

Committee	STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE	
Report Title	CONVOYS WHARF, PRINCE STREET SE8 3JH	
Ward	Evelyn	
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 26 MARCH 2014

Reg. Nos. DC/13/83358

Application dated 29 April 2013

Applicant BPTW Partnership on behalf of Convoys Properties Ltd

Proposal The comprehensive redevelopment of Convoys Wharf to provide a mixed-use development of up to 419,100m² comprising: up to 321,000m² residential floorspace (up to 3,500 units) (Use Class C3) up to 15,500m² employment floorspace (Class B1/Live/Work units) including up to 2,200m² for 3 no. potential energy centres wharf with associated vessel moorings and up to 32,200m² of employment floorspace (Sui Generis & Class B2) up to 5,810m² of retail and financial and professional services floorspace (Classes A1 & A2) up to 4,520m² of restaurant/cafe and drinking establishment floorspace (Classes A3 & A4) up to 13,000m² of community/non residential institution floorspace (Class D1) and assembly and leisure (Class D2) up to 27,070m² of hotel floorspace (Class C1) river bus jetty and associated structures 1,840 car parking spaces together with vehicular access from New King Street and Grove Street, retention and refurbishment of the Olympia Building and demolition of all remaining non-listed structures on site. All matters reserved other than access and the siting and massing of three tall buildings.

Applicant's Plan Nos. CON1-PA-03-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006A, 007A, 008A, 009A, 010A, 011B, 012B, 013A, 014A, 017A, 018A; CW02 Environmental Statement Main Report, Non-Technical Summary & Appendices Vol. 2A, 2B, 2C, Environmental Statement Addendum Report and Environmental statement Technical Note 24 February 2014; CW03 Design & Access Statement and CW03A Design and Access Statement Addendum; CW04 Design Guidelines (Section 4 for information only); CW05A Development Specification; CW06 Planning Statement, Annex 1 - Marine Terminal Assessment & Annex 2 - Boat Yard Assessment; CW07 Transport Assessment and Transport Technical Note; CW08 Energy Strategy; CW09 Sustainability Statement; CW010 Retail Impact Assessment; CW011 Statement of Community Involvement; CW012 Delivery Strategy; CW013 Commercial Strategy, CW014 Heritage Statement; CW015 Cultural Strategy

Background Papers

- (1) Case File DE/131/A/TP
- (2) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (3) Local Development Framework Documents
- (4) The London Plan

Designation

Core Strategy – Area of Archaeological Priority, Thames Policy Area, Protected Vista: Landmark Viewing Corridor and Wider Setting Consultation Area, Site of Importance for nature Conservation, Area of Special Character, Strategic Site Allocation 2

Screening/Scoping

Scoping Opinion – March 2010

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 In October 2013 the Mayor of London advised the Council that he would determine the outline planning application for the redevelopment of the Convoys Wharf site, Deptford.
- 1.1.2 At its meeting on 16th January 2014 the Strategic Planning Committee received a report from the Head of Planning. The report sets out the scope of the application, Officers' views on the proposals, and the process by which the Council could comment on and engage in on-going negotiations with the applicant and the GLA prior to determination of the application by the Mayor of London. The Committee agreed a number of recommendations in respect of the proposed development which should be referred to the GLA and form the basis of the Council's position in continuing negotiations on the application.

Recommendations from Strategic Planning Committee 16 January 2014

Members resolved that the Council:

Supports the principle of mixed use development of the site in accordance with Policy SSA2 of the Core Strategy.

Considers that in its current form the application should not be approved and that amendments should be secured prior to determination in relation to the following matters:

1 Scale, Massing and Relationship with Historic Buildings and Spaces

Reducing the scale and massing of selected development parcels as outlined in the report to achieve an acceptable urban scale and an appropriate relationship of new buildings with historic buildings and spaces, in particular in relation to the Olympia Building, former Master Shipwrights House and site of John Evelyn's House.

2 Sayes Court Garden and The Lenox

The approach to Sayes Court fails to provide a meaningful green link between the site of the Gardens with the remains of Sayes Court House. The opportunity to link these two historically significant spaces should be fully explored. The Lennox preferred building location is either within the Double Dry Dock or Olympia Warehouse. These options need to be explored further, as does the future use of the Olympia Warehouse and an agreement reached on the deliverability of the double dry dock or Olympia Warehouse as options for constructing the Lennox.

3. Building in the Scope for Design Flexibility, Evolution and Innovation

The Design Guidelines should either be significantly streamlined to identify what is essential (mandatory) in terms of providing guidance for reserved matters applications and what is too specific/constraining, or should become 'for information' only.

4 Transport Issues

The site has a relatively low level of public transport accessibility and it is essential that car parking is minimised and the opportunity to provide and ensure access to public transport, pedestrian and cycle links are maximised. This includes the widening of New King Street to allow for two-way bus movement and improved pedestrian and cycle access and the re-design of the New King Street/Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street junction to provide a direct single all-red phased pedestrian crossing. TfL needs to satisfy itself of the robustness of the data and that the modelling outputs can be resolved.

5. Community Benefits

Securing appropriate social infrastructure and the maximum possible amount of genuinely affordable housing to meet the needs of Lewisham residents. There is an identified need for investment in affordable housing and a range of community infrastructure projects directly attributable to the impact of the new development including the need for a new primary school, additional secondary school capacity, GP facilities, jobs and training for local people and open space. A number of questions remain about the applicants' assumptions on costs and future values in their viability statement, changes to which could support additional S106 payments and affordable housing.

The Council considers that to ensure policy compliance and safeguard amenity, and in addition to any conditions and planning obligations that are imposed or agreed, the following are matters on which clarification and appropriate commitment is required from the applicant prior to determination of the application. The GLA must also satisfy itself that it has the relevant information on which to determine the application.

6 Clarifications, Commitments and Procedural Compliance

Operation of the wharf. Process and timing of reducing the area of the safeguarded wharf. Retail floorspace impacts. Housing mix. Transport Assessment modelling. Car parking management. School capacity. Delivery of projects set out in the Cultural Strategy. Mechanism to ensure a mix of uses and affordable business space is secured across the site. Lifetime Homes Standard, wheelchair and housing design standards. Decentralised energy network connection. CfSH Level 4 and BREEAM 'Excellent'.

Environmental Impact Assessment and Flood Risk Assessment. Financial review mechanism.

7 Construction

Ensure there is a Code of Construction Practice to manage and mitigate construction impacts and maximise the use of the river for construction materials and waste from the commencement of the project.

- 1.1.3 Following the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee meeting officers have met regularly with the GLA, TfL and the applicant to seek to secure changes to the application that reflect the recommendations of the Committee. Officers from Lewisham and the GLA have also had meetings with and liaised with representatives from the Sayes Court Gardens and Build the Lenox groups and have been liaising with Joan Ruddock MP and English Heritage.
- 1.1.4 A number of changes to the application have been made, and clarifications and further information submitted to the GLA. These are summarised in section 2 below and considered in detail in section 7 of this report.
- 1.1.5 On 24 February the Mayor of London undertook a site visit attended by Officers from the Council, GLA and the applicant.
- 1.1.6 The Mayor of London has announced that he will determine the application at a public hearing on 31 March 2014.
- 1.1.7 On Monday 24 March the GLA published its report. This has been reviewed by Officers and also assessed as to whether key issues raised in the report of 16 January Strategic Planning Committee meeting and subsequent meetings and negotiations have been taken on board. However due to the timing of publication of the GLA's report and need for the Council to publish its report to the Strategic Planning Committee on 26 March Officers may need to verbally update Members at the Committee meeting should legal or other issues arise following further review.

1.2 Purpose of Report

- 1.2.1 In the light of the negotiations and changes to the scheme since 16 January Strategic Planning Committee and the announcement of the date of the Public hearing, this report updates Members on the outcome of those discussions and sets out a number of recommendations in respect of the Council's position on the application. These will be referred to the GLA and form the basis of the Council's representations at the Hearing on 31 March.
- 1.2.2 MEMBERS ARE ADVISED THAT THIS REPORT DOES NOT REPEAT THE BACKGROUND TO THE APPLICATION OR CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUES THAT ARISE. THESE ARE SET OUT IN THE REPORT TO THE 16 JANUARY STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AND TO WHICH MEMBERS SHOULD REFER FOR FURTHER INFORMATION (Appendix A).

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Site and Surroundings and Planning History

- 2.1.1 There has been no change to the site boundary or context since the 16th January 2014 Strategic Planning Committee.

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Overview of the Proposed Development

- 3.1.1 As originally submitted in April 2013, the application is in outline with all matters reserved apart from access, the primary routes and the siting (subject to limits of deviation) and massing of the three towers.
- 3.1.2 The overall quantum and mix of development remains un-amended, comprising:
- up to 321,000m² residential floorspace (up to 3,500 units) (Use Class C3)
 - up to 15,500m² employment floorspace (Class B1/Live/Work units) including up to 2,200m² for 3 no. potential energy centres
 - wharf with associated vessel moorings and up to 32,200m² of employment floorspace (Sui Generis & Class B2)
 - up to 5,810m² of retail and financial and professional services floorspace (Classes A1 & A2)
 - up to 4,520m² of restaurant/cafe and drinking establishment floorspace (Classes A3 & A4)
 - up to 13,000m² of community/non residential institution floorspace (Class D1) and assembly and leisure (class D2)
 - up to 27,070m² of hotel floorspace (Class C1)
 - river bus jetty and associated structures
 - 1,840 car parking spaces together with vehicular access from New King Street and Grove Street
 - retention and refurbishment of the Olympia Building and demolition of all remaining non-listed structures on site
- 3.1.3 There have however been a number of changes to the application as well as refinement of proposals in respect of off-site works. These are summarised below and an assessment of them provided in section 7 of this report.
- 3.1.4 The overall quantum of development and mix of uses remains un-amended however Plot 17 (proposed location for the Primary school) has been omitted with the Plot being identified as open space. This is the applicant's response to proposals for the inclusion of the Sayes Court Garden project in this location. The floorspace for the Primary school in Plot 17 has been changed and incorporated into the adjacent Plot 16 with the equivalent hotel floorspace in that plot being redistributed to other plots on the site.
- 3.1.5 The maximum and minimum parameters of plot P16 have also changed with the extent of southern most corner of that block slightly reduced. In addition, the minimum parameter for the three tall buildings has been reduced to allow for greater design flexibility. The height remains unaffected.
- 3.1.6 The maximum building height on the eastern wing of Plot 01 has been reduced to 5 storeys as the applicant's response to creating a more sensitive setting for the Master Shipwrights house.
- 3.1.7 The affordable housing mix has been clarified (the application documents incorrectly specified the dwelling mix and tenure) with the scheme now providing 15% affordable with 75% Intermediate and 25% Affordable Rent (previously stated as 60% Intermediate : 40% Social Rent). There have also been changes made to the mix of units, with the number of 3 bedroom Affordable Rent units increased and a reduction in the number of 1 and 2 bed units. The revised

indicative housing mix (table 2-3 of the ES Addendum) proposes provision of housing in the following ranges:

Unit Size	Private	Affordable Rent	Intermediate	Total
1 bed 2 person	40-45%	18-23%	25-30%	35-45%
2 bed 4 person	40-45%	38-43%	65-74%	42-48%
3 bed 6 person	10-14%	27-33%	(1-6%)	10-14%
4 bed 6-8 person	2-4%	2-7%	0%	(2-4%)
	85% of total	25% of affordable 5% of total	75% of affordable 10% of total	

3.2 Application Documents

3.2.1 The topic and scope of the application documents remains un-amended however there have been amendments to the detailed contents to reflect changes to the proposed development. In addition there have been a number of statements received from the applicant in response to matters raised by the Council and TfL regarding transport matters.

Development Specification (February 2014)

3.2.2 Amended to reflect changes to the distribution of uses within the proposed plots and changes to the illustrative masterplan and parameter plans. As a result of the above changes, some of the floorspace totals (by use) in Plots P01, P06, P16 and P17 have changed however the total proposed floorspace for each use remains unchanged from that originally submitted. The changes include the following:

Parameter Plans (February 2014)

3.2.3 Amendments to the plans that define the maximum and minimum dimensions of buildings and plots within the site. The principal changes the relocation of the proposed school from Plot P17 and incorporating it within Plot P16. Floorspace 'displaced' by the school (potential hotel) has been relocated to Plot P06. Plot P17 is to be public open space. The eastern wing of Plot P01 is reduced to a maximum of 5 storeys in height.

Environmental Statement (February 2014)

3.2.4 In the light of comments made by the Council in respect of the submitted Environmental Statement the applicant submitted an ES Addendum report (see section 4 below).

Design and Access Statement (February 2014)

3.2.5 This provides a brief explanation of the changes to the scheme and their rationale including changes to the landscaping proposals in the light of changes to Plots 16 and 17.

Illustrative Masterplan (February 2014)

3.2.6 The Illustrative layout has been amended to reflect the changes to Plots 16 and 17.

Design Guidelines (February 2014)

- 3.2.7 The status of the Design Guidelines has been clarified, with detailed Building Design Guidelines and Tall Building Design Guidelines to be submitted with reserved matters applications.

Sustainability Statement (January 2014)

- 3.2.8 This document summarises the sustainability measures proposed for the development and clarifies the sustainability standards that will be provided on the site.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 ES Addendum Report 14 February 2014

- 4.1.1 The applicant has submitted an ES Addendum that provides further information to address issues raised by the Council in respect of the environmental impact assessment of the proposed development.

- 4.1.2 This covers:

- (i) Amendment to and clarification of the Scheme for Assessment, specifically:

- Parameter Plans/Development Specification/Design Guidelines – amended to reflect changes to Plots P01, P16 and P17
- Jetties – clarification of jetties to be retained, demolished and new
- School – reassessment of impacts arising from relocation of the school from Plot P17 to P16 (including relocation of hotel floorspace from Plot P16 to P06)
- Parking Spaces – clarification of car parking proposed on the site to be up to 1,540 spaces for residential (0.44 spaces per dwelling) and 300 non-residential parking spaces (including the 35 car club bays)
- Affordable Housing provision – clarification of the indicative dwelling size and tenure mix
- New tidal inlet – clarification of the nature of the proposed tidal inlet at the mouth of the former Basin and assessment of the potential for any significant effects on ground conditions and ecology

- (ii) Mitigation

- Summary of incorporated and supplementary mitigation – clarification of which elements of the proposed mitigation is “incorporated mitigation” (which forms an inherent part of the scheme design) and “supplementary mitigation” (which is not inherent in the design but which is considered necessary in order to overcome significant adverse effects)
- Framework Code of Construction Practice – submission of a Framework Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) to avoid and/or mitigate potential adverse impacts arising as a result of the scheme.

- (iii) Topic-Specific Points of Clarification

- Ecology – review of ecological assessment undertaken in connection with the Thames Tideway Tunnel, incorporation of baseline information relevant to the Convoys Wharf scheme and consequential reassessment of the proposed development including identification of the need for mitigation (where relevant)

- Socio-Economics – incorporation into the ES of statements from the Design & Access Statement regarding community cohesion
- Cumulative Impacts – additional assessment to further consider the potential for intermediate year transport effects in terms of the cumulative impact of committed developments and the proposed Thames Tideway Tunnel

4.1.3 Officers have previously raised a number of technical deficiencies with the submitted ES, most notably in relation to sunlight and daylight and cumulative effects on off-site receptors during later phase construction. Whilst the ES has been amended and updated there remain a number of items where the GLA's assessment and interpretation of the Regulations differs from that of Council Officers. As the determining authority it is ultimately for the GLA to satisfy itself that the ES is robust and meets the relevant requirements.

5.0 CONSULTATION

5.1 Consultation Responses since 16 January 2014

5.1.1 Since 16 January the GLA have undertaken another round of public consultation for a period of 21 days. During this time, the following consultation responses have been copied to the Council.

English Heritage

5.1.2 English Heritage have only commented on the revisions to the scheme and note that their position remains as set out in their letter of 18 June 2013. They recognise and support the principle of redevelopment and the considerable benefits this could bring but remain concerned that the opportunity to reflect local character and significant history are not reflected in the submitted proposals. They consider that the Design Guidelines are too prescriptive, are concerned that the parameters for Plot 16 do not secure the deliverability of the Sayes Court CIC (they advocate the CIC's proposal to reduce the minimum development parameter for this plot) and consider that more work is needed to establish the potential use of the Olympia Building, including feasibility into its use to build the Lenox. English Heritage consider that if minor revisions are made to the proposed parameters, Masterplan and Design Guidelines, there would be greater opportunity to develop a scheme which truly reflects the sites unique heritage and better reflects local character. They recommend that the GLA agree appropriate changes to the Outline scheme at this stage to ensure that the Reserved Matters applications will be capable of delivering the necessary heritage response to this historically important site.

London Parks and Gardens Trust

5.1.3 Further to their letter dated 18th December, the London Parks and Gardens Trust have responded reiterating the advice from their previous letter and responding to a letter from Roo Angell for Sayes Court Garden CIC.

5.1.4 They reiterate that the site of Sayes Court manor house and Sayes Court Park were important heritage assets and that every effort should be made to protect them and to ensure that their historic connecting links are re-established physically as well as notionally. They also restated that relaxing the Master Plan's 'tight grip' could help ensure a scheme that celebrated Evelyn in a suitably green way and at a human scale.

- 5.1.5 They request that, as set out in Roo Angell's letter of 26th February, the minimum parameters for site P16 are changed to allow sufficient flexibility to accommodate the CIC's suggestion of a John Evelyn centre with an educational and community commitment and programme.

London City Airport

- 5.1.6 London City Airport have restated their comments from June 2013.

The Lenox Project CIC

- 5.1.7 The Lenox Project CIC have responded to the GLA consultation with a letter dated 26 February 2014 plus an addendum response on 20 March 2014. Within these letters they explain the options available on the site for the building of the Lenox which are the wharf, the Olympia building and the Double Dry Dock and appraise all three. They conclude that the wharf is not suitable but that the Olympia and Double Dry Dock need to be explored further but note that the Olympia Building and a reconstructed basin is their preferred option. The addendum further emphasizes the potential of the Lenox Project to 'create a real and tangible link to Deptford's history by recreating a basin in front of the Olympia Building to provide a direct connection to its heritage and re-establish its historic links to the river'. The Lenox Project CIC consider that the current application has ignored the detail within the Heritage Statement when producing the masterplan and that the concerns and objections raised by bodies such as English Heritage and the CBA, as well as policy requirements, could be addressed with the inclusion of the Lenox Project within the Olympia Building. A series of images for the preferred option of the Olympia Building and basin are outlined.
- 5.1.8 The addendum letter also responds to the recent offer from the applicant to locate the project on the wharf for a limited time period which in the view of the Lenox Project CIC would prejudice the ability of the Project to attract funding and become financially self-supporting at the earliest stage possible. The Lenox Project CIC state that they need an offer of a permanent home before the viability of the project could be secured and raise additional concerns about PLA objections if the wharf option was taken forward. The letter recommends that an independent study is carried out to establish the most feasible location for the project with appropriate weight given to the project contributing to heritage and 'creating the best conditions for its success'. They identify a series of commitments necessary at the outline planning stage to secure the future of the scheme including a commitment by the applicant to accommodate the Lenox and to assist the project to meet the broad aims and aspirations set out in the vision, undertaking an independent feasibility study into the three site options which would also determine the operation requirements but should include matters such as a 100 year lease on the project site, unrestricted access to the site, provision of a river access (cost to be met by the developer) and a home port.

Environment Agency

- 5.1.9 The Environment Agency note that comments regarding flood levels made in their previous letters have not been referred to. The comments made in their letter of 14 November 2014 are still applicable.

Sayes Court Garden CIC

- 5.1.10 The Sayes Court Garden CIC refer to a letter sent direct to the GLA on 26th February in which they suggest an amendment to the Outline Planning application

to secure sufficient flexibility in the parameters for Block P16 to enable options to be explored at Reserved Matters stage. They make clear that they are willing to reconsider their proposal for a standalone building (which was just one early option presented) but emphasise that 1 hectare of open space for educational and training functions and 1500m² of building space are essential to make the project viable. They outline the expert advice sought to arrive at these figures, which has included input from the National Trust. The letter states that any reduction in these minimum requirements would render the project unviable and therefore the current planning application (as amended) would not enable the project to move forward.

- 5.1.11 They also address the GLA suggestion of using the existing Sayes Court Park, raising concerns about how the purpose of the open space for training and teaching would restrict the use of and amount of public park space. The Sayes Court Garden CIC reemphasise their proposed solution of changing the minimum parameters for Plot P16 to secure the future of the project.
- 5.1.12 The letter is accompanied by diagrams demonstrating the proposed change to the parameters for Plot P16 and one option for how P16 could be configured as a result.

Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock MP

- 5.1.13 The letter addresses four key revisions made to the scheme in addition to seeking an additional variation to secure the future of the Lenox Project. It is noted that whilst there's been a willingness to negotiate, there are concerns that the projects may 'fall at the final hurdle' in securing the necessary support and space. The letter states that the Sayes Court Project needs a revision to the minimum parameters to Plot P16 to improve the setting of the archaeology and provide the critical mass to enable the future of the project to be delivered. This is considered to make the future vision possible without harming the aims of the developer or timescale for determination of the outline planning application. Concerns are raised that the changes to the affordable housing proposed would not meet the aspirations or need of local people to have more social housing and advises that revisions are needed to provide more accommodation at social rents.
- 5.1.14 In relation to the Lenox, the letter argues that an independent feasibility study is needed to establish the most feasible location for the project with appropriate weight given to the project contributing to heritage and 'creating the best conditions for its success'. With appropriate planning conditions and a commitment to the project from the applicant, it is argued that this could be achieved without significantly impacting the existing masterplan.

The Tenants' Action Group

- 5.1.15 The Tenants' Action Group strongly object to the scheme and raise a number of detailed points:
- They state that the local community are unhappy with Lewisham Planning as they consider LBL Planning have not responded to objections
 - Blocks have been designed to gain maximum density, they are isolated and are not permeable 'being mediaeval in design', would not provide adequate privacy and would have roof gardens that would not be publically accessible
 - They have unanswered questions

- Objection to the jetty adjacent to a park and number of lorry movements on the wharf
- They state that the plans show a footbridge coming in to an existing 'wildlife area' which should not be disturbed.
- There is a lack of affordable housing, at only 15%,
- They question the job numbers estimated and consider that much less would be achieved
- They support the use of the Olympia warehouse to build the replica Lenox ship, in one half with the other half being used as a Museum recalling the history of Deptford. They note that there are many artefacts to be housed and 'a rich story to tell to the world'
- They propose that the application is deferred until there are clear answers to outstanding questions and consider that the scheme has no substantial benefits for the local community and that the Section 106 Agreement will not be of benefit to local people

The Pepys Community Forum

- 5.1.16 The Pepys Community Forum object to the scheme on a number of grounds which broadly reflect those matters outlined in their original letter related to employment and access to jobs for local people, the level of affordable housing proposed and type of private residential accommodation, the design of the scheme and the tall towers, the approach to archaeology and heritage, transport and traffic impacts and community impacts. The PCF also outline Social Impact Assessments undertaken in 2004/2005.

Other Submissions

- 5.1.17 In addition to the letters copied directly to the Council, letters from the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) and Mark Laird, a senior lecturer at Harvard University in the History of Landscape Architecture have been sent to the Council for information. Both letters raise concerns about the current masterplan, the relationship with the site of John Evelyn's house and endorse the proposed alteration to the minimum parameter of Plot P16. Mark Laird refers to London Plan policy documents, which he states advocate the UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban landscape and an integration of the historic environment within urban development. He also stresses the importance of horticultural training that a Centre for Urban Horticulture on this site could provide. The CBA comment on the need for the substantial features of the historic dockyard, such as the basin, to inform the character areas and be at the core of design proposals. They consider that adjustments need to be made to the masterplan to physically connect the heritage assets, consider the scale of buildings around Olympia building is overwhelming and the change to block P01 is little compromise. The CBA object to the application on the grounds of harm to heritage assets and failure to address paragraphs 129, 131, 132 and 135 of the NPPF.

London Borough of Southwark

- 5.1.18 The Council welcomes the delivery of new homes and employment into an area in need of regeneration and investment, and in conjunction with Southwark's proposals in Canada Water redevelopment of these sites will contribute to transforming this part of London and help to enhance the vitality and viability of

these areas. Based on testing of the proposals in the Canada Water AAP the Council considers there is a need to make improvements to transport infrastructure, or face worsening queues and delays on the current gyratory system around Lower Road, Rotherhithe Old Road, Bush Road, Bestwood Street and Rotherhithe new Road. In response the Council is preparing proposals to introduce 2-way working on local streets, and expected to be delivered alongside Cycle Superhighway Route 4 from 2015.

- 5.1.19 The Council notes the proposals for Convoys Wharf are of a significant scale and will impact not only on local roads adjacent to the site, but also on the wider strategic road network, including Lower Road. It expresses concern that traffic impacts in Southwark have not been considered in the Transport Assessment and given trips from the site travelling through Southwark, considers that it would be appropriate for the development to mitigate impacts in the Lower Road area in the form of a financial contribution from Convoys Wharf.
- 5.1.20 The Council notes the proposals include provision of a two-form entry Primary school to meet the demand of the new resident population, but its own projections for Year 7 (Secondary) pupil demand forecasts a shortfall of places in the borough from September 2016, increasing thereafter. A recent report to its Cabinet recommended that it notes that the financial implications of an expansion to the primary and secondary estate are significant and that the establishment of a new secondary school in the Southwark to meet the place demand from 2016 needs to be given serious consideration. The Council notes that the Convoys Wharf ES child yield calculations (including 142 secondary school aged children) and that a secondary school is not proposed as part of the proposals so these children will need to be accommodated in existing schools within and outside of Lewisham. Whilst the ES concludes that there would be sufficient spare places to accommodate the additional secondary pupils generated by the Convoy's Wharf development, the Council has not been able to reconcile the capacities shown for Southwark's secondary schools with any figures which have been published by the Council. Further, the roll figures are out of date and it is considered that the ES has overestimated the capacity of neighbouring secondary schools to provide places for the additional pupils generated by the development of Convoy's Wharf. The increase in the secondary pupil population as a result of the development of Convoy's Wharf is therefore likely to contribute to the pressure for places at Southwark secondary schools and the associated capital investment by the Council. In the circumstances the Council considers that it would be appropriate for the development to mitigate impacts on secondary school places in Southwark through an appropriate contribution.
- 5.1.21 The Council welcomes the intention to connect directly to SELCHP and that only if this is unavailable will they proceed with the energy centre using gas fired boiler or gas fired CHP with PV. The Council notes that the boundary between the two local authorities falls within part of areas that have been declared by both authorities as Air Quality Management Areas and requests that the developer ensures that adequate monitoring is put in place during the period of the construction to ensure that the level of air quality within Southwark is not further negatively affected. The Council also considers it appropriate for a contribution to be made to mitigate the air quality impacts of the development on Southwark and for the developer to comply with the borough's Low Emission Strategy.
- 5.1.22 Copies of the submissions are available to Members.

6.0 POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 There have been no changes in national, strategic or local planning policy since 16 January however on 6 March the Government published (on-line) Planning Practice Guidance.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Procedural Matters

- 7.1.1 The effect of the Mayor of London's decision to act as local planning authority in this case is that the London Borough of Lewisham has no formal planning powers in the determination of this application, the grant (or refusal) of planning permission, the scope of conditions or the content of any s.106 agreement although the Borough will be party to the s.106. However in meetings and correspondence with the GLA, Officers have made representations regarding the application, the scope of the s.106 agreement and scale of financial contributions, and the wording of conditions.
- 7.1.2 Officers from the GLA have advised that it is the intention that should the Mayor of London grant planning permission for the development then LB Lewisham would be responsible for the determination of reserved matters applications and the discharge of conditions. This is yet to be confirmed by the Mayor of London.

7.2 Considerations

- 7.2.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application identified in the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee were, and remain, the following:

- i) Principle of Proposed Development
- ii) Safeguarded Wharf
- iii) Employment Space
- iv) Retail
- v) Housing (including affordable housing)
- vi) Layout, Heritage, Scale and Massing, Design
- vii) Transport, Access and Movement
- viii) Energy and Sustainability
- ix) Other Considerations
- x) Delivery
- xi) Planning Obligations

Principle of Proposed Development

- 7.2.2 The proposed development remains un-amended in terms of the overall quantum and mix of development and in the light of London Plan and Core Strategy policies regarding the location and scale of development the principle of high-density mixed-use development of the site is supported. Notwithstanding that the current application accords with a number of the priorities and principles set out in Strategic Site Allocation 2 (SAA2), and there have been some changes to the development parameters, there are a number of elements of the proposed development that remain unacceptable.

GLA Report

- 7.2.3 The GLA states that the proposed comprehensive mixed use redevelopment at this site will provide valuable homes and jobs to catalyse the regeneration of Deptford. Accordingly, the principle of mixed use redevelopment at this site is strongly supported in accordance with the NPPF; London Plan Policy 2.13; and, Core Strategy policies SP2, SSA1 and SSA2.

Officer Update

- 7.2.4 Whilst the principle of development is supported, Core Strategy Policy SSA2 also sets out a number of land use and urban design objectives that the current application fails to address or satisfactorily resolve. Accordingly the proposals are not in accordance with Policy SSA2.

Safeguarded Wharf

- 7.2.5 There have been clarifications and further assessment of the proposed jetty for the wharf that are considered acceptable and sufficient in ES terms. As noted in the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee report the proposed reduction in the area of the wharf is in principle supported and subject to conditions regarding its operation this aspect of the proposed development is considered acceptable.
- 7.2.6 No further advice or clarification has been provided by the GLA regarding the process and timing of reducing the area of the safeguarded wharf and it remains officers' view that these procedural matters should be clarified and a mechanism agreed before determination of the current outline application.

GLA Report

- 7.2.7 In respect of safeguarding local amenity from wharf operations the report states that it is considered necessary to seek reasonable controls with respect to environmental impacts associated with future wharf operations. Accordingly a planning condition is proposed requiring details of the operational nature and associated noise, air quality and odour control measures to be approved prior to the commencement of development at [the wharf].
- 7.2.8 The report notes that the applicant has proposed a legal mechanism (related to a restriction on the occupation of private residential units) in order to ensure that the developer is reasonably compelled to secure a wharf operator. Further, if planning permission is granted and the development is to be implemented, the Mayor would, in due course, be advised to seek a formal revision of the safeguarded wharf designation at the site. Proposals for such a review could be managed as part of the Mayor's normal wharf review process, or, potentially, as a standalone case for consideration by the Secretary of State. The report also notes that the direction made by the Secretary of State only requires the referral of planning applications on the wharf to the Mayor, and, therefore, does not preclude implementation of an approved planning application (even where some or all of the development contains land uses that do not comply with wharf-related planning policy).

Officer Update

- 7.2.9 The proposal to include a condition to safeguard local amenity is welcomed however the detailed wording of the condition will be critical to ensure appropriate measures and thresholds are defined and enforceable.
- 7.2.10 The potential processes to review the boundary of the wharf have been identified although it is noted that the development could be implemented in full without the wharf designation being amended or, presumably, the designation removed ahead of implementation of part/all of the development. Whilst the Council supports the principle of reducing the area of wharf, the Mayor of London should identify his preferred option for reducing the area and set out his understanding of how the long-term future of the wharf is to be safeguarded.

Employment Space

- 7.2.11 The overall mix of and quantum of non-residential space on the site remains un-amended and whilst the balance of uses is not in accordance with Core Strategy Policy SSA2 which requires at least 20% of the built floorspace as a mix of business space (excluding the wharf) it is considered that if the proposed mix of uses are provided to their maximum, the development will contribute positively to employment opportunities and wider regeneration of the local area. The delivery of employment space as well as the mix of uses generally will be secured by condition and a land use reconciliation process whereby the applicant would need to demonstrate how each reserved matters application achieves a mix of uses and delivers the form of development presented in the application documents. A commitment to the provision of affordable business space would be secured through the s.106 agreement. The Cultural Strategy submitted with the application identifies a number of projects to be delivered by the development and a mechanism to secure these is proposed within the Heads of Terms (HoT) for the s.106 agreement.
- 7.2.12 Draft Heads of Terms for the delivery of the Sayes Court Gardens project and Build the Lenox project have been proposed by the applicant. Whilst the principle that such matters are secured through the s.106 agreement is appropriate, Officers consider that the current HoT are unacceptable. These matters are considered in more detail below.

GLA Report

- 7.2.13 The GLA supports the proposed employment offer and the proposed nature of the employment offer on the grounds that it would positively contribute towards the wider regenerational characteristics of the scheme, and catalyse the form of urban renewal envisaged for Deptford by Lewisham's Core Strategy. The GLA will secure funding for the provision of subsidised work space for start up businesses through the s.106 agreement. In addition, in order to ensure that the range of uses (and particularly the employment space) would be delivered at reserved matters stage, a planning condition is proposed to secure reasonable minimum floorspace provisions for various specified uses across the masterplan development schedule. A further condition is proposed to secure submission of a Reconciliation Document at each reserved matters stage. The GLA proposes to secure a commitment to the establishment and operation of a cultural steering group to deliver the projects identified in the Cultural Strategy as part of the s.106 legal agreement.

Officer Update

- 7.2.14 The potential employment on the site is welcomed, as is the principle of a condition to secure the delivery of the space or type of employment presented in the application documents and inclusion of a land use reconciliation process (similar to that on other Strategic Sites). Subject to the wording of the conditions this approach is welcomed. Whilst the proposal to establish a cultural steering group is supported, it is considered that a clearer commitment and process to the delivery of projects set out in the Cultural Strategy submitted with the application is appropriate.

Retail

- 7.2.15 The quantum and mix of retail uses remains un-amended. To seek to ensure that development of the Convoys Wharf site does not adversely impact upon the vitality and viability of Deptford High Street and other local parades draft conditions prepared by Officers would control the scale and type of uses. Subject to these conditions being imposed no objection is raised to this aspect of the scheme.

GLA Report

- 7.2.16 The report notes that the applicant has agreed to the recommendations made by the consultants advising the Council and that the GLA intends to secure the necessary retail controls by way of planning condition.

Officer Update

- 7.2.17 Subject to the detailed wording of the conditions this approach is supported.

Housing

- 7.2.18 The application proposes up to 3,500 dwellings in general accordance with Core Strategy Policy SSA2. The policy supports this quantum subject to an acceptable site layout, scale and massing. Officers consider that the minor changes to the height of one building on one Plot does not adequately address the strong reservations previously noted in the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee report regarding the massing of the development. Accordingly Officers consider that the applicant has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that 3,500 dwellings can be accommodated on the site in an acceptable scale, form and massing of development.
- 7.2.19 The dwelling size mix has been amended to provide an increase in larger units and reduction in 1- and 2- bed units and the overall mix is considered acceptable. In addition the registered affordable housing provider with whom the applicants have been in discussion raise no objection to the affordable housing dwelling size or tenure mix. All dwellings are to be built to Lifetime Homes standards and 10% will be wheelchair accessible or easily adapted for those using a wheelchair and it is appropriate that these standards will be secured through the s.106 agreement. A commitment to build to the London Plan space standards as a minimum should also be secured.
- 7.2.20 Clarification has been provided regarding the affordable housing dwelling mix, with the 15% affordable housing being split 75% Intermediate and 25% Affordable Rented. The applicant has submitted a financial appraisal to support this mix (and the development as a whole), and which has been reviewed by consultants advising the Council. As reported at the Strategic Planning Committee meeting on 16 January, they raised a number of questions regarding assumptions on costs

and values in the appraisal. Their conclusion was that a number of items, in particular residential sales values, should be adjusted and that future growth in values over the period of the development should also be captured through a review mechanism which could allow for affordable housing (and other contributions) to be increased should the viability improve. The GLA appointed its own consultants to review the appraisal and who also concluded that the residential sales values are too low, that there is potential for increasing the level of affordable housing and that there should be a review mechanism. These conclusions are welcomed, however in its negotiations the GLA has failed to reflect this advice in terms of the ability of the development to support increased financial contributions and /or affordable housing levels at this stage. In the circumstances, Officers consider that the GLA should be negotiating to increase the level of financial contributions and/or affordable housing to be secured at outline application stage as well as incorporating a review mechanism to deliver additional affordable housing as values increase over the timescale of the development.

- 7.2.21 The consultants appointed by the GLA broadly concur with these conclusions and in the circumstances it is appropriate that a review mechanism is included in the s.106 so that improved viability can deliver additional affordable housing. At the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee Members also highlighted the need for affordable housing to be genuinely affordable housing to meet the needs of Lewisham residents. Officers understand that the confidential financial appraisal has assumed target rent levels for the Affordable Rent units. This approach is welcomed and Officers consider that this will need be secured through the s.106 agreement in order to ensure that the dwellings will be genuinely affordable.
- 7.2.22 In terms of social infrastructure the applicant proposes the funding of a 2 Form Entry Primary school on the site plus financial contributions towards GP facilities, jobs and training for local people and open space. The GLA is seeking contributions to open space and local labour above that proposed by the applicant, and whilst below the Council's proposed contribution this is welcomed. However the Council has also identified the need for additional Secondary school capacity to serve the increased population, which the GLA is proposing is subject to viability. Officers consider that development impacts such as this should be mitigated in full and do not support this approach.
- 7.2.23 Through the development of strategic sites in the Deptford area the Council has been promoting the establishment of a Community Trust to support communities in a deprived part of the borough. To this end financial contributions to the Trust have been secured through the s.106 agreements for Marine Wharf West, Cannon Wharf and Oxestalls Road amounting to £1.17m. The GLA has supported the Council's proposal that Convoys Wharf should also contribute towards the Trust however the level of contribution proposed is significantly below the comparable contribution from these other sites (equivalent to approximately £2m). The GLA proposes that this would be used to support community initiatives and promote social inclusion in Deptford. Officers are proposing that the level of contribution is increased and in addition, consider that the scope of the planning obligation needs to be agreed to ensure that the funding would be made available to a wide range of projects. Officers consider that these matters should remain under discussion during negotiation of the s.106 agreement.

- 7.2.24 The applicant has sought to argue that the massing of the buildings on the site allows them to exceed the London Plan residential standards rather than allow for a quantum of development above 3,500 dwellings. Given the high density of the development it is particularly important that the floorspace and minimum private amenity space standards are achieved or exceeded. Accordingly it is appropriate that a condition is imposed to ensure this commitment, and to the provision of public open space and play space in accordance with the Mayor of London's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012) is delivered.

GLA Report

- 7.2.25 The GLA notes that the level of affordable housing is well below the London Plan and Core Strategy targets but that based on the submitted financial appraisal conclude that the proposed 15% provision of affordable housing represents the maximum reasonable amount at this point in time. The GLA notes the potential for future growth to enhance sales values and to improve the ultimate viability and profitability of the scheme, and that a review mechanism is to be included in the s.106 legal agreement to trigger a further financial review at appropriate milestones along the delivery programme.
- 7.2.26 In terms of the dwelling size and tenure mix the GLA supports the amended proposals (which increases the proportion of larger units) however it makes no comment on the issue of affordability.
- 7.2.27 The report notes and supports the applicant's intention to exceed minimum space standards where possible, however no condition is proposed to secure this other than to secure compliance with London Plan minimums.
- 7.2.28 With regard to children's play space the GLA states that it is satisfied that a combination of on and off site provision will ensure the London Plan standards are exceeded, with a planning obligation to mitigate intensified use of existing local open space.

Officer Update

- 7.2.29 Officers do not agree with the conclusion regarding the level of affordable housing, which fails to acknowledge or assess the effect of cost and value differences identified by their own consultants on overall scheme viability and its ability to support additional financial contributions and/or affordable housing from the outset.
- 7.2.30 Subject to the detailed working and operation of the financial review mechanism this approach is supported.
- 7.2.31 The failure to address the issue of affordability of housing is disappointing and remains an area of objection to the scheme. Likewise the failure to secure a binding commitment from the applicant to deliver dwellings above minimum standards is disappointing, particularly as when applying the minimum space standards (to which the applicant can revert without further approval) the floorspace that can be accommodated within the maximum development parameters significantly exceeds that required to deliver 3,500 homes of the size mix proposed.
- 7.2.32 The method used by the GLA to calculate the level of on-site open space includes areas of public realm that are not considered to be suitable, dedicated play space for children and the inclusion of off-site open space, which already serves a large

existing population is not considered appropriate even with a financial contribution to mitigate its more intensive use.

Layout, Heritage, Scale, Massing, Design

- 7.2.33 At the time of the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee the GLA had indicated that it would be seeking only limited changes to the maximum permitted heights of buildings on the site. Nonetheless Officers have continued to press for a reduction in the scale and massing of selected development parcels to achieve an acceptable urban scale and an appropriate relationship of new buildings with historic buildings and spaces. Particular concerns relate to the setting of the Olympia Building, former Master Shipwrights House and site of John Evelyn's House.
- 7.2.34 The GLA has declined to seek the majority of amendments proposed and as a consequence there has been no change to maximum permitted scale of buildings around the Olympia Warehouse, no change to the siting or height of Plots P02 and P03 to provide a clearer and more appropriate link between the Olympia Warehouse and the Thames. The only change is to the maximum permitted height of the section of Plot P01 adjacent to the Master Shipwrights house to 5 storeys. Whilst this change is welcomed, Officers consider that the failure to seek other changes is disappointing and these remain outstanding objections to the scale of development.
- 7.2.35 In addition to the massing of buildings, Officers together with representatives of the Sayes Court Gardens group have been seeking amendments to Plots P16 and P17 to accommodate the proposals for a horticultural and educational centre on the site of John Evelyn's house, and for it to have a green link between the site of the historic gardens and the house. The Sayes Court Gardens group has undertaken a significant amount of work in developing its proposals and identified the need for 1,500m² of building and 1 hectare of open space adjacent as essential to the viability of this project. To achieve this would require an alteration to the parameters that determine the dimensions of Plot P16 to allow sufficient flexibility to meaningfully explore how the space could be designed at a Reserved Matters Stage. In response, the applicants have made some changes to the layout of Plots P16 and P17 with buildings on Plot P17 (the proposed Primary School) being removed and provided within Plot P16. A green link between the site of John Evelyn's house and the new open space has been provided, and the corner of Plot P16 adjusted slightly. Whilst the principle of the link and moving Plot P17 is welcomed, and floorspace to accommodate the John Evelyn Centre has been confirmed, the amended proposals still fail to reflect or provide adequate scope and open space to accommodate the John Evelyn Centre and its intended programme in a meaningful way.
- 7.2.36 As noted in the report to the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee, strict adherence to the Farrell masterplan is meaning that historic patterns of development within the site, including the relationship between the site of John Evelyn's house and its associated gardens, are being lost. The GLA however has accepted the proposed changes and also indicated that it is satisfied that delivery of the project is a matter that can be dealt with at reserved matters stage within the amended parameters. Officers do not support this conclusion, either in terms of the scope of proposed changes as they fail to address the points raised and lack the flexibility to accommodate the John Evelyn Centre project in a meaningful way, or that the matter can be addressed at reserved matters stage as the

amended parameter plans would prejudice the implementation of the project. Accordingly, Officers consider that the parameter plans need to be adjusted at outline application stage, to acknowledge and respect the historic layout and connections and to enable the John Evelyn Centre project to be implemented as envisaged by the group. With the plot parameters as currently proposed the scope to address the outstanding issues is severely restricted and therefore changes to the development parameters need to be made now otherwise the delivery of the John Evelyn Centre project will be significantly compromised. Officers are satisfied that the changes proposed by the Council could be incorporated into the development without compromising the overall masterplan.

- 7.2.37 At a more detailed level, it is appropriate that the parameters allow for an extra form of entry for the Primary school and that the amended Plot P16 provides sufficient space to accommodate both a playground for the school and land for John Evelyn Centre rather than the school playground and outdoor play space/multi-use games area being shared with the John Evelyn Centre's gardens. The area proposed for the gardens in the amended plot layout amounts to approximately 0.6 hectares i.e. less than the 1 hectare identified by the Sayes Court Gardens group as the minimum required to deliver a viable project. The area identified in the amended layout also includes the playground and outdoor play space for the Primary School, which amounts to approximately 0.27 hectares and further reducing the land available for the gardens. Given the space needs of the school and the John Evelyn Centre gardens, Officers consider that this proposal is inadequate and fails to secure the potential future of the Sayes Court Gardens project or acknowledge the importance of the site's history and the local community and wider value of the project.
- 7.2.38 The GLA are also proposing that the existing public open space of Sayes Court Gardens (approximately 0.6 hectares in size) becomes part of John Evelyn Centre. Given the outdoor play space needs of the new school and that of the John Evelyn Centre gardens, the scale of development proposed on the site and the existing population in the area Officers consider that the space planning in Plot P16/P17 should be reviewed and that the existing local park should not be subsumed into the development. Given that John Evelyn Centre gardens are likely to be managed separately from the existing arrangements for the public open space at Sayes Court Gardens if the space was incorporated into the John Evelyn Centre project then this would involve a loss of public open space. Given the scale and density of development proposed at Convoys Wharf it would be reasonable to expect the scheme to accommodate the relatively small percentage of the overall site area needed to accommodate the John Evelyn Centre in full rather than reduce public open space for the local community.
- 7.2.39 The other local community project being proposed for the site is 'Build the Lenox' which is proposing the construction of a replica ship in the Olympia Warehouse, or within the Double Dry Dock. The applicant has stated that they are not willing to consider the option of locating with project within the Olympia Warehouse and have proposed Heads of Terms for it to be within the area of the safeguarded wharf. The Build the Lenox group have confirmed that they would not consider locating on the wharf and therefore based on current positions this project would not proceed.

Officers consider that the feasibility of using Olympia Warehouse as well as the site of the Double Dry Dock should be explored based on a brief and scope agreed between the applicant and Build the Lenox group, and that if this

concludes that neither is suitable that the Build the Lenox group reconsider the option of the safeguarded wharf. The applicant's own proposals for the Olympia Warehouse remain vague and whilst details at outline application stage will not be known Officers consider that the future of the Olympia Warehouse (refurbishment, use, management) should be the subject of further review and its future conservation managed by condition and through the s.106 agreement.

- 7.2.40 The Design Guidelines submitted with the application, and intended to provide a detailed set of rules and specific design approaches for the design of individual buildings, were considered to be too prescriptive and the parameters for the tall buildings too restrictive to allow for designs outside that shown on the Illustrative Masterplan. The tall building minimum parameters have been reduced to allow greater flexibility and also the GLA and applicant have agreed that Part 4 of the Design Guidelines will be for information only. Officers consider that these changes resolve concerns regarding this document, and wording for a condition to secure this has been agreed with the GLA and applicant.

GLA Report

- 7.2.41 The report states that GLA officers are of the view that buildings framing the Olympia Warehouse are of an appropriate scale to provide the necessary definition to the public space being created around the building and that they positively contribute to the setting of the Listed Building. Further, noting that the parameter plans for Plots P02 and P03 allow for three metres of inward deviation, and having considered the lines of sight along the north bank of the River Thames, the proposed separation between Plots P02 and P03 (and scale of buildings in these plots) is appropriate to allow for favourable framing of the Olympia Warehouse from key riverside vantage points.
- 7.2.42 In respect of the proposed John Evelyn Centre, the report notes that the GLA strongly support the key aims and associated potential public benefits of the project. However the report states that accommodating the proposals as set out by the group would undermine some important urban design principles of the masterplan and have negative implications for the quality and attractiveness of this space, undermining its contribution to the wider network of open spaces in the locality. The report sets out an alternative offer made by the applicant that is still under consideration by the group.
- 7.2.43 In respect of the Build the Lenox project the GLA states that whilst a viable solution for accommodating both Lenox shipbuilding and a multi-use commercial offer at Olympia might be found this it is likely to add additional complexity (and potentially additional financial burden) to the Lenox project business plan. In addition the proposal to moor the boat in a recreated basin is not considered a viable or necessarily desirable approach given its impact on the masterplan. The report sets out an alternative offer made by the applicant that is not considered acceptable by the group.

Officer Update

- 7.2.44 The GLA response on the scale, siting and massing of buildings around the Olympia Warehouse is disappointing and not supported by Officers. The response on the John Evelyn Centre project is considered to be inadequate. The Sayes Court Garden CIC have advised that as designed, the masterplan would not be capable of delivering the project which is not recognised in the GLA report. Whilst the report notes that the GLA hope that joint negotiations with the applicant

and the community group will progress positively, Officers consider that the response fails to grasp the way in which the project would be delivered and is very modest in its ambition and limited in its response to the applicant's proposals. Officers remain of the view that the masterplan could be amended to allow for the project to be refined at reserved matters stage whereas the current position actively prevents this option from being explored and understand that it is likely to mean that the benefits of this community project may not be delivered. On the Build the Lenox project, limiting the offer to the wharf rather than at least commissioning a feasibility study of the use of the group's preferred location is disappointing and Officer considers that options should remain open at this stage. This must include a recognition of the need for a legacy for the Lenox project and options for a permanent home for the ship once constructed.

Transport, Access and Movement

- 7.2.45 The vehicle, cycle, pedestrian access strategy for the site remains un-amended with the principal vehicular access via the existing New King Street and Grove Street site accesses. Officers have been seeking a commitment from the applicant to widen New King Street to allow for two-way bus movement and improved pedestrian and cycle access to the site. Agreement has been reached in principle and discussions regarding the design, timing of delivery and triggers for these works have progressed. Officers consider that subject to detailed wording for inclusion in the s.106 that ensures the works will be governed by a detailed specification and not limited by a cap on their cost, then this matter has been satisfactorily addressed. TfL has recently prepared a 'draft design study' of New King Street and the New King Street/Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street junction however this makes a number of assumptions regarding the layout of the junction that does not reflect the Council's priorities and is not considered an acceptable basis for progressing this matter.
- 7.2.46 In terms of impacts on the local road network, in its Stage 1 report (July 2013) TfL stated that "of key importance is the need to adequately model and assess the transport impacts of the development. TfL remains concerned that the submitted Transport Assessment appears to underestimate ... the impacts on the surrounding highway network. Further trip generation assessment has been requested together with area-wide VISSIM modelling of the Evelyn Street corridor and also the Deptford Bridge (A2)/Deptford Church Street junction. This work will enable further understanding of the interaction of the scheme with the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the TfL Road Network (TLRN) and test options to reduce the impact of the development. It will also clarify the interrelationship between the proposals for Cycle Superhighway 4 and the scheme."
- 7.2.47 Since the GLA took over the determination of the application in October 2013 TfL's position has changed and they are no longer requiring that this modelling work is undertaken and instead suggesting that this is undertaken after planning permission has been granted for the development. The reason for this change in approach is not clear or understood and Officers remain of the view that modelling work (including the use of VISSIM software as originally proposed by TfL) should be undertaken prior to determination of the application. As well as providing evidence as to the robustness of the submitted traffic data, TfL needs to provide reasoned justification why the modelling work should not be undertaken prior to determination of the application.

7.2.48 Since the original application was submitted in 2002 the Council has been promoting the provision of a signal-controlled junction with a direct single all-red phased pedestrian crossing of Evelyn Street and a preliminary layout was prepared as part of that application. Since that time the Mayor of London has introduced the Cycle Superhighway network and is now promoting a route along Evelyn Street. Although no detailed design work of this section of the Cycle Superhighway has been undertaken, nor any modelling of the key junctions, TfL are prioritising the accommodation of the Cycle Superhighway over local pedestrian connections and has raised concerns regarding junction design and highway capacity on Evelyn Street should a signal-controlled junction be introduced. The applicant's own analysis shows that by far the majority of pedestrian movements from Convoys Wharf are likely to be along New King Street to Deptford High Street and the station, and Officers remain of the view that the priority should be on improving local connections, with the junction designed to facilitate pedestrian movements. Should TfL be able to demonstrate that the application can be determined without further analysis then future modelling work should prioritise a signal-controlled junction with a direct single all-red phased pedestrian crossing of Evelyn Street.

7.2.49 The applicant proposes improvements to public transport services in the area and have agreed with TfL a financial contribution to secure this. Members at the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee meeting recommended that opportunities for accessing public transport and pedestrian and cycle links should be maximised and Officers have highlighted areas where this could be facilitated including public realm improvements linking the site to Deptford Station. The applicant has committed to make a contribution to wider works including public realm improvements to Deptford High Street and this is welcomed.

GLA Report

7.2.50 The report notes that TfL has proposed a two-stage approach to resolving highway impact issues; firstly establishing whether the proposed highway interventions are acceptable in principle and relate to development impact based on models submitted, and secondly undertaking further traffic modelling (including micro-simulation using VISSIM) at detail design stage. The further traffic modelling would need to be prepared using VISSIM and covering the Lower Road gyratory west of Evelyn Street, Creek Road to the east and Deptford Church Street/A2 in the south. The report notes that TfL's advice is that it is unreasonable for approval of the development to be withheld at this point on the basis of the need for further detail modelling, which is already required as part of TfL's duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004, and especially given the uncertainties which currently exist as to the proposals and impact of the Cycle Super Highway and other emerging highway schemes. The report states that TfL considers it has sufficient understanding of the local road network and scale of development in outline to provide a level of confidence that appropriate highway measures to mitigate impact and to support non car travel are being developed and can be delivered subject to safeguards in the proposed s.106 agreement, including a requirement that if additional or different mitigation measures to those currently identified for the junctions on Evelyn Street and/or other junctions are agreed these will be funded by the developer in relation to the identified degree of impact which requires mitigation.

- 7.2.51 The timing of the proposed off-site improvements for pedestrians would be related to the phasing of development so as to encourage walking including to/from public transport. In the case of widening New King Street the GLA considers that the additional land is not essential to support walking (and cycling and use of public transport) and therefore whilst the proposed improvements are supported by all parties implementation of the scheme will not be linked to the provision of these works.

Officer Update

- 7.2.52 Officers consider that TfL have not adequately demonstrated that they have sufficient information to reach the conclusions they have regarding the likely significant effects of the proposed development. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed two-stage process poses a significant risk that impacts not identified at this stage will impact on the deliverability of the development as a whole and/or the ability of the local highway network to deliver the necessary improvements to local connectivity and pedestrian priority which the scheme is promoting.

Energy and Sustainability

- 7.2.53 The application proposes a decentralised energy network connection, which will be secured through the s.106 agreement, as will a mechanism to secure subject to feasibility a connection to SELCHP. Relevant policy expects large-scale developments to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM 'Excellent'. An updated Sustainability Assessment proposes BREEAM 'Very Good' on commercial larger units and CfSH 4 where feasible. The GLA has indicated that it is satisfied with this proposal and that the undertakings would be secured by condition. Officers consider that the policy requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy is reasonable and achievable on this site and that the GLA should seek to secure a policy compliant scheme.

GLA Report

- 7.2.54 The report notes that the delivery of the proposed energy strategy would be secured in accordance with the approved planning documents, and that the commitment to prioritise connection to SELCHP will be incorporated within the s.106 agreement. Furthermore, standards associated with BREEAM ('very good') and Code for Sustainable Homes ('Level 4') will be secured by way of planning condition.

Officer Update

- 7.2.55 Officers remain of the view that the achieving the policy requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy is reasonable and achievable on this site.

Other Considerations

- 7.2.56 Where relevant, matters relating to social infrastructure, EIA have been addressed elsewhere in this report.

Delivery

At the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee Members highlighted the importance of a Code of Construction Practice to manage and mitigate construction impacts. A Framework CoCP has been submitted and Officers consider that this provides an appropriate basis on which to develop a detailed

code of practice. The timing for submission and approval of details of the CoCP will be secured by condition. Given the site's location on the Thames and its existing jetties it is essential to make full use of river transport for the import and export of construction materials and waste. The structural integrity of the existing jetties needs to be assessed however it is appropriate that works to the jetties, if required, are delivered as part of the development. This would be secured by condition.

GLA Report

- 7.2.57 The report notes that the applicant intends to make use of the river for transport of materials into and out of the site and that this should be investigated further and use of the river maximised during site preparation and demolition and construction phases. This information should be included within Construction Logistics Plan and Construction Travel Plan secured through the s.106 agreement.

Officer Update

- 7.2.58 Whilst the intentions of the applicant are noted, and the principles of the Construction Logistics Plan are welcomed, there is no explicit commitment to maximising the use of the river during construction.

8.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

- 8.1.1 Since the 16 January Strategic Planning Report the GLA has appointed consultants to review the applicants' confidential financial appraisal and consider the questions raised by the Council's appointed consultants. Negotiations on the s.106 package have continued in parallel.
- 8.1.2 The consultants appointed by the GLA have concluded that the appraisal was broadly acceptable and that 15% affordable housing was the maximum reasonable amount that could be achieved at this time. In common with the Council's recommendation they have recommended that a review mechanism is included in the S106 agreement to secure additional affordable housing should scheme viability improve.
- 8.1.3 Discussions have been continuing on the planning obligations, including the necessary level of financial contributions and the scope of obligations to ensure that the impact of the scheme will be appropriately mitigated. The GLA have recently requested additional contributions and the report proposes additional contributions towards employment and training (£200,000), open space (£560,000), the Community Trust (£250,000), Community Projects (£250,000) and secondary/post-16 education (£440,000 topped up to £881,000, subject to viability). The applicant has also provided offer letters to the community projects, the terms of which it is proposed are captured within the s.106 Agreement. Whilst the additional contributions being sought are welcomed, Officers consider that the amounts are insufficient to adequately mitigate the impacts of the development. Officers also consider that the scope of the contributions need to be defined to ensure they would be sufficient to address the purpose for which they are being sought.

GLA Report

- 8.1.4 The report sets out a list of Section 106 principles for which delegated authority is sought to negotiate, sign and execute the legal agreement. A number of financial contributions are identified within this list.
- 8.1.5 Officer Response
- 8.1.6 There are a number of matters that have been the subject of discussions with GLA officers that do not appear in the s.106 principles list within the report and some topics where agreed sums are not listed. The GLA need to provide assurances that the full range of matters that have been discussed will be addressed and incorporated into the s.106 legal agreement.
- 8.1.7 The contribution towards employment and training needs to cover training for both construction and operational jobs. The Council's Planning Obligations calculator indicates that given the scale of development, a financial contribution in the region of £1m should be sought towards employment training which officers consider to be the starting point for discussions. Given the levels of unemployment in Evelyn ward and number of people without formal qualifications, a full contribution towards employment and training is considered appropriate and reasonable. Accordingly, Officers consider that an additional £500,000 is necessary for end-user training in addition to the £500,000 currently being sought by the GLA.
- 8.1.8 The GLA have proposed a contribution of £560,000 towards open space, which has decreased from a sum of £1,000,000 originally sought by the GLA without any explanation. Given the resident and workforce population of the development the Council's Planning Obligations calculator indicates that a contribution in the order of £3,800,000 would be necessary. Whilst it is considered reasonable that there may be some financial offset if the on site open spaces are delivered to a standard beyond what would normally be expected, existing local parks and play areas in the area already serve a significant local population and the proposed development will add further pressure on these spaces and facilities. Officers consider that the contribution is insufficient and that it is necessary to secure an additional £1,500,000.
- 8.1.9 As outlined in the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee report, Secondary school capacity in the borough is forecast to reduce from 2016 when a current Primary school age pupil 'bulge' progresses through the school age groups, resulting in a significant shortfall in Secondary school places over the following ten years. Whilst acknowledging the need for the development to fund Secondary as well as Primary school places the GLA have proposed that the contribution (£440,000 up to £881,000) is subject to scheme viability. This approach of linking essential mitigation to scheme viability is not considered appropriate and the level of contribution needs to reflect the scale of impact.
- 8.1.10 Given the significant levels of deprivation within the area the Council has been securing financial contributions from Strategic Sites towards the establishment of a Community Trust to fund local projects and support community cohesion. To date through the s.106 agreements for Marine Wharf West, Cannon Wharf and Oxestalls Road these sites together will contribute over £1m towards the Trust. The applicant has proposed, and the GLA has accepted, a contribution from Convoys Wharf of £500,000. This falls considerably short of the contributions secured on other Strategic Sites on a pro rata basis, which would be

approximately £2m. Given the significant levels of deprivation within this ward and the scale of new development it is important that the Strategic Sites contribute positively and appropriately to developing social cohesion. In the light of adjustments to the financial appraisal identified as appropriate by both the Council and GLA consultants, Officers consider that the development is able support a contribution of £2m without impacting on scheme viability or affordable housing provision.

- 8.1.11 In terms of how the financial contribution is used, the GLA have suggested that £250,000 is put towards the community projects with the remainder towards the community trust. Officers do not consider that it is appropriate to limit contributions towards specified projects as is proposed and that a financial commitment to support these community projects should be in addition to the Community Trust.

9.0 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1.1 There has been no change to the Regulations or considerations since the 16th January 2014 Strategic Planning Committee.

10.0 EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.1.1 There has been no change to the relevant considerations since the 16th January 2014 Strategic Planning Committee.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1.1 Following the 16 January Strategic Planning Committee officers have been working with the GLA and applicant team to secure changes to the scheme and other matters in accordance with the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee. Whilst there have been some modest changes to the scheme and some of the deficiencies of the submitted documents have been addressed, overall unfortunately the GLA has adopted a limited and disappointing approach to securing a high quality scheme for this important site that is manifestly part of rather than just located in Deptford.
- 11.1.2 The response of the applicant to the GLA's requests has also been disappointing, notably in how local community projects are incorporated into the development. Officers consider that small scale but significant changes at this stage could provide a meaningful and genuine way forward that would keep the door open for these projects to be delivered on the site.

12.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION A

Members are recommended to resolve that the Mayor of London be advised that the Council:

1. SUPPORTS:

- the principle of high density mixed use development of the site in accordance with Policy SSA2 of the Core Strategy.
- the overall objectives of the masterplan but objects to the layout and massing of buildings in a number of key locations the layout where it fails to respond appropriately or in a meaningful way to the heritage assets on the site.

- in principle the proposed reduction in the area of the wharf and its location on the northern side of the site.
- the floorspace and proposed mix of employment uses, including a hotel, subject to a mechanism being agreed to ensure a mix of uses is secured across the site.
- the changes to Plot P01, the parameters of the three towers, and to the status of Section 4 of The Design Guidelines.
- public transport contributions and provision of new pier subject to capital costs not being capped.
- Travel Plan measures to promote non-car modes of transport.
- the widening of New King Street to accommodate two-way bus movements and cycle lane.
- the provision of Affordable Rented affordable housing at target rents.
- the inclusion of a financial review mechanism to secure additional affordable housing if future viability permits.
- connection to SELCHP or connection to a decentralised energy network in the area with pipework provided to the edge of the site.
- the Framework Code of Construction Practice as a basis for preparing a detailed Code of Practice.

2. RECOMMENDS:

- the GLA confirms that an adequate assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations before the application is determined.
- TfL confirms the robustness of the data and subsequent modelling outputs in the Transport Assessment and that the impacts have been fully assessed and understood before the application is determined.
- TfL confirms its agreement to the Council's priorities for junction design during future modeling work.
- conditions are imposed regarding the operation of the wharf to safeguard residential and public amenity.
- the amount of retail floorspace is controlled by conditions to ensure they do not adversely impact upon the vitality and viability of the nearby town centres, particularly Deptford Town Centre.
- delivery of the commitments and range of projects set out in the Cultural Strategy are secured by reference to an Implementation Plan secured through a s.106 obligation.
- housing design and play space standards and sustainability standards for the residential and commercial space are secured by condition.
- the future of the Olympia Warehouse (refurbishment, use, management) should be the subject of further review and its future conservation managed by condition and through the s.106 agreement.

3. NOTWITHSTANDING POINTS 1 AND 2 ABOVE, CONSIDERS THAT THE APPLICATION SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED IN ITS CURRENT FORM AND THAT PRIOR TO DETERMINATION AMENDMENTS SHOULD BE SECURED IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

A. Scale, Massing and Relationship with Historic Buildings and Spaces

- Reduce the height of buildings around the Olympia Warehouse (P03, P06, P08) to achieve an acceptable urban scale and an appropriate relationship of new buildings with historic buildings and spaces, in particular to the Olympia Warehouse.

- Amend the siting of Plot P02 and P03 to safeguard the visual connection of Olympia Warehouse with the river.
- B. Sayes Court Garden Project and Build The Lenox
- Amend development parameters in Plot 16 to allow for meaningful incorporation of the Sayes Court Gardens project by amending the minimum plot dimensions and minimum building height to accommodate the Sayes Court Garden project (and Primary School), removing the southern and eastern buildings and provision of an area of 1 hectare exclusively for the gardens.
 - Provide sufficient space (not involving the Primary school playground/outdoor play space, or existing Sayes Court Gardens) to accommodate the Sayes Court Gardens project
 - Commission a feasibility study to accommodate the Build the Lenox project within the Olympia Warehouse, Double Dry Dock and Wharf.
- C. Transport and Access
- Design of the New King Street/Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street junction to provide a direct single all-red phased pedestrian crossing.
- D. Community Benefits
- Increase in the level of financial contributions, in particular Community Trust, Secondary School, Open Space and public realm improvements linking the site to Deptford Station.
 - Secure financial contributions towards the capital cost of works (public transport, school, public realm) not limited to a funding cap and to local projects not limited to a specified list.
- E. Sustainability
- Secure a policy compliant scheme in respect of Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM ratings.

RECOMMENDATION (B)

Authorise the Head of Planning to present the Council's case at the Local Hearing on 31 March 2014 and should the Mayor of London be minded to approve the application that the Head of Planning be authorised to continue to liaise with the GLA and the applicant on conditions and negotiate on and enter into the s.106 agreement.