to ask questions or make comments. Below is a list of the questions and comments by attendees and a summary of the responses provided by the client and design team.

1. On the issue of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing, how much daylight will be lost in neighbouring properties?

The impact of the proposal on the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to specific neighbouring properties is not provided in the presentation or the display boards. Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing studies have been carried out on individual properties. The results indicate that reductions beyond the BRE guidelines will occur because of the proposed scheme. Daylight and sunlight impacts on the neighbouring properties can be considered acceptable in the context of Southwark’s planning policy when balancing all the design/planning factors.

2. What this is missing is a whole appreciation of what this is going to do to the infrastructure around the area. What will the actual impact on local services and transport links? Moreover, it does not take into account the impact of other new developments in the area.

The effects of all the developments are considered at a strategic level by the Council in terms of their impacts upon infrastructure and public services. Perhaps the biggest concern is public transport. The Council are working closely with the London Mayor and Transport for London to get such matters resolved. Various issues are under active consideration:

- The Crossrail relieving the Jubilee line
- Increasing the train frequency on the Jubilee line at peak times
- Cycling and pedestrian bridge
- More buses
- Cycle hire expanded to the peninsula
- Resolving traffic congestion on the Jamaica Road gyratory system on the approach to Rotherhithe Tunnel

3. How will you guarantee the target level of council housing suggested in the proposed design will not be reduced?

Councillor Williams reiterated that it was Council policy to get the maximum number of new council homes on all development sites subject of course to the constraints of financial viability and that he was committed to achieving the proposed target level of council homes for the South Dock Marina scheme.

4. The location of the new park is next to the 28 storey tower. Won’t it be overshadowed by the new building? It is concerning that the children’s play area will be overlooked?

The overshadowing studies indicate that the 28 storey will have minimal impact on the new park. It is accepted that the park will be overlooked and that is the case for most parks in Southwark. In any case, some degree of overlooking is advantageous as it provides greater safety and security for park users.

5. You say that the boatyard is your top priority, I don’t see that reflected in your presentation. For example, no attention has been paid within the design to how boatyard users are going to interact and work with one another. Has the impact of the prevailing wind been considered on boats entering and leaving the marina and boatyard been considered? Has the wind turbulence caused by the new building measured?

All applications for major new tall residential buildings are accompanied by a wind and microclimate assessment. Initial studies by the wind and microclimate consultant indicate that as the prevailing wind is from the South West, it is unlikely that there will be any adverse
impacts upon access to the entry lock. Patrick Keating, the South Dock Marina harbour master, observed that the tidal currents in the River Thames are much trickier than wind patterns for boats.

6. Has the safety of people working in the boatyard been considered?

The safety of boatyard users is of paramount concern. One of the primary purposes of the scheme is to provide a much improved boatyard facility and the architects and design team have been working closely with the harbour-master to achieve this objective. Work is on-going regarding the health and safety aspects of the design.

7. A resident raised concerns about GP services in the area. He said that local GP services are already overstretched and that he found it difficult to get an appointment to see his doctor. Where and when will you be providing new GP facilities?

The Council is working with the Southwark Clinical Commissioning Group to improve the delivery of GP services in the area to address the increase in local demand.

8. In relation to the issue of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing and the BRE standards, the area is now being referred to as an urban zone. Yet in the Council’s Core Strategy it is identified as a suburban density zone. When did the Council change the designation?

The Rotherhithe (North Suburban Density Zone), which includes the South Dock Area, is currently under review. Please refer to appendix 3 which includes a note on the ‘urban’ definition applied to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing studies conclusion.

9. A resident of 30 years standing said that she feels she could be pushed out of the area as no new housing provision is being built locally for older people. She also commented that young families could not afford to live in the area and that the boatyard users had been poor neighbours.

10. If we are in a suburban policy zone, how has this zone been defined? How can we gather more information? We as residents need to know what area that defines and will the development redefine the nature of the area? (Please refer to question 8.)

11. Will people working in the boatyard now and using the shipping containers have to rent a new space in the new boatyard? What will the costs be?

The aim is to create high quality and affordable work spaces. The new business units will replace the shipping containers and the rent levels will be affordable for existing users, with any increases introduced in steps over a number of years.

12. A resident who has been living in the area for 16 years observed that the amount of traffic has increased around the area, particularly in Rope Street. The resident was frustrated about the delays on the scheme and the decrease in the amount of social and affordable housing.

The Council explained that it was important to get the scheme right and to take full account of the views of the community. The intention is to maximise the amount of council and affordable housing on the site.
13. **What job opportunities will be created through the boatyard?**

The scheme will provide a new enterprise and business hub of 18 units. This will triple the number of business users and create new commercial possibilities and provide more jobs, apprenticeships and training opportunities.

14. Councillor Dan Whitehead (local ward councillor) questioned the contribution of the scheme to the Council’s target of building 1,500 council homes by 2018 and 11,000 by 2043, noting that the number of social units had now been reduced from 60 to 39. He said that it was misleading to suggest that this was a “council home building” scheme and that it was really a private development with some council homes. He went on to argue that the development would have a negative impact on the infrastructure problems in the area and that those infrastructure issues should be addressed first, in particular the poor public transport.

Councillor Williams replied by saying infrastructure improvements would go hand-in-hand with the development. The planning gains (Section 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy) would be reinvested in the local infrastructure. He reiterated his earlier point that one of the primary aims of the scheme was to protect and improve the boatyard whilst providing much needed new housing for the Borough. The improvements to the boatyard, local facilities and the public realm had to be funded through the housing development (i.e. essentially the sale of private housing) for the scheme to be financially viable and hence the level of council homes it was possible to build.

15. A longstanding resident of 64 years said he was concerned about the affordability of new housing in the area. He quoted the example of his daughter and son-in-law. His daughter is a nurse and his son-in-law an electrical engineer with an average household income. Recently they purchased a shared-ownership property from L&Q in the Quebec Quarter development. The sales price of the 1-bed flat was £510,000 and they could only afford the minimum share of 25%. Their monthly housing costs are: £579 rent, £585 mortgage, £278 service charges, £208 council tax and £150 utilities. A total of £1,800 which they struggle to pay. He challenged whether this was genuinely affordable housing.

16. The disappearance of dry storage in the boatyard is a major concern. How are the boats going to get into the allocated spaces and how will boats with masts fit? This issue is still under consideration. A circular rotating vehicle will be used to move boats around the boatyard facilities.

17. For the small number of Council homes provided, could you consider putting these somewhere else in borough?

The intention is to create a mixed-use and mixed-tenure scheme that will help to maintain a sustainable and successful neighbourhood.

18. How will noise will be managed inside the boatyard.

Noise and air quality investigations have carried out in collaboration with acoustic and air quality consultants, Patrick Keating, the harbour master and a meeting with the Environmental Health Officer. A noise map of different activities has been produced. The boatyard has been designed to mitigate the impacts of noise and acoustics on the existing and new residential properties. For example, the layout of the boatyard prevents most the noise leaving the boatyard; the facilities can allow noisy activates to take place in acoustically controlled workshops, or outside with local acoustic barriers. Similarly, a lot of effort has been put into mitigating the impact of dust, solvents and chemicals.
19. **The proposed design will radically change the character and the use of the boatyard. Who is overseeing the design process and has the London Waterways Committee been consulted?**

The project is subject to an ongoing process of consultation with statutory and non statutory stakeholders. There have been extensive consultation with berth holders, boatyard users and boatyard businesses throughout the design development process. There have also been meetings with the planning department at Southwark the GLA (who the London Waterways Committee advise), the Environment Agency and the Lewisham Regeneration and Transport team. The design team look forward to further consultation events with all interested parties.

20. **What will the impact of the proposed development be on Plough Way, particularly in relation to parking for new and existing residents?**

Improvements are proposed for the Plough Way roundabout. A basement car park, with 78 car parking spaces (including 8 dedicated disabled parking bays), is provided in the scheme for new residents. That is based upon a car parking ration of 0.4 car parking spaces per unit of accommodation.

21. **Will the boatyard continue to operate during the development of the site to ensure that berth-holders (and other boatyard users) can continue to maintain and repair their boats? How much money does Southwark receive from the Marina?**

A management plan will be produced to ensure that the boatyard continues to operate throughout the development process and to minimise disruption. The approximate annual income the Council receives from the marina is £1.271 million.

22. **The major impact of scheme is directly upon the buildings closest to them. However visualisation drawings have not been produced for Plough Way, Calypso Way and St George’s Square and we would like the drawings to be from different perspectives.**

Six different visualisations have been provided today from Rope Street, Lighter Close, Calypso Way, the Thames footpath, Greenland pier and a river view. More visualisations can be produced for the next consultation event. Residents are invited to provide specific suggestions by emailing housingregen@sothwark.gov.uk

23. **Why has this site been allocated for tall buildings when the locality has not been identified as an area suitable for tall buildings in the Council’s Core Strategy and that the buildings proposed are significantly higher than their surroundings?**

24. **Could the height of the buildings be shown is metres?**

25. **Why is the boatyard considered to be underutilised. It seems to me that it is very busy, full of people and boats. What is the Port of London authority’s view on all this?**

26. **Several complaints were raised about the consultation process to date: late notice of consultation events, the response to resident queries and the quality of the information provided.**

**Summary:**
The last public consultation was undertaken on the 19 September 2016 and stakeholders were able to review the latest design proposal and made comments ranging from the density, the design, parking, the public realm and the commercial.
6. Summary

The last public consultation was undertaken on the 19 September 2016 and stakeholders were able to review the latest design proposal and made comments ranging from the density, the design, parking, the public realm and the commercial viability of the boatyard. All of the comments have been recorded and will be fully considered when a developer is appointed. The Council is in the process of appointing a development partner who will take the lead in further consultations and designing of the site.

The council’s vision for the South Dock Marina is to ensure that the development achieves the highest standard of design, exceeding minimum internal space standards, as well as providing an acceptable standard of daylight and sunlight, privacy, good outlook and amenity space. A development partner with good urban design experience and experience in working within a similar context of the site.
7. Next steps

The proposed tenure mix is: 49 Social rented units; 20 Intermediate rented units and 131 market sale units. The tenure mix will consist of 1, 2 and 3 bed flats including some wheelchair units. The planned timetable is as follows:

- OJEU Notice and the Selection Questionnaire to be issued in April 2017
- Invitation to Tender to be issued in June 2017
- Contract Award by November 2017

As soon as a developer is on board, the developer in consultation with the council will engage in very detailed consultations with stakeholders to ensure that the South Dock Marina site provides a sustainable housing development, a viable boatyard, viable economic activities, attractive public realm that will symbolise a sense of place in the area.
8. Appendix 1 - List of Attendees

- Councillor Mark Williams (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and New Homes),
- Bruce Glockling (Head of Regeneration, London Borough of Southwark),
- Nnenna Urum-Eke (Housing Regeneration Programme Manager, London Borough of Southwark)
- Patrick Keating (Harbour Master for London Borough of Southwark)
- Adam Khan, Adam Khan Architects (Architect)
- Ketan Lad, Adam Khan Architects (Architect)
- Jennifer Ross, Tibbalds (Planning Consultant)
- Ben Meekings, Project centre (Transport consultant)
9. Appendix 2 - Display Boards and Model

Link to consultation display boards

http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/4683/south_dock_consultation_boards
Model photograph
Model photograph
10. Appendix 3 - Daylight and Sunlight Additional Information
South Dock Marina - Proposed Development

This file note looks to set out a response for the consultation report in regards to the daylight and sunlight queries.

It is understood that the Canada Water Area Action Plan (CWAAP) deems South Dock Marina as a suburban area. However, for the purposes of the daylight and sunlight assessment the area is deemed to be urban because the density of the proposals is urban.

This view is supported by the GLA in their pre-application feedback, where they stated to consider the site as ‘urban’ to optimise housing potential. In addition, the consented developments in local area along Plough Way by Berkeley Homes (Marine Wharf) and Galliard Homes (Marine Wharf East) are clearly urban.

The BRE guidelines give just one set of criteria regardless of whether the development is in a village, town or inner city area. Flexibility therefore must be applied which is set out in the opening paragraphs of the BRE guidelines as follows:

“The advice given is not mandatory and the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances, the developer or the planning authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in a historic city centre, or in an area with modern high rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings”.

In addition to the above, if the surrounding area is compared to the Residential Design Standards for Southwark Council (October 2011), it is our view that it would be deemed as an ‘urban zone’ as is it characterised by ‘flats, maisonettes and terraced housing. [Whereby,] Suburban Zones generally contain a more open character, with larger gardens and houses rather than flats’.

Therefore, from a Daylight and Sunlight perspective the effects of the Proposed Development on the surrounding residential buildings should be considered from an urban perspective and the BRE guidelines should therefore be applied appropriately.