

Item No: 6.0	Classification : Open	Date: 29 November 2022	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum report Late observations and further information	
Wards or groups affected:		Chaucer	
From:		Director of Planning and Growth	

PURPOSE

1. To advise members of clarifications, corrections, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the stated recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That members note and consider the additional information and consultation responses in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Report clarifications are required in respect of the following planning application on the main agenda, and additional information has been received:

Item 6.1 – 22/AP/2227: Demolition of existing building and structures and erection of a part 2, part 7, part 14 storey plus basement mixed-use development comprising 1733sqm (GIA) of space for class E employment use and/or class F1(a) education use and 219 purpose-built student residential rooms with associated amenity space, including at 7th floor roof level, and public realm works, car and cycle parking, and ancillary infrastructure.

Report Clarifications and/or Additional Information

4. The table in paragraph of 13 of the report is incorrect as it represents the quantum of development for the 16 storey scheme that is subject to appeal. The correct table for the 14 storey scheme is below:

5. View 9, the townscape images of the development from the Inner London Sessions Court on page 48 of the agenda pack is missing the image of the 16 storey scheme, which is reproduced below with the 14 storey scheme for comparison:

16 Storey appeal scheme

14 storey (this application)

6. The application form contained an error for the amount of floorspace which is 8789.45sqm so the archaeology contribution reported in paragraph 187 should be £6,778 instead of the £3,389 reported.
7. Paragraph 91 of the report refers to the appeal scheme which should instead reference this 14 storey planning application before members.

Additional comments

8. Since publication of the report, comments from the HSE on the amended plans have been received. The HSE confirm that they are satisfied with the fire safety design to the extent that it affects land use planning and that the previous concerns have been resolved.
9. Late representations were received from a law practice acting for landowner of Coburg House, 63-67 Newington Causeway SE1 6BD on 8 November. The letter, while referring to both this application (22/AP/2227) and the 16 storey appeal scheme (21/AP/4297) in its heading, refers through the body to the addendum report for the committee on 2 November where members endorsed putative reasons for refusal for the 16 storey scheme. The letter says:
 - The owners of Coburg House are not bringing development forward pursuant to agreement with owners of other parts of the allocated site.
 - Officers' assessment on the impact that development on Avonmouth House could have on reasonable development on the rest of the allocated site is based on the 'masterplan' in the applicant's submission and undefined mitigation
 - The suggestion that the requirements of the allocation could be met on the rest of the site is unsubstantiated.
10. For clarity, officers' advice to members is not based, in any way, on a presumption that the rest of the allocated site may be delivered with one

or more sites in separate ownership being developed together. Indeed in paragraph 90 of the report for the 14 storey scheme recommended for approval, it is stated that officers were informed a comprehensive redevelopment was not likely.

11. The advice in relation to the impact of this development on the rest of the site allocation is not based on the 'masterplan' in the application and it is reiterated that this has no planning weight and should not weigh in members' consideration of this application. Its reference in the report was in response to the landowner objectors referring to the 'masterplan' in their letters. Examples of mitigation that could be provided to reduce mutual impacts are provided in paragraph 95 of the main report such as screening and windows being angled away from each other.
12. The requirements of the site allocation are referenced in the main report but for ease of reference repeated here:

NSP 46 has an indicative residential capacity of 93 homes with its site requirements being:

Redevelopment of the site must:

- Provide at least the amount of employment floorspace (E(g), B class) currently on the site or provide at least 50% of the development as employment floorspace, whichever is greater; and
- Retain the existing theatre use or provide an alternative cultural use (D2); and
- Provide active frontages including ground floor retail, community or leisure uses (as defined in the glossary) on Newington Causeway.

Redevelopment of the site should:

- Provide new homes (C3).

Redevelopment of the site may:

- Provide a new community health hub (E(e)).
13. Of the 'must' requirements of the site allocation, one applies only to the Newington Causeway Frontage while the other regarding the re-provision of the theatre or cultural use is to protect the cultural use presently provided by the Southwark Playhouse; both are not directly applicable to Avonmouth House. Paragraphs 45-49 of the main report explain why the first bulletpoint on employment floorspace is not considered to apply here.
 14. The allocation gives an indicative capacity of 93 homes and while this development does not provide any conventional housing, the London Plan says that student housing should count towards meeting housing targets at a ratio of 2.5:1. This development would provide the equivalent of 87.6 homes, very close to the indicative capacity. The provision of a community health hub is something that the allocation says may be provided so is not crucial to its delivery.
 15. The stage 1 response from the GLA on the afternoon of 29 November. It recommends that the nominations rights be secured in the legal agreement and that information on transport matters is secured through a condition. The nominations agreement will be secured in the legal agreement and officers recommend the following additional condition:

Prior to the commencement of above grade works, a service management strategy shall be submitted to the local planning authority providing information on trip generation, deliveries and servicing and move-in/move-out plan.

16. The GLA have also asked for additional information on the energy strategy; whole life carbon; circular economy; urban greening; sustainable drainage; water efficiency; flood risk and air quality. Some of this information is secured through condition while the rest can be provided before the stage 2 referral by the applicant.

Conditions

17. It is recommended that condition 2 for approved plans be amended to remove reference to:
 - Existing drawings
 - Landscape drawings (this is secured through the s106 and

condition)

- The 3D model drawing

18. It is also recommended that an additional condition be added to control the hours of use of the café to between 07:00 and 22:00 to protect neighbours' amenity.

Conclusion of the Director of Planning and Growth

19. Having taken into account the additional consultation responses and additional information, the recommendation remains that members consider and endorse the Statement of Case that has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate which proposed three putative reasons for refusal.

REASON FOR URGENCY

20. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The applications have been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Planning Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting.

REASON FOR LATENESS

21. The additional information and responses have been received since the original reports were published. They all relate to an item on the agenda and members should be aware of the comments made.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files TP/1411-65	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries Telephone: 020 7525 5403