

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B	
Report Title	Raymont Hall, 57-63 Wickham Road, SE4 1LX	
Ward	Brockley	
Contributors	Karl Fetterplace	
Class	PART 1	Date: 3 March 2016

Reg. Nos. DC/15/94338

Application dated 04/11/15

Applicant Gerald Eve on behalf of Campus Living Villages

Proposal The construction of a two storey extension, forming the 4th and 5th floors to the main block fronting Wickham Road and demolition of existing single storey garden building and replacement with two storey garden building to create 40 new student accommodation rooms at Raymont Hall, Wickham Road SE4, together with the demolition of the external stair link, alterations to the front elevation, the provision of cycle storage spaces, photovoltaic panels and associated landscaping.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 1617_DWG_B_BS_001_P3, 1617_DWG_B_BS_200_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_201_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_202_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_203_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_204_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_205_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_206_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_220_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_221_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_222_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_100_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_201_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_202_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_203_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_204_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_205_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_206_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_207_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_220_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_221_P5, 1617_DWG_B_00_222_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_401_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_402_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_403_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_404_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_405_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_409_P3, 1617_DWG_B_21_500_P2, 1617_DWG_B_21_520_P3, 1617_DWG_B_21_521_P3, 1617_DWG_B_21_522_P3, 1617_DWG_B_21_523_P3, BD 0133 SD 101 R00, BD 0133 SD 104 R01, BD 0133 SD 801 R03, Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment (October 2015, Greengage), Energy Feasibility Assessment (September 2015, Hulley & Kirkwood), Sustainability Monitoring Form, Daylight and Sunlight Report (August 2015, eb7), Bat Re-Entry & Activity Survey Report (August 2015, Greengage), Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (August 2015, Archaeology Collective), Heritage Statement (October 2015, Heritage Collective), Design & Access Statement

(October 2015, Hawkins\Brown), Goldsmiths, University of London GA0/JOR/J7522 (November 2015, Gerald Eve), Vision Statement received 4 November 2015;
1617_SK_160112_SL01_Cycle Store, Revised front elevation CGI received 13 January 2016;
1617_DWG_B_00_406_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_407_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_408_P4 received 9 February 2016;
1617_DWG_B_00_221_P5 received 10 February 2016.

Background Papers

- (1) DE/85/59/TP
- (2) Core Strategy (2011)
- (3) Development Management Local Plan (2014)
- (4) The London Plan (2015)

Designation

PTAL 3
Brockley Conservation Area
Brockley Conservation Area Article 4(2) Direction
Not a Listed Building
Unclassified

Screening

N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 This property is known as Raymont Hall and is part of the Goldsmiths University campus (although it is located separately to the main campus which is approximately a 20 minute walk to the north on Lewisham Way near to the junction with New Cross Road). The address of the site is 57-63 Wickham Road and it is located on the corner of Glensdale Road.
- 1.2 The site incorporates three student buildings: The Manse, Edgecombe (both dating from c.1900) and Raymont Hall (dating from c.1965). Edgecombe and The Manse are converted houses with traditional solid brick walls, and pitched slate roofs. Raymont Hall is a purpose built part 3 storey, part 5 storey brick built block with uPVC windows and a flat roof. Edgecombe House and Raymont Hall are connected via a single storey building and link stair cases at first and second floor. The buildings surround a communal courtyard that includes a single storey outbuilding to the rear of The Manse, which is proposed to be demolished and replaced. No car parking is provided on site.
- 1.3 The site provides 140 bedrooms – 110 in the main Raymont Hall building, 14 in Edgecombe and 16 in The Manse. The surrounding area generally consists of large period residential properties, with the exception of some unit blocks, generally between four and seven storeys. Jasmine House, a six storey block of flats, lies to the south of the site.
- 1.4 The site is located in the Brockley Conservation Area and is subject to the Brockley Conservation Area Article 4(2) Direction. The site is not listed or in the immediate vicinity of a listed building.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 Planning permission was granted in 1960 for the erection of a hall of residence to accommodate 96 students on the sites of no. 59-63 Wickham Road.
- 2.2 In 1961, 1966, 1972 and 1973 permission was granted for the erection for a limited period only, of a single storey corridor and wash up room in connection with the Raymont Hall of residence. The last permission limited the period for the retention of the building until 31st December 1974, on or before, the expiration of which, the building was to be removed.
- 2.3 In 1975 planning permission was granted for alterations and the erection of a part single, part three storey link block, comprising a walkway kitchen and server on the ground floor and walkways at first and second floor levels, between Edgecombe and Raymont Halls of Residence

3.0 Current Planning Application

The Proposal

- 3.1 This application is for the construction of a two storey extension, forming the 4th and 5th floors to the main block fronting Wickham Road and demolition of existing single storey garden building and replacement with two storey garden building to create 40 new student accommodation rooms at Raymont Hall, Wickham Road SE4, together with the demolition of the external stair link, alterations to the front

elevation, the provision of cycle storage spaces, photovoltaic panels and associated landscaping.

- 3.2 For clarification, the proposed development would provide 36 additional units, Twenty-four new rooms would be provided in the new garden block. Eighteen new units would be added to main Raymont Building. Two units would be lost in the Edgecombe building and four in the Manse building. This would take the total no. of beds at this facility from 140 to 176. This proposal would add a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 532sqm of student accommodation to the existing 3,576sqm, to achieve a total of 4,108sqm.
- 3.3 The new two storey garden building would replace the existing single storey outbuilding that was previously used as a teaching block to the rear of The Manse, which is proposed to be demolished. This is proposed to be clad in dark stained timber (Siberian Larch) for both the garden building and extension with anodised aluminium trim to the parapet, to match the proposed two storey roof extension to the 1960s block. The footprint of the building would match that of the existing building, with the height of the new building proposed as 6.24m. This building would have a green roof with photovoltaic panels, projecting a maximum of approximately 0.5m above the parapet.
- 3.4 The roof extension would be clad in dark charred timber, with anodised aluminium trim to the parapet. PV panels would be placed on the roof, projecting approximately 0.15m above the parapet, but set back approximately 1.5m, however the layout shown is indicative. The windows in both the extension and the new garden building are proposed to be an inset timber frame/anodised aluminium composite system with perforated mesh ventilated panels.
- 3.5 The first and second floor level openings on the southern elevation of the Edgecombe building are proposed to be made good due to the demolition of the external stair link. This would include three new windows at ground floor level. Twenty new cycle storage spaces are proposed where the link is currently located. The cycle storage would sit behind a dark charred timber panelled gate, to match the materials of the roof extension and new garden building.
- 3.6 The wall between the Manse and Edgecombe is proposed to be altered to allow access between the two buildings, which is currently only possible by walking back out to the street.
- 3.7 The existing refuse arrangement is proposed to be retained - refuse vehicles would park on Wickham Road and access the existing refuse store at the front of the site. The current hedge screening of this would be improved. No car parking spaces are proposed.
- 3.8 All trees in good condition are proposed to be retained, with the exception of two trees located in the courtyard are proposed to be removed, to the south of the southern elevation of the existing garden building.
- 3.9 The following supporting documents have been submitted with this application:
 - Landscape Drawings
 - Design and Access Statement

- Planning Statement
- Arboricultural Report
- Energy Feasibility Assessment
- Daylight and Sunlight Report
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Bat Survey
- Archaeological Statement

4.0 Consultation

- 4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 4.2 The applicant attended a number of pre-application meetings (ref: PRE/15/02027) with planning and urban design officers in June and July prior to the submission of the application.
- 4.3 Public consultation events were held by the applicant at Raymont Hall on 14 October and 30 November 2015. These were attended by the Brockley Conservation Society and Brockley Conservation of Trees Society. The applicant has stated that no feedback was received from these parties on the night.
- 4.4 The Society objected following the lodgement of the application and its comments are summarised below.
- 4.5 Site notices were displayed and neighbouring properties including the Brockley Ward Councillors were consulted. Eight objections and two sets of comments were received from local residents. The addresses of the objectors are:
- 32 Harefield Road
 - 34 Harefield Road
 - 36 Harefield Road
 - 42 Ellerdale Street
 - 49 Wickham Road
 - 83B Manor Avenue
 - 53 Wickham Road – objections were also raised by this occupier at the public consultation event held by the applicant prior to lodgement of the application, regarding the extent of overlooking into the garden and to the increase in student numbers at the site.

- Ground Floor Flat, 20 Wickham Road

4.6 The Councils Environmental Sustainability, Conservation, Surveying, Environmental Health, Policy, Highways, Tree, Legal, Section 106/CIL and Urban Design teams were consulted.

4.7 Thames Water, Transport for London and Historic England were also consulted.

Written responses (comments) received from residents

4.8 The issues raised in the comments are summarised below:

- There would be construction impacts
- Concerns have been raised about the impacts on existing trees
- New tree planting would be preferable
- The indicative landscape plan does not contain sufficient detail

Written responses (objections) received from residents

4.9 The issues raised in the objections are summarised below:

- Additional noise would be created.
- The first floor windows of the garden building would overlook adjoining properties.
- The design and materials of the development is of poor quality and out of character with neighbouring buildings and the conservation area.
- The scale and massing of the proposal is excessive.
- Overnight street parking would be reduced.
- Two substantial trees would be adversely affected by the new garden block.
- The height of the garden block would result in a loss of visual amenity to nearby properties.
- The proposed garden building should not be allowed in a rear garden.
- Light pollution would adversely impact on nearby occupiers.
- The quality of accommodation space is not considered adequate
- Given that the boundary walls would be demolished, the original iron work between the piers of the Victorian villas should be reinstated.

Brockley Society

4.10 The issues raised in the objection are summarised below:

- 4.11 No objection is raised to the principle of the two storey extension, but objection is raised to the visual and aesthetic means of achieving this, on the grounds that:
- the form and massing adopted introduce an alien and non-conforming solution which makes no attempt to blend in with the predominant 1960s style of the existing hall and adjoining blocks and
 - thereby does not learn from the indigenous design principles inherently required in the Conservation Area as set out in the Brockley CA SPD of January 2006 and which approach per chance is in direct contrast to the applicant's parallel application elevationally for Surrey House, Lewisham Way (DC/15/94339) and
 - does not align harmoniously with the vertical rhythm of the extant window openings and surrounds below
 - uses inappropriate angled/squint window forms which have no architectural relationship with the adjoining buildings and which thereby sets an unwelcome precedent within the CA
 - detracts from the dominant urban streetscape of Wickham Road
 - proposes dark and gloomy cladding materials which have no precedent in Wickham Road.

4.12 Concerns have been raised about the garden building, as follows:

- the increased height and massing contravenes DM Policy 33 on back garden developments re the impact on the rear garden of the adjoining Red House in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, reduced privacy, increased noise and loss of amenity
- the attempted use of angled/squint windows which would further exacerbate these issues rather than reduce and complement as is claimed along with
- the use of dark and gloomy cladding materials which are inappropriate in this location.

Transport for London

4.13 The application will give rise to any adverse impacts on the strategic transport network. The 20 cycle parking spaces provided will be in accordance with London Plan (2015) Policy and these should be secured by condition.

4.14 TfL considers that the proposal would benefit from the installation of a 'wheeling ramp' on the entrance stairs adjacent to the bike store as this would provide a more convenient and direct option for the majority of cyclists than the pedestrian ramps. Details of wheeling ramps can be found in Section 7.5.3 of the London Cycle Design Standards (2014) and it is recommended that this is secured by condition.

Thames Water

- 4.15 Thames Water does not object to the proposal on the basis of sewerage or water infrastructure capacity. Additional comments provided by Thames Water are proposed to be included as an informative.

Historic England

- 4.16 It is concluded that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest and that no further assessment or conditions are necessary.
- 4.17 Copies of letters are available to Members.

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

- 5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
 - (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to

relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.

- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

London Plan (March 2015)

- 5.5 On 10 March 2015 the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was adopted. The policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.18 Education facilities
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.10 Walking
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 5.6 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)

Core Strategy

- 5.7 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy
Spatial Policy 5 Areas of Stability and Managed Change
Core Strategy Policy 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects
Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
Core Strategy Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport
Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Local Plan

5.8 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

5.9 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 8	Student housing
DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 25	Landscaping and trees
DM Policy 26	Noise and vibration
DM Policy 29	Car parking
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions
DM Policy 33	Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas
DM Policy 36	New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens

Brockley Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document

5.10 This document provides a description of the Brockley Conservation Area, and details appropriate changes to buildings and guidance on development in the mews.

6.0 Planning Considerations

6.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Principle of development
- b) Design, scale, impact on the existing buildings and conservation area
- c) Quality of accommodation
- d) Transport and servicing
- e) Impact on adjoining properties
- f) Sustainability and energy
- g) Ecology
- h) Landscaping
- i) Impact on trees

j) Archaeological Impacts

Principle of Development

- 6.2 The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay.
- 6.3 Paragraph 3.52 of the London Plan states that London's universities make a significant contribution to its economy and labour market and that it is important that their attractiveness and potential growth are not compromised by inadequate provision for new student accommodation. The paragraph recognises that there is uncertainty over future growth in the London student population and its accommodation needs, but estimates that there could be a requirement for some 20,000 – 31,000 places over the 10 years to 2025. The paragraph goes on to recognise the value of purpose built student housing which may also tend to reduce pressure on other elements of the housing stock currently occupied by students, especially in the private rented sector. Policy 3.8 'Housing Choice' therefore encourages boroughs to work with higher and further education establishments to meet a demonstrable need for student housing without compromising capacity for conventional homes.
- 6.4 DM Policy 1 states that when considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.5 DM Policy 8 Student Housing of the Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) states that the Council will support proposals for student housing provided that the development:
- a) will not involve the loss of permanent self-contained homes;
 - b) will not involve the loss of designated employment land
 - c) will not involve the loss of leisure or community space
 - d) will not prejudice the Council's ability to meet its annual London Plan housing target for additional self-contained homes
 - e) has an identified end user affiliated with an educational institution or student housing management company
 - f) is well served by public transport and is accessible to a range of town centre, leisure and community services
 - g) provides a high quality living environment and includes a range of unit sizes and layouts, with and without shared facilities, to meet the requirements of the educational institutions it will serve;
 - h) demonstrates that it is suitable for year round occupation and that it has long term adaptability and sustainability, including adequate and suitable cycle parking

- i) contributes to creating a mixed and inclusive community
- j) does not cause unreasonable harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area and
- k) provides 10% wheelchair accessible rooms fully fitted from occupation.

- 6.6 DM Policy 33 Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas states that planning permission will not be granted unless the proposed development is of the highest design quality and relates successfully and is sensitive to the existing design quality of the streetscape. This includes the spaces between buildings which may be as important as the character of the buildings themselves, and the size and proportions of adjacent buildings. In this case, the site already contains a large building in the garden and its replacement with student accommodation as part of an existing Halls of Residence raises no objections in principle.
- 6.7 The proposal is being developed by a student housing provider on an existing student housing site. The proposals would not result in the loss of self-contained homes or of leisure or community facilities and would not prejudice the Council's ability to meet its housing targets as the Council is not currently relying on windfall sites to achieve its targets (and the site is not allocated to housing). A range of unit types and sizes would be developed. The site is within twenty minutes walking distance of the Goldsmiths campus and has a moderate level of transport connection.
- 6.8 Extensions to the main building are considered acceptable in principle, and there is no objection to the demolition of the link building, as this does not make a positive contribution to the site or surrounding conservation area.
- 6.9 The new purpose built accommodation would help to free up the private rented housing sector and family sized housing typically rented by students. The proposals are linked to a specific institution and involve the refurbishment and expansion of existing student accommodation sites and would therefore not prejudice housing and affordable housing delivery in accordance with Policy 3.8 and supporting paragraphs of the London Plan.
- 6.10 Therefore provided that the proposal meets the requirements of the DM Policy 8 in relation to design, quality of accommodation, residential amenity and wheelchair accessibility (which are dealt with in the sections below), the site is considered to be well located for a development of this type and the principle of student housing is considered to be acceptable.

Design, scale, impact on the existing buildings and conservation area

- 6.11 The NPPF states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 131 states that 'in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

- 6.12 London Plan Policy 7.4 states that development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. It should improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features. High quality design requires that the development, amongst other things, is human in scale, ensuring buildings create a positive relationship with street level activity and people feel comfortable with their surroundings and allows existing buildings and structures that make a positive contribution to the character of a place to influence the future character of the area.
- 6.13 London Plan Policy 7.8 states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
- 6.14 Policy 15 'High quality design for Lewisham' of the Core Strategy states that the Council will apply policy guidance to ensure highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the natural environment. This is echoed in DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.
- 6.15 Core Strategy Policy 16 states that the Council will ensure that the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings, conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, registered historic parks and gardens and other non designated assets such as locally listed buildings, will continue to be monitored, reviewed, enhanced and conserved according to the requirements of government planning policy guidance, the London Plan policies, local policy and English Heritage best practice.
- 6.16 DM Policy 36 New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens states that the Council, having paid special attention to the special interest of its Conservation Areas, and the desirability of preserving and or enhancing their character and or appearance, will not grant planning permission where alterations and extensions to existing buildings is incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.

Garden Building

- 6.17 There is an existing large, but single storey structure located on the site, this would be replaced by a new two storey building on the same footprint. During the course of pre-application discussions, options were explored for a replacement building to provide student accommodation, which included partially sinking a building, or dividing the building. These options were not considered acceptable given associated access issues and impacts on design and existing trees.
- 6.18 Officers consider the principle of a two storey, flat roof building in this particular location to be acceptable, although in the garden, would be relatively screened from surrounding view points and would be clearly seen in context of the existing student housing campus. The massing of the building, although larger than the existing building is not considered to appear overly dominant in the rear garden, nor obtrusive in form in the locality given its position and external cladding.
- 6.19 The new garden building would be very marginally visible from Harefield Road, however this does not raise any objection, particularly when also considering that a high quality design is proposed. A Heritage Statement has also been prepared

that supports the proposal from a conservation perspective. It is considered that the proposal is acceptable from a conservation perspective.

- 6.20 The building would be set in an almost identical location to the existing structure. The existing building is set back 3.6m from the boundary to the east, whereas the new building would be set back 1.4m. However, the existing building is set in 3m from the boundary to the north with the Red House, whereas the new building would be set in 3.3m. The decreased setback to the eastern boundary is considered acceptable given that measures have been proposed to mitigate against impacts on neighbouring amenity. Further, existing trees located along the boundary would be retained and therefore provide an element of screening.
- 6.21 The elevations are to be clad in a dark charred timber, which is considered to echo the garden surroundings and therefore be more appropriate than say a traditional brick structure. The elevations are punctured by a regular pattern of windows, with a different treatment on each elevation. Those on the southern elevation facing the shared garden are finished flush with the elevation and would provide a level of animation within the garden.
- 6.22 The windows on the northern elevation facing the Red House have been designed as a series of pop out windows to avoid overlooking. These angular structures are clad in a matching material to the elevation and are considered to be acceptable in design, whilst minimising the impact upon neighbouring amenity. This is discussed in further detail below.
- 6.23 The garden block would have a living roof, this is supported from an ecological perspective but would also help to mitigate the visual impact of the building when viewed from upper level windows for example. Details of the living roof would be required by condition.
- 6.24 Officers consider the garden block to be of an acceptable scale and mass with a high standard of design which would make a positive contribution to the site and replace a poor quality building.

Roof Extension and demolition of link building

- 6.25 The demolition of the existing link block is considered acceptable, as it does not make any positive contribution to the streetscape and the proposed treatment of this area, to provide new cycle storage and route through the site is considered a positive improvement on the existing. This area would be secured by a timber gate which would measure 3.1m, although acknowledged that this is taller than a traditional gate or fence, it would align with the floor to ceiling heights of the Raymont Hall block and Edgecombe, and therefore provide a subtle visual link between the two buildings. The height of the gate would also mean that the cycle storage behind is completely screened from the public realm, this is supported.
- 6.26 Following the demolition of the link building and ground floor kitchen, the Edgecombe flank elevation (previous internal and now becoming external) would be exposed and would need remedial work and a new windows would be inserted along the flank. This raises no objections and the proposed timber gate has been set back from the front elevation to ensure that whilst providing a visual link, both the Raymont building and Edgecombe re-gain some visual distinctiveness, which in turn is considered to emphasise the detached nature of each building which is typical of the Brockley Conservation Area and therefore acceptable.

- 6.27 The Raymont Hall building is a relatively modern building and marks a departure from the prominent Victorian buildings in the area. The proposed modern extension helps to distinguish the addition from the existing building and is considered a high quality use of modern materials and a well designed contemporary addition, rather than attempting to copy the existing building which is not considered to be appropriate. It is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the Edgecombe and Manse buildings on site, nor the buildings in the surrounding conservation area, but would aid their visual distinctiveness by not repeating a pastiche architectural form.
- 6.28 In addition to the ground floor works and demolition of the link building, it is proposed to extend Raymont Hall by two storeys to create a 4th and 5th floor. It is noted that objections have been received that relate to the design, massing and height of the proposed extension, however, the extension is considered to be of an acceptable scale, which remains set below the maximum height of the existing 6 storey element of Raymont Hall. Whilst it is a conservation area, there are blocks of 5-6 storeys in the surrounding area in addition to that of the main Raymont building and therefore an extension of this scale is considered acceptable.
- 6.29 Urban design officers were also involved in the pre-application meetings and are satisfied that the proposal represents an adequate response to the surrounding context whilst differentiating the proposed extension and new building from the remainder of the Raymont Hall complex. The proportions of the windows in the extension reflect that of the existing main building, whilst not offending the character of the surrounding conservation area.
- 6.30 Following a request from officers, the agent provided clarification that the CGI provided of the roof extension had since been modified to reflect the proposed drawings. This amended CGI was then provided to officers. This now accurately shows that the existing parapet is proposed to be removed to allow for the construction of the extension. Officers had indicated a preference for this to be retained, however, the applicant has stated that they are restricted by the existing floor to floor heights and given modern building regulations require thicker wall and floor build-ups to achieve acoustics and heatloss targets. An attempt to reinstate the parapet could produce a patchwork effect of new brickwork, with reduced room and window sizes jeopardising the quality of the scheme overall. Officers consider that this is acceptable.
- 6.31 The windows are proposed to be a timber frame/anodised aluminium composite window system with perforate ventilation panel. The windows on the front of the roof extension would be projecting and angled and reflect the alignment of the windows on the floors below. This is considered appropriate as it acts to break up its massing, despite the objections received. The windows on the rear would be inset slightly from their openings.
- 6.32 Officers stated that the glazed window to the side of the Edgecombe building should be flush with no ventilation grills. All of these details have been considered in the final design solution.
- 6.33 Objection was also received stating that the materials are not appropriate, however, material choice has been subject of extensive discussions with officers who consider the proposed palette to be appropriate for the setting, and complementary to the existing buildings. In order to ensure that final material

choices are of the highest quality, a material samples condition is proposed to ensure that the high quality design as envisaged is delivered.

- 6.34 The proposed removal of a section of the brick wall between Edgecombe and The Manse is considered suitable as the wall has been modified in the past and the area proposed to be removed is of more modern brick, which therefore does not accord with the original structure. This therefore raises no objections.
- 6.35 It was discussed that further detail should be considered for the screening of the refused storage and the gate between Edgecombe and the main building and additional planting should be considered to the ground floor windows in the main building to provide screening from the proposed ramp.
- 6.36 Overall, it is considered that the proposals represent a high standard of design which would make a positive contribution to the existing buildings and wider Brockley Conservation area.

Quality of accommodation

- 6.37 There are no specific standards for student accommodation. DM Policy 8 'Student Housing' requires accommodation to provide a high quality living environment and include a range of unit sizes and layouts, with and without shared facilities, to meet the requirements of the educational institutions it would serve.
- 6.38 Twenty of the rooms proposed in the new garden would have an area of 12.5sqm, with four having an area of 15sqm and have an ensuite shower room, bed, desk and storage space. While the proposed student rooms are small, it is considered that they would meet the needs of the students they would accommodate. The small size of the units would be mitigated by access to good quality communal facilities, as the units would have access to two dual aspect social space areas on each floor of the garden block.
- 6.39 The majority of the new rooms in the extension would have an area of 12sqm, having an ensuite shower room, bed, desk and storage space. While the proposed student rooms are small, it is considered that they would meet the needs of the students they would accommodate. Again, the small size of the units would be mitigated by access to good quality communal facilities, as the units would have access to two dual aspect social space areas in close proximity to this area of the building. The buildings are being refurbished, which does not require planning permission, but would also act to improve the overall quality of accommodation.
- 6.40 The objection with regard to standard of accommodation in terms of daylight & sunlight is acknowledged, however, this design has been devised to attempt to minimise impacts on overlooking of adjoining properties and therefore there must be some level of compromise on the amount of light these rooms would receive. Further, the Daylight & Sunlight Assessment states that all rooms included within the report would be fully compliant with BRE criteria.

Wheelchair housing/accessibility

- 6.41 There is currently no level access to any of the buildings on this site. No wheelchair accessible rooms or lifts are proposed on this site, however, the existing access is proposed to be upgraded. Level access is proposed to be

provided to the front of the building through a new ramp, in turn allowing level access to all buildings from the courtyard, except the Raymont main building, which has level access from the front. The details of this ramp are proposed to be conditioned. It is considered that this proposal has sought to improve accessibility as far as possible given the constraints of the existing buildings. The applicant has stated that the new building would comply with the Building Regulations in terms of accessibility. It is considered acceptable in this instance that no wheelchair accessible rooms are provided on site, given the travel distances from the garden block to the access and general changing levels across the site. It is noted that a separate planning application for the redevelopment of Surrey House (ref number) includes new wheelchair accessible units and is a generally more accessible location for the Goldsmiths campus.

- 6.42 No disabled parking spaces are proposed, however this is not possible within the constraints of the existing site. However, some parking is available directly adjacent to the site on Wickham, Glensdale and Harefield Roads and it is therefore considered that wheelchair users would be able to park on the street with a permit if required. The proposal is therefore considered adequate from a disabled parking perspective acceptable.

Transport and servicing

- 6.43 The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, if safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and if improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Car Parking

- 6.44 This site has a PTAL rating of 3 and therefore the residents of the proposed rooms would have moderate public transport access. The non-provision of car parking with this application is considered appropriate and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 14, DM Policy 29 Car parking and Policy 6.13 Parking of the London Plan. The site is within approximately 20 minutes walk of the main Goldsmiths University campus. Regarding the objections received from residents that there would be additional impacts on parking due to more cars, it is noted that no car parking spaces are proposed and 20 additional cycle spaces are proposed. Additionally, Goldsmiths does not permit students to bring cars with them to their accommodation. As such it is considered that the proposals would be of a limited impact upon the local highway.

Cycle Parking

- 6.45 The London Plan does not contain strict guidance on cycle parking spaces, however, with other student accommodation schemes, the Council has sought a minimum of 1 space per 2 new units as a minimum. Storage is proposed for 20 bicycles at ground level, in the space vacated by the demolished link block. This

would be screened by a timber gate, the details of which have been provided and officers are satisfied with. Provision has been made for this to be double stacked potentially in the future. The 8 existing cycle spaces at the front of the main building are proposed to be retained.

- 6.46 Regarding the TfL comment that the proposal would benefit from the installation of a 'wheeling ramp' on the entrance stairs, it is considered that the pedestrian ramp provides an adequate means of access for cyclists to the cycle store. Further, the proposed new ramp is an improvement on the existing arrangement and cyclists could conceivably carry their bikes up the stairs if not using the ramp, as there would be only be 0.8m to climb via four steps.
- 6.47 Given that a net increase of 36 units is proposed, this is considered adequate and is otherwise consistent with London Plan Policy 6.3 and Core Strategy Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport. Further, this would improve the existing ratio of cycle parking spaces to rooms. A condition is proposed to be included to ensure that this is provided, if the scheme is approved.

Refuse Storage & Servicing

- 6.48 The existing arrangement is that refuse vehicles can park on Wickham Road and access the existing refuse store through the entrance courtyard. This is proposed to remain and is considered acceptable in principle.

Construction Traffic

- 6.49 The proposed condition that requires a Construction Management Plan would include a section on construction traffic and therefore this would be adequately considered prior to construction commencing.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.50 DM Policy 8 Student Housing states that the Council will support proposals for student housing provided that the development does not cause unreasonable harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area.

Construction Impacts

- 6.51 With regard to resident objections about construction impacts, it is acknowledged that there would be impacts on the surrounding area. Therefore, a condition is proposed to ensure that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is provided to and approved by Council prior to works commencing. A CMP would ensure, amongst other things, that there are no unreasonably adverse impacts on neighbouring properties with regard to noise and vibration, dust and traffic. Further to this, a condition would be included to regulate the hours of delivery trucks during construction so that any impacts are kept to a minimum.

Noise

- 6.52 Regarding residents objections about noise impacts and light pollution, it is acknowledged that additional noise and light pollution would be created as a result of this development, however given that the campus currently has 140 rooms, as a proportion of this, 36 new rooms would not result in an unreasonable increase in noise and light pollution over and above that which might already

occur. To a degree, this is considered an expected outcome of inner city living, particularly given that there is an existing student residence in operation. Having said this, the applicant has stated that each resident receives and signs a document as part of their rental agreement entitled "Rules of The Village" which sets out expected standards of behaviour. This document covers topics such as compliance with a site-specific noise policy and strict rules on visitors and guests. Failure to comply with the rules may lead to disciplinary action which can escalate up to being asked to leave. Therefore it is considered that adequate measures are in place to address these potential impacts. Additionally, no new external plant equipment is proposed.

- 6.53 24/7 on site support and security is proposed, through a staff managed reception during the day and provision of a security guard overnight. The management suite would be located adjacent to the ground floor reception.

Daylight & Sunlight

- 6.54 A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been provided that demonstrates that the proposed development would have an impact on the neighbouring buildings in terms of daylight and sunlight. However, the amount to which they are affected is not considered unreasonably adverse. Therefore, the proposal is considered satisfactory from this perspective.

Privacy

- 6.55 For the new garden building, a projecting window type that offers oblique views to students facing away from the neighbouring building would be used on the northern elevation of the first floor of the new garden building to mitigate overlooking impacts. Likewise, a louvred window is proposed on the eastern elevation. Whilst some overlooking could occur into the rear garden of the Red House at 53 Wickham Road, having its nearest window approximately 15m from the proposed building, this window design would prevent overlooking into the dwelling itself and the potential overlooking into part of the rear garden would not be so unreasonably adverse as to warrant refusal, and it is considered that in this context general views across gardens is to be expected as if the case where gardens back onto each other. Further, the retention of the mature trees would assist in this regard by providing screening. With regard to the dwelling to the rear of the garden building, at 32 Harefield Road, only oblique viewing angles would be possible from the windows on the rear elevation of no. 32, the closes of which is approximately 11m away. There are two windows on the eastern elevation, however relatively, one is high and the other is small and therefore the overlooking impacts on these windows would be minimised. The ground floor windows are partially blocked by trees and fences and as such would not result in overlooking of adjacent properties.
- 6.56 It is not expected that there would be unreasonably adverse impacts on overlooking from the windows of the roof extension, given that they face onto the street and the dwellings on the opposite side of Wickham Road are approximately 45m away. It is therefore considered that this issue has been adequately addressed.
- 6.57 Overall, this proposal is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

Sustainability and Energy

- 6.58 The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The NPPF requires planning policies to be consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards.
- 6.59 London Plan and Core Strategy Policies advocate the need for sustainable development, All new development should address climate change and reduce carbon emissions. For major development proposals there are a number of London Plan requirements in respect of energy assessments, reduction of carbon emissions, sustainable design and construction, decentralised and renewable energy. Major developments are expected to prepare an energy strategy based upon the Mayor's energy hierarchy, adopting lean, clean, green principles. Major development proposals are expected to achieve a minimum carbon reduction saving of 19% above 2013 Part L Building Regulations, which equates to a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 rating.
- 6.60 The focus of the renovation of the existing areas from a sustainability perspective is to improve elements of the building fabric and improve the efficiency of building services, through the modification of windows and roofs to upgrade the existing U-Values. Other measures proposed include energy efficient lighting, including sensor lighting and PV panels. The proposed energy efficiency measures would exceed those required by the Building Regulations. This would be expected to provide a reduction in CO2 of 10% of the total emissions.
- 6.61 Several energy saving measures are proposed, including a gas fired CHP sized to meet the majority of the building domestic hot water demand and 50sqm of roof mounted Photo-Voltaic (PV) panels.
- 6.62 The roof extension would not meet the 35% reduction goal, having a total cumulative savings of only 14.29%. However, officers recognise the limited size of the extension and added complications when extending/ adapting an existing structure, therefore the efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions is welcomed.
- 6.63 For the new garden building, the report confirms that the proposal would achieve the London Plan and LB Lewisham policy requirement of a carbon dioxide emissions saving >19% relative to the 2013 Building Regulations. The estimated carbon dioxide emissions saving is set out in the report as 45.88%. On the whole, it is therefore considered that the proposal would perform acceptably from a sustainability point of view.
- 6.64 Regarding sustainable urban drainage systems, an element of permeability is proposed through the retention of some soft landscaping area. This is considered adequate, given that there is some existing hardstand surfaces in the rear courtyard.

Ecology

- 6.65 A Bat Re-entry & Activity Survey report has been submitted, which states that there is no evidence of the use of space on the site by bats. Low levels of bat activity were observed on site, however no roosting activity was observed. The report recommends that new lighting should be sensitively designed to avoid impacting on the foraging and commuting resource that the site currently provides,

along with enhancement measures to increase the biodiversity value of the site, including a living roof and bat boxes. The report finds that if the recommended measures are followed, there would be a net gain in biodiversity. The Ecological Regeneration team has stated that the Bat survey is acceptable and requested a condition that the recommendations in the report are implemented in full. Such a condition is proposed. An informative has also been proposed to request that the applicant formally submit the bat records to the GreenSpace Information for Greater London (regional record centre) as per the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management code of professional conduct, in accordance with the advice of the Ecological Regeneration team.

- 6.66 The Ecological Regeneration team has also provided comment on the proposed living roof, welcoming its inclusion but requesting that it be a plug planted system on a variable depth of substrate (70-150mm) as per the London Plan recommendations for a living roof. The proposal includes 100mm of substrate, which is not considered to be deep enough. The Ecological Regeneration team has also requested that there is a guarantee of establishment and/or maintenance contract so that the roof can be handed to the managing agent as a fully established and healthy roof, with a minimum defects and liability period of 15 months. It is therefore proposed that it be conditioned that the roof have a variable substrate depth that is averaged at 133mm and that the applicant submit details regarding the living roof prior to first occupation of the development. An informative is proposed that addresses the defects and liability period. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable from an ecology perspective.

Landscaping

- 6.67 To ensure high quality landscaping, Development Management Policy 25 requires major developments to submit a Landscape Scheme which should describe the site features that are to be retained and a method for ensuring their provision, management and maintenance.
- 6.68 Seating is proposed to be provided in the existing courtyard, along with a mix of hard and soft landscaping surfaces, which is welcomed. However, it is considered that sustainable urban drainage can be achieved, as the majority of the existing soft landscaped areas are proposed to be maintained. Landscaping is also proposed to the new front entrance, in order to improve the streetscape, including strengthening of the hedge that screens the existing bin store and a new ramp. A condition is proposed to seek detailed drawings of the proposed front ramp. The grounds would be maintained by Village Management. The species proposed for the soft landscaping are considered to be acceptable. The proposal is considered acceptable from a landscaping perspective which would in turn make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Impact on trees

- 6.69 Two moderate/good quality trees located in the rear courtyard to the south of the existing garden building are proposed to be removed. Nine low quality trees and one dead tree are also proposed to be removed. To compensate for the loss of these trees it is proposed to plant five semi-mature native trees along Glensdale Road. It is considered that this is appropriate as it would not harm the arboricultural value of the site and would make a positive contribution to the streetscene.

- 6.70 A condition is proposed to ensure that the trees that are proposed for retention are protected through a Tree Protection Plan.

Archaeological Impacts

- 6.71 The site is located to the south of an archaeological priority area. An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been prepared. This report concludes that the site has a low potential for activity prior to the late 18th century, as impacts would have derived from the development of the area from this time onwards, including the cutting of foundations for several phases of building, as well as any associated service trenches. The report concludes that a watching brief be carried out on intrusive groundworks to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on archaeology. Historic England has stated that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on archaeological assets and that no further assessment or conditions are necessary. Therefore, the proposal is considered appropriate from an archaeological perspective.

7.0 Local Finance Considerations

- 7.1 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:
- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown; or
 - (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

- 7.2 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

- 7.3 The Mayor of London's CIL is therefore a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

8.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 8.1 The above development is CIL liable and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

9.0 Equalities Considerations

- 9.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ("the Act") imposes a duty that the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to:-
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 9.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

9.3 The duty is a “have regard duty” and the weight to attach to it is a matter for the decision maker bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality.

9.4 In this matter there is no impact on equality.

10.0 Conclusion

10.1 The Local Planning Authority has considered the particular circumstances of the application against relevant planning policy set out in the Development Management Local Plan (2014), the Core Strategy (2011) The London Plan (2015, as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

10.2 The proposal would make a positive contribution to the Borough by providing additional student accommodation for Goldsmiths College. It is acceptable from a design and massing perspective and is appropriate in the context of the character of the existing Raymont Hall complex and the surrounding Brockley Conservation area. The standard of accommodation is considered adequate and it is not expected that there would be any unreasonably adverse impacts on neighbouring occupiers. The imposition of a number of conditions would ensure that other necessary matters are adequately addressed.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- (2) The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

1617_DWG_B_BS_001_P3, 1617_DWG_B_BS_200_P2,
1617_DWG_B_BS_201_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_202_P2,
1617_DWG_B_BS_203_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_204_P2,
1617_DWG_B_BS_205_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_206_P2,
1617_DWG_B_BS_220_P2, 1617_DWG_B_BS_221_P2,
1617_DWG_B_BS_222_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_100_P4,
1617_DWG_B_00_201_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_202_P4,
1617_DWG_B_00_203_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_204_P4,
1617_DWG_B_00_205_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_206_P4,
1617_DWG_B_00_207_P2, 1617_DWG_B_00_220_P3,
1617_DWG_B_00_221_P5, 1617_DWG_B_00_222_P3,
1617_DWG_B_00_401_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_402_P3,
1617_DWG_B_00_403_P3, 1617_DWG_B_00_404_P3,
1617_DWG_B_00_405_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_409_P3,
1617_DWG_B_21_500_P2, 1617_DWG_B_21_520_P3,
1617_DWG_B_21_521_P3, 1617_DWG_B_21_522_P3,
1617_DWG_B_21_523_P3, BD 0133 SD 101 R00, BD 0133 SD 104 R01,
BD 0133 SD 801 R03, Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment

(October 2015, Greengage), Energy Feasibility Assessment (September 2015, Hulley & Kirkwood), Sustainability Monitoring Form, Daylight and Sunlight Report (August 2015, eb7), Bat Re-Entry & Activity Survey Report (August 2015, Greengage), Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (August 2015, Archaeology Collective), Heritage Statement (October 2015, Heritage Collective), Design & Access Statement (October 2015, Hawkins\Brown), Goldsmiths, University of London GA0/JOR/J7522 (November 2015, Gerald Eve), Vision Statement received 4 November 2015; 1617_SK_160112_SL01_Cycle Store, Revised front elevation CGI received 13 January 2016; 1617_DWG_B_00_406_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_407_P4, 1617_DWG_B_00_408_P4 received 9 February 2016; 1617_DWG_B_00_221_P5 received 10 February 2016.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

- (3) No development shall commence on site until such time as a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall cover:-
- (a) Dust mitigation measures.
 - (b) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities
 - (c) Details of best practical measures to be employed to mitigate noise and vibration arising out of the construction process
 - (d) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts which shall demonstrate the following:-
 - (i) Rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site.
 - (ii) Provide full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction relates activity.
 - (iii) Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.
 - (e) Security Management (to minimise risks to unauthorised personnel).
 - (f) Details of the training of site operatives to follow the Construction Management Plan requirements.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the demolition and construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise possible noise, disturbance and pollution to neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity and Policy 7.14 Improving air quality of the London Plan (2015).

- (4) No development shall commence on site until a detailed schedule and specifications & samples of all external materials to be used on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local

planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

(5) (a) A minimum of **20** secure and dry cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development as indicated on the plans hereby approved.

(b) Prior to above ground works, full details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

(6) (a) Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, no development shall commence for any phase of the development until detailed plans at a scale of 1:20 showing the front ramp and railings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

(b) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the detailed treatment of the proposal and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

(7) No development shall commence on site until a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has been submitted to and approved by the Council. The TPP should follow the recommendations set out in BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations). The TPP should clearly indicate on a dimensioned plan superimposed on the building layout plan and in a written schedule details of the location and form of protective barriers to form a construction exclusion zone, the extent and type of ground protection measures, and any additional measures needed to protect vulnerable sections of trees and their root protection areas where construction activity cannot be fully or permanently excluded.

Reason: To safeguard the health and safety of trees during building operations and the visual amenities of the area generally and to comply with Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and DM Policy 30

Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (8) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no satellite dishes shall be installed on the front elevation of the two storey extension to the Main Raymont Hall building.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to accord with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (9) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes, including rainwater goods, shall be fixed on the front elevation of the two storey extension to the Main Raymont Hall building.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to accord with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (10) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extension on the main building and the flat roof on the new garden building hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions and DM Policy 33 Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (11) No deliveries in connection with construction works shall be taken at or despatched from the site other than between the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

No work shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupants at unsociable periods and to comply with Paragraph 120 of the National

Planning Policy Framework and DM Policy 26 Noise and Vibration, and DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (12) None of the trees shown as being retained on the permitted plans shall be lopped or felled without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To comply with Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and policies DM 25 Landscaping and trees and 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (13) (a) The development shall be constructed with a biodiversity living roof, as a plug planted system on a variable depth of substrate, averaged at 133mm and maintained thereafter.

(b) The living roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.

(c) Evidence that the roof has been installed in accordance with (a) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.10 Urban greening, 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs, 5.12 Flood risk management, 5.13 Sustainable Drainage and 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2015), Policy 10 managing and reducing flood risk and Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (14) All demolition and construction works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved Bat Re-Entry & Activity Survey Report dated August 2015 by Greengage received 4th November 2015.

Reason: To comply with Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2015), Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

INFORMATIVES

- A. **Positive and Proactive Statement:** The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive and proactive discussions took place with the applicant prior to the application being submitted through a pre-application discussion. Only minor changes were required in order for the

application to accord with the Development Plan. These were made by the applicant following positive discussions.

- B. The applicant is advised that any works associated with the implementation of this permission (including the demolition of any existing buildings or structures) will constitute commencement of development. Further, all pre commencement conditions attached to this permission must be discharged, by way of a written approval in the form of an application to the Planning Authority, before any such works of demolition take place.
- C. As you are aware the approved development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will be payable on commencement of the development. An '**assumption of liability form**' must be completed and before development commences you must submit a '**CIL Commencement Notice form**' to the council. You should note that any claims for relief, where they apply, must be submitted and determined prior to commencement of the development. Failure to follow the CIL payment process may result in penalties. More information on CIL is available at: - <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myserVICES/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/application-process/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>
- D. You are advised that all construction work should be undertaken in accordance with the "London Borough of Lewisham Code of Practice for Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites" available on the Lewisham web page.
- E. In preparing the scheme of dust minimisation, reference shall be made to the London Councils Best Practice Guide: The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition. All mitigation measures listed in the Guide appropriate to the size, scale and nature of the development will need to be included in the dust minimisation scheme.
- F. The applicant be advised that the details to be submitted pursuant to this permission should have regard to the principles of energy and natural resource efficiency through their design, orientation, density and location, in compliance with Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011).
- G. The applicant is requested to formally submit the bat records to the GreenSpace Information for Greater London (regional record centre) as per the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management code of professional conduct.
- H. The applicant is advised that once the living roof is established, the minimum defects and liability period following establishment should 15 months.
- I. **Pre-commencement conditions:**

The pre-commencement conditions imposed are to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, the function of the surrounding highway network,

deliver high quality design, ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and safeguard the health and safety of trees.

J. Thames Water Comments:

Waste – Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you contact Thames Water to discuss their status in more detail and to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required. You can contact Thames Water on 0800 009 3921 or for more information please visit our website at www.thameswater.co.uk

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Water - Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.