

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	Elizabeth Industrial Estate, Juno Way, London SE14 5RW	
Ward	New Cross	
Contributors	Peter Munnely	
Class	PART 1	Date: 29 August 2013

Reg. Nos. DC/12/81950

Application dated 21.11.2102

Applicant Howard Lewisham Ltd

Proposal The demolition of 8 existing units on the site of Elizabeth Industrial Estate, Juno Way SE14 and the construction of 2, two storey buildings to provide Class B1, B2, B8 and sui generis trade counter uses together with associated landscaping, hardstanding and the provision of 38 bicycle spaces, 52 car parking spaces including 10 mobility spaces.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 2710-2 Site Plan Ph1-2 P12, 2710-10 Floor Plans 1-8 P3, 2710-20 Elevations 1-8 P6, 2710-110 Floor Plans 9 P2, 2710-120 Elevations 9 P3, 2710-EPB Boundary Site Plan exg P1, 2710-IP Indicative Phasing Plan P2, 2710-SS Site Sections P3, 2710-Roofs Roof Plan, 2710-21 Bin Store P1, CGI of Surrey Canal Road, 3640/503P5 External Works Drainage Layout, Air Quality Statement, Travel Plan, Energy Statement, Sustainability Statement, Design and Access Statement, Tree Survey, Phase 1 Environmental Review, Landscape Statement, Archaeological Assessment, Transport Statement, Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test, Ecological Appraisal Planning Statement

Background Papers

- (1) This is Background Papers List
- (2) Case File DE/237C/TP
- (3) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (4) Local Development Framework Documents
- (5) The London Plan

Designation [Core Strategy or Adopted UDP] - Existing Use, SIL

Screening No Screening Opinion sought

1.0 Property/Site Description

1.1 The site is an industrial estate to the south of Surrey Canal Road and to the east of Juno Way. There are 13 industrial units on the site with B1, B2 and B8 uses. Immediately to the west of the site is a large maintenance shed serving the London Overground Orbital Rail Network. A planning application is currently with the Council to extend this shed northwards. To the south of the application boundary is that part of the Elizabeth Industrial Estate that will be retained. It is understood that the buildings on this part of the site are more recent and complete redevelopment of the site would, in any case, be difficult because of leasehold

issues. The applicant also controls the adjacent Juno Way Industrial Estate although again this is not part of the existing application.

- 1.2 The Elizabeth Industrial Estate and the Juno Way Industrial Estate are within the Surrey Canal Road Strategic Industrial Location (SIL), one of only two SILs designated by the London Plan in the Borough.
- 1.3 Apart from the SIL designation the application site is within one of LBL's Regeneration and Growth Areas (Deptford and New Cross). These areas will provide the majority of the Borough's new housing, retail and employment uses and will make a significant contribution to sustainable local regeneration objectives.
- 1.4 There is no residential development in the vicinity of the site and no heritage asset designations.
- 1.5 Site coverage is currently in the form of single and two storey buildings of varying ages which in footprint terms provide for approximately 10,000 sq. m of floorspace. The buildings make up around 77% of all site coverage over the red line boundary, which is excessive (modern industrial estates tend to have building coverage at 50-55%). This has increasingly led to problems with servicing, deliveries and parking. Other constraints associated with the site and its surrounds include difficulty accessing the strategic road network, fractured pedestrian and road networks, an awkward and unwelcoming frontage to Surrey Canal Road which contributes to the generally poor environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 1.6 The buildings on the Estate are no longer fit for purpose with most coming to the end of their lifespan. Many suffer from wind and rainwater ingress and fall well short of even basic sustainability standards. Although most of the units are occupied, the relatively low rentals achieved have resulted in physical decline of the estate with little finance to arrest the decay. Existing and recent uses have included activities such as furniture manufacture, paint spraying and logistics which would fall largely within the B1 (c), B2 and B8 Use Classes. It is reported that there are the equivalent of 15 full time jobs provided by the existing buildings on the application site (It is estimated that this would increase to 100 were the application scheme to be implemented).

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 The Estate has little relevant recent planning history with various use related applications and proposals relating to minor building alterations. The site however does have some local historical interest as in 1901 it became home to the Mazawattee Tea, Coffee and Cocoa Company who built a large factory on the site and employed up to 2000 people enjoying a relatively successful period of operation and trading in the first half of the 20th century. The factory was heavily bombed and severely damaged in the Second World War. As a consequence the company was forced to downscale and other operators were set up in new buildings on the factory site which were erected as late as the 1980's. Elements of the Victorian factory remain although much of this has been incorporated into the fabric of the more recent buildings. Little of significance remains of the factory and so that it was not considered worthy of either a statutory or local listing.

2.2 The estate is close to the strategically important Surrey Canal Triangle regeneration site. The overarching planning permission for this development provides 2,400 homes, 15,000 sq. m of commercial floorspace and 10,000 sq. m of community floorspace. Work on the first phases of this development are due to commence in early 2014 after determination of reserved matters applications. The Surrey Canal Road Development will trigger the provision of the Surrey Canal Road Overground Station and improvements to bus services in the area. Public realm will also be upgraded, including links to Bridge House Meadows and on Surrey Canal Road itself.

3.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposal

- 3.1 The application site will be cleared of all existing buildings. The proposals feature Phase 1 and Phase 2 elements. Phase 1 will be that part of the Estate nearest Surrey Canal Road and features one block with 8 two storey units of varying size with 5 of the units having a Surrey Canal Road facing frontage (Unit Nos 1,2,3,4 & 5) with the other Units (6,7 & 8) facing directly opposite back across the site. The total gross floor area provided is 4118 sq. m. The Phase 2 building to the south of the application site is also 2 storey although currently arranged as one singular unit with a total gross floor area of 3,117 sq. m. The location of the buildings, particularly Phase 1, is heavily influenced by the presence to the north of the site of a large underground electrical infrastructure cable running east/west over which building cannot occur.
- 3.2 The buildings are designed in a contemporary manner using an approach that could be described as clean and uncomplicated. A stepped front elevation facing Surrey Canal Road is proposed, breaking up what would have been a long and monotonous frontage. Materials mainly consist of aluminium cladding, polyester coated window frames and coloured panelled towers over the entrances of the Phase 1 building which were introduced to break up the large expanse of grey and silver that would be seen from Surrey Canal Road. Unit 9 within Phase 2 is also largely grey and silver coated aluminium although does not feature panelled towers due to its set back location away from Surrey Canal Road. It has a large double height dock loading bay.
- 3.3 Car parking for Units 1-5 is within a landscaped area between the Phase 1 building, a service road and Surrey Canal Road while parking bays for Units 6-8 are directly adjacent to the entrances to each Unit with some attendant landscaping. There are two proposed vehicular access points to the Estate both off Juno Way.
- 3.4 Other design elements to be noted include a large bin store to the east of the site adjacent to Unit 4, weldmesh fencing between Phase 1 and 2 and pedestrian refuges to the entrances on Units 1-5 which include cycle parking facilities. A small area of landscaping is proposed between the buildings and the footpath on Juno Way.
- 3.5 At the time of writing this report it has been agreed with the applicant that the area between the Phase 1 building and Surrey Canal Road footpath will be redesigned with a landscaping arrangement which will be less vehicular orientated and more acknowledging of the North Lewisham Links Strategy which although not part of

the Council's Statutory Development Plan is considered, amongst other things, to provide valuable guidance on how the pedestrian and cyclist experience on linkages such as Surrey Canal Road can be improved. It is hoped that an appropriate plan showing a revised landscaping arrangement can be added to the drawing list prior to consideration by members and should this not be possible a suitably worded condition can be attached to any permission resolved to be granted.

Supporting Documents

- 3.6 Air Quality Statement, Travel Plan, Energy Statement, Sustainability Statement, Design and Access Statement, Tree Survey, Phase 1 Environmental Review, Landscape Statement, Archaeological Assessment, Transport Statement, Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test, Ecological Appraisal, Planning 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 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors. TfL and the Environment Agency were also consulted.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

- 4.3 No representations were received from surrounding businesses or local Councillors that were notified of the application.

Written Responses received from Statutory Agencies

TfL

- 4.4 Transport for London have indicated no objection in principle to the proposals with a number of matters initially a concern having been addressed by a Technical Note provided by Meyer Brown, the applicant's Transport Consultant. They indicate that it is for LBL to decide whether pre-commencement conditions relating to Construction Management, Delivery and Servicing and Parking are appropriate.
- 4.5 They have indicated that the level of car parking proposed for staff, customers and operational needs is acceptable although request that the Council consider possible ways of reducing car parking provision as public transport improves in the area and Travel Plan measures take effect.
- 4.6 TfL welcomed the proposals to provide means of charging electric vehicles.
- 4.7 They requested that consideration be given to land for a bus stop outside the site on Surrey Canal Road. This is in relation to the s106 agreement for the Surrey Canal Triangle development which provides funding for new bus services and infrastructure provision on and close to the (Surrey Canal Road Triangle) site. However the agreement does not provide for new bus stops at the eastern end of Surrey Canal Road. TfL have identified that the footway adjoining the application

site represents a good opportunity to locate a stop as the levels differences are comparatively little. The current application scheme proposes landscaping to the back edge of the footway although site ownership falls short of this line. In the event that a bus stop and shelter on Surrey Canal Road were required in this location, some of this planting would need to be removed.

Environment Agency

- 4.8 The EA originally objected to the proposals on the grounds that the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment proposes an outline drainage strategy that does not meet the planning guidance requirements. More particularly the EA required that the applicant demonstrate that sufficient rainwater attenuation can be accommodated within the design to reduce runoff rates and that consideration had been given to incorporating SUDS techniques providing habitat, amenity and water quality benefits.
- 4.9 Following liaison between the applicant's consultant and the EA and additional information having been submitted the EA consider that the proposed development will now meet the requirements of the NPPF subject to a number of conditions being attached to a planning permission. These relate to restriction of surface water drainage, the submission of a ground remediation strategy, verification report associated with the remediation strategy and a restriction on piling and boreholes.

Lewisham Design Panel

- 4.10 Acknowledged the industrial estate use and has functional requirements but considered that better relationship was needed between frontage and the public realm of Surrey Canal Road given the context of the Surrey Canal Triangle redevelopment and the higher footfall in this area because of the proximity of the new Overground Station. The design was considered to be dominated by car parking, hard surfacing, deliveries and refuse storage.
- 4.11 The Panel requested that the proposed materials be improved with cladding, window frames, signage and doors considered together rather than jumbled together. Signage should also be reduced.
- 4.12 They emphasised that high quality landscaping is critical to soften such a development and feared that the landscaping proposals were unsustainable particularly the narrow strip of land along Juno Way. The Panel requested that the applicant consider other examples of industrial development and the London Overground Maintenance Shed which they viewed as a far more elegant design than the proposals.
- 4.13 The Panel provided views in March of this year and subsequent to their consideration the applicant has amended the scheme mainly with regard to the design of the Phase 1 building providing panelled entrance towers, reduced emphasis on signage and some variation on the fenestration facing Surrey Canal Road.

Highways and Transportation

- 4.14 Requested that a Delivery and Servicing Plan and Car Parking Plan be required through condition were planning permission to be granted. A condition requiring review and monitoring of the Travel Plan was also requested.
- 4.15 The officer however indicated concern about the amount of car parking proposed. The latest plans show 48 spaces and this quantum is above maximum parking standards set out in the London Plan. Whilst it is accepted that the London Plan only provides parking standards for Class B1 employment land use in inner London and Outer London locations it is not accepted that the site can be classed in outer London thereby allowing a more lenient approach in terms of spaces.
- 4.16 It is accepted that there is ambiguity on parking because of the mixed use nature of the proposals and that applying Class B1 standards to the whole development may not be fully applicable.
- 4.17 There is a need to balance the operational needs of the development and the requirement to encourage more sustainable modes of transport use associated with the site. With off street parking levels heavily influencing transport choices and undermining cycling, walking and public transport use if such provision is excessive there is a need to understand how the car parking spaces will be used. That is which spaces will be allocated to staff, visitors, trade counter users, who will enforce the hard surface areas and disabled bays, etc. hence the need for a car parking and servicing management plan.

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 any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (DPD) (adopted in June 2011), those saved policies in the adopted Lewisham UDP (July 2004) that have not been replaced by the Core Strategy and policies in the London Plan (July 2011). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27th 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 that (paragraph 211), 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 and saved UDP policies 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.

Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)

- 5.5 The Statement sets out that the planning system has a key role to play in rebuilding Britain's economy by ensuring that the sustainable development needed to support economic growth is able to proceed as easily as possible. The Government's expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy.
- 5.6 The statement further sets out that local authorities should reconsider at developers request, existing Section 106 agreements that currently render schemes unviable, and where possible modify those obligations to allow development to proceed, provided this continues to ensure that the development remains acceptable in planning terms. [Delete if not relevant]

Other National Guidance

- 5.7 The other relevant national guidance is:
- Planning and Access for Disabled People: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM, March 2003)

London Plan (July 2011)

- 5.8 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:
- Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
 - Policy 2.17 Strategic industrial locations
 - Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy
 - Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
 - Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 - Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
 - Policy 5.7 Renewable energy

Policy 5.8 Innovative energy technologies
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.10 Walking
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 6.14 Freight
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

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

Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (2004)
Industrial Capacity (2008)
Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)
Planning for Equality and Diversity in London (2007)

London Plan Best Practice Guidance

5.10 The London Plan Best Practice Guidance's relevant to this application are:

Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition (2006)

Core Strategy

5.11 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the London Plan and the saved policies of the Unitary Development 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 2 Regeneration and Growth Areas
Core Strategy Policy 3 Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Employment Locations
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 10 Managing and reducing the risk of flooding
Core Strategy Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport
Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham
Core Strategy Policy 21 Planning obligations

Site Allocations

- 5.12 The Site is located within the Surrey Canal Road Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs). Core Strategy Policy 3 states that the Council will protect SILs for uses within the B Use Class (B1c, B8 and where appropriate, B2 industry) and also appropriate sui generis) use to provide land for activities that support the continued functioning of London as a whole such as waste management, transport and utilities, and uses that require 24-hour functioning.

Unitary Development Plan (2004)

- 5.13 The saved policies of the UDP relevant to this application are:

STR URB 1 The Built Environment
STR URB 4 Regeneration Areas
STR ENV PRO 3 Energy and Natural Resource Conservation
URB 1 Development Sites and Key Development Sites
URB 3 Urban Design
ENV.PRO 10 Contaminated Land
ENV PRO 17 Management of the Water Supply

Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (January 2011)

- 5.14 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to the provision of affordable housing within the Borough and provides detailed guidance on the likely type and quantum of financial obligations necessary to mitigate the impacts of different types of development.

Emerging Plans

- 5.15 According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision makers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

- 5.16 The following emerging plans are relevant to this application.

Development Management Plan

- 5.17 The Development Management Local Plan – Proposed Submission Version, is a material planning consideration and is growing in weight. Public consultation on the Proposed Submission Version begun on 16 August 2013 and runs for eight weeks ending on Friday 4 October. Therefore, in accordance with the NPPF, the weight decision makers should accord the Proposed Submission Version should reflect the advice in the NPPF paragraph 216.

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

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 23	Air quality
DM Policy 24	Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches
DM Policy 25	Landscaping and trees
DM Policy 26	Noise and vibration
DM Policy 28	Contaminated Land
DM Policy 29	Car parking
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character

- *General principles*
- *Detailed design issues*

5.19 The Council have commissioned a number of studies on transport linkages, permeability and the public realm in North Lewisham. Although not part of the Statutory Development Plan there should be mindfulness of the conclusions and recommendations of these Studies in any decision making process. The studies include the North Lewisham Masterplan (February 2007) by the Landscape Partnership and HKR Architects, the North Lewisham Links Strategy (June 2007 and updated in December 2012) by the same parties together with Longboard Consulting and a more specific study, again by the Landscape Partnership on the Surrey Canal Road/Grinstead Road junction, Deptford: Movement and Feasibility Study (April 2008).

5.20 The North Lewisham Masterplan was a 'background study of the urban form of North Lewisham (that) examines the strengths, failings and opportunities represented by the area and develops a strategic place making vision for the area' (Development Control Policies Preferred Options p151) while the North Lewisham Links Strategy 'identified key routes within and across the area in need of development or enhancement'. This included Surrey Canal Road. The Surrey Canal Road/Grinstead Road Junction Study was intended to 'identify the key problems associated with the junction and adjoining area and to develop a design framework for its future improvement'. This study was commissioned largely in response to the potential redevelopment of the Grinstead Road Neptune works site although it can be noted the application site falls outside of the study area.

6.0 Planning Considerations

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

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design
- c) Highways and Traffic Issues
- d) Sustainability and Energy
- e) Ecology and Landscaping
- f) Planning Obligations

Principle of Development

- 6.2 The proposed Class B1, B2, B8 and sui generis trade counter uses reflect the land use designation of the site as part of the wider Surrey Canal Road Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) and are therefore acceptable. However the Council does wish to maintain an appropriate balance of such uses within its designated SILs and proposes to attach a condition to any planning permission that will restrict trade counter operations to those units that will front onto Surrey Canal Road which are shown as Units 1-5 on the accompanying drawings. The relevant condition will not only restrict the number of units that will be allowed a trade counter but will also restrict the proportion of floorspace within the individual units that can be associated with this use in order to protect land and floorspace that continues to play a vital part in the functioning of London's economy as well as Lewisham's economic needs for business premises and services.
- 6.3 Significantly SILS were reviewed in the Council's Employment Land Survey, which confirmed that some sites on the boundaries of Surrey Canal Road SIL were deteriorating, had lacked investment over many years and required significant refurbishment. With this in mind Officers welcome the estimated £6 million reinvestment in employment floorspace by the applicant in the Borough. This is at a time when Lewisham's economy still faces significant strategic challenges such as the relatively small area of land designated for employment use within the Borough, the loss in the last decade of nearly a third of its industrial base and the continued need for housing which exerts a pressure on the employment land stock. This need to balance employment and housing land have culminated in 'restructuring the allocation of employment land to facilitate regeneration and growth by better reflecting the economic realities of the Borough, the requirements of the London Plan and to ensure the most efficient use of land (LBL Core Strategy 6.20). In practice this has involved releasing land on the periphery of the Surrey Canal Road SIL for mixed use development and focussing on strengthening employment activity on those retained designated areas within the SIL.

Design

- 6.4 The Core Strategy emphasises the need to use development opportunities to improve connectivity throughout the area for pedestrians and cyclists. The 2007 North Lewisham Links Strategy identified Surrey Canal Road as one of a number of key selected projects (including the completed Priority Route One scheme from Deptford High Street to Kender). The recent 2012 Update considers the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011 and its importance in setting out a clear development strategy for the area with its emphasis on Regeneration and Growth in Deptford and New Cross. The Core Strategy identifies the role that individual sites will play in delivering the vision of Deptford and New Cross becoming a well connected and sustainable place. The Links Update acknowledges the potential contribution major development sites identified in the Core Strategy can have in terms of enabling, funding and delivering improved and new routes and public realm and provides a reappraisal of 16 priority projects which includes Surrey Canal Road (Number 2).

- 6.5 The Review identified a number of objectives for any improved Surrey Canal Road link:
- Upgrades to footpath and cycleways and landscape intervention along full length of the road;
 - Improved signage, surfaces, crossings and traffic calming measures;
 - Upgrade to pedestrian/cycle crossing at Juno Way and Landmann Way junction. Feature lighting to bridges to create landmark features;
 - Bus stop, access points and pedestrian crossings improvements;
 - Roadside verge improvements; remove shrubs to improve natural surveillance; introduce wild flower;
 - Planting in maintainable strips.
- 6.6 The Links Update states that ‘Development of sites along Surrey Canal Road may provide an opportunity to improve the adjacent public realm through alternative boundary treatment (currently dominated by steel palisade fencing, inactive building frontages and overgrown planting), improved surface finishes, lighting and tree planting’.
- 6.7 The 2008 Grinstead Road/Surrey Canal Road Junction Study in analysing Surrey Canal Road develops this theme further describing it as follows: ‘the streetscape and many of the business units have become degraded over the years...’ adding that the road is not overlooked, separated by dense planting, is lined for most of its length by palisade fencing and as a result is unattractive and perceived as unsafe.
- 6.8 The application, along with the Surrey Canal Road Triangle and Grinstead Road schemes are considered to be the first significant opportunities to begin to deliver some of the objectives sought by the Strategy. One of the principal means of funding for any works will be through Section 106 funding and the applicant has agreed that a contribution towards the enhancement of Surrey Canal Road in line with the Links Strategy is reasonable, fair and related to the proposed development.
- 6.9 It is acknowledged that in addition to the need to meet commercial occupier requirements the scope for bold and innovative design in this location is somewhat restricted by a number of fixed considerations. The first of these is the presence at the front of the site of two 132,000 volt oil-filled cables which must be retained in their current position. Roads and car parking can be set over the cables but not buildings. This limits the extent that buildings can be moved forwards towards Surrey Canal Road on the site. Secondly there is the need to preserve access through to the Rail For London Maintenance building to the east and provide a turning circle for service vehicles. To the west is the need to have access off Juno Way that is a sufficiently safe distance from the roundabout on Surrey Canal. Both of these requirements mitigate against being able to bring any building too close to Surrey Canal Road.

- 6.10 Notwithstanding the above, officers, in line with relevant design policies in the Core Strategy and guidance in the NPPF, which both stipulate that all new development should feature good quality design, have negotiated extensively with the applicant to reach a stage where the design of the Phase 1 building (that is Units 1-8) that would face Surrey Canal Road is acceptable given the benefits that will occur through reinvestment .
- 6.11 A reduced set back was secured allowing the building to be moved closer to Surrey Canal Road boundary than the existing building by an average of around 20%. This movement forwards will, it is hoped, help activate Surrey Canal Road if not actually bring active frontage and also deliver an element of passive surveillance.
- 6.12 Another feature of the building is the stepped frontage. This is a response designed to add interest to the elevation with the shadow and undulating form helping to maintain interest on Surrey Canal Road as opposed to a consistently 'flat' profile which has limited visual impact and creates a 'tunnel' effect. The stepped profile also reflects the need to have adequately sized service yards in front of each unit to accommodate commercial vehicles of particular size (7.2m panel vehicles). The service road will be too narrow to allow larger HGV's or a fixed wheel base lorry access normal access.
- 6.13 Distinctive panelled entrance 'features' have been added to help enliven the frontage. A different shade of cladding has also been added around the loading bays to achieve the same result. Signage panels have been reduced in size and the glazed areas within the frontages remodelled from original plans.
- 6.14 Notwithstanding the revisions made to the building design and the site constraints officers will require an acceptable landscaping arrangement to be either submitted prior to consideration at Committee or through discharge of a relevant condition requiring such detail to be approved. The landscaping arrangement currently shown does not respond appropriately to Surrey Canal Road, largely ignoring aspirations set out in the recent studies. It omits to have regard to the high quality landscaping strategies proposed within the nearby Surrey Canal Triangle and Grinstead Road planning permissions which would help deliver a part of the public realm links strategy in the vicinity of the site. The landscaping proposals provided thus far other are vague and lack significant detail. There is a small strip of landscaping along Juno Way which is too narrow to provide any substantive landscaping however it is that land between the proposed Phase 1 building and the footpath on Surrey Canal Road which is the most important area. At the time of drafting this report, and at the request of the Council, the applicant is currently working alongside The Landscape Partnership in order to deliver a more responsive landscaping arrangement. It is hoped that this work will allow better provision for pedestrian and cycle access (for employees and visitors) through the Surrey Canal Road perimeter of the site rather than the unsafe shared access currently proposed off Juno Way. Similarly it is hoped that a less obtrusive boundary treatment on Surrey Canal Road can be found than weldmesh fencing and that equally, a more thoughtful, measured approach to proposed plant and tree species can be proposed.

Highways and Traffic Issues

- 6.15 The site is currently in a PTAL 2 zone which is termed 'poor' in terms of public transport accessibility. This rating is however expected to improve with the advent of the Surrey Canal Triangle development and other schemes such as Grinstead Road. Parking around the existing Estate is ad hoc and largely uncontrolled with no formal arrangement or layouts. Despite this officers are not aware of any particular problems or issues in regards to parking and highways associated with the existing operation. Vehicular access to the site is via Juno Way.

a) Access and Servicing

- 6.16 Proposed access to the site will be via Juno Way. This is regarded as acceptable with the northern service road junction sufficiently distant from the mini-roundabout on Surrey Canal Road not to cause a problem to traffic on Surrey Canal Road. As indicated earlier the proposed layout and its space restrictions is likely to mean all proposed units are serviced by smaller delivery vehicles.

b) Car Parking

A total of 48 parking spaces are included with 12 of these being allocated for blue badge holders. LBL's Core Strategy Policy 14 (Sustainable movement and transport) states that car parking standards contained within the London Plan will be used for a basis for assessment. Policy 6.13 (Parking) of the London Plan refers to maximum parking standards. For Class B1 uses in inner London the standards require 1 space be provided per 600-1000 sq. m of gross floorspace. No specific standards for sui generis use are given other than at 6A.5 which states that parking for commercial vehicles should be provided at a maximum standard of one space per 500 sq.m of gross B2 or B8 floorspace. The relevant Policy also states that 'standards for B2 and B8 employment uses should have regard to the B1 standards although a degree of flexibility maybe required to reflect different trip generating characteristics' (paragraph 6A.7). Reference is also made to cycle, motorcycle parking requirements and provision for electric vehicles.

- 6.17 Although it is acknowledged that applicability of parking standards for one use class on a development that has been deliberately designed to operate on a flexible basis is difficult, it is noted in correspondence from the applicant's agent that 'the development is intended to attract good quality occupiers with relatively high employment density rather than simply storage. There is a relatively high office content in many of the buildings, which reflects the high quality jobs that will be generated and the good quality businesses we hope to attract'. This statement suggests that the units will be marketed at Class B1 occupiers and this assumption can be further supported by reference to a possibility of 100 jobs being created by the development.
- 6.18 Given the proposed gross floor area of approximately 7000 sq.m it can be seen that were the proposed space to be any of the singular B-Class uses, the proposed car parking provision would be significantly in excess of the maximum normally considered acceptable. Even if the London Plan Class B2-B8 standards were to be generously applied as opposed to Class B1 parking standards, this would still result in a maximum of around 14 spaces allowable.

- 6.19 Notwithstanding an acknowledgment that the London Plan does provide for some flexibility as outlined above to reflect different trip-generating requirements and that applying Class B1 standards across the whole development would not be appropriate, concerns have been raised by LBL's own Highways Engineer that the number of proposed car parking spaces has not been fully justified.
- 6.20 Whilst the number of spaces is in excess of what would normally be allowed for this amount of employment floorspace for any of the proposed use classes, officers, acknowledging the current amount of floorspace, the existing parking and servicing environment which is uncontrolled and the fact that a condition will be attached to any planning permission requiring a parking and service delivery management plan to be approved by the Council, are confident that vehicular parking within the site will not cause issue to the surrounding road network. Furthermore cycle parking provision is above required standards and further detail will be sought through condition in regard to motorcycle parking and electric vehicle charging provision.
- 6.21 The site has a 'poor' PTAL rating of 2. Given the Surrey Canal Triangle development nearby and the improvements it will bring in transport infrastructure to the area, namely a new overground station on London Orbital route less than 5 mins walking distance from the application site and the likelihood of more frequent bus services along Surrey Canal Road, it is proposed that a condition be attached to any planning permission which requires that a revised Travel Plan be submitted and approved to the Council as the PTAL level of the site improves. The revised Travel Plan would aim to demonstrate how occupiers would actively respond to the improvements in public transport provision.

Sustainability and Energy

- 6.22 Policy 8 (Sustainable Design and Construction and Energy Efficiency) of LBL's Core Strategy requires that all major non-residential development should reach a minimum BREEAM 'Excellent' standard. Failure to meet this standard requires the applicant to explain in detail why the 'Excellent' rating cannot be achieved.
- 6.23 The applicant has consistently maintained that while LBL's preference for a BREEAM 'excellent' rating is understood, it is not deemed feasible for the proposed scheme for reasons of financial viability. The applicant has indicated that achieving BREEAM 'excellent' is difficult for Class B buildings which have limited energy demands and where final occupiers are unknown. The applicant has proposed that a BREEAM 'very good' rating be achieved by implementing a number of measures relating to and including:
- Commitment to sustainable procurement and construction practices;
 - Improved building user comfort (indoor air quality, water quality, safety and security);
 - Reduced energy consumption and carbon emissions;
 - Water efficient building features;
 - Use of building materials with lower lifecycle impacts; Effective construction and operational waste management plans;
 - Management and reduction of pollutants.

a) Living Roofs

- 6.24 Pre-application discussions covered the possibility of providing living roofs across the development. The applicant referred to the additional structural and maintenance costs that would be brought about by inclusion of such a feature across the development and cited financial viability as a problem with the view being taken that there is little evidence that target occupiers for the units would be willing to pay a premium for green roofs as opposed to larger national operators whose high profile social/green corporate objectives are met by the inclusion of such facilities.

b) Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

- 6.25 The Environment Agency had objected to the proposals on account that the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment proposes an outline drainage strategy which did not meet specified requirements. More specifically it needed to be demonstrated that sufficient rainwater attenuation can be accommodated within the design to reduce runoff rates. Additionally the EA noted that there was a lack of an acceptable Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDs) solution as part of the proposals providing habitat, amenity and water quality benefits. The applicant's revised outline drainage strategy includes use of permeable paving in the car parking areas and underground storage to control discharge into the existing sewer. Having reviewed the revised outline drainage scheme the EA were able to remove objection. Furthermore it has been acknowledged by the EA that any SUDs provision is difficult due to a number of constraints on this site namely a 132 Kv buried cable adjacent to Surrey Canal Road, buried services, shallow drainage, public sewer diversions and significantly irregular ground levels.

c) Low Carbon/Renewable Feasibility

- 6.26 Officers acknowledge the difficulties with regard to renewable energy provision associated with buildings such as that proposed which often have low heat demand and are reasonably satisfied with explanations by the applicant as to why such technologies would not be appropriate in this instance.
- 6.27 A biomass system whilst technically feasible in a limited capacity would not be appropriate in this urban environment and would have an unacceptable carbon cost due to the need to transport fuel from outside London. Such an option would have a prohibitive level of management cost given the scale of the scheme proposed to be supplied. Similarly a Combined Heat and Power System would be inefficient because of the likelihood of irregular usage patterns from individual occupiers and the need to operate in parallel with conventional gas heated boilers thus reducing potential carbon savings. Given the proximity of the South East London Heat and Combined Heat and Power plant 300m north west of the site District Heating was also considered. Dialogue was set up with Veolia however connection to the heat network was considered to be inefficient because of potential low and even negligible heat demand combined with the fact that the heating network is, initially, being created north of SELCHP as opposed to south – a separate system would be financially prohibitive. Air source heat pumps are considered technically the most feasible option for the development, particularly that part of the development that would be offices, however are considered financially unviable given the proposed margins of return on the scheme. Solar thermal and photovoltaic (PV) systems were considered and although a significant

amount of roof space exists most of the roofs are orientated in east west direction rather than the optimum southerly direction. With hot water demand relatively low the solar thermal solution was considered of limited use. Photovoltaics were also considered of limited use given that lighting demand would be highest at that point when PV performance is negligible. Wind turbines were not regarded as appropriate as wind speeds were relatively low at this level and the technology is therefore likely to underperform.

- 6.28 In the context of the above findings, the applicant maintains priority has been given to efficient design with a particular focus on highly efficient ventilation and lighting systems including rooflighting and equally efficient conventional heating systems.
- 6.29 Officers, mindful of the enhanced employment opportunities offered by the redevelopment of the Estate, the potential for the scheme to help deliver some key objectives outlined in the North Lewisham Links Strategy and the difficulties of obtaining the BREEAM 'excellent' rating on speculative employment space in this location would in this instance, accept a lower 'very good' rating. This rating will be secured by a condition attached to any planning permission.

Ecology and Landscaping

- 6.30 An ecology survey was submitted with the application. This survey concluded that other than on its northern boundary there was little of ecological value in and around the site. Beyond its northern boundary lies an area of planting which also features a number of semi-mature trees. The accompanying tree survey identifies these trees of being of low to moderate quality. Were an appropriate landscaping scheme for this area to be agreed upon either at application or post permission stage through use of a condition, retention of these trees may not be required.

Air Quality

- 6.31 An Air Quality Assessment by Meyer Brown was submitted with the application. The site stands within an existing Air Quality Management Area. The Assessment concludes that the residual construction air quality impacts, development traffic impacts and operational impacts from the development are anticipated to be local, temporary and of minor significance.

Planning Obligations

- 6.32 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in dealing with planning applications, local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. It further states that where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled. The NPPF also sets out that planning obligations should only be secured when they meet the following three tests:
- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable
 - (b) Directly related to the development; and
 - (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

- 6.33 Paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (April 2010) puts the above three tests on a statutory basis, making it illegal to secure a planning obligation unless it meets the three tests.
- 6.34 The applicant has provided a planning obligations statement outlining the obligations that they consider are necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 6.35 The applicant has undertaken to provide a contribution of £52,000 (calculated through LBL's relevant s106 SPD) to mitigate against the high level of car parking provided within the development and the greater number of people working on the development site. The contribution will be used to help delivery of the Surrey Canal Road Improvement works identified within the North Lewisham Links Strategy as an 'essential' Transport project. This figure will be distinct and in addition to that needed to significantly improve the site's immediate boundary with Surrey Canal Road and Juno Way.
- 6.36 Officers consider that the obligations outlined above are appropriate and necessary in order to mitigate the impacts of the development and make the development acceptable in planning terms. Officers are satisfied the proposed obligations meet the three legal tests as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (April 2010).

7.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.1 The above development is not CIL liable because there is no net increase in floorspace.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposals for new employment space and associated car parking and landscaping have been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 8.2 Although in regard to sustainability and car parking provision the scheme falls short of relevant development plan policy, officers are mindful of the direct and indirect economic benefits that redevelopment will bring. Namely these are the significant amount of new jobs that will be created on a site which has not been utilised to its full potential because of the existing obsolete building stock. In addition redevelopment of the site will, along with other significant redevelopment proposals, help act as a delivery mechanism for the Surrey Canal Road improvements as envisaged in the North Lewisham Links Strategy. Officers are mindful that any scheme would need to include an acceptable design solution for the significant part of the site which overlooks and adjoins Surrey Canal Road and are confident that ongoing work will deliver that. Officers have been disappointed by the lack of flexibility demonstrated by the applicant in regard to matters such as sustainability and parking. However in assessing the wider regeneration and economic benefits the development is likely to bring, the scheme, on balance, is considered acceptable.

9.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1 **RECOMMENDATION (A)**

Authorise Officers to negotiate and complete a legal agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Act (and other appropriate powers) to cover the following principal matters including such other amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development:

- A contribution of £52,000 to assist delivery of the North Lewisham Links Strategy.

9.2 **RECOMMENDATION (B)**

Subject to completion of a satisfactory legal agreement, authorise the Head of Planning to **GRANT PLANNING 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

2710-2 Site Plan Ph1-2 P12, 2710-10 Floor Plans 1-8 P3, 2710-20 Elevations 1-8 P6, 2710-110 Floor Plans 9 P2, 2710-120 Elevations 9 P3, 2710-EPB Boundary Site Plan exg P1, 2710-IP Indicative Phasing Plan P2, 2710-SS Site Sections P3, 2710-Roofs Roof Plan, 2710-21 Bin Store P1, CGI of Surrey Canal Road, 3640/503P5 External Works Drainage Layout, Air Quality Statement, Travel Plan, Energy Statement, Sustainability Statement, Design and Access Statement, Tree Survey, Phase 1 Environmental Review, Landscape Statement, Archaeological Assessment, Transport Statement, Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test, Ecological Appraisal Planning Statement

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 related 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 Saved Policies ENV.PRO 9 Potentially Polluting Uses and HSG 4 Residential Amenity in the Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

- 4. No development shall commence on site until a detailed schedule and samples of all external materials and finishes/windows and external doors/roof coverings/other site specific features to be used on the buildings 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(s) and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Saved Policy URB 3 Urban Design in the Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

- 4. No development shall commence on site until details of the number and/or location of electric vehicle charging points and a programme for their installation and maintenance have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The electric vehicle charging points as approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the Development and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To reduce pollution emissions in an Area Quality Management Area in accordance with Policy 7.14 Improving air quality in the London Plan (July 2011).

- 5. No development shall commence on site until a local labour strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall include (but is not limited to):
 - (a) Proposals to achieve a target of fifty per cent (50%) local people and local businesses as employees contractors and sub-contractors during the construction of the Development.

- (b) A commitment to working with the local planning authority's local labour and business coordinator.
- (c) Routes to employment, including direct access to employment opportunities at the development and addressing wider barriers to employment.
- (d) Early warnings within the local planning authority's area of contracts to be let at the development.
- (e) The number and type of jobs to be created and the skill requirements in relation to those jobs.
- (f) Recommended training routes to secure jobs.
- (g) Proposals to encourage diversity in the workforce.
- (h) Measures to encourage local businesses to apply for work in relation to the development.
- (i) Training opportunities and employment advice or programmes and employment and training brokerage arrangements.
- (j) Provision of opportunities for modern apprenticeships including the number and type of apprenticeships available.
- (k) Provision of opportunities for school leavers, older people and those who have been out of work for a long period.
- (l) Provision of work experience for local people during the construction of the development including the number of weeks available and associated trades.
- (m) Provision of childcare and employee assistance to improve working environments.
- (n) Interview arrangements for jobs.
- (o) Arrangements for working with schools and colleges.
- (p) Measures to encourage local people into end use jobs.
- (q) Targets for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategy including but not limited to the submission of monitoring information to the local planning authority on a monthly basis giving details of:-
 - The percentage of the on-site workforce which are drawn from persons whose normal residence is within the Lewisham borough.
 - Social and demographic information of all contractors, sub contractors, agents, and employers engaged to undertake the construction of the development.
 - Number of days of work experience provided.
 - Number of apprenticeships provided.

The strategy approved by the local planning authority shall be implemented in its entirety and distributed to all contractors, sub-contractors, agents and employers engaged in the construction of the development.

Within three months of development commencing and quarterly thereafter until the development is complete, evidence shall be submitted to demonstrate compliance with the approved strategy and monitoring information submitted to the local planning authority in writing, giving the social and demographic information of all contractors, sub-contractors, agents and employers engaged to undertake the construction of the development.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the development makes appropriate provision for local labour and delivers jobs to supports sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and to comply with Core Strategy Policy 21 Planning Obligations in the Core Strategy (2011).

- 6 No development shall commence on site until a full and comprehensive landscaping and boundary treatment scheme (including full details of proposed materials, plant numbers, species, location and size of planting, hardstanding and boundary treatment) and details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall principally relate to that area between the hereby approved Phase 1 building (featuring Units 1-8) and the footpath on the northern side of Surrey Canal Road but shall also be applicable to that area marked as landscaping facing Juno Way.

All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Core Strategy Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Saved Policies URB 3 Urban Design, URB 12 Landscape and Development and URB 13 Trees in the Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

7. No development shall commence on site until a remediation strategy that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses;
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors;
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason:To ensure that development of the site is carried out with due regard to addressing issues of historic contamination that could present a risk to groundwater in the underlying Principal and Secondary aquifers in accordance with the NPPF.

- 8 No part of the development shall be occupied until a Car Park Management & Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and any approved Plan shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details from the first occupation of the development and shall be adhered to in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory vehicle management and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

9. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a “long-term monitoring and maintenance plan”) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason:To ensure that development of the site is carried out with due regard to addressing issues of historic contamination that could present a risk to groundwater in the underlying Principal and Secondary aquifers in accordance with the NPPF.

10. A minimum of 36 secure cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development as indicated on the plans hereby approved. The cycle parking spaces pertinent to each building phase shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of that part of the development and maintained thereafter. 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).

11. Piling or any other foundation designs / investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure any foundation works are only carried out once a suitable scheme has been devised based on the ground conditions with due regard to contamination risks posed to the environment.

12. The Units hereby approved shall achieve a minimum BREEAM Rating of 'Very Good'.

- (a) No development shall commence until a Design Stage Certificate for each Unit (prepared by a Building Research Establishment qualified Assessor) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate compliance with part (a).
- (b) Within 3 months of occupation of any of the Units, evidence shall be submitted in the form of a Post Construction Certificate (prepared by a Building Research Establishment qualified Assessor) to demonstrate full compliance with part (a) for that specific building.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.1 Climate change and mitigation, 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions, 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, 5.7 Renewable energy, 5.15 Water use and supplies in the London Plan (2011) and Core Strategy Policy 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects, Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency (2011).

13. After the opening of the Overground Station on Surrey Canal Road an updated and revised Travel Plan, in accordance with Transport for London's document 'Travel Planning for New Development in London' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall operate in full accordance with all measures identified within the Travel Plan from that point of discharge of this condition.

- (a) The Travel Plan shall specify new initiatives to be implemented by the landlord and tenants to encourage access to and from the site by a variety of non-car means including the enhanced rail network, shall set revised targets and shall specify a monitoring and review mechanism to ensure compliance with the Travel Plan objectives.

- (b) Evidence shall be submitted to demonstrate compliance with the monitoring and review mechanisms agreed under part (a) according to a timetable that should form part of the approved details..

Reason: In order that both the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the practicality, viability and sustainability of the Travel Plan for the site and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

14. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987 as amended, (or any other order revoking or re-enacting this order) the agreed provision of 'trade counters' within the approved Units 1-5 hereby approved shall be ancillary to the main use within each unit (Use Class B2/B8) and shall not comprise more than 10% of the floor area within any of the units

Reason: In order to enable the local planning authority to control the amount of trade counter usage at the site in the interests of protecting the vitality and viability of nearby shopping centres in accordance with Policy 6: Retail hierarchy and location of retail development in the Core Strategy (2011) and STC1 The Shopping Hierarchy.

15. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:To ensure that any drainage systems installed do not present a pollution risk to groundwater within the underlying Principal and Secondary aquifers.

INFORMATIVES

- (A) 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 discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.
- (B) 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.