

Item No. 6.2	Classification: OPEN	Date: 28 November 2011	Meeting Name: PLANNING COMMITTEE
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-0868 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 2-10 STEEDMAN STREET, LONDON SE17 3AF Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of a part 8 / part 9 storey (maximum 29.79m high) building comprising 1,308 sqm of commercial floorspace (Classes B1 office / B8 warehouse and storage / A1 retail) and 28 cluster flats and 4 studios (total 221 bedrooms) for student accommodation with ancillary facilities, refuse and cycle storage, public walkway and associated public realm works		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Newington		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 21/03/2011		Application Expiry Date 20/06/2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission is granted subject to conditions and the applicant first entering into an appropriate S106 legal agreement.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 Members will recall that this application was reported to Planning Committee on 18 October 2011. The recommendation of that report was that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement.
- 3 After considering the report, and hearing representations, the Committee deferred making a decision on the application and requested that further information be provided on the S106 Heads of Terms. In particular, Members required clarification on the mechanism to secure reduced rents, and that a mechanism be put in place to ensure that, in the allocation of rooms, priority would be given to those students attending London College of Communications and Camberwell College of Arts, and students in greatest financial or other defined needs.
- 4 In their discussion, Members also sought further information to justify the weight being accorded to the benefits to the University of the Arts (UAL), and their importance to the regeneration and identity of the Elephant and Castle.
- 5 Following that meeting, further discussions have been held with Alumno and the UAL, and the following additional documentation has been submitted:
 - **Housing Priorities** – details of allocation process.
 - **LCC Business Incubation Units Note** – information on the incubator unit offer and details of LCC work with local community and schools.

- **Affordable and Rent Policy Analysis** – justification for proposed subsidised rents set against the policy background.
 - **Financial Viability and Planning Contributions Paper** – includes planning obligations offered; predicted obligations if open market rents were charged; mechanism for controlling rent increases through S106 agreement.
- 6 The report has been updated to include additional information and analysis as requested by the Committee on 18 October. For clarity, the following sections of the report have been revised to incorporate the additional information:
- Background to the application – paragraphs 20-22
 - Location and concentration of student housing – paragraphs 70-80
 - Affordable housing contribution – paragraphs 88-96
 - UAL and affordability – new section – paragraphs 97-102
 - Cycle parking – paragraphs 137-138
 - Planning obligations – paragraphs 167-185
 - Conclusion – paragraphs 199-201
 - Appendix 2 – Consultation responses, which now includes the responses set out in the Addendum report dated 18 October, plus one response from 24 Peacock Street which was received by officers after that report had been published.

Site location and description

- 7 The application site is located to the west of Walworth Road and is bounded by Hampton Street to the north, Steedman Street to the south and an elevated railway viaduct immediately to the west. An eight storey block in blue render (Julian Markham House) comprising a ground floor Chinese restaurant and student accommodation on the upper floors is immediately adjacent to the eastern site boundary. The site is 0.2085 hectares in size with the application red line boundary incorporating the adjacent railway arches.
- 8 The existing three storey building on the site contains a number of uses related to vehicle servicing and repairs (Class B1/B2/B8 and Sui Generis). The ground floor is used as a car wash, car park, storage and office space with a vehicle workshop, car park, storage and ancillary offices located at first floor level. The second floor is used also as a vehicle workshop and further commercial car parking area. There are currently four vehicle access points to the site from Hampton Street and three from Steedman Street.
- 9 The immediate surrounding area comprises a varied mix of commercial, industrial and residential properties. To the north of the site on the corner of Walworth Road and Hampton Street there is a three and four storey terrace (4-6 Hampton Street and 94-96 Walworth Road) comprising commercial uses on the ground floor and residential units above. To the west of these buildings on the other side of the railway viaduct there is a two storey building used as a day centre (Castle Day Centre). Residential use predominates on the western side of the viaduct with a mix of housing types including purpose built blocks of flats and terraced housing. There is also a single storey day nursery on the corner of Hampton Street and Steedman Street close to the railway viaduct and a single storey car repairs is located immediately adjacent to the western side of the railway viaduct (20 Steedman Street). Planning permission has recently been refused on this site for redevelopment for offices on the ground floor and residential above.
- 10 To the south of Steedman Street, opposite the application site, is a seven storey building in brick and purple render (11 Steedman Street) and a larger building in green render set back from Steedman Street that graduates up in height from seven storeys at its southern end to 11 storeys opposite the application site (9 Steedman Street). On

the corner of Steedman Street is a part six/seven storey building (T.Clarke) used for offices and at 120-138 Walworth Road there is a recently completed development for student accommodation with commercial uses at ground floor level.

- 11 The application site is extremely well served by public transport and this is reflected in the high Public Transport Accessibility (PTAL) rating of 6b. The London Cycle Network runs along to the north and south of the site. The University of Arts London (UAL) is located approximately 500m from the site.

Details of proposal

- 12 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part eight / part nine storey building comprising 1,308 sqm of commercial floorspace (Class B1 / B8 / A1) and 221 bedspaces for student accommodation, refuse and cycle storage, new public walkway and associated public realm works.
- 13 The building would be set back from the railway viaduct and at ground floor level would occupy the whole of the site with a frontage onto both Hampton Street and Steedman Street. At upper floor level the building has a 'C-shaped' form in order to take account of Julian Markham House. The development appears as three distinct but related blocks with a block addressing each of the Hampton and Steedman Street sides and a 'linking' block facing west alongside the railway. At Steedman Street the block would be eight storeys with the top floor set-back, the linking element would rise to nine storeys with the top floor set back, culminating in a full nine storey height at the Hampton Street block (plus roof plant room / lift overrun). The proposed elevational treatment comprises a mix of brick combined with metal trims, frameless glazing and precast stonework.
- 14 A landscaped public walkway for pedestrians and cyclists would be created between the railway viaduct and the proposed building, connecting Steedman and Hampton Streets. The development has been designed to provide an active frontage for the length of the walkway.
- 15 The commercial space within the ground floor of the main building is located towards the Hampton Street side and comprises 391 sqm of Class B1 floorspace to be used as 'incubation' units, accessed from both Hampton Street and the new public walkway. A Class A1 coffee bar / sandwich shop (106 sqm) would be located adjacent to the incubator units and would be accessed from the new walkway. The ground and mezzanine floors of five railway arches located adjacent to the proposed building are also proposed to be used to increase the extent of the commercial offer. Three of the arches would be used as Class B1 'incubation' units (473 sqm), with the remaining two arches to be used for flexible Class B1 / B8 (338 sqm) purposes. The railway arches would be directly accessed from the new public walkway.
- 16 The student accommodation comprises 221 bedrooms in the form of 28 cluster flats and 4 studio units. 11 bedrooms (5%) would be designed to be wheelchair accessible. All the student rooms would be located on the upper floors of the building and accessed via a main entrance from Steedman Street. At ground floor level there would be a student reception, office and staff room, a laundry and student common room which has direct internal access through to the coffee / sandwich bar.
- 17 The development is proposed to be 'car-free' with the exception of one parking space for disabled users provided on Steedman Street. 128 cycle spaces are proposed to be provided and separate refuse storage areas are provided for both the student accommodation and the commercial uses.
- 18 Background to the application
The application is submitted jointly by Alumno Developments and University of Arts London (UAL). Alumno is a specialist provider of student accommodation who has entered into a 25 year nominations agreement with UAL where the University would

occupy and manage the accommodation. The following colleges make up UAL:

- Camberwell College of Arts
- Central Saint Martins College of Arts and Design
- Chelsea College of Art and Design
- London College of Communication (LCC)
- London College of Fashion
- Wimbledon College of Art

The Colleges offer a range of art, design and media courses at levels from further education courses to undergraduate, postgraduate and research degrees. A key business objective for UAL is to support enterprise through the promotion of commercial services and local business partnerships.

19 The student accommodation would be occupied on academic year tenancies to students registered at UAL and it is anticipated that the majority of students residing in the accommodation will be studying at LCC which is less than half a mile from the application site.

20 *Incubation space*

UAL also intend to occupy the commercial floorspace for use as 'incubation' units in order to provide low cost workspace on flexible terms to assist UAL graduates as well as benefit the local community. The commercial units will have a specific focus on assisting artists and designers who are attempting to establish themselves as businesses and/or artists and develop business ideas, but struggle to afford commercial rents and rates and/or need flexible letting. The proposed new commercial units would be made available not only to UAL graduates but also to new local start-up businesses and local residents.

21 A number of Universities in the UK offer incubation units to business start up companies. They are essentially serviced workspace premises which are managed by the business and enterprise units of universities. The workspace is available on a variety of short term rental arrangements to selected new businesses, and usually started by graduates from the host university. Beside space, incubator units offer business advice to entrepreneurs.

22 Additional information has been submitted to further explain what will be offered by the proposed incubation units at Hampton Street. Generally incubator spaces linked with universities differentiate themselves from commercial space providers through the provision of business start up advice and support. Whilst businesses in LCC's incubator space in Hampton Street will have access to business start up advice from the University's Enterprise Centre for the Creative Arts, the College will also offer a range of other services to businesses. This combination of services and access to facilities will differentiate the Media Village in Hampton Street from other serviced business space and from other UK incubator units. The incubator package offered by LCC will have the following benefits to offer which would be specific to this scheme:

- Affordable rents negotiated between LCC and the developer – not greater than £12 per sq ft;
- Serviced spaces will start at £200 per calendar month for a single person workstation;
- 10% of the space available to the local community via LCC 'Wider Participation' programme;
- Access to LCC's community of expertise in design and media, including research;
- Access to networking and industry events, and research seminars;
- Preferential rates for hire of lecture and exhibition space;
- Affordable access to events organisational skills within the marketing teams;
- New business opportunities from relationships with other education and research centres;

Planning history

- 23 Two planning applications were submitted in 2008 for the redevelopment of the application site (references 08-AP-0528 and 08-AP-2206) comprising ground floor commercial space and student accommodation above. These applications were withdrawn prior to determination.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 24 20 Steedman Street (reference 11-AP-2163) - application submitted for: erection of a 6 storey building comprising office space on the ground floor (Use Class B1) and 9 self-contained flats above (4 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) (Use Class C3), following demolition of the existing building on the site. The application was refused on 7 October 2011.
- 25 120-138 Walworth Road (reference 09-AP-1069) - allowed on appeal on 15th July 2010 for: erection of a part 4, part 5, part 7 and part 8 storey building providing a mixed use development comprising 734 sqm of commercial floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A4 Use Class) at ground floor level and 232 student accommodation units above with landscaping, 4 disabled only car parking spaces and 116 bicycle spaces. Building works on the site are now complete.
- 26 100 Walworth Road (reference 02-AP-1290) - granted in May 2002 for erection of an 8 storey building comprising commercial space (Class A1 / A2 / A3) on the ground floor and 50 flats for student accommodation on the upper floors. As referred to above this building is now known as 'Julian Markham House' and includes a Chinese restaurant on the ground floor.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 27 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- Principle of proposed development, including need for student accommodation;
 - Environmental Impact Assessment;
 - Impact on amenities of neighbouring residents and occupiers;
 - Transport issues;
 - Design and layout;
 - Quality of accommodation
 - Flood risk;
 - Archaeology;
 - Planning obligations, including provision of affordable housing; and
 - Sustainability.

Planning policy

- 28 The application site is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area, the Elephant and Castle Town Centre, and an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The site is also within Flood Zone 3, as designated within the Environment Agency's Flood Map. The site does not lie within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings adjoining the site. The nearest listed buildings are to the south east further along Walworth Road and include John Smith House (144-152 Walworth Road) and Council offices (151 Walworth Road) on the corner of Walworth Road and Wansey Street. The most relevant policies are set out below.
- 29 Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Targets Policy 1 - Achieving growth
Strategic Targets Policy 2 - Improving places
Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment
Strategic Policy 4 - Places to learn and enjoy
Strategic Policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes
Strategic Policy 8 - Student homes
Strategic Policy 10 - Jobs and businesses
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

30 Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 1.4 Employment sites outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations
Policy 1.5 Small Business Units
Policy 1.7: Development within Town and Local Centres
Policy 2.5: Planning Obligations
Policy 3.1: Environmental Effects
Policy 3.2: Protection of Amenity
Policy 3.3: Sustainability Assessment
Policy 3.4: Energy Efficiency
Policy 3.6: Air Quality
Policy 3.7: Waste Reduction
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 3.28: Biodiversity
Policy 3.31: Flood Defences
Policy 4.7: Non-self contained housing for identified user groups
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

31 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Documents (SPD)

Design and Access Statements SPD (2007)
Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD (2007)
Affordable Housing SPD (2008)
Sustainable Transport SPD (2008)
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009)
Walworth Road SPD (2008)
Elephant and Castle Development Framework SPG (2004)
Residential Design Standards SPD (October 2011)
Draft Affordable Housing SPD (June 2011)

32 London Plan (2011)

Policy 2.5 Sub-Regions
Policy 2.9 Inner London
Policy 2.10 Central Activities Zone - Strategic Priorities
Policy 2.11 Central Activities Zone - Strategic Functions
Policy 2.12 Central Activities Zone - Predominantly Local Activities
Policy 2.13 Opportunity Areas And Intensification Areas
Policy 2.15 Town Centres
Policy 3.1 Ensuring Equal Life Chances For All
Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
Policy 3.8 Housing Choice

Policy 3.9 Mixed And Balanced Communities
 Policy 3.10 Definition Of Affordable Housing
 Policy 3.11 Affordable Housing Targets
 Policy 3.12 Negotiating Affordable Housing On Individual Private Residential And Mixed Use Schemes
 Policy 3.18 Education Facilities
 Policy 4.1 Developing London's Economy
 Policy 4.7 Retail and Town Centre Development
 Policy 4.12 Improving Opportunities For All
 Policy 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
 Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
 Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design And Construction
 Policy 5.5 Decentralised Energy Networks
 Policy 5.6 Decentralised Energy In Development Proposals
 Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy
 Policy 5.9 Overheating And Cooling
 Policy 5.10 Urban Greening
 Policy 5.11 Green Roofs And Development Site Environs
 Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management
 Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
 Policy 5.15 Water Use And Supplies
 Policy 6.3 Assessing Transport Capacity
 Policy 6.9 Cycling
 Policy 6.10 Walking
 Policy 6.11 Smoothing Traffic Flow And Tackling Congestion
 Policy 6.13 Parking
 Policy 7.1 Building London's Neighbourhoods And Communities
 Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
 Policy 7.3 Designing Out Crime
 Policy 7.4 Local Character
 Policy 7.5 Public Realm
 Policy 7.6 Architecture
 Policy 7.13 Safety, Security And Resilience To Emergency
 Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
 Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise And Enhancing Soundscapes
 Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

33 Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
 PPS 3: Housing
 PPS 5: Planning for the Historic Environment
 PPG 13: Transport
 PPS 22: Renewable Energy
 PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control
 PPG 24: Planning and Noise
 PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk
 Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations

34 Draft National Planning Policy Framework

The draft NPPF was published at the end of July 2011 for consultation until 17 October 2011 and is capable of being a material consideration. The draft is currently the subject of public consultation and could be subject to change in the light of that consultation. As a result, whilst it carries some weight, it should not be given substantial weight. The Government has set out its commitment to a planning system that does everything it can do to support sustainable economic growth. Local Planning Authorities are expected to plan positively for new development. All plans should be based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and contain clear policies that will guide how the presumption will be applied locally.

35 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is a new policy designed to

ensure that the planning system as a whole focuses on opportunities. The presumption, in practice, means that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system and Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for new development and approve all individual proposals wherever possible. But development should not be allowed if it would undermine the key principles for sustainability in the Framework. The draft NPPF makes clear that the policies should apply 'unless the adverse impacts of allowing development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'.

- 36 The draft NPPF also states that 'The primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent development' and that local authorities should look for solutions to problematic applications, so they 'can be approved wherever practical to do so'.
- 37 The draft NPPF also sets out core principles that should underpin both plan-making and development management. It states that 'every effort should be made to identify and meet the housing, business, and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth'.
- 38 The NPPF builds upon the Government's 'Plan for Growth' which was published in March 2011. The overall theme of this document is to support long term sustainable economic growth and job creation in the UK. This is set out as a clear and current Government objective.

Principle of development

- 39 PPS 1 seeks to promote the efficient use of land by optimising the use of previously development land (brownfield sites) and vacant or underused buildings. The application site is located within the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area and Town Centre where the spatial vision for the Opportunity Area set out in the Core Strategy is to facilitate the regeneration of the area into a more desirable place for both existing and new residents. Strategic Targets Policy 2 states that there will be excellent shopping, leisure facilities and cultural activities. London South Bank University and London University of the Arts will develop further as important centres of learning. The vision also sets out that we will meet our target of 4,000 new homes and a minimum of 1,400 affordable housing units as well as meet the London Plan target of 5,000 new jobs by encouraging more offices, hotels, small businesses and developing the evening economy and cultural activities.
- 40 The existing building on the site contains a mix of Class B and Sui Generis uses including vehicle repair workshops, car wash, internal car park, storage, and ancillary office space. Although the building is occupied it does not maximise the efficient use of the site, particularly in respect of the internal car park, and the Class B2 industrial / B8 storage mix is not considered to best utilise the site's highly accessible and sustainable town centre location. Furthermore, the building is not considered to be of architectural merit and does not positively contribute to the character of the local area.
- 41 The proposal would see the redevelopment of the site for a high density, mixed use development comprising student housing and commercial floorspace, including the provision of flexible low cost incubation units and start-up business space, which involves the activation of the adjacent railway arches. This is considered to represent a much more sustainable and efficient use of the site and no objections are raised in principle to the redevelopment of the site, subject to compliance with all other relevant plan policies.
- 42 Loss of Class B employment floorspace
Core Strategy SP 10 seeks to protect existing business floorspace as well as provide an additional 25,000 - 30,000 sqm of business floorspace over the plan period in the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. Saved Policy 1.4 of the Southwark Plan states that on sites which have an established Class B use and are within the CAZ

development will be permitted provided the proposal would not result in a net loss of Class B floorspace. An exception to this can be made where the exceptions tests listed in the policy have been met. These tests are:

- where the applicant can demonstrate convincing attempts to dispose of the premises either for continued B use or for mixed uses involving B uses, including redevelopment, over a period of 24 months have been unsuccessful;
- the site or buildings would be unsuitable for re-use or redevelopment for B use or mixed uses including B use having regard to physical or environmental constraints; or
- the site is located within a town or local centre, in which case suitable A class or other town centre uses will be permitted in place of B uses.

- 43 The Elephant and Castle Development Framework SPG (2004) sets out in policies DFP 1a and 1b that many of the existing buildings in the area are already in employment use. The SPG states that the Council will seek to protect the employment potential of these sites and proposals will be expected to demonstrate no net loss of Class B employment floorspace. An exception to this may be justified where it can be demonstrated that substantial employment can be provided by a use class other than Class B. The SPG highlights the importance of the railway arches in that they provide an excellent opportunity to accommodate a diverse mix of smaller / start up business activity. In this respect a key policy aim in the SPG is to protect the railway arches and their ability to accommodate existing and new low cost employment generating activity.
- 44 In 2009 the Council carried out an employment land review (ELR) as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. The ELR found that there is a forecast demand for around 25,000-30,000sqm of office space suitable to accommodate smaller Class B1 office units for the local market. The town centre area demonstrates strong suitability for Class B1 uses with good public transport accessibility. The ELR analysis concluded that the existing accommodation in the local office market is dominated by second-hand office accommodation, with an oversupply of poor quality second-hand accommodation and an under supply of modern quality office space.
- 45 The existing building on the application site has a total floorspace of 4,043 sqm of which 2,103 sqm is in Sui Generis use, 1,856 sqm is in Class B employment use and 84 sqm of plant. In this case at least 1,856 sqm of Class B floorspace would normally be expected to be re-provided in any development proposal for the site. The proposed development provides 1,308 sqm of replacement commercial floorspace in the form of 1,202 sqm of Class B use and 106 sqm of Class A1 retail. There is therefore a shortfall of 548 sqm of replacement Class B provision.
- 46 A Marketing and Demand Report prepared by Kalmar's has been submitted. The report notes that the existing building is in a poor state with limited services and that the existing layout is irregular with many supporting columns obstructing the clear space. Large capital expenditure would be required to allow maximum use of the space.
- 47 In terms of marketing, the report confirms that Kalmar's were originally instructed by the existing vendor to market the property 'for sale' in March 2008 as its existing use. During the course of the marketing period the report states there was little interest from industrial users; the majority of interest was for residential development, student housing, religious use, college, and nightclub. Kalmar's were again instructed by the applicant (Alumno) to market the property 'for sale' and 'to let' in April 2010 but there has been limited commercial interest.
- 48 The report further provides a market overview and assesses other potential commercial uses through refurbishment of the existing building (Class B8 storage, B2 industrial, B1 office, A1-A5 retail, and other uses) and provides an analysis of market demand for commercial property in the Elephant and Castle area. The report

concludes that, based on the knowledge of the local market, that a suitable occupier could not utilise nor occupy the site in its current condition and layout and a substantial amount of capital expenditure would be required to refurbish the building into acceptable standards. The return on investment into the works would take considerable time to recover. Additionally, while the regeneration of the Elephant and Castle will contribute to new office space within the area over the coming years but, in Kalmar's opinion, the uptake will be slow which could result in an oversupply of B1 offices in a secondary location. This location, away from the transport hub and without a main road frontage, is not one where companies will look for head quarter offices or large office spaces. A majority of the applicants require smaller office space and Southwark is a leading borough in London providing start up units for businesses.

- 49 Officers consider that it has been adequately demonstrated that attempts have been made to dispose of the existing building for Class B purposes. The redevelopment of the site will replace the majority of the existing Class B floorspace with more modern affordable accommodation which will contribute towards meeting the needs of the start up businesses and reflect the SPG's objective of protecting and promoting the employment potential of the area. The retention and provision of small business units is also encouraged by saved Policy 1.5 of the Southwark Plan in order to promote a more sustainable local economy and the activation of the railway arches is a principal SPG objective.
- 50 A key benefit of the scheme to the Elephant and Castle is the inclusion of flexible, low-cost, affordable incubation units that will be managed by UAL for graduates and local people attempting to establish themselves in business. Both the Council's Economic Development Team and the Elephant and Castle Project Team have confirmed their strong support for the scheme and consider that in this instance the small loss of Class B floorspace is far outweighed by the positive benefits that will come forward through the offer of affordable incubator business space. The application documents refer to that fact that nearly 20%, or 1 in 5, of UAL's graduates become self employed or set up their own businesses within 6 months of completing their courses. The Elephant Team advise that there is currently no equivalent space targeted at this growing sector of the economy at the Elephant and Castle and therefore the proposal represents a significant opportunity to capture some of this potential activity and retain it at the Elephant and Castle. As such the proposal has the capacity to diversify the local economy and strengthen it in the longer term.
- 51 There are approximately 14 people currently employed on the site of which 13 are full-time. The proposed commercial uses have the potential to support 44 employees and there will be employment, albeit limited, associated with the student housing. The proposal will therefore support a higher employment level than currently supported and based within modern accommodation. The applicant has advised that they intend to acquire the site with vacant possession but most of the tenants will not need to be relocated. The existing coachline business is winding down as the owners are planning to retire and the other businesses are on short term leases which will not be renewed. A car mechanic will need to be relocated but it is considered that there are other suitable premises that could be found.
- 52 The SPG sets out at paragraph 3.1 that there is a requirement for substantial provision of Class A1, A2, and A3 uses across ground and first floors in the town centre. The SPG also designates the land use of the ground and first floors of the application site as 'High Street retail / mixed use' (figure 3.1). The inclusion of 106 sqm of Class A1 use earmarked as a sandwich / coffee shop together with the incubator units meets the policy objective of the SPG.
- 53 Provision of active frontages
Saved Policy 1.4 allows a loss of Class B provision where an active ground floor is provided. The scheme has been designed to ensure that activity at ground floor level is maximised around the building, and particularly along the new public walkway. Local concerns have been raised about the potential vacancy of the new commercial

units and that in this location there would be limited foot traffic. Comparisons have been made with other vacant commercial units in other nearby developments such as the 'Printworks' on Amelia Street and 'O Central' on Crampton Street. Officers acknowledge that the take-up of other commercial units in the locality is currently proving problematic, but there is a material difference between these units and the ones now proposed. UAL will take-up the management of the commercial units from the outset with the objective of providing low-cost flexible space for UAL graduates as well as local people. Given the nature of incubation units it is unlikely these spaces will be vacant for any length of time. Occupation of these units (including the rail arches) will create activity and increased footfall thereby improving the commercial viability and vitality of the area.

- 54 The current building on the site and its uses do not provide any genuine activity at ground floor level and therefore the scheme would represent a significant improvement in this respect. The provision of a Class A1 retail unit that can be accessed independently from the walkway or internally through the student accommodation will ensure a level of activity and provides a suitable town centre use for the benefit of future occupiers of the development as well as existing occupiers in the vicinity.
- 55 While UAL would in the first instance look to occupy all the five railway arches as incubator units, Network Rail (freeholder of the arches) have requested that two of the arches (338 sqm) retain a flexible Class B1 / B8 use in the event they need to use them for their own purposes. Class B8 warehouse and storage use does not always provide the most active of frontages given the nature of warehouse use. In this case however the primary use of the arches would be for either as affordable incubator space or start-up Class B1 businesses and therefore the frontage treatment to the arches will be designed to ensure an open frontage is maintained.
- 56 It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a small net loss of commercial floorspace but it has been demonstrated that attempts have been made to market the building for Class B purposes. Furthermore, the proposal has the potential to bring significant regenerative benefits to the area (as discussed further below) as compared with the existing under-utilised use of the site and fully accords with the overall vision and objectives for the Elephant and Castle set out in the London Plan, Core Strategy and saved Southwark Plan policies.
- 57 Student accommodation
PPS 3 and the London Plan state that local authorities must take into account and acknowledge that students need to be provided for. London Plan Policy 3A.18 concerning Education Facilities states that development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported. This support is reiterated in Policy 3.8 Housing Choice which advises that the strategic and local requirements for student housing meeting a demonstrable need are addressed by working closely with higher and further education agencies and without compromising capacity for conventional homes. A key objective of Policy 3.8 is to ensure new developments offer a range of housing choices in terms of mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups. As discussed below, Core Strategy SP 8 also recognises the need for student accommodation whilst balancing this against other housing need.
- 58 In Southwark, student accommodation is considered to be non self-contained accommodation, defined as "Sui Generis" under the Use Classes Order. Policies relating to housing targets, dwelling mix and quality of residential accommodation are therefore not directly applicable. However, student housing is considered housing for monitoring purposes through the Council's and the GLA's annual monitoring reports.
- 59 Saved Policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan states that new development which provides non self-contained residential accommodation will normally be permitted where the need for and suitability of the accommodation can be demonstrated. In addition, there

must be adequate local infrastructure and the proposed accommodation must be of a satisfactory standard. The new development should not result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

- 60 Core Strategy Policy SP 8 deals specifically with student homes and sets out the Council's approach to the provision of student housing over the future plan period (2011 to 2026). Policy SP 8 seeks to ensure that development meets the needs of universities and colleges for new student housing whilst balancing the building of student homes with other types of housing such as affordable and family housing. This will be achieved by:
- Allowing development of student homes within the town centres, and places with good access to public transport services, providing that these do not harm the local character.
 - Requiring 35% of student developments as affordable housing in line with policy 6 and figure 22 [Strategic Policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes]
- 61 Section 4.3 of the adopted Residential Design Standards SPD (2011) and Section 6.2 of the adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2008) sets out further requirements in respect of student housing, including evidence of need, confirmation that the accommodation would be affordable, and details of the security and management arrangements. The Affordable Housing SPD is being updated to take account of policy changes introduced through the Core Strategy. Formal consultation on the draft Affordable Housing SPD closed on 30 September 2011 and the responses are currently being considered.
- 62 *Need for student accommodation*
Saved Policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan and Section 4.3 of the adopted Residential Design Standards SPDs require proposals for student housing to demonstrate an identified need for this type of housing, including a letter from a recognised educational establishment. In addition, confirmation that the accommodation would be affordable to that user group, and details of the security and long-term management arrangements are required.
- 63 In terms of existing student accommodation, the Southwark Student Housing Study (July 2010) sets out the number of student schemes under construction and schemes consented but not yet implemented. The Study found that Southwark had the second highest number of student schemes of any London borough in the development pipeline. Additionally, there are a number of new student schemes that have been granted permission since the date of the Study, including the nearby 120-138 Walworth Road student scheme which was allowed on appeal on 15 July 2010 (reference 09-AP-1069) for 232 student units. Permission was granted in December 2010 for a student scheme 30-32 and 33-35 Peckham Road for student accommodation (155 bed spaces) where the applicant was Alumno Developments (reference 10-AP-2623).
- 64 Notwithstanding this, the Study found that there was still insufficient student accommodation across London with demand outweighing supply. It was noted that the lack of purpose built accommodation within central London was placing upward pressure on housing demand in the private rented sector. High house prices in some central London boroughs (such as Westminster and Camden) is increasing the demand for rented accommodation in adjacent boroughs such as Southwark. At the same time the provision of purpose built accommodation has not expanded sufficiently and there is, even taking into consideration student schemes in the pipeline, an inadequate amount of purpose built student accommodation.
- 65 Although there is no formal policy requirement in the Core Strategy and associated updated SPDs to demonstrate a *local* need for student accommodation, Alumno have entered into a 25 year nominations agreement with UAL so that the proposed accommodation would be occupied by students registered at UAL, with the majority of

these students likely to be studying at the nearby LCC. The direct link to a local institution is unlike most other student schemes that have recently come forward in the borough which have been speculative in nature with the accommodation offered on a direct-let basis.

- 66 UAL has submitted evidence to demonstrate the need for additional accommodation in the borough. UAL advise that last year's full-time student number across six sites was 20,049 whereas the number of bed spaces UAL was able to offer was 2,767, a total of which was heavily oversubscribed (4,000 applications received). Many of the students thus have to seek either expensive direct-let student residences or bedrooms in houses of multiple occupation. UAL say that neither of these options offer the level of pastoral support they would like to give and are unattractive for students looking to move to London for the first time. At a local level the two colleges located in Southwark (LCC and Camberwell College of Arts) make up circa 7,200 full time students but the accommodation available in the borough through UAL is 712 beds.
- 67 The draft Affordable Housing and adopted Residential Design Standards SPDs require details of affordability. This is to ensure that the housing is affordable to that user group by being benchmarked against other similar student accommodation. The applicant has advised that a key development principle of both Alumno and UAL is affordability. As part of the nominations agreement it is proposed that rents will be affordable and in line with UAL's existing portfolio. The rental increases will be linked to the Retail Price Index (RPI) and therefore there is no risk that the rents would be 'hiked'. UAL currently occupy Julian Markham House (231 bed spaces) and their agreement with the landlord (Unite) will expire in 2013 and is unlikely to be renewed. It is then likely that the accommodation in that building would be let on an open market rather than subsidised basis. Officers consider that the scheme will offer much needed *affordable* accommodation within the locality and this is a positive aspect of the scheme. The affordability of the units will need to be secured via a clause in the Section 106 Agreement. Further information on this issue is provided at paragraphs 176-179.
- 68 A Student Accommodation Management Proposal has been submitted which details the proposed management and security arrangements in accordance with the requirements of the adopted Residential Design SPD. Again, relevant management and security measures would have to be secured via a legal agreement to ensure these were in place for the lifetime of the development.
- 69 Overall, officers conclude that whilst Southwark is relatively well provided for in terms of student housing, there is still an unmet need for student accommodation within the Borough and more significantly on a London-wide basis. Supporting text to London Plan Policy 3.8 states that London's universities make a significant contribution to its economy and labour market. It is important their attractiveness and potential growth are not compromised by inadequate provision for new student accommodation (paragraph 3.52). This proposal, unlike a number of other student schemes in the borough, will directly benefit a local university by offering affordable rents to UAL students. It is therefore considered that the need for the accommodation has been demonstrated.
- 70 *Location and concentration of student housing*
Saved Policy 4.7 and the Residential Design Standards SPD require student housing to be located in areas that have adequate infrastructure and are easily accessible to public transport. Core Strategy SP 8 allows for student housing developments within town centres, and places with good access to public transport services "*providing that these do not harm the local character*". A number of local residents have raised concerns about the amount of student accommodation in the locality and the disadvantages such a concentration that could have on the wider regeneration of the Elephant and Castle.
- 71 The proposed student housing is considered to be appropriately located within the

CAZ, the Elephant and Castle Town Centre and benefits from excellent public transport accessibility. The site is also favourably located for LCC which is within easy walking or cycling distance. A dense pattern of development is to be expected in town centres and areas with good public transport services, indeed this is encouraged in the interests of promoting sustainable development. Most student schemes represent intensive developments with relatively high numbers of beds resulting in an increased number of people using the surrounding infrastructure. Town centres and places with good access to public transport are considered to be the most suitable locations for such developments.

- 72 The Core Strategy also requires that proposals for student housing must not harm the local character of the area. An over-concentration of a single use can harm the character of an area at the expense of the provision of other uses. It is recognised that there are a number of student developments in the immediate area, including the existing accommodation at Julian Markham House (231 bed spaces) and the recently completed scheme at 120-138 Walworth Road (232 bed spaces). If the application proposal is included it would result in a total of 684 student beds located within this section of Walworth Road. In addition works have recently started to implement the Oakmayne development at Elephant Road (243 bed spaces).
- 73 Despite the existence of student schemes there remains a wide range of uses within the vicinity of the site such as residential, light industrial, office, retail, food and drink and library as well as student accommodation. Such a range of uses is consistent with the requirements of the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area and the CAZ. If the proposal were implemented then there would still be a genuine mix of uses present and therefore it is considered there would be no resultant significant harm to the local character of the area.
- 74 As referred to above, a number of residents have raised a concern about the transient nature of students and that to successfully regenerate the area the Council should be encouraging family homes for people who are more likely to settle down and have a long term interest in the area. Officers agree that there is a shortage of general purpose housing, particularly affordable family homes, and the provision of a mix of good quality affordable housing is a principal objective for the Opportunity Area. Student housing, whilst not subject to the same requirements as general needs housing, does contribute towards overall housing provision and, as noted by the Walworth Road appeal Inspector, student housing can contribute towards achieving a "vibrant integrated mix of uses" (paragraph 45). Officers consider the key is to achieve a balance between different housing types to ensure the creation of mixed and balanced communities.
- 75 An important distinction between this scheme and other recent schemes is the direct link to UAL who are key stakeholders at the Elephant and Castle with the LCC campus located in the heart of the area. The Elephant and Castle Project Team advise that LCC works closely with local school's through their 'Widening Participation Team' and have demonstrated a commitment to bringing a diverse range of people into design and media education. The applicant further advises that the Widening Participation Team has established progression agreements with Saint Michael and All Angels School and with Southwark College. In addition the Team runs summer courses, taster days, student mentoring and ambassador schemes for schools across Southwark and Greater London.
- 76 LCC has also worked over the last three years with a significant Southwark employer, IPC Media, which is the UK's largest magazine publisher. LCC has worked on programmes for training and work experience for 14 to 16 year olds from local schools and provided specialist training in desktop publishing and supervised work experience programmes at IPC Media.
- 77 Additionally, over the last five years LCC has led the 'Elephant and Castle Cultural Quarter Group' a networking and lobbying group representing local design and media

business organisations. This group has worked with Southwark's Culture and Regeneration Teams on fostering a vibrant local design and media community in the Elephant and Castle area. In addition to working with Alumno on the proposal scheme, LCC BA Interior Design students are working with Southwark's Cuming Museum and St Modwen to re-imagine the Elephant and Castle Shopping Centre for local people for the 21st century. Other collaborations include the 'Elephant Vanishes', a long-term photography and oral history project documenting the regeneration of the area and capturing stories from residents of the Heygate Estate.

- 78 Officers consider that UAL's capacity and commitment to working with the local community and supporting employment opportunities is evident, thereby helping contribute towards the wider regeneration of the Elephant and Castle. In particular, LCC is a key institution in the area that will assist in achieving the Core Strategy's overarching objective of redeveloping the Elephant and Castle into an attractive central London destination.
- 79 As the majority of student beds are likely to be occupied by students at LCC, the students would be both living and studying in the area for most of the year as the tenancies will be offered on a yearly basis. These students are more likely to spend time at the Elephant and will contribute to the local economy through increased use of local services and facilities. This is in contrast to occupants of direct-let student residences where it is likely a good proportion of the students would be registered at universities outside of the borough, thereby spending much of their time outside of the area.
- 80 Officers believe that the direct link with a local educational institution and the positive regenerative benefits arising from this is a material consideration that should be given weight when determining the application and in this respect the proposal can be distinguished from other speculative or direct-let schemes that have come forward in recent years.
- 81 *Affordable housing contribution*
It is not disputed that there is a recognised and established need for student housing across London and that student accommodation could be appropriately located on the site. However, the provision of student housing has to be balanced with the provision of other types of housing, particularly affordable and family homes. Southwark's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2010) and Housing Requirements Study (2009) highlight a significant need for more family and affordable housing, whereas the findings of the Southwark Student Housing Study (January 2010) show that the borough is already relatively well provided for with student accommodation as compared with other London boroughs. Additionally, there are a number of new student schemes that have been granted permission since the date of the Study, including 120-138 Walworth Road scheme. As referred to above Southwark has the second largest number of student homes in London. It is therefore imperative that a balance is achieved between the provision of student accommodation and other types of housing. Core Strategy SP 8 seeks to address this by requiring 35% of student developments as affordable housing, in line with Core Strategy SP 6 - Homes for people on different incomes and figure 22.
- 82 By requiring an element of affordable housing or a contribution to affordable housing for student accommodation schemes the Council can ensure that it is meeting the needs for both student accommodation and affordable general needs accommodation.
- 83 The proposed development is designed to be 100% student housing with no on-site or off-site affordable housing provision. Since the submission of the application the Council has published the draft Affordable Housing SPD (June 2011) which sets out the mechanism to which SP 8 should be applied. It explains that the policy applies to all student schemes above the threshold of 30 or more bedspaces and living spaces, or where the development is over 0.5 hectares (whichever is the smaller). Section 6.3 adopts a sequential approach to ensure delivery of as much affordable housing policy

as possible and sets out three stages in which affordable housing should be secured:

a) On-site provision: All housing, including affordable housing should be located on the development site.

b) Off-site provision: In exceptional circumstances, where affordable housing cannot be provided on-site it may be provided off-site. In these circumstances affordable housing should be provided on another site or sites in the local area of the proposed development.

c) In lieu payment: In exceptional circumstances where it is accepted that affordable housing cannot be provided on-site or off-site, a payment towards providing affordable housing will be required instead of the affordable housing being built as part of the proposed development.

- 84 Given that the scheme was designed and submitted prior to the publication of the mechanism in the SPD, it is accepted that it would be impracticable to redesign the development to include on site affordable housing, or to identify off site opportunities, without significant delay to the development. The applicants have explained that their programme is tight, since they want to deliver the new units for the academic year 2013/14 to dovetail with the loss of the spaces which their students currently occupy in Julian Markham House. If the scheme is to contribute to the delivery of affordable housing, then a commuted sum would be the most realistic option.
- 85 If pooled contributions towards affordable housing were to be accepted then Section 6.3.14 - 6.3.15 details the calculations required for pooled in-lieu contributions which is £100,000 per habitable room of affordable housing not being provided on site. In the case of student housing, habitable rooms would be all bedrooms / studio rooms and communal living/dining areas in cluster flats (where applicable). Other communal spaces such as common rooms or management offices are excluded. The proposal incorporates 221 bed spaces (4 studios and 28 cluster flats) with a number of communal living/dining areas within the cluster flats resulting in an overall 249 habitable rooms within the development. Under this methodology a sum of £8,715,000 would be required (being 35% of 249 habitable rooms = 87.15 x £100,000) as an in-lieu payment in the absence of any proposed on-site or off-site contribution.
- 86 The application was accompanied by a detailed Viability Report which sets out the assumed development costs and end values of the scheme. This Viability Report has been the subject of protracted negotiations, with the Council commissioning the District Valuers Service to act on its behalf. As is the case with any development, the ability to make an affordable housing contribution is dependent on its ability to produce a financial surplus over and above a reasonable profit level.
- 87 In this case, there are a number of factors which impact directly on its profitability, and these matters need to be given appropriate weight in making a decision.
- 88 The factor which has the most significant impact on the viability is the development agreement between Alumno and the UAL. Unlike most 'direct let' student schemes, this development is being provided directly to UAL for the exclusive use of their students, and in line with their client brief. Most significantly, the terms agreed by these parties include discounted rents for the students for a period of 25 years (with a 'break' clause at 22 years). The discount is in the order of 30% below current equivalent market rents (base rents for 2012 being £144.20 per week for a cluster bedroom / £185.00 per week for a studio). This reduced rent has a substantial impact on the overall value of the development, and therefore its ability to support an affordable housing contribution. Similarly, the inclusion of low rent 'incubator' business units offer a lower return than market rate business space would produce with incubator rents not to exceed £12 per square feet.
- 89 The provision of 'affordable' student rooms for a local institution is a factor which can be given weight in the determination of the application. As noted above, London College of Communications has been a significant presence at the Elephant and Castle for 40 years, and are an important part of the identity of the area. The Core

Strategy recognises the importance of educational institutions to the economic well-being of the Elephant, and their role in developing the cultural and creative industries. If an institution like the LCC is to thrive, and attract high calibre students, it has to be able to provide, amongst other things, good quality, convenient and importantly affordable accommodation for those students. UAL (incorporating LCC) has sought to do this by delivering accommodation in partnership with Alumno, in order to exercise greater control over quality and rents. The Council's Affordable Housing SPD recognises that accommodation delivered directly by (or on behalf of) universities will be less able to support affordable housing contributions than open market, or direct-let, student schemes.

- 90 Officers have taken the view that, whilst the objective to support the UAL/LCC has significant weight at the present time, particularly in light of the regeneration ambitions for the Elephant and Castle, it is difficult to be certain how far the same objective would apply in 22 or 25 years time. It was therefore suggested that the scheme should be valued on the basis of a potential reversion to full market rents at the end of the current lease period. This 'reversionary value' does have some impact on the assessment of the appraisal.
- 91 The lengthy negotiations with the District Valuers (DV) have focussed on matters such as the rental levels, facilities management costs, financing costs, and yield. The DV has acknowledged that the reduced rents, for both the student rooms and the incubator space, have a significant impact on the overall viability of the scheme. At the conclusion of these discussions, Alumno have made a final offer of a contribution in lieu of affordable housing of £500,000. This would be payable on first occupation of the development.
- 92 Discussions with the DV have been on-going since the last committee meeting and it is still the case that agreement has been reached on some, but not all, of the variables within the financial appraisal. That said, the DV are now suggesting that in the case of a scheme with a reversionary value, it may be able to support a contribution of £1.27 million rather than £1.5 million as originally cited. The £1.27 million would include both an affordable housing contribution and other S106 costs.
- 93 The current offer from Alumno / UAL is detailed in the S106 section of this report at paragraph 169. It comprises £650,001 cash contributions, plus in kind benefits (works to Robert Dashwood Way) to the value of £227,418. Additional payments would also come forward in certain circumstances, namely a health contribution of £109,630 which would become payable if the University are not able to demonstrate adequate health facilities on their campuses for their students, and an additional payment of £54,445 for sports development if UAL could not demonstrate sufficient provision of its own facilities.
- 94 Inclusion of the in kind public realm works (to the value of £227,418) would take the overall value of the agreement (including £500,000 affordable housing payment) to £1,377,419 which is in excess of the £1.27 million the DV suggests could reasonably be supported. Moreover, in the circumstances that all the payments were required (i.e. health and additional sports contributions) then this would take the overall value to £1,541,941 which is considerably more than that suggested by the DV.
- 95 In this circumstance, it is recommended that, when the viability of the scheme is taken into account as required by the draft Affordable Housing SPD, the contribution for affordable housing, whilst significantly short of that suggested in the SPD methodology, is acceptable. Any outstanding differences of opinion between the applicant and the DV in terms of outputs into the financial appraisal are of much lesser concern given that the amount being offered by the applicant is in excess of the DV's conclusions about the maximum contributions which the scheme could reasonably support.
- 96 Taking into account the very special circumstances of the case, it is recommended

that in this instance the in lieu payment of £500,000 be accepted as the most the scheme can support.

97 UAL and affordability

At the previous committee meeting, Members questioned the weight being accorded to the reduced rents for UAL students, since that had a significant impact on the overall viability of the scheme and the size of the commuted payment that could be made towards general needs affordable housing. The £500,000 commuted sum is a very significant distance from the £8,715,000 calculated using the draft Affordable Housing SPD methodology.

98 The applicant has advised that a key development principle of both Alumno and UAL for halls of residents is affordability, and this forms part of the nominations agreement with the University.

99 The proposed rents will be capped in their development agreement and are in line with existing rents within their portfolio. The starting rents proposed would be circa 30% below market rate (starting rents for 2012 being £144.20 per week for a cluster flat / £185.00 for studio) to ensure affordability and the increases would be fixed for the length of the agreement and will not exceed Retail Price Index (RPI) plus 1%. There is therefore no risk within the 25 year agreement of the rents being hiked beyond the levels stipulated in the agreement between Alumno and UAL. The agent states that it is vital to the University that the rents are fixed as it allows them to guarantee the letting of the rooms for the long-term.

100 UAL are striving to attract the best students in a challenging and competitive market, particularly post the 2012 rise in student fees. The desire to improve UAL and ensure its attractiveness and long term economic health is linked to providing good quality and affordable accommodation.

101 The proposed incubator units will serve as workspace premises which would be managed by the business and enterprise units of the university. Serviced workspace would be available on a variety of low cost and short term rental arrangements to selected new businesses. These new businesses would be primarily started by graduates or alumni from UAL and it is important for UAL and in particular LCC that rents are kept low in order to enable the new businesses to invest in their growth.

102 In order to assess the potential S106 payment which might be secured on an open market rent student scheme, the Council instructed the DV to carry out an appraisal which included the same inputs in terms of build costs etc, but included full market rental income. Although there are some outstanding differences of opinion between the DV and the applicants valuation agents in terms of some of the inputs, the DV concluded that, in his opinion, a scheme with full market rents could support a total payment in the order of £4.685 million (to include both an affordable housing payment and other S106 costs). This compares to his conclusion on the reduced rents model of £1.27 million. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of the Council's student housing study which formed part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, which recognised that University-provided scheme would be able to make lesser payments than open market or 'direct let' developments. It is clear that, when looking at the specifics of this site, even a full market rent scheme would not be able to support a payment close to the £8.7 million suggested by the draft SPD methodology. The draft SPD clearly recognises that each scheme will need to be considered on its merit, usually based on the viability of the development. In this case the provision of dedicated space for UAL, on a reduced rent basis, would support the future success of this institution at the Elephant and Castle, and this is a material factor which should be given weight in making a decision on the application.

103 Conclusion on land use matters

The proposal would see the redevelopment of an under-utilised site for a mixed use development which is more sustainable and maximises the efficient use of the site.

There would be some loss of Class B floorspace but the positive benefits arising from the provision of affordable modern incubator units outweighs this loss. The direct link with UAL, a major stakeholder in the Elephant and Castle, will help UAL to further develop as an important centre of learning and the offer of low cost business space will have wider regenerative benefits for the area. The need for the student accommodation has been demonstrated and the accommodation will be affordable to that user group. The provision of student housing does have to be balanced with the provision of affordable general needs housing and in this respect the applicant has submitted a viability assessment to demonstrate that the policy requirement to provide 35% of the development as affordable housing cannot be met in this instance. Nonetheless, the applicant has offered an in lieu payment and when taking account of the special circumstances of the case this is acceptable.

Environmental impact assessment

- 104 An Environmental Statement is not required with this application as the development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999.
- 105 A Screening Opinion was not requested prior to the submission of the application as the site falls well below the 0.5ha threshold (being 0.2085 hectares) for classification as a Schedule 2 'Urban Development Project'. Even if the proposed development was of a size to be considered as an 'Urban Development Project', the development is highly unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size, and location based upon a review of the selection criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations which are used to screen Schedule 2 Development. Furthermore, the site is outside a designated 'sensitive area' as per Regulation 2(1). On this basis it is considered an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

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

- 106 Saved Policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan states that permission will not be granted for developments where a loss of amenity, including disturbance from noise, would be caused. In addition, Saved Policy 4.7 states that the provision of non self-contained housing (such as student accommodation) should not result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. The adopted Residential Design Standards SPD expands on policy and set out guidelines for protecting amenities in relation to privacy and daylight and sunlight. Core Strategy SP13 - High environmental standards seeks to ensure that development sets high standards for reducing air, land, noise and light pollution and avoiding amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment in which we live and work.
- 107 Daylight and sunlight
A Daylight and Sunlight Report was submitted with the application which assesses the impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight of adjoining properties. The BRE Guidelines "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (1991)" considers residential properties as being more important in receiving adequate levels of daylight and sunlight compared to commercial buildings and hence only the residential buildings within proximity of the application site have been assessed. The following properties have been identified:
- 1-27 Marlborough Close
 - 9 Steedman Street
 - 11 Steedman Street
 - 94-96 Walworth Road (upper floors)
 - 4 Hampton Street (upper floors)
 - 6 Hampton Street (upper floors)
 - Julian Markham House - student accommodation

- 108 In terms of daylight the following tests have been carried out:
- Vertical Sky Component (VSC) - the amount of skylight reaching a window expressed as a percentage. The guidelines recommend that the windows of neighbouring properties achieve a total VSC of at least 27% of that the VSC is reduced to no less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. 20% reduction) following construction of a development.
 - No-Sky Line (NSL) - the area of a room at desk height that can see a small proportion of sky. The guidelines suggest that the NSL should not be reduced by more than 20% its former value.
 - Average Daylight Factor (ADF) - determines the natural internal light or daylight appearance of a room and recommend that 1% ADF value is achieved for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for kitchens.

109 In terms of sunlight, the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (ASPH) was considered for all windows facing within 90 degree of due south (windows outside of this orientation do not receive direct sunlight in the UK). The guidelines advise that windows should receive at least 25% ASPH with 5% of this total being enjoyed in the winter months.

110 1-27 Marlborough Close

This is a block of flats located to the west of the application site on the opposite side of the railway viaduct. The main living rooms of these flats face away from the site, but there are windows that would directly face the proposal. The Study found that the properties are sufficiently distanced from the proposal to ensure they would not experience any material change in sky visibility with the VSC levels to all windows achieving in excess of 0.8 times their former value. The flats weren't relevant for the sunlight analysis as the windows are not within 90 degrees of due south.

111 9 Steedman Street

This is situated on the south side of Steedman Street, set back from the street frontage, with the flank elevation facing the application site. There is a good separation between this and the proposed development and consequently there is little impact on sky visibility with all the windows retaining VSC in excess of 0.8 times their former value. The windows of this development are not within 90 degrees of due south and hence the windows are not relevant for the sunlight test.

112 11 Steedman Street

This is a block of flats situated directly across Steedman Street where the north facing windows comprising single aspect bedrooms and dual aspect open plan living / kitchen areas would face the application site. The main living areas also receive daylight from windows on the western side elevation of the block. A resident from this block has objected on the grounds that the proposal would result in a loss of daylight to the main living room.

113 With the exception of the top floor all the north facing windows serving bedrooms and open plan living areas would experience VSC reductions to less than 0.8 times their former value (i.e. more than 20% reduction). Whilst this is unfortunate, the open plan living rooms are dual aspect with the side windows unaffected, retaining high VSC levels. The ADF results for the living rooms achieve between 3.5 and 5% which demonstrate that the living rooms would still achieve internal daylight in excess of BRE guidelines of 1.5% for a living room and 2% for a kitchen.

114 The retained ADF levels for the north facing bedrooms are below the BRE 1% target at first to fourth levels ranging from 0.56 to 0.98% (the worst case being at first floor level). Notably the first floor bedrooms achieve below 1% target ADF values in the current situation (0.79% ADF for the worst case) and therefore the level of ADF reduction is relatively small with losses of 0.02% - 0.3%. Again, no sunlight analysis was carried out as the windows are not within 90 degrees of due south.

115 94-96 Walworth Road

This property is located to the north-east of the application site and comprises

commercial units on the ground floor and residential accommodation above. The main windows of the residential units are offset from the proposal thereby ensuring that daylight levels are unaffected, with the exception of one secondary first floor window situated in a lightwell to 4 Hampton Street. However the reduction is marginal and would not be noticeable. Although there are south facing windows to this property as they directly face Julian Markham House there would no impact from the proposal on sunlight levels to these windows.

116 4 Hampton Street

This property is located to the north of the application site and the main windows face Julian Markham House. The windows tested would achieve VSC levels in excess of 0.8 times their former value. As these windows face due south a sunlight assessment was carried out where it was found that sunlight levels would exceed the BRE guideline APSP level of 25%. Levels of low-angle winter sunlight fall below the recommended 5% but the existing situation is already constrained as the units face Julian Markham House.

117 6 Hampton Street

This contains residential accommodation on the upper floors where the assessment found there would be some minor changes to VSC levels to all the windows. ADF results show that currently the windows only just achieve the recommended target of 1.5% for living rooms (between 1.49% and 1.70%). Under the proposal ADF levels would be reduced to 1.15% and 1.38%. These levels are below the 1% target for living rooms but the reduction that could be attributed to the proposal is relatively small (circa 0.3%) and is unlikely to be noticeable. In terms of sunlight it was found the levels would either achieve or exceed the recommended 25% ASPH. Again, levels of low-angle winter sunlight would fall below the guideline 5%.

118 Julian Markham House

This is the student housing block immediately adjoining the application site. The Study advises that historically the application site was intended to be developed as 'Phase 2' of Julian Markham House, mirroring its massing and creating a central courtyard between the two. As a result the layout of Julian Markham House places student bedrooms with relatively poor existing light levels facing the central courtyard. Furthermore, lounge / kitchen areas are situated to the 'corner' of the wings and are served by small windows such that the daylighting potential is constrained with existing ADF values of between 0.4% and 0.5% being typical for the lower floors. The redevelopment of the application site and completion of the 'courtyard' block would inevitably lead to reductions in VSC such that levels are reduced to less than 0.8 times their former value.

119 ADF levels show that the windows to the lowest three floors fail to achieve the recommended ADF levels for lounge, kitchens and bedrooms but they don't reach these levels in the current situation. In the majority of cases the ADF reduction would be circa 0.3% - 0.4% under the proposal which is a relatively small reduction and indeed most of the bedrooms achieve ADF levels within 0.3% of the recommended 1% ADF target. Above third floor level all the bedrooms would fully comply with the 1% ADF target. The lounge / kitchen / diners on all the seven floors would fail to achieve recommended ADF values but ADF levels are not achieved in the existing situation.

120 The Study concluded that the technical derogations to Julian Markham House were acceptable given the urban context of the site, the lower target levels that may be applied to student housing and the compromised daylighting potential due to the building being designed with the intent of adjoining a neighbouring block. Reference is made to Section 2.3 of the BRE guidelines which state that properties close to a joint site boundary should not take more than their 'share' of light and that alternative levels may be appropriate when development occurs close to a joint boundary. The impact of the proposal on Julian Markham House was therefore found acceptable.

121 Officers recognise that in the case of dense urban environments there will inevitably

be some impacts on daylight amenities from a development of this scale, but in this instance only limited daylight infringements would occur. The worst affected would be the north facing flats in 11 Steedman Street where the amount of sky light reaching the windows would be somewhat affected, but the internal day lit appearance of the main living areas would still achieve in excess of BRE guidelines. The reduction in light to the bedrooms, whilst below target levels, represents a minor change and therefore is unlikely to have a serious impact on daylight amenities for the occupiers. Officers consider that the local objection received from 11 Steedman Street could not therefore be sustained. The light to the adjacent Julian Markham House student block, particularly for the lower three floors, is compromised but the actual reductions are relatively low with the majority of bedrooms in the development achieving 1% ADF or thereabouts. Overall the impacts of the development on the daylight and sunlight of adjoining existing properties is acceptable.

122 Outlook and Privacy

In order to prevent against harmful overlooking, the Residential Design Standards SPD advises that developments should achieve a separation distance of 12m at the front of a building and any elevation that fronts a highway and a minimum 21m at the rear. The separation distance between the proposed scheme and the nearest residential block, 11 Steedman Street, is 15m. The flats fronting Steedman Street do have projecting balconies but these are provided on the western side of the building and do not directly face the proposal scheme. There is approximately 20m between the windows of the proposal and the adjacent student rooms in Julian Markham House. The proposal will therefore not give rise to any significant loss of privacy. Given the separation distances and taking account of the urban context the proposal would not compromise on outlook from existing properties.

123 Noise Impact on Neighbouring Properties

The proposed commercial uses are not of a type that would cause significant noise levels. In terms of the student housing, there would be the potential for pedestrian movement to and from the site on a 24 hour basis. Local concerns have been raised about possible noisy and anti-social behaviour of students. A Student Accommodation Management Proposal has been submitted which advises that there will be an on-site management team Monday to Friday from 8.30am - 5.00pm. Out of hours would be covered by student wardens who are resident on the site. Their role would be to provide a visible presence and a point of contact for students and any other parties and would be responsible for dealing with noise and any minor anti-social behaviour. All communal areas, including the common room and laundry, would be monitored via CCTV. The details of a Student Management Plan will need to be approved prior to occupation and this would be secured by legal agreement.

124 The plant required to serve the development has the potential to affect the amenity of adjacent occupiers due to noise. The Environmental Protection Team (EPT) have advised that a condition is imposed to ensure that the noise level from any plant is controlled.

125 In summary, the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of adjacent occupiers and complies with saved policies 3.2 and 4.7 of the Southwark Plan and SP 13 of the Core Strategy.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

126 Although there are no existing uses in the vicinity of the site that would be detrimental to future users of the student accommodation, a noise and vibration assessment has been submitted due to the location of the site within proximity of a railway in accordance with PPG24: Planning and Noise.

127 Noise

The report considered that the railway would represent the most significant dominant

source of noise affecting the proposal, and that the worst case facade would directly overlook the railway. Mitigation of rail noise would therefore also mitigate against other identified noise sources. The survey found that the noisiest facades fall into PPG24 Noise Exposure Category (NEC) C for the day and night time periods. PPG24 advises for NEC C that noise mitigation measures may make the development acceptable. The report concludes that acceptable internal noise levels could be achieved based on an assumed set of construction details. EPT have raised no objections in respect of noise but advise that if permission were to be granted then a condition would be needed to ensure all the student rooms are designed to achieve the required internal noise levels.

128 Vibration

The railway was considered to be the only significant source of ground-borne vibration which could affect future occupiers. On the basis of vibration measurements and established train numbers, ground-borne vibration levels are considered to be acceptable for residential use. EPT have not raised any concerns in this respect.

129 Air Quality

Saved Policy 3.6 of the Southwark Plan states that permission will not be granted for a development that would lead to a reduction in air quality. The site falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) where an Air Quality Assessment is required to be submitted. EPT initially raised concerns in that there were inconsistencies between the submitted Air Quality Report and the Energy Statement in terms of ventilation. An updated Assessment was received on the 26th May 2011.

130 The assessment takes account of the air quality impacts associated with both the construction and operation of the proposed development. The report advises that the construction works, have the potential to cause a nuisance, albeit temporary, from dust without suitable control measures. EPT advise that a Construction Management Plan would need to be submitted and approved prior to works commencing on the site. Once operational, as the railway line is electrified, it is unlikely that there would be any significant impacts associated with the railway. The scheme would be largely car-free and would therefore not result in a degradation of local air quality, and indeed the proposal would represent an improvement when taking into account that the existing building is partly used for car parking purposes.

131 A heat recovery mechanical ventilation system would serve the development and this would be capable of supplying all required air to habitable rooms. Student bedrooms would still be provided with openable windows but the times students would be most likely to open their windows is not likely to coincide with the hours when traffic pollution (and traffic noise) and highest. The report therefore considers that it is not necessary to seal the windows. EPT consider that the recommendations made in the report in respect of ventilation are sufficient to mitigate the impacts of air quality so that future residents would not be affected.

Traffic issues

132 Saved Policy 5.1 of the Southwark Plan requires major development to be located near transport nodes. Saved Policy 5.2 states that planning permission will be granted for development unless there is an adverse impact on the transport network or if provision for adequate servicing is not made. Saved Policy 5.3 requires that provision is made for pedestrians and cyclists within the development and Saved Policies 5.6 and 5.7 relate to car parking. Core Strategy Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable Transport re-asserts the commitment to encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by car and requiring transport assessments with applications to show that schemes minimise their impacts, minimise car parking and maximise cycle parking to provide as many sustainable transport options as possible. A Transport Assessment, draft Travel Plan and Waste Management Strategy have been submitted.

133 Access

Saved Policy 4.7 concerning non self-contained housing requires such developments to be located in areas where there is adequate infrastructure in the area to support any increase in residents. There are bus stops within 50m of the site with a high frequency of buses towards Camberwell, Elephant and Castle and beyond. It is less than 400m from the nearest London Underground station and is approximately 250m away from the overground rail station at Elephant and Castle. Accordingly, the site has an excellent public transport accessibility rating (PTAL) of 6b.

134 The Transport Planning Team advise that pedestrian access to the site is currently poor with some of the walking routes to and from the site are not acceptable due to narrow pavements and lack of tactile pavings. It is therefore recommended that S106 monies need to be secured to improve the surrounding walking routes. TfL also recommend that monies are secured for this purpose.

135 Car parking

The Council is seeking to encourage reduced car dependence, particularly in areas with good accessibility to public transport and thus encourage the use of more sustainable transport modes. The CAZ is considered to be an area appropriate for car-free development, with the exception of on-site provision for wheelchair accessible parking. Local concerns have been raised about the lack of car parking provision but in this location car-free development would be expected and future occupiers will be prevented from obtaining on-street parking permits. TfL have advised that a car free development is welcome.

136 A single disabled parking space is proposed on-street, on the northern side of Steedman Street, outside the main student entrance. Disabled parking provision should normally be provided on-site because there is no way of ensuring exclusive use of a disabled bay for a specific development. In this case the Transport Team advise that they would accept on-street disabled parking because of the constraints in providing on-site parking, particularly as it would necessitate the reduction in the amount of much needed incubation Class B1 space. They recommend that two spaces will need to be provided and that the applicant should contribute £5,500 for costs associated with amending the Traffic Order to accommodate the disabled parking bays on-street. The bays will be implemented as and when there is a request for an on-street bay in the area.

137 Cycle parking

The Southwark Plan and Core Strategy do not provide cycle parking standards for student accommodation, but TfL require one cycle space for every two students (or bed spaces) or in this case 111 cycle spaces would be required for the student accommodation. A minimum of 5 spaces would be needed for 1,308 sqm of commercial floorspace. A total of 128 cycle spaces were originally proposed (6 of these located on the new public walkway) but the Transport Team raised concerns about the capacity of the student cycle storage area as the cycle spaces shown did not meet current guidelines. A revised ground floor plan has been submitted (drawing PL_1201 Rev P) showing 93 spaces rather than 122 student cycle spaces. A sum of £3,000 is also proposed to be paid to the Council to meet the cost of installing an additional 20 Sheffield cycle stands on the street.

138 It is normally expected that adequate cycle facilities are provided on the development site. However in this instance much of the ground floor of the building is taken up with much needed low cost Class B1 incubation space. To reduce the size of the refuse store would have an impact on servicing the development. In this case the financial contribution would enable additional cycle provision to be provided on-street to ensure that the total required number of cycle spaces can be provided. Notwithstanding this, a condition requiring details of the cycle storage on-site will be required as the revised plan shows a mix of Josta two tier cycle stands and Josta wall hooks. The wall hooks are not acceptable as some users find it difficult to lift their bike into place. It would be preferred if horizontal cycle parking were used.

139 The request from a resident at 11 Steedman Street to have access to the student cycle parking is noted but this application could not be expected to provide on-site secure cycle parking for other developments.

140 Travel Plan

A Travel Plan Framework was submitted which seeks to promote more sustainable transport choices such as walking, cycling and public transport. The submission of a full Travel Plan would need to be secured via a legal agreement which would also cover Travel Plan monitoring within which time necessary adjustments could be made in accordance with the success and evolution of the scheme.

141 Servicing

Waste collection for the commercial units would take place from Hampton Street and from Steedman Street for the student accommodation. The retail space would be serviced from the new walkway and be limited to early morning and evening deliveries to avoid conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. A Servicing Management Plan will need to be submitted and approved and this can be dealt with by condition.

142 Move In Move Out Procedure

The proposal will have less of an impact on the highway network than the existing use of the site. The largest vehicular impact would be when students are moving in and out at the start and end of terms. A Move In /Move Out Strategy provides various measures to ensure that any impacts on the highway are limited. The measures include welcome packs for each student which details local public transport services, allocated times for student arrivals, luggage storage at ground level to speed up loading/unloading and helpers on hand to assist in the move in/out process. The Transport Officer has advised the Strategy is acceptable.

143 In summary, the proposal will have less of an impact on the highway network than the current use of the site and the proposal complies with all relevant transport policy and guidance.

Design issues

144 Saved Policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that a high standard of architecture and design are achieved in order to enhance the quality of the built environment in order to create attractive, high amenity environments. More specifically, Saved Policy 3.13 requires that the principles of good design are taken into account in all developments in terms of height, scale, massing, layout, streetscape and landscaping and inclusive design. Saved Policy 3.11 requires all developments to maximise the efficient use of the land.

145 Core Strategy SP12 - Design and conservation also seeks to ensure that developments will achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings and public spaces to help create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in.

146 Context

This is a significant site within the Elephant and Castle, being located within the central core area, and thereby important to the wider Elephant and Castle regeneration area. A number of key buildings have come forward in the last 5 years, most notably the recent student housing scheme at 120-138 Walworth Road, Strata Tower, and the 'Printworks' on Amelia Street. The building immediately adjacent to the site, Julian Markham House, is of poor quality in terms of architecture and materials; redevelopment on the application site will have a difficult task in that it must relate physically and visually to it, but significantly improve on its quality of design.

147 The site is also adjacent to a railway viaduct which raises a number of opportunities as well as limitations. While there are some large-scale relatively new developments to

the south-east of the railway to the west, with the exception of Strata and Draper House, the existing context is of much smaller-scale and lower density buildings. The existing building on the site is of no architectural merit and therefore the opportunity for redevelopment is welcome. The proposal however does need to very carefully consider its scale relative to the street scale and wider context.

148 Height, Scale and Massing

The height of the proposal can be read as three blocks, 9-storey (plus roof plant / lift over-run) to Hampton Street, 8-storey to Steedman Street with top floor set-back, and a linking 9-storey section with set-back top floor facing towards the railway. When viewed from the west, which is the only vantage point where the whole development could be appreciated, the progression down in height from north to south is rational and well considered.

149 In terms of bulk and massing the stepping-down in height adds definition to the articulation of the three blocks. The Hampton Street block, being narrower, has more variety in its massing, but there is also a rather incongruous quality about the tallest element of the proposal being read in such close juxtaposition to Julian Markham House. The least successful of the blocks, however, is Steedman Street which has a rather monolithic quality in comparison, an impact that is emphasised by the repetitive fenestration.

150 Site Layout

The basic form of the proposal is a 'C-shaped' block which mirrors the form of the adjacent Julian Markham House, creating a 'courtyard' between them. A double-height commercial zone wraps around the base of the building which provides it with a reasonably strong base and active frontages. This is complemented with the opening up of the railway arches and the new pedestrian 'railway lane' access.

151 The majority of servicing is from a concentrated zone on Steedman Street. Although this in itself is rational the servicing does take up nearly 50% of the length of this frontage and thus reduces the potential level of activity and visual interest at ground floor level. This is not helped by the internal layout of the ground floor student accommodation where the ancillary office / staff meeting room which may not be that well used would be sited on the prominent corner of Steedman Street. The principal focus for activity on the Steedman Street frontage would be the main student entrance located between the student reception and the servicing zone. Officers raised concerns during the course of the application about the student entrance and its lack of physical and visual prominence (both on plan form and elevation). Amended plans were received which do represent an improvement but a condition will be required to secure detailed drawings of the student entrance.

152 At the heart of the proposal is the central courtyard now created with Julian Markham House which on the proposal side would have a green roof. Details of the green roof will be required by condition, together with its management, as officers are concerned that the courtyard would receive very little sunlight and a restricted amount of daylight. It is disappointing that living roofs are not proposed elsewhere on the development and although a good deal of roof space is taken up with plant, the provision of green roofs should be maximised where possible.

153 New Promenade

A new pedestrian access is proposed alongside the viaduct and this together with the opening of the arches is highly desirable. For this lane to work effectively a high quality and safe environment has to be created. During pre-application discussions with the applicant, officers raised a concern that the upper floors of the building projected forward of the ground floor and this appeared overbearing and oppressive to the new access. The current drawings show that the development at ground level steps back from the railway by approximately 5.9m to 7.3m but the upper levels project forward being between 4.8m to 6.7m from the viaduct. Officers would have preferred if the blocks had stepped back from the railway in order to improve the

lane's environment and to improve the amenity of the student bedrooms facing onto the railway. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that if this lane is to be perceived as a safe and inviting route for people to use at all times, then the key issue for its design will be visibility through the route, accompanied by high quality materials, planting and lighting. These can be dealt with by an appropriate condition(s).

- 154 Local representations have been received supporting the provision of the principle of the new route but that further consideration needs to be given to how this will relate to the existing streets, particularly Robert Dashwood Way to the south, and also to its detailed design. Officers agree that the success of this space will be down to how well its used as well as its connectivity to adjacent streets. Robert Dashwood Way is currently dominated by car parking and appears uninviting. The proposal will help to improve activity and natural surveillance in the locality and S106 monies will help to improve the public realm in the vicinity. As referred to above, the detailed design of the walkway would be subject to condition to ensure a high quality design.
- 155 Elevational treatment
The proposed elevational treatment varies across all the blocks. The southern block facing Steedman Street is proposed to be faced predominantly with 'blue' brick, presumably to relate to the adjacent blue render of Julian Markham House. The windows would be full height PPC aluminium framed, with a triple window at the recessed break to Julian Markham House and a corner window facing Steedman Street and the railway. Additionally the fenestration pattern alternates alignment on alternate floors which adds visual interest. The central 'linking' block is predominantly faced with a 'grey-rustic' brick and the fenestration pattern is pairs of windows, 'hit-and-miss' on alternate floors which gives a visual variety to this block to contrast with the fenestration on either side. The northern Hampton Street block on its western elevation facing the railway is clad predominantly with terracotta ceramic 'shingles' with the expressed stair clad in PPC aluminium. Its Hampton Street face returns to the blue brick as proposed for the Steedman Street elevation. The fenestration on this block would be the same alternating pattern as that proposed for Steedman Street, but with a larger alternating corner window to maximise the north-west views.
- 156 The set back upper level to the blocks would be faced with PPC aluminium cladding, the quality and detailing of which will need to be dealt with by condition as such facings can often appear cheaper and aesthetically weaker than the masonry facings below.
- 157 The central courtyard would be faced with through-coloured render. Although it has minimal impact on the surrounding townscape, it is considered to be a low-quality material both physically and aesthetically. It is disappointing that the courtyard is not proposed to be finished with a light and reflective material to improve its character and appearance.
- 158 The quality of materials and detailing will need to be of the highest quality to ensure these large and repetitive facades contribute positively to the streetscapes and surrounding wider townscape. Particular attention will also need to be given to the ground floor frontages, particularly the service area and entrance on Steedman Street, the commercial frontages to Hampton Street and the viaduct walkway as well as the renovated railway arch frontages. In this respect detailed elevations will need to be secured via condition. The hard and soft landscaping for the walkway will also be crucial to the success of this as a public space and again the details will need to be secured.
- 159 Overall the height, scale, massing and design of the proposal is considered to be generally acceptable. There are some issues with the detailed design, as set out above, but these and can be resolved by condition. The proposed development is therefore consistent with the requirements of saved policies 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, and 3.14. of the Southwark Plan and SP 12 of the Core Strategy.

Quality of Internal Accommodation

- 160 Criterion (iv) of Saved Policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan and the Residential Design Standards SPD require any proposal for student accommodation to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation, including shared facilities. There are no policy standards for size of units within student accommodation.
- 161 The proposal provides 221 bed spaces in the form of 4 self-contained studios and 28 cluster flats. The 4 studio units are wheelchair accessible and range in size from 30.60 sqm to 38.09 sqm. Each studio contains a kitchenette, bathroom and living/study space. The cluster flats comprise either 7, 8 or 9 bedrooms with a shared kitchen/lounge. Where possible the lounge/kitchens are located on the corners of the building to take advantage of open views to the west. The bedrooms are typically 12.8 sqm in size (22.65 sqm for wheelchair accessible bedrooms) and contain a shower/WC and living/study space. 11 wheelchair accessible bedspaces (5%) are proposed which meets Building Regulations minimum requirement.
- 162 In terms of communal facilities, there would be a student communal lounge on the ground floor which would have direct internal access into the adjacent coffee / sandwich bar. A laundry is also provided on the ground floor. The lounge areas within the cluster flats would also provide a sociable space.
- 163 Internal daylight and sunlight
An Internal Daylight Study has been submitted which assesses the level of available internal daylight within each of the student bedrooms which would face within the lightwell created to Julian Markham House. Only these rooms have been included in the analysis as they would potentially receive the least amount of light. The bedrooms form part of larger cluster flats so their occupiers would have access to separate kitchen and lounge areas which are positioned facing outwards onto the street. The Study has used the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) methodology for the analysis which determines the natural internal light or daylight appearance of a room. The BRE Guidelines recommends for residential properties that bedrooms should achieve an ADF value of 1%.
- 164 The survey results show that the majority of bedrooms situated within the lightwell exceed the BRE target of 1% ADF. The rooms on the lowest two floors (first and second) are somewhat compromised with all the 9 bedrooms on the first floor and 6 of the second floor bedrooms achieving less than 1% ADF (between 0.7% and 0.9%). This however is not a significant shortfall from the recommended target and only affects 15 out of the total 221 bedrooms contained within the whole development. The Study considers that as student accommodation is of a transient residential use and potentially vacant for much of the day then lower target levels could be applied. Officers concur with this view and consider that an acceptable level of daylight to the internal student accommodation would be achieved.
- 165 Amenity Space
It is noted that outdoor amenity space is not provided on-site. Whilst this would normally be preferred, there are no specific amenity space standards for student housing. The site is physically constrained in terms of size and a large proportion of the ground floor is given over to much needed flexible, low cost start-up business space and a coffee shop which are positive elements of the scheme that will not only enhance the development but will have regenerative benefits for the wider area. In this instance the lack of outdoor amenity space is acceptable.
- 166 A local objection has been received stating that the student accommodation is "not fit for purpose". There are no policy requirements relating to student accommodation in terms of size of rooms and indoor and outdoor communal amenity spaces. A refusal on this basis could therefore not be sustained. In any event the accommodation offered is comparable with other schemes permitted elsewhere in the borough and this scheme has the additional benefit in that it would be available at lesser rents than an

equivalent open market student scheme. Overall the standards of the accommodation is considered acceptable in accordance with saved policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan and relevant design guidance.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

167 Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Section 106 Planning Obligations, which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations, and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations. Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery of the Core Strategy states that planning obligations will be sought to reduce or mitigate the impact of developments.

168 The applicant submitted a proposed Heads of Terms based on the Council's Planning Obligations SPD. The draft HOT was subject to negotiation during the course of the planning application. As the proposal is for student accommodation, contributions in respect of education and children's play equipment are not required. The contributions have been calculated on future occupancy rates (i.e. student bed spaces) within the completed development. The following table sets out the contributions payable based on the S106 SPD and accompanying developer's toolkit as compared with what the applicant has proposed to offer.

169	Topic Area	SPD Requirement	Applicant's Offer
	Employment construction	during £173,584	£173,584
	Employment construction management fee	during £13,382	£13,382
	Employment Development Health	in the £18,062	£18,062
		£109,630	£0.00 (in the event that on first occupation no health facilities at UAL have been secured then £109,630 will be paid)
	Transport Strategic	£70,982	£70,982
	Transport Site Specific	£130,120	£130,120
	Public Realm	£185,370	£122,120 (in addition to £227,418 in kind works for new public walkway)
	Sports Development	£108,890	£54,445
	Public Open Space	£44,630	£44,630
	Community Facilities	£5,472	£5,472
	Admin Fee (2%)	£17,202.44	£17,204.30 (includes in kind public realm works)
	Total	£877,324.44	£650,001.30 (or £877,419.3 including in kind public realm works)

170 The applicants propose a 50% reduction of the required sports contribution as UAL provide their own sports facilities, including netball and basketball courts, football, rugby and hockey. There is a dance studio at the student hub for dance, yoga and exercise classes. Additionally, the Students Union offer a range of sporting

opportunities for students and UAL have agreements with a number of local gyms and leisure centres including Fitness First. Notwithstanding this, the applicants have agreed that in the event they are unable to justify such provisions at the time of occupation, the remainder of the sports contribution (£54,445) will be paid. A clause will be included in the legal agreement to require that unless the developer can demonstrate prior to occupation that there are adequate sports facilities then the remainder of the monies will be payable.

- 171 At this stage no health contribution is offered as the applicants consider that appropriate health facilities are provided on site at all UAL campuses. Again, it is agreed that a clause be included in the S106 agreement to require the full contribution to be paid in the event no health facilities at UAL have been secured at the time of first occupation.
- 172 In terms of public realm, the Council's Public Realm Team advise that both Hampton and Steedman Streets are in a poor state of repair and in need of re-paving at least between the application site up to Walworth Road. They estimate this will cost some £40,000 - £50,000 depending on materials. The applicant has offered a contribution of £122,120 in light of further public consultation, discussions with the Elephant and Castle Project Team and local members. It is intended that the monies will be used to improve the public realm at Hampton and Steedman Streets and railway underpasses adjacent to the site (as part of the Three Bridges Scheme), especially as the bridges in the vicinity and the areas beneath them are poorly lit.
- 173 In addition the applicants will be providing in-kind works on the site through the creation of the new public walkway. This will include high quality public realm, street furniture and lighting and this has been costed at £227,418.
- 174 The Transport Planning Team advise that due to the existing poor pedestrian links from the development site to key routes then the £130,120 site specific transport monies will be put towards pedestrian improvements. Additional to this sum, £2,750 will be required to amend the Traffic Management Order to ensure that future occupiers of the development (with the exception of blue badge holders) are prevented from being eligible for on-street car parking permits. A further £5,500 will be required for the necessary amendments to the Order to allow the provision of on-street disabled parking bays as well £3,000 to provide 20 on-street Sheffield cycle stands to counter the lack of available cycle storage space within the development itself. Transport for London did not request any S106 transport mitigation monies.
- 175 A number of local residents expressed concerns about the quality of the public realm and community safety on adjoining streets, particularly Steedman Street and Hampton Street. The public realm and site specific transport payments, in addition to the in-kind works for the creation of the new walkway, will enable local improvement works to take place which will be of benefit to future occupiers of the scheme as well as existing occupiers in the wider area.
- 176 Mechanism for controlling rent levels
The affordability of the incubator units and the student accommodation is a key material consideration, and it is therefore crucial that a robust mechanism is put in place to secure affordability. In terms of the student accommodation, rents will be charged as stipulated in the UAL / Alumno Heads of Terms for the 25 year 'nominations agreement' (a copy of which has been submitted). Rents will be controlled for a period of 22 years which is the point at which UAL has an option to break the contract with Alumno. Officers note that Alumno say they have no intention of increasing rents at the end of Year 22 but will continue to provide subsidising rents. However, as discussed earlier in the report, the nominations agreement could be broken at Year 22 and therefore the S106 cannot consider the subsidised rents in perpetuity.
- 177 The base rents for 2012 are:

- En-suite cluster bedroom £144.20 per week
- Studios £185.000 per week

These are comparable with the rents set at the UAL student accommodation scheme at Peckham Road. The affordability of the student units will be ensured by rents restricted to an annual growth of no more than RPI plus 1% for the length of the agreement and this will be tied into the S106 agreement.

- 178 The affordability of the incubator units will also be set in the S106 agreement with rentals not to exceed £12 per sqft starting at 2012. Again, these will be subject to the same requirements as the student accommodation in that annual rent increases will be fixed to a maximum of RPI plus 1%. As set out in the submitted LCC Business Incubation Units Note, 10% of the incubator space will be let in the first instance to the local community via the LCC 'Widening Participation' Programme. In addition, whilst UAL would look to occupy all five railway arches as incubation units, Network Rail wish to retain a flexible Class B1 / B8 use for two of the railway arches in the event they need to use them but if these units are let as incubation units then they would be subject to the same rental conditions as the other incubation space.
- 179 As the viability of the scheme is clearly premised on sub-market rents, then a review mechanism needs to be included in the S106 to require the submission of a new viability assessment in the event that the agreement between UAL/ Alumno is not secured or terminates early. Additional surplus sums will then be payable if it is demonstrated that a higher affordable housing payment in-lieu is found to be viable.
- 180 Allocation Process
Members also required information on how the student accommodation would be allocated to ensure that the proposal maximises its benefit to the Elephant and Castle. The applicant has agreed to include a cascade mechanism in the legal agreement, whereby priority will be given to first year students and that the accommodation will be offered in the first instance to students registered at the LCC. After that the accommodation would be offered to students at the Camberwell College of Arts, Peckham Road as the next nearest college and only after that would any surplus rooms be offered to students at other UAL colleges.
- 181 UAL state that their allocation policy is reviewed annually and is adapted as required to meet changes in accommodation, student needs and where necessary to take account of legislative changes. Although financially disadvantaged students are not currently a published criteria for priority, the expectation is that to tie in with the National Scholarship Programme (NSP) being introduced from 2012, students receiving assistance under this scheme would be a priority group. Applications from students with disabilities and students under the age of 18 are prioritised. Additionally, as a condition for the Buttle Trust Quality Mark which UAL has been awarded, accommodation for care leavers is now prioritised.
- 182 The applicant is agreeable to detailed clauses to be included in the legal agreement to ensure that allocations are made in favour of LCC students, and priority in selections given to hardship cases, being to those with an identified need and welfare requirements or in receipt of a bursary, hardship loan or similar. It is noted that students in receipt of hardship/bursary entitlement will have already been means tested to qualify for this support and therefore the accommodation as far as possible will be occupied by those students in most need. It is not considered to be practicable, or reasonable, to seek to further control through the planning system the process for allocation of this accommodation.
- 183 The £500,000 payment towards affordable housing will also need to be secured via the legal agreement, to be expended on the provision of additional affordable housing in the borough.

- 184 In addition to the above the following clauses should also be included:
- submission of a Residence Management Plan
 - commitment to developing, implementing and monitoring a travel plan including the appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator
 - to ensure that the student accommodation is used as a single planning unit at all times
 - details of the public realm works for the walkway to be submitted
 - the applicant will be required to enter into a S278 Agreement with the Highways Authority in relation to the public realm.
- 185 The contributions agreed are considered to provide significant environmental improvements to the area, thereby contributing towards the regeneration of the Elephant and Castle. Officers consider they would adequately mitigate against the impacts of the development and meet the requirements of regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The proposed Heads of Terms is therefore in accordance with saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan, SP 14 of the Core Strategy and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.

Sustainable development implications

- 186 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires that major development schemes should provide an assessment of their energy demands and demonstrate how they have taken steps to apply the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Policies 5.5 and 5.6 require consideration of decentralised energy networks and Policy 5.7 requires the use of on-site renewable energy technologies, where feasible. Saved Policy 3.3 of the Southwark Plan requires the submission of a Sustainability Assessment. Saved Policy 3.4 seeks energy efficient development and Saved Policy 3.9 advises that all development should incorporate measures to reduce the demand for water supply. Core Strategy SP13 - High environmental standards applies a similar energy hierarchy to the London Plan and requires the highest environmental standards, including achieving targets based on Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM. A Sustainability Checklist, Energy Statement and a BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report have been submitted.
- 187 The current design of the development achieves a BREEAM rating of 60.93% or 'Very Good' rating. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD advises that all major non-residential development should aim for BEEAM 'Very Good' as a minimum. This target has been updated to "Excellent" in Core Strategy SP 13 (requiring a minimum 70% of the available credits) and therefore the proposal does not conform to this specific policy requirement.
- 188 The applicant has submitted further information to demonstrate why at this stage of the design process the building is not designed to achieve an 'Excellent' rating. Firstly, it has not yet been decided whether the building will be built out by Alumno's contractor and handed over to UAL to carry out their own internal fit out, or whether Alumno's contractor will carry out both the shell construction and fit out. This forms a fundamental part of the BREEAM Assessment as the process of awarding credits is different for a construction including fit out, or a shell and core construction. Secondly, it would be extremely difficult for the railway arches to achieve an 'Excellent' rating. The arches are not likely to score well in their Energy Assessment as there is little natural light available so the lighting load will be higher than a typically newly-designed building. Further issues include the limited possibilities to upgrade the thermal performance due to the units being situated under the railway arches. Such problems could be overcome by installing renewable energy technologies to offset the poor performance in the fabric and lighting, but the arches have no roof space for PV's and wall-mounted panels would be overshadowed for much of the day.
- 189 The planning agent further submits that the proposal has been in the design stage for a considerable time when 'Very Good' was the required rating. The Sustainability Checklist also makes it clear that the development brings a wide range of other

benefits including helping people into jobs, providing local services, and the development would reduce overall carbon dioxide emissions by a minimum of 20%. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the broader principles of sustainability set out in the Core Strategy. Notwithstanding the above, the applicants would agree to achieve a minimum 'Very Good' with an aspiration of achieving an 'Excellent' rating.

- 190 Be Lean - Use Less Energy: The report seeks to demonstrate how a range of passive design features could minimise the energy use of the proposal. A number of passive design and energy efficiency measures are proposed including high performance U-values and air permeability standards; all lighting will be energy efficient; energy efficient boilers; and efficient inverter driven fans and pumps.
- 191 Be Clean - Supply Energy Efficiently: The proposed development seeks to supply the required energy as efficiently as possible. It is proposed to heat the building and provide domestic hot water from central gas-fired condensing high efficiency boiler and CHP (Combined heat and power) plant. This would result in a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of 39.24 kg/CO₂/year or 23% from the 'base' condition of a new energy efficient development.
- 192 Be Green - Use Renewable Energy: The Energy Statement details a range of technologies but found a number to be unsuitable. Both solar thermal and solar PV panels would each offer a small carbon dioxide reduction (2.1% each) but only 100 sqm of panels could be installed on the roof due to the amount of air handling plant required for the development. Ground source heat pumps would offer reasonable reductions of (7.3%) but the performance is uncertain due to the unknown ground conditions at depths of up to 100m. There is also limited external footprint available to accommodate the vertical bored heated exchangers. Air Source Heat Pumps are again restricted by the limited amount of roof space available. In view of the above it is considered that a CHP lead gas-fired CHP / boiler installation (with condensing technology) is the most appropriate sustainable solution. It could be installed in conjunction with additional renewable technologies if required.
- 193 The report advises that the development has the potential to contribute and connect to the Elephant and Castle Regeneration by linking to a future district energy plant that may come forward in the future and connections will be designed into the plant rooms to facilitate future connections.
- 194 Officers consider the Mayor's Energy Hierarchy has been followed in accordance with policy and in excess of 20% carbon reductions would be achieved through the use of CHP plant. The proposal does not incorporate any renewable technologies at this stage of the design proposal and justification has been provided to show that there are site specific constraints which limit what is feasible. The applicant has suggested that additional renewable technologies could be installed if necessary and officers recommend a condition is imposed seeking submission of an energy renewables strategy.
- 195 While the development may not accord fully with plan policies in terms of its BREEAM rating and lack of onsite renewable technologies it is considered that on balance the proposal is acceptable.

Flood Risk

- 196 The site is located within Flood Zone 3 which is considered to be an area of high risk of flooding due to the proximity to the tidal River Thames. However the site is protected by the Thames Barrier and related defences. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted and this confirms that the site has the potential to be inundated in the event that the flood defences fail. The Assessment details the proposed mitigation for the residual floor risk. No student living accommodation would be provided at ground floor level and the finished floor levels would be set at approximately 2cm higher than the pavement. The report states that the development

would participate in the Environment Agency's (EA) flood warning telephone service. The EA has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

- 197 Consideration must be given to the sequential test, advocated in Planning Policy Statement 25 "Development and Flood Risk" which requires Local Planning Authorities to direct development towards lower flood risk zones and within development sites where the highest vulnerability uses should be located on parts of the site at lowest probability of flooding. A significant part of Southwark is within Flood Zone 3 and there are no sites at a lower risk of flooding for some distance. The proposed scheme is considered to meet the PPS 25 sequential test.

Contaminated Land

- 198 The application is supported by a Phase I Geoenvironmental Assessment which recommends intrusive works are undertaken to assess the risk of contamination to relevant receptors. EPT are satisfied with the conclusions of the report but recommend that these works are conditioned with a reporting mechanism in place should contamination be found. The EA also require such a condition in order to protect groundwaters.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 199 The application would see the redevelopment of an under-used brownfield site. The existing uses, particularly the car parking, is not sustainable given its central London location, nor does it optimise the use of the land as required by the wider Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. The proposal, including the activation of the railway arches, would deliver much need low cost Class B1 incubation space which will enhance the employment potential of the area. The need for student accommodation has been demonstrated and it has been found there would be no resultant significant harm to the local character of the area. A material consideration to be afforded some weight is the direct link to a local institution, UAL, where the 25 years nominations agreement will ensure affordable student accommodation for students registered at UAL with first priority given to students studying at the nearby London College of Communication. The acceptance of reduced student rents has a significant impact on the ability of the development to make a contribution to affordable housing, as required by Core Strategy SP 8 but, as set out above, officers consider there are very special circumstances in this case to justify why an exception can be made.
- 200 A satisfactory standard of student accommodation, including communal facilities, would be provided and appropriate measures could be secured by legal agreement to ensure affordability to student users and the management and maintenance of the accommodation. There would be no serious impacts on local residential amenity that could not be resolved with appropriate conditions in place. There would be no harmful impact on the transport network. The height, bulk, and massing of the development is considered acceptable and the quality of the materials and detailed design can be secured by conditions. The provision of a new public walkway to connect Hampton Street and Steedman Street is welcome and the landscaping of this can be dealt with by condition. Further details will also be required in respect of energy efficiency and on-site energy renewable provision.
- 201 The scheme would generate S106 contributions which would enable improvements to be made the environment within Steedman Street and Hampton Street, as well as funds for other townscape and open space improvements. Taking all matters into consideration the development proposal is considered acceptable and it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Community impact statement

- 202 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.

Consultations

- 203 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.
- 204 A Statement of Community Involvement was submitted which set out the applicants pre-application consultations carried out. An Addendum to the Statement was submitted which sets out details of further on-going engagement and feedback since the submission of the application in March 2011. The Addendum notes that following the first exhibition in November 2010 it was brought to their attention that not all the TRAs had been invited to the first exhibition. A second exhibition was held 9 May 2011.

Consultation replies

- 205 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.
- 206 Summary of consultation responses
- saturation level for student accommodation already reached
 - student accommodation does not provide affordable housing
 - noise from students / anti-social behaviour
 - poor quality student accommodation
 - doesn't support development of sustainable and diverse communities - transient nature of students
 - potential vacancy of commercial units
 - excessive height
 - loss of outlook
 - loss of daylight and sunlight to 11 Steedman Street
 - cycle parking should be available for 11 Steedman Street
 - construction noise and disturbance
 - lack of car parking will increase pressure on existing provision, included disabled parking
 - cycle signage needs amending to take account of new walkway
 - poor quality of existing public realm
 - lack of consideration of how new walkway will exist with existing streets
 - design and layout of walkway is poorly considered and not enough space for pedestrians / cyclists / sitting out
 - existing building should be re-used and refurbished
 - inaccuracies in documentation
 - lack of public consultation

Human rights implications

- 207 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
- 208 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a mixed use development comprising student accommodation and commercial floorspace. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1065-98 Application file: 11-AP-0868 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone:: 020-7525-5349 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Images

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Helen Goulden, Development Management	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 November 2011	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	17 November 2011	

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

Site notice date: 19/04/2011

Press notice date: 21/04/2011

Case officer site visit date: 19/04/2011

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 18/04/2011

Internal services consulted:

Elephant and Castle Projects Team, Economic Development Team, Environmental Protection Team, Public Realm, Transport Planning Team, Planning Policy, Waste Management

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency, Thames Water, Network Rail, Transport for London, London Fire and Emergency Planning, Metropolitan Police

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

See map and neighbour list on file.

Re-consultation:

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED

Internal services

Environmental Protection Team:

Air quality – amended AQ report is acceptable and I agree with its recommendations in respect of ventilation and feel that this is sufficient to mitigate the impacts of poor air quality affecting the end users of the development.

Contaminated Land – Phase 1 Site Investigation (desk study) recommends intrusive works are undertaken to assess the risk of contamination to relevant receptors. This needs to be conditioned.

Noise – Plant is required to service the development and a condition is recommended to ensure this does not cause adverse impacts on amenity. Site is affected by relatively high levels of noise from railway and a condition is required to ensure occupiers of the residential units are afforded an appropriate level of protection. Non-residential uses on the ground floor and roof plant have the potential to affect the amenity of adjoining residential units. A condition is recommended to ensure sufficient protection against sound transmission.

Construction – a construction management plan should be submitted prior to commencement of works.

Economic Development Team

Note the change of use from Class B to A1 and the overall loss of Class B floorspace. In isolation the net loss of Class B space is not welcome. Nor would displacement / loss of existing businesses and type of uses currently occupying the site would be welcome if there is no possibility of replacement with a similar use type to meet demand and provide similar employment. However, the proposed development brings alternative benefits in the form of new B1 accommodation. The new A1 unit could provide a potential home for displacement of retail operators during redevelopment of the Elephant & Castle; however the location would likely rule out all but footloose tenants who are not reliant upon a location with passing footfall. The new affordable start-up units are welcome as a scarce facility that will support test-trading and establishment of new businesses, with the potential to become established in Southwark subject to finding suitable space to move on.

Elephant & Castle Projects Team

E&C Team strongly support the proposal which will contribute to the delivery of the Council's agreed Core Strategy vision for the E&C by developing the college's presence at the E&C and diversifying the range of facilities it can offer to new students.

LCC are a partner in the regeneration of the area and remain committed to the E&C. LCC is working to bring further investment to develop the campus and facilities. They work closely with local schools through their widening participation team and have demonstrated a commitment to bringing a diverse range of people into design and media education. LCC have chaired the Council supported E&C cultural quarter group which provides an opportunity for groups in this growing sector to contribute to the regeneration of the area.

The proposed location is a highly restricted backland site located between student accommodation and rail viaduct and as such its attractiveness for other commercial uses, including residential, is likely to be limited. It is questionable whether the sites characteristics make it suitable for residential development, including family and affordable housing. Student accommodation should be viewed as an appropriate use which will make a positive contribution to the overall mix of the emerging town centre. There are other sites, including the Heygate, which can provide more suitable locations for residential.

Specific regeneration benefits arising from the proposal are:

- UAL has agreed to enter into a 25 year nominations agreement with Alumno ensuring that unlike other recent student schemes at E&C that this accommodation has a long term link to a local institution and that rents will be charged at sub market levels. This factor should be given weight when considering whether the scheme is able to comply with policy which requires student developments to make a contribution to affordable housing. UAL has a restricted amount of accommodation within Southwark and evidence has been supplied to show there is significant demand for more housing. At E&C only Julian Markham House is available to UAL students and this lease will end in 2013 when the accommodation will then be let on an open market rather than subsidised basis.
- Given the buildings location and nominations agreement, occupants can be expected to be LCC students. They are more likely to spend time at E&C benefitting the local economy when compared with occupants of open market blocks where students can spend large amounts of time outside the area.
- Incubation units will provide graduates with business support. Flexible and affordable business space will allow new business start ups to establish themselves. 1 in 5 of UAL's graduates become self-employed or set up their own businesses within 6 months of completing their courses. There is no equivalent space targeted at this growing sector of the economy. The accommodation offers the opportunity to capture some of this potential economic activity and retain it at E&C. While the proposal represents a net loss of B1 space, it has the capacity to diversify the local economy and strengthen it in the long term.
- Development will open up a new pedestrian and cycle walk, extending Robert Dashwood Way northwards as proposed in the E&C SPG.
- Provision of active ground floor uses which is encouraged in the E&C SPG.
- Will result in redevelopment of an underused site which has been contaminated through previous uses and its current design makes it unlikely to be suitable for conversion to alternative employment uses.
- Scheme will generate investment through S106 payments which can be used to address the concerns residents have expressed about the quality of public realm and community safety on adjoining streets. E&C Team suggest that the bridges on Steedman and Hampton Streets and the areas beneath them which are poorly lit should be prioritised for investment.

Public Realm Team

After a review of the submitted designs for the above planning application the following aspects of the highways S278 works have been identified;

- Reinstatements of the footway/s where access to the property has been removed both on Steedman Street and Hampton Street.
- New materials to be installed and should to be in line with the current Southwark Standards. On Steedman Street this should be from the western end of the development to the junction with Walworth Road. And on Hampton Street from the Western extend of the boundary to the eastern end. These areas should start and end where aesthetically and practically appropriate to do so.
- Kerb realignment and reinstallation on Steedman Street and Hampton Street.
- Tactile paving to be included at footway crossovers and access points and including drop kerbs to the current Southwark Standard Details.
- Drop kerbs are to be included at refuge collection / bin store points and all areas

were access from the carriageway for services are needed.

Steedman Street and Hampton Street need some paving enhancements at least up to Walworth Road. A sum in the region of £40 – 50,000 will be required, depending on the materials chosen.

Transport Planning Team

Access – pedestrian access is poor and some of the walking routes to and from the site are not acceptable due to narrow pavements, lack of tactile paving, and some of the routes under the railway are not attractive walking routes. Recommend that S106 monies are secured and used to improve the walking routes.

Car parking – Car free development is welcome and in accordance with policy. The site is in a CPZ and therefore £2,750 will be required to amend the TMO to prevent future occupiers from being eligible for on-street parking permits.

Disabled parking - Would normally require more than one disabled parking space for this development and parking to be provided on-site. Justification for the level of disabled parking based on take up of disabled spaces on other sites has been provided. It is acknowledged that there are site constraints due to land use issues which prevent the implementation of on-site disabled bays. Therefore we would look for the applicant to contribute £5,500 for the costs associated with amendment of a TMO to provide for 2 disabled parking bays. These will be implemented as and when there is a request for an on-street bay in the area.

Cycle parking – This needs to be revisited. Further details are required detailing that the adequate number of cycle parking spaces can be accommodated in the storage area. This is required prior to conditioning in order to ensure there is adequate room to provide policy compliant cycle storage.

The revised ground floor layout plan shows 93 spaces. A sum of £3,200 is also proposed to meet the cost of installing an additional 20 Sheffield stands on street. It is normally expected that adequate cycle facilities are provided on site, but in this case much of the ground floor is taken up with B1 incubation space. In this instance the financial contribution would enable additional cycle provision to be provided on-street to ensure the total required number of spaces is provided. A condition requiring details of cycle storage is required as the revised drawings include Josta wall hooks which are unacceptable.

Servicing – Refuse collection for the student building will take place from Steedman Street and from Hampton Street for the office element. The retail unit will be serviced from the new walkway. A Service Management Plan will be required.

Highway impacts – Scheme will have less of an impact upon the highway network than the existing uses. The largest vehicular impact will be when students are moving in and out at the start and end of terms. The Move In and Move Out Strategy addresses this. The Travel Plan submitted is acceptable at this stage. A full Plan must be submitted for the student housing and office units and this should be secured by S106 Agreement.

Planning Policy

Land use – principle of a mixed use development including business floorspace, A1 and student accommodation is acceptable in principle. It is noted that a redevelopment of the site to provide some replacement of the existing office floorspace with more modern accommodation would contribute towards meeting the needs of the local office market and the E&C SPG objective of protecting and promoting the employment potential of the area. In this case, the small loss of B1 is acceptable given that the proposal includes the provision of start-up incubator units and also utilises the railway arches, which is permitted in accordance with saved policy 1.5. We encourage the provision of small business units in order to promote a

sustainable local economy. The promotion of an active frontage to incorporate A1 use and the incubator units meets SPG objectives.

Student accommodation – While it is acknowledged that there is a London-wide need for student housing, the levels of student housing in the borough should not prejudice the development of general needs and affordable housing. The Southwark Housing Requirements Study (2009) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2010) highlight the need for more general needs and affordable housing in Southwark. SP 8 requires the provision of 35% affordable housing within student accommodation schemes to help meet the need for affordable housing, including family affordable housing. The draft Affordable Housing SPD (June 2011) sets out the sequential approach that should be followed in delivering affordable housing. A financial appraisal must be submitted to justify that at least as much affordable housing will be provided through a pooled contribution as would have been if the minimum 35% affordable housing requirement were achieved on-site. A minimum £100,000 of pooled contributions per habitable room of affordable housing will be required. In this case a financial appraisal has been submitted. For a pooled contribution to be acceptable the applicant needs to demonstrate why the affordable housing cannot be delivered on-site or off-site.

Waste Management - no comments received.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency

Planning permission should only be granted if conditions are attached concerning site contamination and foundation designs in order to protect controlled waters.

Thames Water

No impact piling should take place until a piling method statement has been submitted and approved as well as detailed drainage strategy. These should be secured by conditions.

Network Rail

Have no objections in principle. Due to the location of the site and the proposed works a condition will be required concerning construction.

Transport for London

- Welcome a car free development in an accessible location and the developer should sign a S106 agreement preventing future occupants from applying for parking permits.
- Welcome the pragmatic approach taken to cycle parking and support the proposals.
- Provision of a Framework Travel Plan is welcomed. Recommend a full Travel Plan is secured via S106 Agreement.
- A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) should be secured by condition.
- Advise LB Southwark to seek contributions to improve access for pedestrians.

Metropolitan Police

No issues raised.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

The development should comply with the requirements of B5 of Approved Document B and copies of the site plans should be sent to our Water Office.

Neighbour and local groups

28 Sutherland Square

There are good things to say about the development especially in relation to other student accommodation that has been built in the area. The attention that is being paid to the creation of active frontages is extremely welcome as is the desire to create

a vibrant public realm and to bring the railway arches to life. An important aspect, however, is the relationship that the development has within Hampton Street and Steedman Street.

a) relationship of new public walkway to other links along east side of railway line

While the new public walkway looks excellent and conforms to the E&C Masterplan there must be severe doubts about its actual value if the onward connections:

- to the south rely on Robert Dashwood Way as it is currently configured. There are few people who would choose to walk along this as it is a space for large commercial vehicles;
- to the north require people to turn right onto Hampton Street which is an appalling setting for those on foot.

There is a danger the new walkway will exist in glorious isolation and be little used unless other changes are made to the north and south.

b) surrounding streets

Hampton Street is a horrible street to walk down with broken narrow pavements and carriageway; poor lighting; and a major imbalance between footways and carriageways and an excess of carriageway capacity. It is an awful walking route from Walworth Road to Newington Estate. It is important that the developer contributions from this scheme are spent on improvements to this link. For local people and the residents of the new block it will be far more important to create a safe and attractive link along Hampton Street than to create the north-south walkway. Steedman Street also remains a poor link into the Newington Estate and should have wider pavements and far narrower carriageway. Lighting improvements are needed throughout.

130 Draper House

I am supportive of creating a new public passage along railway arches and turning them into affordable units with glazed frontages. I am worried about the high concentration of student accommodation from neighbouring buildings. Having some student accommodation integrated into residential areas is a good thing, however, if the concentration is too high it will have adverse impacts on the neighbourhood as well as on the student accommodation itself. Object therefore on the following grounds:

- Saturation level for student accommodation in this area has been reached
- Student accommodation will not provide affordable housing. This is even more needed given the fact that the Heygate Estate was decanted and residents moved out.
- To successfully regenerate this neighbourhood we need good quality housing in order for people to settle and make this place their home, and not a stepping stone for a year or two only.

Should this development be granted permission, it is essential to ensure no parking permits for on-street parking will be made available for future occupiers as there are already insufficient parking spaces available.

43 Marlborough Close

Object on the grounds that there would be more traffic and too few parking places.

58 Marlborough Close

At present parking on Steedman Street severely restricts access and the proposed development can only increase this problem. Any increase of traffic in this area will impede any response to an accident by the emergency services. Access to garages belonging to Marlborough Close will be impeded by the associated mechanics for such a project. The impact of work will also mean building work will generate inconvenience, including increased noise and pollution. The 'high spirits' of students may also create problems for residents. The affect of almost constant building work has also been detrimental to my standard of living.

Flat 407, 8 Walworth Road

Deep concerns about the transport impact of this development. There is a decent objective to have a car free strategy but this has a severe negative impact on the

already limited shared public parking bays available within the CPZ for local residents with disabled relatives who need to visit. The assessment of demand for loading / unloading and start / end term time seems wholly inadequate and grossly underestimated. This will place massive pressure on local parking facilities. The additional provision of office space in the development has no car parking and no assessment of unloading/loading requirements of deliveries generated as the existing commercial activities all have off-street parking and access. For the safety of students arriving / departing at night by taxi there needs to be a waiting / drop-off area provision.

Recommend that the development should provide increased provision for short-stay parking and at least double the allocation of loading / unloading facilities for up to 6 vehicles. The restricted double-yellow zones of Hampton Street and Steedman Street should be reviewed with the aim of converting these to single-yellow or pay-and-display short term parking. The footpaths in this area are unacceptable for wheelchair users and need dramatic improvement if this new development is to be properly accessible to those with limited mobility.

Apartment 508, 8 Walworth Road

Commend the proposal to open a public space adjacent to the arches and open these as low rent commercial units. I would anticipate the presence of UAL students will have a positive influence on the regeneration of the area. I have a concern related to access to the new public space by bicycle. There is currently a no entry sign at the corner of Hampton Street and Steedman Street that prevents cyclists from legally turning off CS7 via Hampton Street and continuing to their destination on Hampton Street after this no entry sign. This includes journeys to Strata and would include people accessing the north entrance of the new commercial area. Request that provision is made to amend the signage at Hampton Street / Steedman Street to allow cyclists to continue east to access these destinations from CS7 without a diversion via Walworth Road.

Flat 110, 9 Steedman Street

Complain about the late notice given of the 18 October Planning Committee. Received the letter on 12 October which was less than 24 hrs to give comments on the application (letter is dated 07/10/2011).

1. Area will not benefit from such a dense concentration of students. The area of Steedman Street (0.014 km²) contains the following buildings:

- 9 Steedman Street – 270 residents approx
- Dashwood Studios [*120-138 Walworth Road*] – 230 students approx
- Julian Markham House – 300 students approx
- Proposed development at 2-10 Steedman Street – 221 students

This means a split in the local population of students to residents of 750 / 270 and gives a population density of 72000 people per square kilometre. With problems to London's surface water drainage noted by DEFRA and the EA another high-rise building in a densely populated area is not the answer.

2. There is a need for more affordable housing for local people, especially with the removal of residents from the Heygate Estate. There is no need for more student accommodation in this small area. There is development space to the east around the Heygate Estate as well as a plot near St Mary's Churchyard.

3. Given the pressure on street car parking that already exists, I do not see anywhere in the proposal the mention of parking spaces within the premises.

4. Steedman and Hampton Streets are already very busy during the evenings and weekends with the amount of traffic dangerous to local residents. Another large building will add to the amount of traffic.

5. Demolition of the existing buildings will create a lot of noise and disruption to the

local area. The existing building could be redeveloped. This would cause less of an environmental impact. A smaller development which makes use of the existing building would be much better for the local area.

Flat 304, 9 Steedman Street

Concerned that there would be even further congestion and lack of available parking spaces on Hampton Street and Steedman Street. Feel strongly that we have enough student premises in the vicinity of Steedman Street already. A new block is just being finished on Walworth Road and there is already a block on the corner of Steedman Street and Walworth Road. Residential development will improve the area, but I feel it is counterproductive to build an excessive number of student flats which will inevitably lead to a transient population in an area that needs a solid local community.

Flat 702, 9 Steedman Street

- Local area is already saturated with student accommodation with 2 large blocks within 50m of the proposed building.
- Proposed building is too high and will block views for those directly south (in 9 and 11 Steedman Street) and east (in existing student block) of the proposed block.
- There will be increased noise and traffic which already has pressure on parking spaces.
- Construction period and the noise and disturbance generated will have a negative impact on the local community.
- Another student block would mean the local area becomes more transient with less of a feeling of belonging and togetherness for the local residential population.
- Believe that the existing buildings do need upgrading but this would be better suited to re-using the existing building. With some minor alterations the existing building could be turned into private accommodation or live/work units or affordable housing. This would relieve the chronic shortage the area currently has.

Flat 804, 9 Steedman Street

- Existing building is of architectural merit and is beneficial to retaining the character of the area. With so many new buildings in the area, to retain what little architectural heritage there is should be of importance. It would be better to reuse, update, and renovate the existing building.
- Proposed building is too high and seems out of place on a street where the heights of its neighbours are at a lower level. The building should be no higher than Julian Markham House, if anything it should be lower so that Steedman Street is of varied height and not a faceless narrow street with high buildings throughout.
- The living quarters are too close to the rail line impacting on the quality of life of future occupiers. This site would be better suited to offices and work studios.
- The amount of student flats should be dispersed throughout E&C and not just concentrated within one small area around Steedman Street. The amount of student flats in such a small space impacts on the community and makes it become more transient and divided.

Flat 601, 11 Steedman Street

- I have already experienced noise pollution from the students at Julian Markham House as my bedroom is directly opposite the building. Once the scheme at 120-138 Walworth Road is occupied, it will increase the noise pollution in the area. Adding another student accommodation in close proximity to the other ones will only serve to increase the incidence of noise pollution.
- There will also be increased littering on the streets. The students from Julian Markham House regularly leave rubbish along Steedman Street.
- Height of the proposed building will leave a reduction of daylight and sunlight in my property as my living room will be completely blocked off. My building is 6 storeys high.
- The Planning Committee meeting minutes regarding 120-138 Walworth Road showed it was originally refused for: 1) Student accommodation is inappropriate use of the site and fails to provide a balanced and integrated mix of residential

accommodation; and 2) Need for the student accommodation has not been demonstrated. I am at a loss to understand why it was subsequently approved. Therefore the need for a third student scheme further adds to the imbalance type of housing in this area.

Flat 6.03, 11 Steedman Street

Generally in favour of this development, but would like to request some secure bike storage be made available for local residents as part of the scheme. There is no communal bike storage in my building. There are a number of residents who store bikes in our flats which is not ideal in terms of wear and tear and use of space in the flat. Making secure bike storage available for local residents would redress the problems caused at No.11 and bring the area more in line with Council policy.

108 Amelia Street

The project does not support the development of sustainable and diverse communities. Adding a third high-density block housing a transient population who are unlikely to put down roots in the area, provide local jobs, create diverse local businesses or make a sustainable contribution to the community will not 'trigger sustainable, economic, environmental and social regeneration'. The two buildings already in place (Julian Markham House / Walworth Road) provide housing for hundreds of students who probably have little interest in the area other than as a cheap and convenient place to live.

This situation is already to be found. As a result of the national obsession with buy-to-let as a profit vehicle, the Oakmayne building has just 3 owner occupiers out of 126 flats. The rest are occupied by tenants who are in the main not much older than students and will themselves be hoping to buy elsewhere. The occupation of the Printworks building will probably reflect a similar pattern and the green and magenta buildings and Strata probably also already do. In addition, the business units in these developments that were intended to provide local jobs and contribute to the local economy all remain unoccupied.

As a result, the small area between Amelia Street, Walworth Road, and Crampton Street is already planned to be or occupied by a high density of a single societal of people who are probably not particularly interested in the E&C per se and who are unlikely to put down roots or be part of a longer-term genuine community. Having a large population at the beginning of their working lives, all living in one place, resembles more of a ghetto or dumping ground than a diverse community who are genuinely 'local'. We need families and older people as well as singles and couples if we are to be a genuine and diverse community and hope for local jobs.

45 Pullens Buildings, Peacock Street

a) use of proposed pedestrian promenade

Idea of a pedestrian promenade should be commended. However we feel there needs to be a better consideration of how this promenade will be used and linked to the surrounding area. At the Steedman Street end of the promenade the natural path is to continue down Robert Dashwood Way. However this is used almost exclusively by cars and vans; understandable given the light industrial nature of the existing businesses on that road. Unless there is a wider strategy in the pipeline to change the usage and signing of Robert Dashwood Way, it could end up as a dead end for pedestrians and cyclists emerging at the southern end of the promenade. There is also a question over whether there is public access through this walkway as the plans show gates at either end. Public access should be unimpeded as this impacts on the usage and the overall aspirations of the E&C Masterplan.

The space between the arches and new building is inadequate for the use envisaged. The illustrations show this space supporting both pedestrian and cycle thoroughfares and also space for tables, chairs, benches, planting and lighting bollards. The design of this space needs more consideration given the proposed use and relatively limited area that has been allocated.

b) retail units: viability and use

Concerns about how realistic these spaces are as commercial units. There are commercial units in the ground floor of the O Central building on Crampton Street almost all of which have been empty since the building's completion. If the proposed units suffer the same fate then proposals for interim uses should be included. A more realistic proposal of how these units are expected to be filled – and the interim strategy if they are not - is an essential part of this application. As a location which would have limited foot traffic it would be primarily dependent on the student population for business. This in turn dictates the type of businesses which could operate. If the aspiration is that the building be integrated with the surrounding area, and that retail tenants should service the broader community, then it would be beneficial if the developer could provide examples of successful retail businesses in comparable locations to demonstrate viability. The application discusses these units as LCC Business Incubation Units which would seem like a positive proposal but it is unclear what proportion of the units are earmarked as business incubators and what proportion are expected to be filled by local businesses.

24 Peacock Street: First representation

Statement of Community Involvement

I attended the November consultation and completed a questionnaire pointing out that the E&C was becoming a student ghetto. This has not been included in the SCI. Despite being on the developers contact list, I did not receive notification of the 9 May 2011 event. TRAs on nearby estates were not consulted.

Affordable Housing Statement

The premise is based on subsidised rents; in the current economic climate this is unsustainable. The developers and University will not have a ring fenced and guaranteed reserve that would enable these subsidies. After a term of two the rents will be increased. Therefore there is the case for the inclusion of social housing in the development.

Marketing and Demand Report

There is no comment or comparison with the "Technopark" in London Road. Why not if similar incubator units are proposed? The appendices are full of inaccuracies. Firms which went into liquidation years ago are shown as still trading.

The above documents should be disregarded as not fit for purpose. This development will only exacerbate the growing tendency for the Elephant to become a student ghetto. Such a large concentration of students on one area does nothing to regenerate the community.

24 Peacock Street: Second representation

- Apart from the reply from Kalmars the points raised in my original letter have not been answered. Kalmars do not give any methodology for the survey used. There are still empty commercial properties in the immediate area including Strata, Crampton Street, Printworks and 120-138 Walworth Road.
- There has been no guarantee about the subsidised rents. UAL are subject to stringent budget cuts. Where are the accounts creating such a reserve? If they have arranged for special grants for the next 25 years then details should be provided.
- There is some mention in the officer's recommendation about Southwark being relatively well supplied in terms of student accommodation. Why then do we need more, particularly at the Elephant, with one block just completed (120 Walworth Road), one under construction (Elephant Road) and others in Dante Road, St George's Circus, Borough High Street and several in Great Dover Street. Para 54 [officers report] says a balanced approach should be taken to student housing. This project does not meet these criteria. In fact they will bring an over concentration of student housing into the area (para 66).
- No reply has been given to the lack of consultation, particularly from UAL. Para

178: The exhibition on 9 May was not widely advertised in the area. I did not hear from the applicants directly about it despite it taking place less than 200 yards from my home a week before the deadline. Genuine community involvement would have more intensive and properly announced. Also no reply has been received from the developers since I raised these matters in May.

- Details in paras 75-83 of the officer's report do not take into account the lack of any guarantee about rents. They should be revised to take into account the urgent needs in Southwark for affordable social housing unless a contractual agreement and/or a bond has been deposited for the amount of £8,715,000 specified in para 75 in order to provide the necessary social housing.
- Para 14 anticipates (does not guarantee) the majority of students will be from LCC. But this is the only campus in the area and the others are spread across London.
- Para 116 does not allow for the council's parking contractor issuing permits in error, despite clauses in any rental agreement preventing them from doing so.
- Para 150 the sports facilities mentioned are private and not available to the public and will increase demand without any increase in public facilities.
- Para 173 makes no provision for the discovery of asbestos or any other toxic materials during demolition.

Kalmars Commercial (in response to first representation from 24 Peacock Street)

The commercial occupier list was produced and provided from the industry specific research company FOCUS, This is the UK's largest database of property transactions and is used by the majority of professionals within the property industry. The data is continuously updated and is regarded as generally accurate, though it is acknowledged that it can't be 100% accurate at all times. The Technopark houses the main administration for London South Bank University as well as a number of small businesses. The proposed development would provide start-up units for graduates and local people. The intention is to develop creative spaces which are not currently available and will be fully administrated by UAL. These units are not intended to be built out or fitted out for standard office purposes but rather as studio spaces on flexible terms. This represents a different offering to the Technopark.

11 letters were received from the following addresses:

- 60 Amelia Street
- 38, 45 Pullens Buildings, Peacock Street
- 27, 28, 30, 31 Pullens Buildings, Penton Place
- 8, 52, 93 Iliffe Street
- No address given

The matters are raised in the letters are the same and are summarised below.

Students who have stayed in halls located in the immediate vicinity have a poor impression of student halls in E&C including the standard of accommodation offered, the location by a busy and polluted road (Walworth Road) and the lack of amenities. They find Hampton Street and Steedman Street unsafe at night and unsightly during the day. There is no sense of "place", their experience of E&C is unmemorable they have quickly moved out to other London neighbourhoods. During this period of extensive regeneration we should be aiming much higher in terms of producing high quality student accommodation with proper amenity space where students can feel secure, valued and become connected to the "place". We want students to stay in the area for the duration of their studies and beyond. The proposed block does not offer a suitable environment or design for student accommodation.

a) project does not support sustainable or diverse communities

If progressed this will be the third high density block of student housing in the immediate area. The design of this building, in no way delivers a diverse, vibrant or adaptable solution to regenerating this part of the E&C. All three buildings will be inhabited by residents of similar ages who will reside in these blocks for short periods

of time. In the main they will have little interest in the upkeep of the buildings or making a contribution to the community, the area and its wider commercial life. A more sustainable and long term approach needs to be taken to land use in this area ensuring that such high density student housing is spread amongst existing communities who have longer term interests in the area and can support a more diverse range of commercial businesses.

b) accommodation proposed for the students only maximises rental profit, it is not fit for purpose and does not make an attractive city block at ground level

Student rooms are cramped and very small, particularly when considering many LCC students will study art and design. The single aspect bedrooms facing the rear courtyard / light well are poorly appointed especially at lower levels. Communal spaces facing east will have little light and have no view. The corridor and shared spaces are ill thought out in terms of use. They are dark, without natural ventilation, and will need to be artificially lit and mechanically ventilated. There are no spaces to congregate, work on design and art projects or to meet their peers. The layout is determined by the maximum number of minimally sized bedrooms that can be squeezed into the plan. There are no external amenity areas or green spaces for students to use. The immediate area around the block is harsh and urban in character with no green spaces in the immediate vicinity. The proposed blocks seem to be of poor quality cheap buildings of very limited life span which will age quickly and not be able to be maintained satisfactorily.

c) project does not deliver public realm of quality

Lack of vision demonstrated is staggering. The drawings and visuals are deceiving because they are not consistent in the information they depict. The new walkway is shown as paved; there is no plating. Even though it steps back along its length, the new building will be experienced as a relentless and high wall. The new street is shown on plan as gated. Gates alienate communities and do not contribute to making coherent, mixed use, fluid or adaptable bits of city where residents can interact and share green spaces and routes through these. The proposed frontages will not be active and for security reasons will have blinds at the very least. The only active street frontages could be the A1 shop which appears to be takeaway only for the public as there is no space to sit down. The route should never be allowed to be gated preventing public access as shown on the submitted drawings.

d) we need a "joined up" strategy to deliver public realm of quality that works

There is a real opportunity to join up through imaginative public realm work all the new housing blocks that run adjacent to the railway line, starting at Amelia Street and ending at E&C. This and previous applications demonstrate that developers working within their own demise do not have vision or motivation to deliver anything beyond the practical and piecemeal. We need a coherently and imaginatively designed public route along the side of the railway line where new and local businesses can flourish inside the arches making into a safer, greener, populated and commercially flourishing alternative to using the Walworth Road.

e) inadequate public consultation

The first consultation that Pullens TRA has been invited to was on 9 May 2011, after the application submission. Pullens TRA are listed in the application as having being invited to attend the consultation event in November and closely consulted. The claims made in the Statement of Community Involvement are flagrant abuse of the consultation system.

Alumno Developments Ltd / University of Arts

UAL consulted their staff and students at the London College of Communication (LCC) and submitted 183 forms in support of the development proposal.