

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	EXCALIBUR ESTATE REGENERATION AREA, LONDON, SE6	
Ward	Whitefoot	
Contributors	Monique Wallace	
Class	PART 1	Date: 21 APRIL 2011

Reg. Nos. DC/10/75973, DC/10/75973A, DC/10/75973B & DC/10/75973F

Application dated 17.11.10, revised 16.2.11, 7.3.11 & 7.4.11

Applicant BPTW Partnership on behalf of London & Quadrant

Proposal The redevelopment of the Excalibur Estate SE6, seeking full planning permission (Phase 1) for 152 residential units, and outline planning permission (Phase 2) for 219 residential units, creating a total of 371 residential units in buildings ranging from 1 to 3 storeys in height, together with car and cycle parking, associated highway infrastructure, soft and hard landscaping including the provision of open space.

Applicant's Plan Nos. APL0001, 0002, 0003 Rev B, 0004 Rev F, 0005, 0006 Rev A, 0007, 0008, 0009, 0010, 0011, 0012, 0013, 0014 Rev B, 0015 Rev A, 0016 Rev A, 0017, 0018, 0019, 0020 Rev B, 0021, 0022 Rev A, 0023 Rev A, 0024 Rev B, 0025, 0026 Rev A, 0027 Rev B, 0028, 0029, 0031, 0032, 0034, 0035, 0036, 0037, 0038, 0039, CBA7569.02, Planning Statement (bptw November 2010), Transport Assessment & Appendices (Scott Wilson November 2010), Residential Travel Plan (Scott Wilson November 2010), Air Quality Impact Assessment (Scott Wilson November 2010) PPG 24 Noise Impact Assessment (Scott Wilson November 2010), Code For Sustainable Homes (Eight Associates 16 /11/10), Sustainability Statement (Eight Associates 16 /11/10), Statement of Community Involvement (L & Q, received 15/3/11), Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment (Scott Wilson Nov 2010), Design & Access Statement (hunters, November 2010) Heritage Statement (Alan Baxter Nov 2010), Sunlight, Daylight and Shadowing (BLDA Consultancy 19/11/10), Preliminary Phase II Initial Geo-environmental Assessment Report (NLM November 2010), Appendix 1 – Revision A (16/2/11) Accessibility Statement, Energy Assessment (Eight

Associates 16/11/10), Energy Statement Addendum (Eight Associates 22/02/2011), Phase 2 Design Code (Hunters February 2011), Aborigicultural Development Statement (CBA Trees, November 2010), Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Purcell Miller Tritton, January 2011) and Economic Viability Appraisal Report (Jones Lang La Salle November 2010)

Background Papers

- (1) Case File - LE/H92/TP
- (2) LDF: Residential Standards SPD (August 2006)
- (3) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (4) The London Plan (2004, consolidated with alterations 2008)
- (5) PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
- (6) Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS 1 (2007)
- (7) PPS 3: Housing (2006)
- (8) PPS 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009)
- (9) Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment
- (10) PPS 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)
- (11) PPG 13: Transport (2001)
- (12) PPS 22: Renewable Energy (2004)
- (13) Planning for Renewable Energy – A Companion Guide to PPS 22 (2004)
- (14) PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004)
- (15) PPG 24: Planning and Noise (1994)
- (16) PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk (2006)
- (17) Delivering Affordable Housing – Good Practice and Guidance (2006)
- (18) The Code for Sustainable Homes – Setting the Standard in Sustainability for New Homes (2008)
- (19) Planning and Access for Disabled People – A Good Practice Guide (2003)
- (20) Circular 05/2005 – Planning Obligations
- (21) Mayor of London's Housing Strategy (2009)
- (22) Mayor of London's Biodiversity Strategy (2002)
- (23) Mayor of London's Energy Strategy (2004)
- (24) Mayor of London's Housing SPG (2005)
- (25) Mayor of London's Sustainable Design

- and Construction SPG (2006)
- (26) Mayor of London's Accessible London SPG (2004)
 - (27) Mayor of London's Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2008)
 - (28) Mayor of London's Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG (2007)
 - (29) Living Roofs and Walls – Technical Report Supporting London Plan Policy (2008)
 - (30) Mayor of London's The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition BPG (2006)
 - (31) Mayor of London's Wheelchair Accessible Housing BPG (2007)
 - (32) Interim London Housing Design Guide (August 2010)
 - (33) LB Lewisham Residential Development Standards SPD (2006)
 - (34) Lewisham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007, draft published 2008)
 - (35) Lewisham Leisure and Open Space Study (draft 2009)
 - (36) By Design – Urban Design in the Planning System: Towards Better Practice (2000)
 - (37) Urban Design Compendium (2000, 2007)
 - (38) South East London Housing Partnership's Wheelchair Homes Design Guidelines (2008)
 - (39) Homes and Communities Agency's Investment and Planning Obligations – Responding to the Downturn Good Practice Note (2009)
 - (40) Homes for our old age CAGE publication (2009)
 - (41) Local meeting notes (December 2009)
 - (42) Funding Options letter dated 15th March 2010
 - (43) Stock condition survey 2004 by Savills (apex)
 - (44) Cost of repair report (Adams report 2005)
 - (45) Decant Strategy)

Zoning

UDP – Housing/Existing Use, PTAL 1a
 PTAL 1b, Local Open Space, Affecting the setting of Listed Building

1.0 Background

- 1.1 There is a long history of interaction with residents of Excalibur around achieving decent homes on the Excalibur Estate. A short summary of this work since L&Q's selection as the preferred partner is outlined below:

- 1.2 April 2007 – L&Q recommended by residents as preferred Registered Social Landlord (hereinafter referred to as RSL) partner for redevelopment through stock transfer and appointment by Mayor and Cabinet (hereinafter referred to as M&C).
- 1.3 March 2009 – DCMS (Department of Communities and Local Government) listed six properties (nos 1-7 (odd), no 25 and no 39 Persant Road at Grade II. They were considered to be of special architectural or historic interest as a result of being the amongst the least altered prefabs on what is the largest post-war prefab estate in England their and because of their innovative prefabricated design and construction.
- 1.4 April 2009 – February 2010 - scheme redesigned in order to accommodate listed properties and economic downturn, funding sought to make revised scheme deliverable.
- 1.5 February 2010 – HCA (Homes and Communities Agency) confirm that funding could not be made available to a stock transfer, only a regeneration scheme. Residents are consulted, results of which are fed back in a report to Mayor and Cabinet.
- 1.6 March 2010 – Mayor and Cabinet decide that residents should be offered the unprecedented option of a ballot on the regeneration proposals. Officers are instructed to prepare for a ballot, and to explain to residents the impact of a yes and no vote.
- 1.7 In July 2010 Lewisham Council, through the independent Electoral Reform Services Ltd, conducted a confidential ballot of residents. The ballot was offered to resident tenants and freeholders whose primary homes would be demolished. In total, 224 ballot papers were sent out.
- 1.8 After being shown proposals of the redevelopment of the Excalibur Estate, residents eligible to vote were asked 'Are you in favour of the regeneration of the Excalibur estate as proposed by L&Q?' Residents were given two options to answer. Out of the 224 possible votes, 203 (90.6%) were returned. A total of 56.2% of residents supported the re-development of the Excalibur estate as proposed by L&Q. Even if the 21 who did not vote, had voted 'No', there still would have been more residents that wanted the re-development to go ahead. Following the results of this ballot, it was clear that the majority of residents support the regeneration proposals and not the retention of the current prefabs.
- 1.9 In September 2010, Mayor and Cabinet agree to progress the redevelopment of the Excalibur Estate.
- 1.10 November 2010, the Authority was required to carry out statutory Section 105 consultation with secure tenants affected by proposals. At the closing of the consultation period a total of 38 responses had been received from secure tenants, which represented a 21% response rate. 23 of the responses were classified as opposed to the development while 4 were in favour and 11 were neutral.
- 1.11 Apart from the current planning application, Housing Officers and L&Q have carried out extensive consultation with estate residents over many years. This has included meetings, development of a resident steering group, exhibitions, a

regeneration forum and other subject specific sub groups, involvement of an independent tenant advisor and the ballot.

- 1.12 The Council's Housing Officers continue to communicate regularly with residents about the regeneration and how the scheme is progressing. There was consultation and information sharing with regards to the detailed plans being submitted in the planning application which now forms the subject of this report.

2.0 The Purpose of this report

- 2.1 An application dated 17th November 2010 was submitted to the Planning Department in the form of a hybrid (part detailed, part outline) planning proposal made by BPTW Partnership on behalf of London & Quadrant for the redevelopment of the Excalibur Estate. The proposed development comprises a total of 371 residential units, in buildings ranging from one to three storeys in height, together with car and cycle parking, associated highway infrastructure and public realm works.
- 2.2 This report considers the proposals in the light of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received and other material considerations, and makes recommendations on the determination of the application.

3.0 Site and Surrounds

- 3.1 This section describes the site and surrounding area, and outlines relevant planning history.

The application site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.2 The Excalibur Estate is 6.17 hectares in size and is bounded by Hazelbank Road to the north, and within the Downham Estate which encircles the remainder of the site; Battersby Road to the west, Boundfield Road to the south and Baudwin Road to the east, all of which are residential roads, apart from Baudwin Road which comprises the Excalibur Tenant Management Office (TMO), St. Marks Church and Church hall.. Within the Estate there are seven roads being Wentland Road, Wentland Close, Meliot Road, Pelinore Road, Persant Road, Ector Road, Baudwin Road and Mordred Road. Within the matrix of roads are pedestrian pathways leading to the properties that do not front any of the roads.
- 3.3 To the north of the application site is the Corbett Housing development built by Archibald Corbett in the late 19th century that has a rigid grid layout, with the majority of the roads branching northwards from the spine of Hazelbank Road. The properties within this grid are two storey houses with pitched roofs, bay windows and, generously apportioned front and rear gardens, which further confirm the systematic road layouts.
- 3.4 Encircling the sides and lower borders of the Excalibur estate, the Downham estate comprises a mixture of two storey houses with front and rear gardens and 3 storey blocks of flats. The relevant, northern half of the Downham estate does not benefit from any particular structured road layout, but given the minimum two storey heights of buildings, the distinction between the dwellings in the Downham and Corbett estates and the Excalibur Estate is visually apparent.

- 3.5 Contrary to the surrounding property styles, the Excalibur Estate does not have the structure of the surrounding roads and instead comprises irregularly angled road with a series of pathways penetrating the relatively tightly packed single storey houses therein. It is the single storey heights of the properties, and the informal road layout and unique access to the properties, which all provide the visual incongruousness of the estate in the context of the surrounding roads, and properties.
- 3.6 The Excalibur Estate originally comprised 187 single storey bungalows, but one has since been demolished, leaving 186 of which, 151 are owned by Lewisham Council and the remaining 27 are privately owned. Six dwellings to the south of the site have recently been Grade II Listed and do not form the application site boundary. All of the dwellings and St Mark's Church, Baudwin Road, were built between 1945 and 1946 on land formerly intended as an open space for the adjacent Downham Estate. A more detailed description of the Excalibur Estate is provided in the Character Appraisal below.
- 3.7 The Excalibur Estate has a density of 35 houses per hectare; the Downham estate houses have a density of 42 dwellings per hectare, whilst the flats have a density of 63 dwellings per hectare and; the Corbett Victorian terraces have a density of 42 houses per hectare.

Surrounding Amenities and Infrastructure

- 3.8 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature. However, to the north, Torridon Road comprises a small parade of shops, which is approximately a 10-15 minute walk away. To the south east of the site, at the junction of Castillon Road and Boundfield Road there is a further parade of shops, approximately 5 minutes walk away from the estate. To the east, Verdant Lane also has a further choice of local shops. To the southeast corner of the estate, the Goldsmiths Community Centre, which fronts Castillon Road is a 5 minute walk away from the farthest part of the estate and one minute from the closest. To the south western corner of the site is the special needs mother and baby unit/nursery, which fronts Meliot Road. St. Marks Church forms part of the estate and is located on Baudwin Road, one of the parameter roads of the estate. Catford Town Centre is to the far north west of the site and to the far southeast lies Grove Park Town Centre.
- 3.9 The closest Classified road to the site is Hazelbank Road which is a relatively trafficked road connecting parts of the Corbett, Downham and Excalibur Estates with Grove Park and Catford and beyond. The 124 Bus runs through the eastern side of the Excalibur estate, providing direct a public transport route to the local town centres and transport hubs. Hither Green Railway station to the north east of the Excalibur estate is approximately 20-30 minutes walk, whilst Grove Park Railway station is almost equidistant in a south eastern direction.
- 3.10 There are limited bus services locally and there are no railway stations within the immediate vicinity of the site and due to this, the site has a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1-1b, where 1 is poor and 6 is excellent.
- 3.11 With regard to Lewisham UDP designations, the area around and including the application site is located in an area of Local Open Space Deficiency. The site is not within a Conservation Area, although there are 6 Listed buildings, which have been excluded from the application site but do form an integral part of the

Excalibur Estate. The Grade II Listed Buildings are grouped in a row of 2 and a row of four, both groups being located on Persant Road, to the south of the site.

Excalibur Estate Character Assessment

- 3.12 In response to objections received to the estate's redevelopment and requests to designate it as a conservation area, the following character assessment of the estate has been prepared. However, whilst the current application has to be considered in line with current land designations, which does not provide any protection to the estate in policy terms, the character of the estate is unique. Therefore, the historic importance of the site will form a material planning consideration.
- 3.13 The Excalibur Estate is a predominantly social housing estate to the south east of the London Borough of Lewisham adjacent to the Downham Estate. It comprises of 186 (one has been demolished), single storey prefabricated buildings laid out in a grid formation and a prefabricated church.

History of the estate

- 3.14 The estate was built between 1945 and 1946 on land originally designated as amenity space for the adjacent Downham Estate (1923). Prefabricated buildings were an ingenious and popular solution to the housing shortage that followed WWII. The Excalibur Estate was one of many estates built around the country to provide temporary accommodation. There were 11 designs approved by the Ministry of Works and Excalibur is comprised of 84 Uni-Seco Mark 2 and 104 Uni-Seco Mark 3 modules. Uni-seco prefabs were built by Selection Engineering Company Ltd and were mainly erected in London and the South East. In total around 29,000 units were erected. The prefabs were assembled on site with the kitchens and bathrooms arriving ready assembled. It is believed that the assembly works were carried out by German and Polish prisoners of war.
- 3.15 Although prefabricated they offered a high standard of accommodation for residents of post-war London. It was common for families to share houses with other families or for extended families to live together in this period of housing shortage. The prefabs offered a private detached home with an indoor toilet, plumbed bathroom and kitchen and a garden.
- 3.16 The name Excalibur comes from the road names on the Downham Estate which follows the theme of the Knights of the Round Table. The roads on the estate are named Baudwin, Pelinore, Mordred, Ector, Wentland, Meliot and Persant.
- 3.17 In the 1970s the GLC proposed the demolition of the estate and it was again considered in the 1980s. In 2006, English Heritage recommended 24 prefabs to be added to the statutory list with the Secretary of State selecting 6 of the best preserved examples. These six prefabs are not the only example of listed prefabs. In 1998 sixteen prefabs of the Phoenix design made by Laing achieved Grade II listed status in Birmingham and there are two listed prefabricated houses in Auckley, Doncaster.

Buildings

- 3.18 The residential units on the Excalibur Estate comprise of the Uni-Seco Mark 2 and Mark 3 with the external difference being the location of the front door; Mark 2

have recessed entrances to the side and the Mark 3 have flush central entrances. Each type had two bedrooms with a living room, kitchen and bathroom. Both types have a resin-bonded plywood frame with asbestos sheet walls with wood wool core. The windows are clear glazed with timber-frames and metal casements. In plan form they are rectangular, including the recessed porch of the Mark 2, and appear to be flat roofed although the roof is slightly pitched.

- 3.19 The prefabs have a moderne aesthetic which is unusual in social housing of this era and in this area. The nearby Downham and Bellingham estates are brick built in a solid vernacular style with neo-Georgian detailing. Excalibur's flat roofs, simple plan form and double aspect corner windows have the architectural simplicity of modernist design along with the movement's functional ethos.
- 3.20 The prefabs have been altered in the last 60 years with the loss of many of the original windows and all of the front doors. The simple plan form now includes extensions and porches. In some cases the prefabs have been re-clad, in brick in one case. A few have been painted in distinctive colours.
- 3.21 Many of the prefabs are in a poor state of repair with some showing sign of dampness externally and worn materials. There are examples of external wall cladding in Rockwool. There have been two assessments on the condition of the prefabs that have been carried out as part of re-development proposals. Visible deterioration includes windows, doors and roof materials. It has been suggested that hidden structural issues could be underlying because of the life cycle of the construction materials.
- 3.22 The other buildings on the site are the Excalibur Tenant Management Organisation offices and St Mark's Church and church hall. The church is also a prefab and has a distinctive curved roof.

Street scene

- 3.23 The estate has been laid out in a grid pattern with each prefab being detached and in an individual plot. Many of the bungalows do not have vehicular access and a series of straight pathways dissect the site and connect the properties to the road. This means some remain hidden from the roads which is unusual in a suburban setting and contributes towards a rural atmosphere. The perimeter buildings all face into the site.
- 3.24 The properties were built with low level boundary treatments of wire fencing and low level timber gates. Many of the properties have retained either the original fencing and gates or have replaced it with other materials but keeping the same scale. The scale and transparency of the boundary treatments contribute towards the character of the estate as they allow open views into and across the gardens and onto the prefabs. A number of properties have put up full height larch lapping fencing panels, which have enclosed the space and negatively changed the relationship between the prefab (now hidden) and the rest of the estate.
- 3.25 The low massing of these properties results in an expanse of sky which is normally restricted within a suburban street setting. There are few trees on this site to interrupt this. Again this open vista is contrary to the surrounding residential streets.

Nature of the site

- 3.26 Excalibur's character is defined by the openness of the site derived from the low-level buildings, layout and low density. This gives the open feeling to the site that has been likened to 'a country village'. The distinctive grid layout and repetitive plot style gives a sense of familiarity to the site. There is nothing unexpected in the streetscape and it is very simple. The open nature of the site affords limited privacy with the entire external space to most of the properties being visible from, and in close proximity to, pathways and neighbouring bungalows. The large fence panels erected to some properties have increased privacy but eroded character.
- 3.27 The functional and temporary nature of these buildings has introduced a unusual palette of building materials into this suburban area. Unfortunately, the short-term nature of these materials has seen the necessity for wide spread alterations to the original prefab structure. These changes do affect the value of the historic fabric as recognised by the Secretary of State who decided to list only six of the proposed twenty-four. This decision values the historic fabric over the overall character of this prefabricated estate.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1 There are very few entries for developments to the residential bungalows, however owner-occupiers within Ector Road and Meliot Roads have applied to demolish and re-build their pre-fabricated houses. The permission granted in 2002 for Ector Road, was for a straight forward re-build and has since expired, whilst the Meliot Road permission, which would result in a three bed roomed bungalow was renewed in 2008 which is set to expire in October 2011 if works have not commenced before then. The occupier of the Meliot Road prefab has however, submitted a renewal application (received in January, but validated 18 February 2011) which, at the writing of this report remains undetermined by the Council. This application is due to be determined 15 April 2011.
- 4.2 A screening opinion was sought in June 2009 that resulted in the Council determining that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would not be required for the re-development of the Excalibur Estate for higher density housing.
- 4.3 The current application for planning permission was received on 18th November 2010. A further Screening Opinion was also submitted with the application dated the same. The Council determined on 14 December 2011 that an EIA was again not required as it was the local planning authority's view is that the impact of the proposed development would only be of local importance. It was further concluded that, as a matter of planning judgment, the proposed development is not likely to have significant environmental effects and an EIA is not, therefore, required.

5.0 Present Application

Format of Present Application

- 5.1 The application is a hybrid of detailed and outline submissions.
- 5.2 The scheme is split into two parts; crudely split into north and south; north being the detailed phase one of the application and the south being phase 2 forming the

outline element of the application. Approximately 40% of the total development is in the first phase.

- 5.3 There are five matters with an outline application that can be considered, which are scale (how big the buildings are to be), Layout (where the buildings and other attributes of the scheme will be located), appearance (what the buildings would look like), access (how the site and buildings therein are to be accessed) and landscaping. The application in its original form sought approval for Scale and massing, Layout, access and the location of landscaping. Only the external design and the internal layout of the buildings were to be considered at the reserved matters stage.
- 5.4 However, as a result of negotiations with the applicant, as requested in letter from the applicant dated 22nd February 2011, and as per the revised drawing APL004 Rev F received 7th April 2011, the scheme has now been revised and the applicant has asked for the consideration of scale and mass to be withdrawn from the outline element of the application and for it to be considered at the reserved matters stage. This revision to the application results in officers no longer considering the absolute heights of the buildings within the southern Phase two of the proposal, but to consider maximum and minimum height parameters, where they are to be located and means of access. Landscaping and actual scale and massing (heights) are now to be considered at reserved matters stage if members and the GLA are mindful to grant planning permission.

Development Proposal

- 5.5 The applicants propose the redevelopment of the site to provide a mixture of flats and houses, ranging from single to three storey buildings. The scheme proposes 371 new dwellings (184 habitable rooms per hectare), double the current density, derived by a detailed submission (Phase 1) for 152 residential units, and outline planning permission (Phase 2) for 219 residential units, together with 296 car parking spaces, of which 38 would be disabled parking bays, 371 cycle spaces, associated highway infrastructure, soft and hard landscaping including the provision of open spaces.
- 5.6 As the scheme has been revised to withdraw the consideration of scale and massing (height), the revised drawings show indicative heights only.

Detailed Element: Phase one

- 5.7 Phase one would necessitate the demolition of 81 of the existing dwellings to create the full mixture of bungalows, two storey houses and three storey blocks of flats creating a total of 152 new residential units. A full breakdown of the development is provided below. One hundred and fourteen parking spaces are proposed for this phase of the development (as shown in drawing number APL004 Rev F) and 152 cycle spaces are proposed to accommodate all of the units. A public open space is also proposed to the north western corner of the site juxtaposed between the Baudwin Road entrance from Hazelbank Road and the proposed spine Road which is to run horizontally through the centre of the site separating the two phases.

Block 1, fronting Baudwin Road.

- 5.8 Block one is the first block fronting Baudwin Road when entered from Hazelbank Road. Located on the western side of the road, west of the proposed public open space, this block comprises five, 2 bed roomed terraced bungalows (single storey). Each of the bungalows have their own disabled bays to the front and direct access to private rear gardens of 8-9m in depth.
- 5.9 The design is simplistic with shallow pitched roofs and small front gardens. No windows are proposed in the northern flank facing the rear of properties 109-111 Hazelbank Road; outlook from the terrace would be westerly facing into Baudwin Road or easterly into their own rear gardens and the new blocks beyond.
- 5.10 Elevations of the bungalows would be finished in brickwork with white rendered gable features to their frontages and feature porches.
- 5.11 To the north of the terrace are two parking bays proposed for carers/visitors to the bungalows.

Block 2, fronting Baudwin Road

- 5.12 Comprising five bungalows, this block is a replica and continuation of Block 1 which leads to the spine road that separates the two phases of the application. This block is also set behind (west) of the proposed public open space, will share the same design, scale and massing attributes as Block 1.

Block 3

- 5.13 To the north of block 3, closest to the properties within Hazelbank Road are two storey terraced houses; the northernmost comprising 4 bedrooms with those within the centre of the terrace comprising two bed rooms. The rears of these properties back onto the gardens of the bungalows within Blocks 1 & 2 and front into the first of the vertical roads, which branch northwards, off the spine road. The height of southern end of the block increases to three storeys to front the spine road and comprises a mixture of one, two and three bedroom units. This block comprises a mixture of brick and rendered materials and would have porches to their fronts. Parking spaces allocated to the block are also located in front (west) of the block, whilst to the south of the block is soft landscaping separating the block from the public spaces within the spine road. The southernmost element of this block is proposed to have a green roof, whilst at green floor at the same end of the building bin and cycle storage are proposed.
- 5.14 The dwelling mix would comprise 9 x 2 bed houses, 1 x 3 bed house, 1 x 4 bed house, 6 x 2 bed flats and 3 x 1 bed flats.

Blocks 4, 5 8 & 9

- 5.15 These blocks are considered together as they collectively form the group of buildings located to the centre, north of the application site. Starting from Block 4, this detached building is single storey in height, fronting southwards back into the first new road within the site, and backs onto the properties within Hazelbank Road. Comprising a pair of semi-detached bungalows, this building also contains a two bed wheelchair unit and benefits from two disabled parking bays to the front. The attached pair is three bedrooms. The design of this building is similar to

the bungalows in Block 1 in having brickwork and white render materials, shallow pitched roofs and gable walls to the front. Both properties have shallow, north facing gardens which separate them from the gardens of the properties fronting Hazelbank Road.

- 5.16 Block 9 is a replica of Block 4, but faces south-south east and benefits from slightly more generous gardens.
- 5.17 Collectively comprising six units, Blocks 5 & 8 are also duplicate buildings reflecting, but facing away from each other. Block 5 faces easterly onto Block 4, whilst Block 8 faces westerly onto block 9. Both these blocks form a terrace of three properties each comprising a four, three and two bed roomed house which have first floor balconies to the front except for the four bed units. Measuring two storeys in height, the northern flanks of both blocks face the rear of the properties, which front Hazelbank Road, whilst their southern flanks face back into a newly created internal road. Again with shallow pitched roofs, these properties would comprise brick and rendered materials and have shallow gardens.

Block 6 & 7

- 5.18 To follow suit with Block 3, Blocks 6 & 7 are two storey at the northern end and in the majority, and three storey at the southern end fronting the spine road. Located directly south of Blocks 5 & 8 and separated horizontally by a new road, blocks 6 & 7 also reflect each other, forming the centre of an upside down horseshoe shaped road. These two blocks each comprise one three bed house at the northern end, four two bed houses in the centre and three one bed and six two bed flats at the southern ends. Each of the houses would benefit from front and rear gardens. Backing onto each other there is a 23m distance between the two blocks separated by their private gardens whilst the flats at the southernmost ends of the blocks benefit from two respective communal gardens. The flats also benefit from landscaping which separates the block from the amenity space within the spine road. A green roof is proposed at the southern ends of the two blocks. The western fascia of Block 7 and the Eastern fascia of Block 6 would comprise bin and cycle storage for the flats.
- 5.19 Each comprising fourteen units, broken down for both blocks, the dwelling mix would be 4 x 2 bed houses, 1 x 3 bed house, 6 x 2 bed flats and 3 x 1 bed flats. The latter composition and layout of units is mirrored between the two blocks.

Block 10

- 5.20 This block would comprise 6 x 2 bed houses, 1 x 3 bed house, 6 x 2 bed flats and 3 x 1 bed flats. Running vertically, parallel to Blocks 1-3 and 6 & 7, Block 10 follows the format of being two storeys in height at the northern end closest to the Hazelbank Road properties and three storeys at the southern end fronting the spine road. This block however creates a slightly staggered terrace of houses, to accommodate a 3 three bed room house juxtaposed between three, 2 bed houses either side. The properties face westwards onto Block 7 with east facing rear gardens. Again all houses have front and rear gardens, whilst the flats benefit from a communal garden. The upper floor flats also benefit from balconies and again the southern end of the block would comprise a green roof and photovoltaic panels. The bin and cycle stores for the flats are at the southern end, fronting the spine road.

Block 11

- 5.21 This block is contrary to the loose uniform of the other parallel blocks to the west in that it has three storey elements to the north and south. The northern end at its closest point is 27m south of the houses within Hazelbank Road, separated mainly by depth of the existing gardens, but also by a proposed green buffer and 4-10m deep gardens. To the west and east of the northern element are the higher three storey parts of the building, whilst in between is a two storey house. The northern side of this block will comprise balconies facing northwards. Travelling southwards within Block 11, the heights again fall to two storey, backing onto Block 10, whilst, back to the typical pattern of development, the height again rises to three storeys at the southern end of the building upon approach to the spine road.
- 5.22 Comprising thirty units, proposed are 4 x 2 bed houses, 1 x 4 bed houses, 16 x 2 bed flats, 9 x 1 bed flats and 1 x 3 bed flat. This building again would comprise gabled walls and shallow pitched roofs, with balconies looking onto the spine road, a green roof at both the southern and northern ends of the building, and bin and cycle stores fronting the spine road.

Block 12

- 5.23 Being the lowest of all of the blocks within the north western corner of the site, these single storey buildings, formed from a semi-detached pair and a detached property, will accommodate three, two bed roomed wheelchair units. Using the same brick and rendered materials as the previous blocks, the properties will have projecting flat roof features to the front, with shallow pitched roofs behind. Being in excess of 27m from the properties within Hazelbank Road, the group of buildings would be the most inconspicuous when viewed from the surrounding existing properties. All units within the two blocks have their own shallow, north facing gardens. Green roofs are proposed on the buildings.

Block 13

- 5.24 Block 13 comprises a row of 6, 2 storey terraced houses, comprising four, two beds and two, three bed wheelchair units at either end of the terrace. Having their frontages facing back into the site, the rear of the houses back onto the rear gardens of the existing properties within Wentland Road. However, to minimise overlooking, views from the rear elevations have been angled in a northerly direction, away from the immediate rear gardens of the Wentland dwellings. In design terms, this block confirms the final transition from shallow pitched roofs to flat ones and the use of more render on the facades rather than brickwork delineating the four differing designs in building types within the scheme, even though the internal layouts of the properties are almost identical with regard to dwelling types. Only the properties at the ends of the terraces benefit from first floor balconies, but all of the properties have front and rear gardens.

Block 14

- 5.25 This Block comprises twenty, two bed roomed over 55's units and is three storeys in height. It is located entirely within the site and forms the centre building in the smaller upside down horse shape, similar to the positioning of Blocks 6 & 7. This building again provides a different design identity in that the white rendered elements of the building would comprise varying bright and contrasting colours.

This Block would have a centrally located ground floor communal area for all residents to share, whilst all of the flats therein are self-contained. Upper floor balconies are proposed to the front and rear (south and north respectively) and at the eastern and western corners of the block, but none with the flanks of the building. The majority of the units are dual aspect with outlook into the site, or from the upper levels, to the rears of the properties within Hazelbank Road in the distance. A substantial amount of the flat roof of this building would comprise a green sedum roof covering, whilst photovoltaic panels are also proposed.

Block 15

- 5.26 Contrary to the logical numbering of the Blocks, Block 15 is proposed to be located at the junction of Baudwin and Castillon Roads, which is the westernmost corner of the site, set behind (east of) the two storey houses fronting Castillon Road and north of the tennis courts forming part of Goldsmiths Community Centre. The dwellings would have their entrances onto Baudwin Road, with views towards the Phase 2 area of the site. Forming the new corner of the road junction, Block 15 would comprise a terrace of 8 two storey houses, running southwards, derived from one three bed, one four bed and 6, 2 bed houses, all with shallow front and rear gardens. The units would also benefit from first floor balconies to the front of the properties. This block doesn't have a green roof or solar panels.

Residential accommodation

- 5.27 Of the 152 units proposed within Phase one, 102 of the units would be affordable. The tenure mix and their dwellings sizes are summarised in the table below.

Table 1: Phase 1 Dwelling size and tenure mix

Type	General Needs rented	Equity Ownership	Shared Ownership	Sale	Grand total
2B Bungalow	15	0	0	0	15
3B Bungalow	2	0	0	0	2
2B House	23	9	0	7	39
3B House	7	0	0	0	7
3B Wheelchair House	2	0	0	0	2
4B House	4	1	0	0	5
over 55's 2B apartments	20	0	0	0	20

1B Flats	0	0	6	15	21
2B Flats	0	0	10	30	40
3B Flats	0	0	1	0	1
Totals	73	10	17	52	152

5.28 In terms of portions, of the hundred and fifty-two units proposed within this Phase, 100 of those units would be affordable.

5.29 Nineteen wheelchair adaptable units would be provided in Phase one and built to be capable of adaption for full wheelchair use to the South East London Housing Partnership (SELHP) standards. The wheelchair units would be derived from all 15, 2 bed roomed bungalows fronting Baudwin Road and the additional two, three bed bungalows to the north of the application site. A further two, three bed houses would also be wheelchair units.

Outline proposal: Phase Two

5.30 For the part of the proposed development for which outline permission is sought, this relates to the southern side of the scheme. The applicants are seeking approval of permission for 219 residential units.

5.31 The applicant has provided drawings similar to those provided for the detailed element of the application, but without the internal layouts of the dwellings nor with the external appearances of the buildings.

Siting

5.32 The blocks are larger but still follow the principle of leading from a 'secondary' spine road with new roads emanating northwards from it, resulting in three large blocks (20, 21 & 23) being juxtaposed between the spine road in phase one and the secondary spine road to the south of the site in phase two;

Block 16 & 17

5.33 Located at the western side of the application site, the gardens of this block are to back onto the gardens of those fronting Battersby Road, with a minimum separation distance of 13m. This block is to have a minimum height of two storeys and a maximum height of three storeys.

Blocks 18 & 22

5.34 These blocks line the southern boundary of the site. Block 18 provides a footprint which suggests a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The indicative drawings state that they would be no more than single storey in height, adjacent to the common boundary with 9-15 Boundfield Road to the southernmost, south western corner of the application site. The indicative drawings suggest that these properties would be single storey in height. Block 22, is to be located in the centre of the southern

boundary and would be north of 29-61 Boundfield Road, separated from their rear gardens boundary by at least 9m deep gardens.

Block 19

- 5.35 This Block would be located west of the two, stand alone Listed prefabs (25 & 39 Persant road) which are to remain. The height parameters set for this block is also single storey.

Blocks 20, 20a 21, 21a, 23, 23a, 24 & 25

- 5.36 These blocks are located within the centre of the site, and the height parameters set for the blocks range from 1-3 storeys. Forming a collection of three loose circles, the properties would face onto newly created roads, with garden areas backing onto each other.
- 5.37 It is specifically due to blocks 20 and 21 that are north, north-west of the western Listed Buildings why the scale of the outline element was withdrawn as a consideration. As with phase one, the indicative drawings for phase two initially suggested three storey heights adjacent to the secondary, or southern spine road within this phase. As part of the consultation process, the heights of the southern ends of the blocks were considered inappropriate to the setting of the Listed Buildings to the South. To that effect, the southern ends of those blocks were re-named with 'a.' Therefore whilst the indicative heights suggest that these blocks would be three stories to the south of these blocks; this will not be the case. The reduction in the maximum height from three storeys to two is confirmed in the applicants letter dated 22nd February 2011 and revised drawing APL004 Rev F which sets out a maximum height parameter of two storeys for blocks 20a, 21a and 23a. However, as layout is a consideration, the locations of the buildings remains as per the drawings indicate.

Table 2: Phase 2 Dwelling size and tenure mix

	Type	GN Rent	Equity Ownership	Shared Ownership	Sale	Grand Total
Phase 2	2B Bungalow	13	0	0	0	13
	3B Bungalow	0	0	0	0	0
	2B House	45	5	0	10	60
	3B House	22	0	0	0	22
	3B Wheelchair House	0	0	0	0	0
	4B House	10	0	0	0	10
	over 55's 2B apartments	0	0	0	0	0
	1B Flats	3	0	4	13	20
	2B Flats	12	0	14	68	94
Phase 2 Total		105	5	18	91	219

Access to the entire application site

- 5.38 The existing pedestrian access from Boundfield Road, between houses 27 & 29 Boundfield Road will remain and is included within the application site boundary and therefore will be enhanced as part of the redevelopment of the estate.
- 5.39 Vehicular access within Phase two is derived from the southern, secondary spine road linking at its northern junctions to the spine road proposed in phase one. The phase one spine road then forms junctions with Castillon Road and Baudwin Road to the east of the site, and Wentland Road to the west.

Table 3: Overall (Phases one & Two) dwelling mix and net increase

Unit Size	Total in units	Net increase
One beds	41	41
Two beds	281	103
Three beds	34	34
Four beds	15	15
Total units	371	193

- 5.40 Tenures would be spread around the site, with each home zone accommodating a mixture of dwelling sizes and tenures.
- 5.41 To conclude, the heights and internal layouts of buildings, elevation detailing, and the precise locations of trees and play equipment, are to be reserved for submission under future reserved matters applications. Detailed environmental information, including a daylight and sunlight study, has also been submitted to support the number of residential units, (indicative) heights and densities proposed in Phase 2.

Open Space, Play space and Landscaping

- 5.42 The main landscaped feature and area of open space is to be provided in the western corner of Phase One running parallel to the Bungalows in Blocks one and two measuring 1047m² which also includes small pockets of play space dispersed around the entire application site. At present, the plans show that the treatment of this space to be limited to just soft landscaping with the applicants requesting flexibility about any features for this open space such as play equipment and/or benches and landscaping. This would be secured by way of condition.
- 5.43 The focal visual amenity open space is the central spine road running across the application site. This road, whilst for vehicles and pedestrians is hard and soft landscaped to encourage usage for transition to and from the west and east of the

site, whilst the surrounding buildings have been located as to ensure a clear view from one end of the spine road to the other.

- 5.44 Doorstep play, which is defined by the for children is also provided within the scheme. Both phases provide a cumulative 1479m² of child play space provided in the form of door step play (432m²) which are formed by small individual designated play areas to the fronts of the properties. Many of these would line sections of the new streets within the development, which would be set out as Home Zones involving shared surfaces and street trees. Separate pedestrian footpaths and low hedges are proposed in many locations.
- 5.45 All of the proposed bungalows and houses benefit from their own private gardens, whilst the flats have access to either a communal garden or a balcony.

Biodiversity

- 5.46 Sedum roofs (referred to as “green roofs” within this document), which would not be accessible to residents, would be provided on many of the blocks.

Parking, Traffic Movement and Highways Works

- 5.47 Two hundred and ninety-six car parking spaces (all on street, in designated bays) are proposed, representing a provision of 80% parking ratio of the 371 dwellings. Thirty, of the 296 would be bays for disabled users.
- 5.48 One secure cycle parking space per dwelling, plus visitor cycling parking, is also proposed for all of the new dwelling within the scheme.
- 5.49 Vehicular access to the site would remain to be from Baudwin Road, with access through the spine road leading to Wentland Road at the western edge of the site. A existing bus stops on Baudwin would be slightly relocated to a newly created ingresses on either side of the road.

Servicing and Refuse

- 5.50 Deliveries and refuse collection would take place within the site, via the new streets proposed as part of the development. Refuse would be collected from designated collection points, managed by the applicant to ensure that the communal Euro bins within the blocks are brought to the collection points and returned on a systematic basis.

6.0 Consultation & Replies

- 6.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application, and summarises the consultation responses. The applicant had previously held consultation exercises as set out in the ‘Background’ section of this report.

Consultation Process

- 6.2 The Council consulted as per the requirements of the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement. As part of the planning process, 510 local residents were consulted on 29 November 2010 as well as local ward councillors. Notices were also displayed on site and in the local press. More than ten written

objections were received (19 in total). As a result, a local meeting was held at St. Marks Church hall, Baudwin Road. Twenty-seven people attended the meeting, including representatives from the applicant and a local ward councillor who chaired the meeting.

- 6.3 Copies of all drawings, reports and other submission documents were published on the Council's website with revisions updated as they were received.

Statutory Agencies and Organisations and internal consultees

- 6.4 The following statutory agencies and organisations were consulted:-

Transport for London
The London Cycling Network
Lewisham's Crime Prevention Unit
The Environment Agency
The Council's Parks Manager
Greater London Authority
The Local emergency services
Thames Water
English Heritage – Archaeology
English Heritage – Historic Buildings

- 6.5 The following internal Council Departments were consulted:-

The Council's Education Department
The Council's Housing Officer
The Council's Occupational Therapists
The Council's Sustainability Officer
The Council's Environmental Health team
The Council's Highways team
The Council's Primary Care Trust
The Council's Cycle Officer
The Council's relevant Town Centre Managers

- 6.6 The scheme has also been laid before the Council's Design Panel during pre-application stage when considering the proposal at the master planning conceptual phase, and during the course of this application.

Consultation Responses

- 6.7 Written comments were received from a total of twenty addresses of local residents in response to the consultation. Sixteen of the letters were objections from residents of 171 Hazelbank Road, 13 Longhill Road, 14 Merliot Road, 5 & 7 Pelinore Road, 6, 20, 27, 31, 43 & 47 Persant Road, 307 Torridon Road and 18 Wentland Road, one was from a resident of 14 Wentland Road commenting on the application and three were from residents of 18 Baudwin Road, 149 Hazelbank Road and 6 Pelinore Road in favour of the application. Their comments are summarised below:-

Objections to the proposal

- Prefab, area & St Marks Church unique & perfect for needs, feel safe
- Council failure to carry out assessment as conservation area

- 93% of residents sent individual letters to Head of Planning requesting Conservation Area status which were ignored
- Estate has high historic national importance as said by English Heritage, SAVE and the 21st Century Society
- Our duty to protect these buildings
- Do not destroy history in the name of housing and profit
- Health problems make prefab good for living
- Prefabs more affordable than new development
- Little wrong with current prefab – good enough despite health problems of asthma & arthritis
- Not enough thought given to needs of residents
- Prefabs are stress free environment – good for health conditions
- Current housing type is not available in new development or in temporary move
- New development properties not suitable to many existing residents
- New homes too small for medical requirements
- Bungalows in new development will suffer from noise of adjacent play areas and family homes
- New development = pressure on overstretched local services
- Deterioration of current properties has been exaggerated – could be used to provide better care for elderly & disabled
- Changing the area would be contravening the rules applied to the listings
- Council should be protecting area
- The Forster Estate Archives indicate that the land not suitable for housing use – prefabs of a light construction will not cause subsidence
- Ancient wells on the land at the back of Downderry Road and covered over in 1961
- Increase in dwellings would lead to additional noise / children playing outside
- Overlooking from flats / loss of privacy
- Sun will be blocked
- Tall buildings in new development will devalue property, block views, cause overcrowding
- Hundreds of new homes will make area dangerous & increase crime

Comments neutral about the planning application

- 6.8 The writer requested that she is only moved once during the decanting and re-housing exercise to minimise disturbance as she was elderly.

Comments in favour of the planning proposal

- Seen the drawings and have no objection. (Writer then referred to ditch behind his property where rubbish is dumped).
- We re in full agreement of the redevelopment of the Excalibur estate and look forward to a successful outcome

(Individual letters and e-mails are available to Members)

Local Meeting

- 6.9 Due to the level of response, in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement a local meeting was held on 13th January 2011. All those who had made representations were invited to the meeting, as were ward Councillors. The meeting was chaired by Councillor Janet Daby (Labour). The public meeting was attended by twenty-seven people, 11 of which were neighbours from within the Excalibur estate and from surrounding roads. The remaining attendees included representatives from the Council's Housing and Planning Department and the applicant and their agents and architects. Notes taken at the local meeting, including further comments submitted by attendees of the meeting are set out in Appendix 4.

Statutory Agencies and Organisations

Mayor of London GLA Stage 1 Report

- 6.10 The application is referable to the Mayor of London under Categories 1A ("development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats or houses and flats"), and 1C ("development which comprises or includes the erection of a building of one or more of the following descriptions – the building is more than 30 metres high and is outside the City of London") of the Schedule to The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.
- 6.11 The cover letter accompanying the reasons for the referral to the London Mayor quoting the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

Compliance with the London Plan policies

- 6.12 The letter states that in the first instance, the scheme does not comply with the London Plan (2008), but that possible remedies set out in the report could address the deficiencies.

Principle of development

- 6.13 To introduce the Stage 1 report, it is confirmed that the principle of renewing the estate is strongly supported and that it is in the interest of good strategic planning in London. However, Whilst it is also confirmed that the scheme is broadly consistent with London Plan policies, the proposal would benefit from some design alterations and that further information and discussion is also required in respect of access, child play space, energy and transport.
- 6.14 With regard to the principle of development, paragraph 20 of the report identifies the local support for the retention of the estate. However, the GLA supports Lewisham's justification for [estate] renewal.

Dwelling mix & density

- 6.15 Paragraph 19 of the report identifies the heavy provision of 2 bed units, but confirms the proposed mix in dwelling types is broadly acceptable.

- 6.16 The proposed density of 184 habitable rooms per hectare is within the London Plan contextual policy recommendation of 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare and therefore this element of the scheme is considered acceptable.

Master plan

- 6.17 The Stage one report again confirms that the proposed spine road goes some way to aiding the legibility of the site. However the linear park which runs parallel to the spine road could be stronger. The current proposal suggests more or a green buffer to the spine road, rather than a park; parts of the green space should be increased in size.
- 6.18 More information needs to be provided to demonstrate how the existing perimeter buildings outside the application would integrate with the proposal. Key to the success of the layout of the buildings however, is the northern orientated perimeter blocks.

Units

- 6.19 Some of the units could benefit from a more flexible internal layout. Whilst all of the upper floor units have access to a private balcony, the drawings do not provide details for the ground floor units or how the communal space at ground floor level is allocated.

Design

- 6.20 Of the five character areas as seen in the detailed, northern half of the application site, Character 5 needs further consideration regarding the broad approach. As this character area is intended to house the over 55's and therefore its appearance has to be distinguishable, this shouldn't be to the detriment of other urban design considerations.

Access

- 6.21 It is not clear how many of the parking spaces will be for blue badge holders. Further, the design & Access confirms that some of the units would not meet Lifetime Homes and therefore the scheme would not be policy compliant.

Child play space

- 6.22 Insufficient information has been provided and it is not possible to ascertain whether the proposal complies with policy. Details of the location, size and nature of the designated play spaces should be provided.

Climate change mitigation

- 6.23 The applicant should provide an estimate of the carbon savings. Information on district heat networks should also be provided.

English Heritage (Archaeology)

- 6.24 In the first instance, English Heritage required additional information to consider the development. The initial response identified features of the site such as whilst the application site is not within an Area of Archaeological Potential as defined by

borough policy, the site is over 0.4ha in area at 6.17ha, and therefore archaeology should be assessed, in line with PPS 5.

- 6.25 The subsequent report was received from Ms J Brown, Historic Environment Consultant for Purcell Miller Tritton LLP and dated 25 January 2011 in respect of the above site.
- 6.26 In response to this additional information, English Heritage does not raise any objections to the scheme, but requests that should the Council be mindful to grant planning permission, that a condition be placed on the decision notice pertaining to the implementation of an archaeological work programme.

English Heritage (Listed Buildings)

- 6.27 The consultation documents dealt only with the northern half of the estate and contained no information regarding developments in close proximity to the six listed prefabs.
- 6.28 The applicants should be encouraged to look at the distribution of the proposed new residential units and strive to reduce the three storey elements to the north of the two listed prefabs grouped in the south west corner of the estate.
- 6.29 The prefab's are modest buildings in terms of scale and there is concern about the visual over-dominance that these proposed three storey blocks might have in terms of the impact upon the setting of the listed buildings. Obviously, if there were some visual assessment included in the application documentation to demonstrate the impact that the proposed buildings would have upon the settings of the listed buildings, that would be extremely helpful.
- 6.30 As this information has not been submitted as part of the outline application it is not possible to make a reasonable assessment of the impact that the proposed development will have upon the settings of the listed buildings.

Environment Agency

- 6.31 The Environment Agency raise no objections to the proposals so long as the measures as set out in the applicants Flood Risk Assessment, produced by Scott Wilson, dated November 2010 are secured by way of planning conditions.
- 6.32 A request for a copy of the decision notice was also mentioned in the consultation reply.

Thames Water

- 6.33 Waste Comments - With the information provided Thames Water, has been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application ahead of further information being provided, we request that the following 'Grampian Style' condition be applied pertaining to drainage.
- 6.34 Surface Water Drainage - 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 Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water.

- 6.35 There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval must be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings.
- 6.36 Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.
- 6.37 Water Comments - 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.
- 6.38 Better advice can be given once the drainage strategy for the development has been issued and early contact with Thames Water Developer Services Department is recommended. The strategy should indicate the proposed discharge rates compared to those existing, together with the proposed alterations to the connection points to the public system and should be submitted as soon as possible.
- 6.39 Clean Water response:- In order that the development does not detrimentally effect the water supply infrastructure, conditions should be imposed.

Transport for London (TfL)

- 6.40 The context of the site was considered as the following by TfL; The site forms part of an estate renewal, and is located on borough roads approximately 1km from the A21 Bromley Road and the A205 South Circular Road, both of which form part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). The nearest railway stations are Grove Park and Bellingham, although as These are both located over a kilometre away, they are not considered to be within an acceptable walking distance of the site. The site is directly served by one bus route, with bus stops located at regular intervals throughout the estate. As such, it has been demonstrated that the site records a very poor Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1, on a scale of 1-6, where 6 is the highest.
- 6.41 Baring in mind TfL's assessment of the site, they consider that a ratio of 80% parking provision is appropriate for the scheme.

- 6.42 In terms of sustainability, TfL request that 20% of the car parking spaces are fitted with electronic vehicle charging points (EVCP), with an additional 20% of parking spaces having passive provision.
- 6.43 Whilst TfL also agree with the 100% cycle space provision proposed for the scheme, it is recommended that a minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling are provided for the 3+ bed units within the scheme.
- 6.44 Given the nature and distance of the site from the TfL road network, TfL is satisfied that the development is unlikely to negatively impact on the operation of the TLRN. Similarly, it is considered unlikely that the development would have a negative impact on the capacity of the local bus network, given that it is an estate renewal and that the number of new trips being generated will be limited. However, given that the scheme is to provide accommodation for disabled and older residents, TfL would like to see an audit of the bus stops within the estate to ensure that they are adequately accessible to all members of the public. In the absence of the audit, TfL would like to see £20k secured through a S.106.
- 6.45 TfL thought considered the travel plan submitted with the plan to be of a very high standard which passed the ATTrBuTE assessment. As such TfL recommend that the Travel Plan submitted with the application is also secured, managed, monitored and enforced through the s106 agreement.
- 6.46 Lastly, TfL request that a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be secured for the site by condition. The plan should include measures to limit the impact of the development during the construction period.

Design Panel

- 6.47 The Design Panel comprises a collection of external independent architects and urban designers who independently comment on major schemes within the borough. Their comments are as follows;
- 6.48 The Panel considered that though the proposals were generally unobjectionable, the redeveloped estate lacked distinctiveness. There was no playground, shops or community facility to provide a focus, a place for people to gather.
- 6.49 The opportunity could have been taken to build up parts of the estate to a higher density, creating communal space to act as a focus for the estate. As an alternative consideration could be given to creating a better sense of place through the landscape treatment of the central boulevard.
- 6.50 Panel members also thought that the building design was not particularly inspiring, so the idea of distinctive character areas was supported and should be developed to its full potential.
- 6.51 A successful landscaping strategy was considered essential to make the estate a pleasant place. The home zone approach and the diverse range of planting on the landscape plan was generally welcomed. The Panel questioned whether the trees and planting were sufficiently protected from potential vehicle damage.
- 6.52 Lastly, the panel considered the estate in its current form and suggested that as the Excalibur Estate is unique, it should be properly recorded prior to demolition.

Highways and Transportation

- 6.53 The level of off-street car parking complies with Lewisham's UDP parking standards and is considered acceptable
- 6.54 The proposed development will generate additional walking and cycle trips so a financial contribution is required towards improving cycle and pedestrian routes within the vicinity of the site.
- 6.55 A Waste Management Plan (WMP) is required; the plan should include details of refuse and re-cycling collection points which should be accessible from within 10m of kerb line. The plan should illustrate how bins will be brought out to collection points on collection days & returned.
- 6.56 A Construction and Logistics Plan (CLP) is required, It should be submitted prior to the commencement of each phase of the development and should specify how the impacts of construction activities and associated traffic will be managed.
- 6.57 The implementation of the Travel Plan is required to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport and a financial contribution towards monitoring the travel plan, to ensure the Travel Plan is taken forward and delivered.
- 6.58 The applicant will also be required to enter into a S278 Highways Agreement which would secure reinstatement/improvement works adjacent to the site and shall include works to Baudwin Road, Castillon Road and Battersby Road (following construction).
- 6.59 Improvements should be made to the path that runs south from Persant Road to Boundfield Road (lighting, etc), to make it a more attractive, accessible pedestrian route.
- 6.60 With regard to the proposed site layout, if the new carriageways/footways are to be adopted by the Highway Authority, The developer would be required to enter into a S38 agreement with the Highway Authority. The highway authority will require a financial contribution for maintenance of the numerous green areas/strips on the proposed highway. Amendments to the layout of the proposed carriageways/footways would be required to make them a adoptable (such as minor changes to the geometry of carriageway and measures to regulate vehicle speeds), as the site is within a 20mph zone.
- 6.61 I the new carriageways/footways are to be private, the applicant will be required to submit a Parking Management Plan (PMP). The plan should provide details of measures to prevent parked vehicles from obstructing routes through the site.

Strategic Housing

- 6.62 This scheme is a high priority regeneration scheme of a Lewisham owned estate of prefabs. The scheme mix and design has been the subject of extensive consultation with residents of the estate who will be able to move back into the new homes on the estate if they choose to. Officers from Lewisham's strategic housing team have been closely involved at all stages in the development of the proposals to ensure that the proposed scheme meets the needs of existing and future residents.

- 6.63 One key requirement has been to honour commitments made to residents, so that they are able to, as a minimum, return to a new property that is at least the same number of bedrooms as they are vacating.
- 6.64 All 178 existing prefabs have 2 bedrooms. There are a higher than normal number of 2 bed properties in the proposed scheme but this takes into account the decant requirement of existing residents and the need to re-provide a high number of 2 beds to meet those requirements.
- 6.65 The scheme also provides a number of larger family homes for social rent to meet the requirements for existing residents who are overcrowded and the need for large family homes for social rent generally.
- 6.66 The current site is almost 100% social rented housing apart from a number of prefabs sold under the right to buy. The proposed scheme introduces housing for sale and shared ownership. This introduces an element of mixed tenure as well as assisting with financial viability.
- 6.67 The policy requirement to provide 35% affordable units has been met and is therefore acceptable. Of the 371 units, 143 are private and 228 are affordable, providing 61% affordable provision.
- 6.68 Tenure split; 178 socially rented units and 50 intermediate which meets strategic housing requirements.
- 6.69 16 points will be achieved for Lifetime Homes which meets policy.
- 6.70 The 10% wheelchair unit provision including 10% for affordable rent meets policy however we need to clarify how many are to be delivered in each phase, their size, location and tenure. Normally we would expect the numbers in each tenure to be proportional to numbers overall. We should ensure that there is provision for social rented wheelchair units to be fitted out as per the SELHP guide.
- 6.71 In proposing to achieve Code Level 4 for Sustainable Homes, this exceeds the minimum requirement of Level 3.
- 6.72 The wheelchair unit parking spaces are larger than the remainder proposed within the 80% parking provision. The provision should be provided equally across the tenures.
- 6.73 The layout of the units is acceptable.

Environmental Health

- 6.74 The internal Environmental health officer is happy with the acoustic noise report and the recommendations proposed.
- 6.75 With regard to contaminated land, the relevant internal Environmental Health (different to the latter) accepts that contaminated land conditions can be applied to a decision. However, the officer goes further to request additional sampling to specifically target testing in the proposed private gardens. Further, it was disagreed with the applicant that further sampling for asbestos is unnecessary as fill materials from unknown historical sources are well known to contain such

materials, and in any event the existing buildings will require assessment for the presence of asbestos containing materials.

Ecological Regeneration Manager

- 6.76 The Ecological Regeneration Manager is disappointed at the quantum of living roofs proposed. He considered that anything less than 50% is somewhat tokenistic and will fail to grasp the full benefit or maximise the opportunity as presented. To conclude, it was considered that the reasons given for not achieving more living roofs were not currently defensible but appreciates that there are other planning considerations which might affect the viability of providing additional green roofs.

Sustainability Officer

- 6.77 Following the Mayors energy hierarchy is expected as part of this process.
- 6.78 The applicant provided examples of other schemes within the borough where the level of CO2 reduction derived from onsite technologies is less than 20%. However, the examples provided are all very different because of their strategic importance and their proximity either to SELCHP or, in the case of Loampit Vale, because it is developing an energy centre which provides the opportunity in the longer term to pursue an energy centre.
- 6.79 The expectation is that [applicants] maximise CO2 reductions at each stage until you reach the point it isn't feasible. There are clearly further opportunities to increase the energy efficiency of the buildings. [It is therefore] disappointing to see that they aren't doing this and just repeating the same line about financial viability being an issue without giving any more detail about opportunities to improve whilst still staying within the bounds of financial viability, which is in fact the reason they aren't proposing to do more.

7.0 PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Introduction

- 7.1 In considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must "have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations" (Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This approach is reflected in PPS 1, where, at paragraph 8 (and again at paragraphs 28 and 31), it is confirmed that, where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the saved policies in the adopted Lewisham UDP (July 2004) and policies in the London Plan (2004, consolidated with alterations 2008).

Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements

7.2 Planning Policy Guidance and Statements of relevance to the application are:-

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)

Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS 1 (2007)

PPS 3: Housing (2006)

PPS 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009)

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment

PPS 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)

PPG 13: Transport (2001)

PPS 22: Renewable Energy (2004)

PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004)

PPG 24: Planning and Noise (1994)

PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk (2006)

Other National Guidance

7.3 The following national guidance is also considered relevant to the application:-

Delivering Affordable Housing – Good Practice and Guidance (2006)

The Code for Sustainable Homes – Setting the Standard in Sustainability for New Homes (2008)

Planning and Access for Disabled People – A Good Practice Guide (2003)

Circular 05/2005 – Planning Obligations

Mayor of London's Housing Strategy (2009)

Mayor of London's Biodiversity Strategy (2002)

Mayor of London's Energy Strategy (2004)

Mayor of London's Housing SPG (2005)

Mayor of London's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2006)

Mayor of London's Accessible London SPG (2004)

Mayor of London's Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2008)

Mayor of London's Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG (2007)

Living Roofs and Walls – Technical Report Supporting London Plan Policy (2008)

Mayor of London's The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition BPG (2006)

Mayor of London's Wheelchair Accessible Housing BPG (2007)

Interim London Housing Design Guide (August 2010)

London Plan

- 7.4 The London Plan, consolidated with alterations since 2004, was published in February 2008. Together with the saved policies in the adopted Lewisham UDP (July 2004), the London Plan comprises the development plan for Lewisham. The policies that are relevant to the application are:-

The Overall Strategy

2A.1 Sustainability criteria

Living in London

3A.2 Borough housing targets

3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites

3A.5 Housing choice

3A.6 Quality of new housing provision

3A.7 Large residential developments

3A.8 Definition of affordable housing

3A.9 Affordable housing targets

3A.10 Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes

3A.15 Loss of housing and affordable housing

3A.17 Addressing the needs of London's diverse population

3A.18 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities

3A.23 Health impacts

3A.28 Social and economic impact assessments

Connecting London – improving travel in London

3C.1 Integrating transport and development

3C.2 Matching development to transport capacity

3C.17 Tackling congestion and reducing traffic

3C.18 Allocation of street space

3C.21 Improving conditions for walking

3C.22 Improving conditions for cycling

3C.23 Parking strategy

Enjoying London

3D.8 Realising the value of open space and green infrastructure

3D.13 Children and young people's play and informal recreation strategies

3D.14 Biodiversity and nature conservation

Climate change and London's metabolism

4A.1 Tackling climate change

4A.2 Mitigating climate change

4A.3 Sustainable design and construction

4A.4 Energy assessment

4A.7 Renewable energy

4A.9 Adaptation to Climate Change

4A.11 Living Roofs and Walls

4A.13 Flood risk management

4A.14 Sustainable drainage

4A.16 Water supplies and resources

Designs on London

4B.1 Design principles for a compact city

4B.2 Promoting world-class architecture and design

4B.3 Enhancing the quality of the public realm

4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment

4B.6 Safety, security and fire prevention and protection

4B.11 London's built heritage

4B.15 Archaeology

The sub-regions

5D.1 The strategic priorities for South East London

Implementing the London Plan

6A.4 Priorities in planning obligations

6A.5 Planning obligations

Supplementary Guidance

- 7.5 The Mayor of London has also published a number of strategies, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and Best Practice Guidance (BPG) notes in order to help implement London Plan policies. The following strategies, SPGs and BPGs are particularly relevant to this application:-

Transport Strategy (2001) and draft Transport Strategy (2009)

Housing Strategy (2009)

Air Quality Strategy – Cleaning London’s Air (2002) and draft Air Quality Strategy (2009)

Biodiversity Strategy (2002)

Energy Strategy (2004)

Draft Water Strategy (2009)

Housing SPG (2005)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2006)

London View Management Framework SPG (2007)

Accessible London SPG (2004)

Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2008)

Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG (2007)

Living Roofs and Walls – Technical Report Supporting London Plan Policy (2008)

The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition BPG (2006)

Wheelchair Accessible Housing BPG (2007)

Tomorrow’s Suburbs: Tools for making London more sustainable (June 2006)

Development Plan Policies for Biodiversity (November 2005)

Housing Design Guide (2009)

- 7.6 The South East London Housing Partnership's Wheelchair Homes Design Guidelines (2008, updated 2009) are not published by the Mayor of London and do not set out planning policy, but are nonetheless considered relevant to this application.

Adopted Unitary Development Plan

- 7.7 The relevant saved policies of the UDP (adopted July 2004) are set out below.

Urban Design And Conservation

STR.URB 1

URB 3 Urban Design

URB 4 Designing out Crime

URB 12 Landscape and Development

URB 13 Trees

URB 14 Street Furniture and Paving

URB 18 Preserving Listed Buildings

URB 21 Archaeology

Open Space

STR.OS 1, STR.OS 2 and STR.OS3

OS 7 Other Open Space

OS 8 Areas of Public Open Space Deficiency

OS 10 Trees in Open Space

Environmental Protection

STR.ENV PRO 1

ENV.PRO 10 Contaminated Land

ENV PRO 15 Sustainable Surface Water Drainage in New Development

ENV PRO 17 Management of the Water Supply

Housing

STR.HSG 3

HSG 1 Prevention of Loss of Housing

HSG 2 Housing on Previously Developed Land

HSG 4 Residential Amenity

HSG 5 Layout and Design of New Residential Development

HSG 6 Dwelling Mix

HSG 7 Gardens

HSG 14 Provision of Affordable Housing

HSG 15 Creating Viable and Balanced Communities

HSG 22 Consultation on Housing Developments

Sustainable Transport and Parking

STR.TRN 1, STR.TRN 3 and STR.TRN 4

TRN 1 Location of Development

TRN 2 Travel Impact Statements

TRN 3 Developer Contributions

TRN 4 Access for Public Transport

TRN 5 Green Travel Plans

TRN 10 Protection and Improvement of Public Transport

TRN 14 Cycle Parking (and related Table TRN2)

TRN 15 Provision for Cyclists and Walkers

TRN 16 Developing Pedestrian and Cycle Networks

TRN 20 Improving Road Safety

TRN 22 Homes Zones

TRN 26 Car Parking Standards (and related Table TRN1)

Leisure, Community Facilities And Education

STR.LCE 1 and STR.LCE 2

LCE 2 Existing Leisure and Community Facilities

LCE 4 Places for Children to Play

Implementation, Resources And Monitoring

STR.IRM 2 and STR.IRM 3

IRM 2 Implementation

IRM 3 Community Benefit and Planning Loss

IRM 4 Consultation

- 7.8 Referring to the Council's UDP Proposals Map adopted with the UDP in July 1994, the Excalibur Estate is not designated land, although the application site is within an area considered to be in an area of Local Open Space deficiency.
- 7.9 In August 2006 the Council adopted the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document. This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, back land development, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility and materials.
- 7.10 Lewisham's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007, draft published 2008) and the Lewisham Leisure and Open Space Study (draft 2009) are also considered relevant to this application, although these are not planning policy documents.

Local Development Framework

- 7.11 The UDP is to be replaced by Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) that will comprise the Borough's Local Development Framework.
- 7.12 Lewisham is in the process of replacing the UDP with the documents that comprise the Local Development Framework (LDF). The most important document in the LDF is the Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (DPD). The Lewisham Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State on 29th October 2010, and its Examination in Public was held on 1st and 2nd February 2011. The Council has now received the Inspector's report. The Inspector has found the Core Strategy to be sound provided certain amendments, identified in his report, are made. In accordance with the regulations Officers will make the necessary changes with the intention of adopting the Core Strategy subject to its approval at the full Council meeting in June 2011.
- 7.13 For development control purposes the Core Strategy will become part of the development plan when adopted by resolution of the full Council. Government advice on the weight to be attached to emerging DPD policies is that this is determined on the stage of preparation or review, increasing as successive stages are reached. As the Core Strategy has been found sound all that remains for legal adoption is a resolution of full Council. As such very considerable weight can be attached to the Core Strategy in the decision making process.
- 7.14 The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:-
- Objective 1: Physical and socio-economic benefits
 - Objective 2: Housing provision and distribution
 - Objective 3: Local housing needs
 - Objective 5: Climate change
 - Objective 6: Flood risk reduction and water management
 - Objective 7: Open spaces and environmental assets
 - Objective 8: Waste management
 - Objective 9: Transport and accessibility
 - Objective 10: Protect and enhance Lewisham's character
 - Objective 11: Community well-being

Spatial Policy 1: Lewisham Spatial Policy

- Policy 1: Housing provision, mix and affordability
- Policy 7: Climate change and adapting to the effects

- Policy 8: Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
- Policy 9: Improving local air quality
- Policy 10: Managing and reducing the risk of flooding
- Policy 12: Open space and environmental assets
- Policy 13: Lewisham's waste management requirements
- Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport
- Policy 15: High quality design for Lewisham
- Policy 16: Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment
- Policy 19: Provision and maintenance of community and recreational facilities
- Policy 20: Delivery education achievements, healthcare provision and promoting healthy lifestyles
- Policy 21: Planning obligations

8.0 Planning Considerations

Introduction

- 8.1 This section identifies the key planning considerations of the scheme;

Key Planning Considerations

- 8.2 The key planning considerations relevant to the proposed development are:-

1. Principle of Development
2. Housing need
3. Residential Quality of the Units proposed
4. Urban Design & Conservation
5. Impact to the Historic Environment and retained six Listed Buildings
6. Neighbour objections
7. Impact on Local Infrastructure
8. Public and Private Open Space and Landscaping
9. Sustainability
10. Transport

Principle of Development

Land use

- 8.3 The site was originally used as green open space for the residents of the Downham estate to the south. Some of the received objection letters refer to this use, claiming that if the site were to be redeveloped, it should be returned to its original use. However, the site has been used for housing purposes for more than 50 years, and it is considered that the current residential use purposes would

better benefit the community, considering the close proximity of Forster Park, whilst also contributing to housing and sustainability objectives.

- 8.4 In 1945-6 German and Polish Prisoners of War built the temporary dwellings on the open space to house people quickly after the World War II bomb damage. This is the largest estate of its kind remaining in England.
- 8.5 The application site is currently used entirely for residential purposes and this would not change if the site is developed as proposed. Residential unit numbers would increase from 178 units to 371, therefore the current housing provision would double in density which is in accordance with UDP policy HSG 1 and London Plan policy 3A.15.

Demolition or Retention of existing dwellings

- 8.6 A stock condition survey was carried out in 2004 by Savills (apex), which showed that 100% of the existing, rented (151) pre-fabricated houses within the Excalibur estate did not meet the decent homes standard. The subsequent Adams report (2005) identified that none of the properties on the estate met the decent homes standard and a total of £8.4m would be required over the next 30 years to deal with catch up repairs, future programme renewals, improvements, contingent major repairs, related assets and the removal of asbestos. Their non-traditional construction means they require extensive structural work to over-clad the properties to improve thermal insulation and extend the life of the properties.
- 8.7 Following discussions and presentations from financial consultants and surveyors commissioned by the council, it became clear that refurbishment would not represent value for money. The Government has said to the Council that they will only provide financial support for schemes that can demonstrate value for money. For the bungalow estate, the best solution is a stock transfer to an existing housing association, who will redevelop the estate by building brand new homes.
- 8.8 The Council submitted an application for a place on the Government's 2005 transfer programme for Excalibur in 2005. This was based on refurbishment of the housing and indicated a maximum gap funding need of £5.3m. However, it was acknowledged that a refurbishment programme for 159 properties requiring £5.3m of gap funding would raise value for money issues. As a result, the Council undertook to work with residents to select an RSL partner who would commit additional resources to minimise the need for gap funding, whilst delivering an option that had residents' support. It was anticipated that this option would include an element of new development. After this application further discussions took place with Government and a refurbishment option was ruled out, as it would not represent value for money.
- 8.9 As noted above, for many years, the Council and residents explored options to upgrade the estate. To further support the abandonment of the refurbishment of the dwellings, it should be noted that the site has an existing density of 35 dwellings per hectare. This density is below the level which it is capable of accommodating in planning policy terms]. This is relevant to the planning application as it is apparent from resident and media attention that many would like the estate to stay as it is, with the individual units retained and upgraded.
- 8.10 The proposed habitable room per hectare density of 184 habitable rooms per hectare is within the London Plan (3A.2) contextual policy recommendation of

150-200 habitable rooms per hectare. This presents opportunities to build new homes on the site, as re-provision for the existing units and allow space for further, higher density development. This is discussed further later on in the report.

- 8.11 The community also needs to be a recognised feature of the Excalibur Estate which is managed by the Excalibur Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) since 1991. The TMO is formed from estate residents who have management responsibility for rent collection, repairs and maintenance, and empty properties (voids). The TMO involves tenants in all aspects of decision making about their homes and immediate community. Again, relevant to the application, the close knit community is identified as being another unique feature of the estate.
- 8.12 Apart from the TMO and St. Marks Church, the remainder of the estate is in residential use. Goldsmiths Community Centre, which fronts Castillon Road, backs onto the estate but the remainder of the estate backs onto the gardens and roads of the surrounding residential properties.
- 8.13 The topography of the application site provides a relatively flat table. The application site is large, measuring 6.17 hectare in size. This large table of land provides the ability to have lower (no more than 2 storey) properties at the parameter of the development and taller buildings within the centre, pulled away from the existing dwellings surrounding the site. In having the larger buildings within the centre of the site. There is also an opportunity for higher densities, still within the guidance parameters within the London Plan Density Matrix and policy 4B.1. The aforementioned policy also requires developments to maximise the potential of sites. The site is previously developed land that, in accordance with PPS 1, PPS 3, the Mayor of London's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG and UDP policy HSG 2, makes it an appropriate site for development that will contribute towards meeting Lewisham's need for new housing.

Conservation Area Designation

- 8.14 There has been support for conservation area designation for the estate from local people, SAVE Britain's Heritage and the Twentieth Century Society. English Heritage also suggested in their listing adviser's report of March 2009, that conservation area designation would be a more appropriate way of recognising the interest of the estate as a whole.
- 8.15 The special interest of the estate is described and acknowledged in the Character Assessment at section 3.0 above. Originally designed as temporary structures, the Stock Condition Survey, as referred to in paragraph 3.21, explains that the current condition of the majority of the buildings is poor. It is also understood from the Adams Report and the letter from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) dated 15th March 2010 that the costs of repairs needed are not considered by the HCA to represent value for money, so no government subsidy for their repair is available to the Council. Instead the redevelopment of the estate has the support of the majority of residents and represents an opportunity to provide sustainable and energy efficient new homes for twice as many households for many years to come. Whilst the Character Assessment recognises the importance of overall estate layout as a component of character, the six listed prefabs being retained adjacent to the redevelopment at least provide a reminder of the estate as it originally was.

- 8.16 For these reasons it is considered that conservation area designation of the estate as a whole does not represent a sustainable future use for the prefabs; instead its redevelopment is considered to represent a substantial public benefit which outweighs the loss of the majority of the estate (PPS 5 HE.9.2).

Loss of Community

- 8.17 In addressing the loss of the community within the Excalibur estate as it stands, the level of active interest from the residents within the estate and the relative success of the TMO, is a testament of the strong community cohesion. Community well being.
- 8.18 The Excalibur estate is mainly occupied by social rent tenants. The choice of occupier therefore is already subject to equal opportunities and race equality provisions when being placed as a tenant within the estate by the Council's Housing department. For the remainder of the private dwellings, again, many have been bought under the right to buy and therefore would have initially been placed there being through the housing process.
- 8.19 It is argued that the close community is derived from the intimate arrangement of the dwellings, the longevity of the occupation of the residents therein and the central hub of the TMO.
- 8.20 As part of the transfer negotiations, then of the subsequent ballot, it was negotiated that anyone within the existing estate would be re-housed at a substantially discounted rent in a dwelling of equal size in the new development. As for the owner occupiers, they can either sell their property to the applicant, or they can use the equity from their property and transfer this to be used as equity in a new dwelling within the application site.
- 8.21 In light of the above, whilst not explicitly stated in the planning application, this provides an opportunity to minimise the displacement of the existing community within the Excalibur estate by re-housing and subsidising with the estate, keeping the existing tenants who wish to remain in relative close proximity to their current neighbours. The scheme has been designed to provide a large proportion of 2 bed units in terms of dwelling mix. With regard to tenure mix, 178 are to be affordable rent and 50 intermediate. The dwelling and tenure mix is to be secured via a S.106 to ensure that the above commitments to re-house the existing tenants within the estate are adhered to.
- 8.22 It is not disputed that the social community of the Excalibur estate will change if planning permission is granted but much effort has been given to ensure that this is minimised as much as is practicable through the minimising of moving times; i.e. moving out of the existing dwelling and into a new one, either into the new development or off site elsewhere. The Council's Strategic Housing Department have a Decanting team who manage the moving process using a decant strategy which has been created for the redevelopment of the estate. The decant strategy can be found in the case copy documents. However, for those who would like to stay on the estate, they might have to move away temporarily before their new home back on the estate is ready.

Conclusion

- 8.23 To conclude, it is considered that the demolition and redevelopment of the estate provides an opportunity to offer a density and standard of living accommodation which is not currently viable to achieve. It is acknowledged that the existing community within the estate will suffer disturbance. However, remedies such as minimising the amount of moving times and providing existing occupiers within an opportunity to move into a new dwelling through heavy financial subsidies which would benefit from better insulation, appearance and layout, have been put in place to ensure this is minimised. Therefore, the principle of the demolition and the redevelopment of the Excalibur estate is considered acceptable.
- 8.24 Further, Officers are satisfied that the benefits of developing the site outweigh the historic value of the estate and the retention of the individual dwellings therein.

Housing need

- 8.25 The ongoing need for housing and affordable housing in the Borough is briefly discussed above in paragraphs in the introduction to the 'Principle of Development' chapter of this report. The need for, and importance of, housing and affordable housing provision in Lewisham is a material planning consideration.
- 8.26 Detailed Phase 1 of the subject application would provide 152 residential units whilst the outline Phase 2 would provide 219 units. The proposed unit sizes and tenure breakdowns of the development are demonstrated earlier in tables in chapter 5.0 and within the following paragraphs.
- 8.27 The draft Lewisham Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2007 (SHMA) published on 24/10/2008 states at summary paragraph 33 that 1,345 dwellings should be built in the Borough per annum to meet current identified need. Table 3A.1 of the London Plan sets out a target of 9,750 additional homes to be built in Lewisham in the 10 years from 2007/8 to 2016/17, which is reflected in a monitoring target of 975 additional homes per year. According to the Council's latest (2008-9) Annual Monitoring Review, over the next 5 to 10 year period it is forecast that the Borough will be able to meet and exceed its housing delivery targets, partly due to the provision of additional homes as part of estate renewal and development projects. The Borough's projected housing delivery figures (which, from 2013/4, are expected to again be ahead of target) take into account the proposed development of the Excalibur estate and development at other estates such as Heathside and Lethbridge and Silwood.

Affordable Housing

- 8.28 At national level, PPS 1 (from paragraph 14 onwards) and PPS 3 recognise the need to develop socially inclusive communities, creating a suitable mix (both market and affordable) of housing. In relation to the latter, there is an overwhelming need for affordable housing in the London Borough of Lewisham the draft SHMA estimates at paragraph 6.81 that over 80% of all new housing built would need to be affordable in order to meet identified need.
- 8.29 PPS 3 requires the Council to set a plan-wide target for affordable housing, and targets relating to the mix in terms of social and intermediate housing, size and type. In addition, PPS 3 requires the Council to set a threshold above which

developments would be expected to achieve such targets and an approach for seeking developer contributions towards the provision of affordable housing.

- 8.30 The relevant UDP policy in this matter is HSG 14. At 6.17 hectares in size, the application site exceeds the 0.5 hectare threshold set out in the first sentence of the policy, and is capable of accommodating 15 dwellings or more (and thus also exceeds the London Plan threshold, set out in policy 3A.11, that refers to a 10 dwelling capacity). Having met these basic thresholds, policy HSG 14 goes on to set out a series of criteria, against which a site's suitability for affordable housing provision is assessed. The site is within reasonably close proximity to local services, therefore in terms of accessibility to the necessary social infrastructure, residential development at this site would be considered appropriate for affordable housing. The likelihood of prejudicing other planning objectives of a higher priority is considered very limited – officers are not aware of any reason why affordable housing at this site would give rise to harmful impacts in the site's vicinity. This notion is supported, specifically by the positive comments received from the Council's housing department who agree to the proposed tenure mix of the scheme.
- 8.31 Given this context, UDP Policy HSG 14 commits the Council to negotiating for an element of affordable housing to be provided in any major residential development at this site.
- 8.32 The supporting text of HSG 14 adds that the Council considers it pragmatic to seek an affordable provision of 35% of the residential content in developments, although it should be noted that London Plan policy 3A.9 refers to a higher target of 50%. With regard to tenure mix, the supporting text of HSG 14 refers to a target proposed by the Mayor of London in 2001 of 70% social rent / 30% intermediate housing within affordable housing provisions. The more recent London Plan policy 3A.9 confirms that, within affordable housing provisions, a London wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision should be applied. These proportions are supported by the most recent published study of housing need in the Borough - at paragraphs 6.82 and 6.83, the draft SMHA indicates that affordable housing provisions in Lewisham should comprise 76.6% social rented housing, and 23.4% intermediate housing, in order to meet need.
- 8.33 All of the abovementioned policies would apply to any major residential development in the Borough. In addition, in respect of the proposed redevelopment of the Excalibur estates, the Council must take into account existing numbers of residential units (which should not decrease with redevelopment), affordable housing (which should similarly not decrease), and the housing needs of the existing occupants of the estates (who would be re-housed in the completed development).
- 8.34 In response to the planning policy requirements set out above, and as part of the ballot process, the applicants have proposed a significant affordable housing provision as part of the proposed development. At present, there are one hundred and fifty-one affordable units on site, and the completed development initially proposed a net gain of 87 affordable units, which, through negotiations throughout the course of the application has been reduced to 77 additional affordable units. The justification for the reduction in the affordable units and the acceptability of this provision is discussed in the following paragraphs.

8.35 The detailed Phase 1 of the subject application would provide 152 residential units whilst the outline Phase 2 would provide 219 units. The proposed unit sizes and tenure breakdown of the detailed elements of the proposed development are summarised in the tables below.

Table 4: Phase 1 Dwelling size and tenure mix summary

Unit Size and tenure type	Socially rented	Intermediate	Private	Total in units
One beds		6	15	21
Two beds	58	19	37	114
Three beds	11	1		12
Four beds	4	1		5
Total units	73	27	51	152

8.36 The high proportion of two bed units within the scheme is in response to the re-provision of the existing two bed dwellings, which currently exist on site.

8.37 Of the hundred and fifty-two units proposed within Phase one, 100 of those units would be affordable, equating to approximately 67%. Of the 100 units, there would be 73 socially rented and 27 intermediate units, crudely providing a 70:30 socially rented against intermediate split. The thirty-eight (10%) wheelchair units are also proposed to be provided in this phase of the development, dispersed throughout the bungalows, houses and over 55's block.

8.38 Table 5: Phase 2 Dwelling size and tenure mix summary

Unit Size and tenure type	Socially rented	Intermediate	Private	Total in units
One beds	3	4	13	20
Two beds	70	19	78	167
Three beds	22			22
Four beds	10			10
Total units	105	23	91	219

8.39 Again, the high proportion of two bed units is apparent in the scheme in comparison to the provision of other dwelling sizes within the development. This imbalance in dwelling mix is in response to the re-provision of the existing two bed

dwellings as negotiated in the stock transfer ballot which has been carried forward onto the planning application.

- 8.40 For the outline element of the scheme, of the two hundred and nineteen units, 128 will be affordable. Of the affordable units, 105 would be socially rented and 23 would be for intermediate. This equates to 58% affordable homes achieving a 82:18 affordable rent to intermediate split.
- 8.41 Cumulatively, the two phases would create 228 affordable of the 371 units proposed in total; one hundred and seventy-eight would be affordable rent, whilst 50 would be intermediate.
- 8.42 The disproportionate level of two bedroom units is a reminder that the proposed development is replacing 178 existing 2 bed dwellings, of which 151 of those were social rent. Therefore, in real terms, the table below provides a comparison of the actual increase in affordable units;

Table 6: Overall (Phases one & Two) Density, dwelling and tenure mix

Phase	GN rented	Equity Ownership	Shared Ownership	Private	Grand total
Existing	151	0	0	27	178
Proposed Phase 1	73	10	17	52	152
Proposed Phase 2	105	5	18	91	219
Proposed Total	178	15	35	143	371
Net increase	27	15	35	116	193

- 8.43 The net gain table demonstrates that the net increase in dwellings still provides an net increase (uplift) in affordable rent dwellings of 27, albeit that the dwelling mix of affordable units has now changed to incorporate 1 to 4 bed units.
- 8.44 London plan policies state that in ‘Estate Renewal Schemes’ should not result in a loss in affordable housing. Of the 178 current dwellings 151 are affordable, and therefore, as a minimum, the scheme should re provide the 151 affordable rent units in addition to meeting the Council’s policy of 35% affordable housing.
- 8.45 Therefore, the net gain of units is 371 proposed, less the 151 existing providing an uplift of 220 units. Policy 3A.10 of the London Plan encourages Borough’s to seek maximum Affordable Housing from the residential property development. The scheme proposes to deliver 228 affordable units (61%) or 77 additional units which is 35% of the uplift. HSG 14 requires the provision of 35%, whilst the London Plan requires 50%.
- 8.46 The scheme provides 228 affordable units between the two phases which is an additional 77 affordable units to that presently on site. After replacing the existing number of affordable units (151) to meet Lewisham’s affordable housing policy, the scheme has to provide 77 ($371 - 151 = 220 \times 35\% = 77$) additional affordable units or 110 ($371 - 151 = 220 \times 50\% = 110$) additional affordable units in accordance with London Plan policy requirements.
- 8.47 In only providing seventy-seven affordable units, the proposed development is still providing less than required by the London Plan policy objective of 50% (110)

affordable housing provision. In the cases where policy targets cannot be met, the applicant has to provide a Financial Viability statement stating why the scheme is unable to provide the policy requirement affordable housing provision.

- 8.48 To this regard, the applicant submitted a Financial Viability statement with the application which does not form part of the published application documents. In accordance with the Council's adopted Obligations SPD, financial viability assessments are treated as confidential. The Homes and Communities Agency's guidance on 'Investment and planning obligations - responding to the downturn' also advises Local Authorities to use appropriate safeguards for commercial confidentiality as the document could contain certain commercially sensitive data.
- 8.49 Upon initial submission of the application, the scheme proposed 238 affordable units. This provided 39.5% affordable housing ($371 - 151 = 220 \times 39.5\% = 87$). Therefore the scheme was failing achieve a level of affordable housing provision in accordance with London Plan policy requirements of 50%, but exceeding the Council's saved policy requirement of 35%. For the additional dwellings proposed for the site, the applicant initially proposed financial contribution proposed of £400k which the applicant considered appropriate to mitigate the impact of the scheme to local schools, hospitals, transport infrastructure etc.
- 8.50 The applicants submitted Financial Viability statement, sought to justify the level of affordable housing proposed by the scheme, which was less than 50% as required by the London Plan Policy 3A.9 Affordable housing targets, as well as the level of financial contributions. The assessment of the submitted statement therefore had to determine whether or not the scheme could provide any additional affordable homes and the financial contributions required to mitigate the impact of the scheme which officers calculated to be £772,533.00.
- 8.51 The statement was considered by an independent assessor, employed by the Council. This assessment examined the justifications for the proposals and the feasibility of providing the affordable housing for the scheme and the financial contributions proposed. It was concluded that some of the figures within the document were erroneously stated which revealed a surplus of funds to which enabled the scheme to provide a marginally reduced level of affordable housing at 35% in accordance with Lewisham's UDP saved policy HSG 14 Provision of Affordable Housing, but all of the financial contributions (£772,533.00) sought from the Council to mitigate the impact of the scheme.
- 8.52 The list of financial contributions sought can be found within the planning obligations section of this report, whilst their justifications can be found under their relevant considerations of the scheme throughout the current chapter.
- 8.53 In light of the above, officers have negotiated to accept Lewisham's UDP policy requirement of 35% affordable housing resulting in the a reduction to 77 affordable units instead of the 87 proposed and the full amount of financial contributions required to mitigate the impact of the additional dwellings on the application site. The 35% affordable units is broken down in the following table.

Table 7: Tenure mix summary

	Affordable rent	Intermediate	Total affordable
Phase 1	73	27	100
Phase 2	105	23	128
Both phases	178	50	228

- 8.54 The above proportions closely match the 70% social rent / 30% intermediate housing proportions set out in UDP policy HSG 14 and London Plan policy 3A.9. Officers in the Council's Strategic Housing department have found the proposed tenure mix to be acceptable.
- 8.55 The applicants have submitted drawings indicating the tenures would be appropriately distributed around the site, with every block accommodating both affordable and private sale units. It is recommended that the physical spread of tenures around the site be controlled through the Section 106 agreement.
- 8.56 Phase one crudely matches the 70% social rent / 30% intermediate housing proportions set out in UDP policy HSG 14 and London Plan policy 3A.9 by providing a 73:27 split, whilst phase two clearly does not in providing a 82% social rent / 18% intermediate split. However, the applicants have explained that this is because the proposed development is required to re-house tenants of the existing estates, who require housing of the same tenure as that which they currently occupy. Officers in the Council's Strategic Housing department have verified this explanation, and it is recommended that the above tenure mix be accepted. The development as a whole, provides for a 78% social rent / 22% intermediate split, which is acceptable for the above mentioned reasons.

Dwelling mix

- 8.57 As regards the mix of housing sizes and types, it is considered the site is capable of accommodating a mix that would be suitable for the inclusion of an affordable housing element. There is no adopted Planning Brief in existence for the site.
- 8.58 The size breakdown of the 371 residential units proposed would be as follows:
- 41 (11%) 1-bedroom units
 - 283 (76%) 2-bedroom units
 - 34(9%) 3-bedroom units
 - 15 (4%) 4-bedroom units
- 8.59 As mentioned at the beginning of this section, there is a high level of 2 bed units due to the necessity to re-provide the existing 2 bed units within the Excalibur estate as negotiated with residents prior to the submission of the current application. Due to that commitment to provide equally sized or larger units for the existing occupiers of the Excalibur Estate, all of the houses within proposed development would be used for affordable housing; either social rent or intermediate.

- 8.60 The Council's Strategic Housing department have been working with the applicant to ensure that the submission is able to re-provide units of the same size or larger for the existing residents who would like to remain in the estate, whilst the remainder of the dwelling mix addresses local housing needs.

Residential Quality of the Units proposed

- 8.61 The scheme provides 48 more larger (3-4 beds) dwellings than the estate currently provides and therefore the scheme is honouring the obligation to the existing residents to provide them with either the same size or larger dwellings, whilst still providing additional larger dwellings for new occupiers.
- 8.62 All of the residential units in Phase 1 would meet the dwelling size (overall floor area) standards set out under paragraph 3.4 of the Council's Residential Standards SPD. Not all of the Council's minimum room sizes as set out in the Residential Standards SPD would be achieved, but the failures are few and marginal, and those units would always benefit from other habitable rooms therein being larger. Further, all units benefit from generous storage spaces. In most cases however, the minimum room standards are comfortably exceeded the standards. Most of the dwellings also have logical and simplistic layouts. The GLA however made reference to the preference to more flexible units. At a meeting on 10th February 2011 with GLA officers, it was confirmed that the reference to the inflexibility of some of the units was due to a centrally located downstairs w/c. The location of the w/c prohibited future occupiers from opening up the ground floor to create a combined living/dining area. However, Council planning officers consider that the scheme proposes a selection of units which offer both design options of combined and separate kitchen, dining and living spaces in the units, and therefore the flexibility of the units is considered acceptable.
- 8.63 Detailed floor plans have not been submitted for the outline (Phases 2) element of the application, however typical flat layouts can be seen on the detailed drawings for phase one.

Accessibility

- 8.64 Policy HSG 5 of the UDP states that the Council will only permit new residential development which provides physical accessibility for all members of the community including people with disabilities, and that where appropriate the Council will seek the provision of new homes designed, or capable of adaptation, to housing for long term needs. The supporting text later confirms that the Council will encourage developers to provide facilities that improve upon those statutorily required, and that the Council will encourage the provision of units that are designed to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Lifetime Homes Standards. Policy 3A.5 of the London Plan states that 'DPD policies should seek to ensure that:... all new housing is built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards.
- 8.65 The Residential Standards SPD (Adopted August 2006) reflects London Plan (pre-2008 version) policy 3A.4 Housing Choice, which stated that UDP policies should seek to ensure that all new housing is built to Lifetime Homes standards, and to ensure that 10% of the new housing is designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. These standards are repeated in the updated (2008) London Plan, at policy 3A.5.

8.66 The Design and Access and Planning statements confirm that the scheme aims to achieve Lifetime Homes and Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.

Wheelchair units

8.67 Sixty-six of the wheelchair units would be provided within Phase 1. This is because all of the existing dwellings on the Excalibur estate are wheelchair-accessible accommodation, and therefore are to be re-provided as soon as is practicable, given that 81 of the bungalows will need to be demolished to make way for the development, of which are all wheelchair accessible.

8.68 The units are to be wheelchair-accessible, or capable of adaptation to full wheelchair standard without further structural alterations. They will all achieve the South East Housing Partnership standards as confirmed also on page 18 of the Planning Statement and page 48 of the Design and Access Statement which goes further to confirm that all wheelchair units are located at ground floor level with private amenity space. All of the 38 wheelchair units will have an allocated disabled parking space and a further 12 disabled spaces are to be provided for disabled/blue badge visitors.

8.69 The proposed size and tenure mix of the wheelchair/adaptable units is considered acceptable. Of the 119 units proposed, 61 would be for affordable rent, and 58 would be for private sale. The size breakdown of these units would be as follows:

Table 8: of wheelchair unit breakdowns

Unit Size and tenure type	Phase one	Phase two	Totals
Two beds (Over 55's block)	8		8
Two bed bungalows	15	13	28
Three bed	2		2
Total units	25	13	38

S.106 Contributions

8.70 Firstly, the density of the site is more than doubling. Therefore, in order to insure that the impact of the additional dwellings is mitigated, contributions have been sought to mitigate the impact of the additional homes and thus the additional people and the additional pressures placed on local resources.

8.71 In terms of the new dwelling mix, the proposed development is to introduce family sized dwellings which will mean additional pressures on the local education capacity and health provision in particular. More recently, all of the secondary schools within the vicinity of the application site have benefitted from Private Finance Initiatives and have been redeveloped. However, the nursery, primary and 16+ education facilities within the vicinity require financial contributions to help with the additional places created by the development. For the same reasons, the Council require contributions towards health provision for the

additional occupiers of the scheme. In light of the dwelling increase and new mix, financial contributions for education are considered necessary and the contributions are listed in the S.106 and recommendations section at the end of this report.

Urban Design and Conservation

- 8.72 UDP policy URB 3 Urban Design states that the Council will expect a high standard of design in new development or buildings, whilst ensuring that schemes are compatible with, or complement the scale and character of existing development, and its setting. Scale, mass, layout, access, townscape, height, alignment, quality and use of materials, ornamentation, and energy/resource efficiency will be taken into account. The Council will consider the preservation and creation of urban form which contributes to local distinctiveness such as plot width, building features and uses, roofscape and open space.
- 8.73 Other UDP policies (including HSG 4 and HSG 5), and the Residential Standards SPD, similarly stress the importance of good design.
- 8.74 Relevant national guidance is provided in PPS 1 and PPS 3, and the documents By Design and the Urban Design Compendium. At a regional level, London Plan policies 4B.1 and 4B.2 are relevant.

Master planning

- 8.75 The main elements of the proposed master plan are considered to be:
- The arrangement of the development around a central spine road, running west to east.
 - Perimeter 3 storey blocks flanking the green spine.
 - Suburban low density home zone design principles
- 8.76 Particular note should be made at this point of the character and certain attributes of the site. The land is flat, and all of the surrounding dwellings are relatively low rise with the majority being 2 storey in height with pitched roofs, and a three storey block to the west. Therefore, any development within the Excalibur estate will be clearly visible from the surrounding properties. That said, given the large scale of the site, there is ample opportunity to create low rise development around the perimeter of the site, and create a taller, higher density development towards the centre of the site, minimising the impact to the existing surrounding dwellings.
- 8.77 However, as discussed in at the beginning of this chapter, pre-application negotiations with the existing residents on the site and planning officers, the proposed development purposefully comprises relatively low level (maximum 3 stories), low density buildings to ensure that the development didn't overwhelm the surrounding two to three storey buildings and to retain the character of the area generally which is relatively low density.

Spine Road & Communal Amenity Space

- 8.78 The current complex, matrix design of the estate is one of the design features which makes it unique. The narrow footpaths leading to many of the properties are a distinctive feature of the estate forming a fundamental contribution to enforcing the community cohesiveness. However, whilst they have not

commented during the planning application process, during pre-application discussions, some neighbours suggested that the narrow walkways between the properties provided absconding criminals an opportunity to hide. Therefore, the scheme was designed so that permeability was integrated into the design of the resulting new development.

- 8.79 In response to the above, the master plan of the proposed development has resulted in a relatively simplistic design, based on the central spine road that connects the different elements to the scheme.
- 8.80 The Design Panel considered that the proposals were generally unobjectionable but that scheme lacked distinctiveness. There was no playground, shops or community facility to provide a focus, a place for people to gather. The Design Panel also criticised the low density of the scheme. It was argued that [taller buildings] could have resulted in an ability to create communal space to act as a focus for the estate.
- 8.81 The applicants assert and officers consider that the spine road and the small amenity space at the north western corner of the site provided estate communal space for future residents. The Design Panel did however agree that a better sense of place could be created through the landscape treatment of the central boulevard.
- 8.82 Furthermore, a greater provision of public space was omitted from the scheme as there is ample provision in the form of Forster Park, 320m west of the site, less than 10 minutes walk away, and Goldsmiths Community Centre located to the south eastern corner of the site.

Affect of development proposals on the setting of the listed buildings

- 8.83 The proposals to demolish the Excalibur Estate will affect the setting and context in which the listed buildings were built and are experienced. The 6 listed prefabs are estate properties being fundamentally identical and contemporary to one another. However, to what extent the setting will be affected and how the proposals have overcome this has been the subject of discussions with the applicant. PPS5 (HE9.2) directs local authorities to demonstrate that substantial public benefits can be achieved to outweigh harm or loss to designated heritage assets.
- 8.84 It is important that the buildings remain in their current location and are widely visible, as this is how they were always viewed. Special regard was given to this and it was felt desirable to retain the immediate setting of the listed buildings. The applicant responded to the Council's request to pull back the parking originally located to the front of 25 and 39 Persant Road. Concerns were also raised that the row of three storey buildings opposite created an overly urbanised setting for the listed buildings, which are single storey. The applicant accepted these comments and the height designation on these blocks has been removed from the outline planning application. In addition, maximum and minimum height parameters were provided in drawing APL004 Rev F which restricts the height of the relevant buildings to no more than two storeys.
- 8.85 The setting of 1 to 7 (odd) Persant Road is less affected by the proposals, being in the south eastern corner of the site. The proposed road layout will remain exactly as it is currently and the name, Persant Road, will be retained. In response

to officers' comments, 1 to 7 (odd) Persant Road will face new single storey bungalows to respect the scale and context of the historic prefabs.

- 8.86 The road names are an important part of the setting and character of the listed building because these road names and the estate name follow the same theme of the adjacent Downham Estate; they are on the theme of the Knights of the Round Table. Re-numbering of the listed properties and changing the name of Persant Road would not be encouraged.
- 8.87 The character assessment of the site carried out by the Council identifies the character of the estate. When assessing applications that affect the significance of a heritage asset PPS5 states that the Council should consider the particular nature of the significance and the value it holds for this and future generations (HE7.2)
- 8.88 Proposals affecting designated heritage assets (listed buildings and conservation areas) that would substantially harm or result in a loss of significance would be acceptable if it were necessary to deliver substantial public benefits. (HE9.2) The potential harm to the setting of designated heritage assets of proposals should be weighed against the wider benefits of the application (HE10). Council planning policy URB18 Preserving Listed Buildings also requires that special regard be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of Listed Buildings.
- 8.89 As a result of the amendments made to the original proposals (removing the car parking, reducing the height of the blocks opposite 25 and 39 Persant Road and by positioning single storey bungalows in front of 1 – 7 Persant Road) the setting of the Listed Building is considered not to be substantially harmed by the proposals. To this end, the wider public benefits of the redevelopment of this site outweigh what officers consider to be insubstantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings.
- 8.90 English Heritage have expressed concerns about the impact of the new development on the setting of the listed buildings, particularly the proposed three storey buildings close to 25 – 39 Persant Road.
- 8.91 In response, the three storey height designation on the blocks opposite 25 – 39 Persant Road have been removed from the application and a revised drawing submitted which limits the height of these units to two storeys.

Design Codes

- 8.92 Design Panel members also thought that the building design was not particularly inspiring, so the idea of distinctive character areas was supported and should be developed to its full potential. In Phase one, there are four design character areas. The four grouped areas comprise the full spectrum of dwelling types, but what differentiates them is the choice and use of their facia materials and colours and their home zone layouts. The home zone approach and the diverse range of planting on the landscape plan was generally welcomed by the Design Panel.
- 8.93 However, the stage one response from the GLA confirmed that they wanted to see further information regarding the design codes for the scheme. Design codes set out the rules for a development and can incorporate anything from limits to distances. heights of buildings to material quality, dwelling types etc.

- 8.94 In response to the latter, the applicant submitted a Design Code to which officers conclude that the document provides a sufficient framework of principles, confirming the parameters which have been set for the detailed part of the application (Phase one), and which would be used to govern the development of the outline element of the application (Phase two). In particular, the Code confirms the height limits of the buildings proposed to surround the retained six Listed Buildings. That said, officers conclude that further information about the design code can be provided to further tighten the principles and boundaries of development for the outline phase of the application, especially considering the sensitivity in design which is required to protect the setting of the Listed Buildings. This additional information can be provided by way of condition to ensure that the development principles for the second phase of the development is more strict, but which is still able to tie the two phases together.

Materials

- 8.95 The materials proposed for Phase 1 are considered acceptable. The applicants have opted for robust materials, including brick and painted render, which are considered appropriate for the elevations. That said, a condition requiring the submission of details and samples of all external materials, is recommended.
- 8.96 For Phase two, the choice of materials will be considered at the reserved matters stage, but again would be governed by the provisions of the Design Code.

Design and crime

- 8.97 In the first instance, the estate would no longer have the narrow pathways hiding the dwellings therein from the benefit of natural surveillance. Instead, the simplistic, legible layout of the new development would mean that properties are overlooked, but not to the detriment of compromising privacy levels. Further, the whole site is permeable, being centrally accessed from the spine road. Again, the communal spaces from the blocks of flats, the landscaped areas surrounding the spine road and the north western open space would be overlooked, as would other publicly accessible routes through the site. Entrances to all blocks would be on elevations, which residents and members of the public can walk, or cycle past and these entrances would benefit from good visibility back into the public realm.
- 8.98 Given the above, the proposed layout and design raises no significant concerns in terms of crime and the fear of crime. Officers are not aware of any evidence to suggest that the proposed development would create a hostile physical environment that would repeat any problems of the existing estate.

Conclusion

- 8.99 To conclude, the design of the scheme is acceptable, whilst the applicant has submitted a Design Code which ensures that the standard of design would be consistently applied to the second phase. Further, the proposed design of the estate successfully blends in with the subtle property types surrounding the estate.

Landscaping

- 8.100 The Design Panel stated that a thorough landscaping strategy would be required to ensure that the design of the proposed development is successful.

Landscaping information pertaining to the location, types and quantities of landscaping was submitted.

- 8.101 The Council's Trees officer provided comments on the submitted landscaping proposals. In her response, reference is made to the importance of the protection of established trees during works, including trees and hedgerows which are on the outskirts of the application site as they form an important wildlife and historic feature and much should be retained. The Tree Officer raised further queries as appropriateness of the chosen planting.
- 8.102 A After numerous negotiations between the applicant and the Tree Officer, it was concluded that the landscaping strategy could be submitted by response to a condition added to the decision notice if members are mindful to grant planning permission. That said, it is only the detail of the landscaping, such as the choice of plants, and surfaces etc. The location of the proposed landscaping was considered acceptable by the Tree Officer.
- 8.103 Neighbour Objections
- 8.104 As noted earlier in the Consultation chapter of this report, paragraph 5.5 provides a summary of the neighbours concerns. Twenty written replies were received in response to the consultation exercise for the current exercise of which three were in support, one provided a non planning related comment and the remainder were objections to the proposals.

Historic Value

- 8.105 The historic importance of the site was a reoccurring theme amongst the objections which has been considered in the 'Principle of Development' section within this report. Objectors wanted to see the prefabs retained and the application site designated as a Conservation Area. In response to calls to the Council to designate the application site, it was concluded that whilst the site does have historic value, designating the site as a Conservation Area would not represent a sustainable future use for the prefabs; instead the redevelopment of the Excalibur Estate is considered to represent a substantial public benefit which outweighs the loss of the majority of the estate.

Affordability

- 8.106 An objection was raised from an existing resident as to the affordability of the new dwellings. For instance, the Estate has one standing charge for water rates, whilst the new dwellings would be on meters which monitor usage and occupiers would be charged accordingly. However, as the new dwellings would be insulated better, and have been passively designed to maximise solar gain, energy bills for the new dwellings should be considerably less, requiring less energy for heating and cooling. Further, for those existing residents who chose to remain within the estate, their rents would be subsidised to match the existing rents or they would have the opportunity to have an equity share in the new dwellings without the necessity to pay rent on the level of equity that they do not own. Therefore, for the existing occupiers of the estate, there is an opportunity to substantially improve their living conditions at similar costs to current living costs within the prefabs.

Health Concerns

- 8.107 Concerns were raised as to the ability of the new dwellings to accommodate people with ill health and disabilities. Objectors suggest that the new dwellings would be too small. It was argued that the simplistic, flat layout of the prefabs comfortably provided ease of access in and around the unit. However for the occupiers who, in the first instance, wish to be re-located within the new development, they would be provided a like for like property and in the scheme providing bungalows and wheelchair accessible units within the over 55's flats, all residents and their individual needs would be provided for within the new development. Further, the wheelchair units in particular would be designed to the South East London Housing Partnership Standards which provide very generous and flexible living accommodation standards to ensure that the any occupier with an illness or disability can be comfortably accommodated even if their needs change as the units are created to be adaptable.

Overlooking/Loss of privacy

- 8.108 The heights of the buildings within phase one are 1-3 stories in height with the majority of the three storey elements being located to the south of the blocks, away from the properties within Hazelbank Road, adjacent to the spine road. The only exception is Block 11, which has a three storey element to the north of the block. Officers raised concerns as to the proximity of the three storey block, being south of the properties within Hazelbank Road and only a minimum of 27m away from the closest habitable window within the existing dwelling. To the west of Block 11, the three storey element has been revised to be 'pulled back' away from the rear elevation of that block and now provides a staggered, part 2/part 3 storey block with the bulk being pulled away from the properties within Hazelbank Road. This revision has also resulted in a two bed unit being reduced to one within the top floor of Block 11.
- 8.109 With regard to Phase 2, scale and massing has been withdrawn from the matters to be considered in a letter dated 16th February 2011. This is a result of discussions with English Heritage and the Council's Conservation team who considered the three storey height of blocks 20 and 21 was too oppressive in relation to the setting and context of the western pair of Grade II Listed prefabs.
- 8.110 In light of the above, the scale of the proposed buildings within Phase one of the scheme and the massing of the buildings within Phase two are to be considered at the reserved matters stage, whilst the parameters set out within the Design Code are also considered acceptable.
- 8.111 The site boundary abuts the rear gardens of the surrounding properties that share a common boundary with the application site. Therefore, any building proposed it at least the distance of the garden, which separates the neighbours from the application site. The buildings proposed to be closest to the existing buildings outside of the site are block 15 within phase one, to the east of the application site, is a row of two, storey terraced properties which back onto existing two storey dwellings which front Castillon Road. The proposed new houses are separated from the existing plots by 9m deep gardens. A similar relationship can be found in block 4 & 5 and 8 & 9 to the north and block 22 to the south. The distances between the existing and proposed are considered normal for a back to back row of terraced properties and therefore whilst overlooking will occur between the

properties, the distances between them then renders the level of overlooking acceptable.

- 8.112 Officers did however, raise concerns as to the relationship between the existing dwellings at the eastern side of Wentland Road and the proposed two storey block of terraced houses labelled as block 13. Significant concern was raised as to the overlooking from the southern end of the block, directly into the immediate private rear amenity space of the existing houses. To remedy the concern, north, north western facing windows are proposed for the second and third unit (counting from south to north) houses only. The first house has outlook back onto the Spine Road, with no windows proposed in the rear flank.

Loss of light/overshadowing

- 8.113 A sunlight, daylight and shadowing report was submitted with the application which considered the impact to and from existing and proposed dwellings in and around the application site.
- 8.114 The report concludes that all new dwellings would benefit from adequate access to sunlight and that acceptable levels of overshadowing would occur within the site. The report also concludes that there would be no adverse overshadowing to the existing surrounding dwellings.
- 8.115 The report identifies that three quarters of the surrounding properties have an orientation which would provide access to sunlight for most of the day, that is the properties lining the perimeter of the application site, located to the east, west and south. The properties north of the application site would be affected the most by the heights and bulk of the proposed new buildings. However, the properties to the north, within Hazelbank Road have exceptionally deep gardens and therefore if overshadowing were to occur, it would only be to the rearmost parts of their gardens which is considered acceptable.
- 8.116 Within the scheme, some of the flatted units would be solely reliant on daylight from north-facing windows. However, this only relates to the over 55's Block, in phase one. These units benefit from generously proportioned windows and therefore whilst they would not benefit from sunlight, they would however benefit from ample access to daylight which is considered acceptable. Overall, the development provides a generous provision of either south facing and/or dual aspect units and therefore a few which do not provide this, in conjunction with the conclusions set out in the sunlight, daylight and shadowing report, this is considered acceptable.
- 8.117 Further, outlook from all habitable rooms in Phase 1 is considered to be adequate. Buildings are located at least 18m apart, back to back providing a adequate distance to ensure that windows serving habitable rooms would not be inappropriately enclosed by buildings within or adjacent to the application site itself.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.118 An occupier from Hazelbank Road which is to the north of the application site objected on the grounds that the higher density would result in additional noise disturbance to the existing surrounding properties. Whilst additional noise would naturally ensue from the new dwellings, any noise or disturbance from them would

be of the types and levels associated with a residential development. It is not considered that the increase noise levels from the same land use (residential) would significantly compromise the amenities of existing dwellings to warrant refusing the proposal.

Impact on local infrastructure

- 8.119 Many neighbours have argued that the amenities serving the area such as schools, general practitioners, public transport are already overstretched and therefore doubling the density of the site would only exacerbate matters.
- 8.120 Officers agree that the increase in density would create a further burden on local facilities and therefore have negotiated financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the scheme.
- 8.121 In doing so, officers have to ensure that any contributions sought in respect of development are relevant to the development and application site, necessary to mitigate the impact of the development and reasonable in scale and kind. In light of the latter considerations, contributions have been sought with regard to education as the development would provide more dwellings of which many are larger family sized units, health for the same reasons, transport as the Council have an obligation to encourage sustainable forms of transport, employment and training and community facilities as the proposed new occupiers should be encouraged to use work and learn locally and make use of local leisure facilities. All of the latter contributions would add to the sustainability of the proposed development. The full list of contributions can be found within the Planning Obligations section of this report.

Public and Private Open Space and Landscaping

- 8.122 The applicants propose a 500 square metre communal space referred to playable space and youth space to the north western corner of the site adjacent to the bungalows fronting Baudwin Road. This publically accessible is to proposed to have landscaping and play equipment to attract younger and older children.
- 8.123 Throughout the site there are 12 sites of various sizes comprising pocket play area which is intended for the 0-4 years age group. These sites are located in the home zones and are intended for children to play outside close to their dwellings, but with the other children within the immediate vicinity.
- 8.124 There is also a small provision of public amenity space running parallel on the perimeters of the spine road which runs through the site, which will have sporadic seating areas. The flatted units also have access to either communal outside space and/or private balconies. The most generous provision of amenity space however is for the houses. All of the houses have a front and rear gardens. The Council's UDP policy HSG 7 Gardens requires that all family sized units (3+ beds) have gardens with a depth of 9m. Even the 2 bed houses have gardens and therefore the provision of private amenity space has exceed Council requirements.
- 8.125 The proposed provision of private amenity space in the scheme is considered acceptable for a development of this nature and density. The inclusion of balconies for every flat is to be welcomed.

- 8.126 In addition to the acceptability of the provision of private and communal amenity space as mentioned above, additional drawings demonstrate the distance of open space within the immediate vicinity of the application. Whilst it is disagreed that Hither Green cemetery can provide amenity space for future occupiers of the site as depicted on drawing number APL0034, this drawing does demonstrate the close proximity of publically accessible facilities within walking distance from the site:
- Goldsmiths Community Centre shares a common boundary with the application site to the south eastern corner and provides a selection of leisure and community facilities, including an outdoor tennis court;
 - Forster Memorial Park to the west of the application site is 129m away (6 minutes walk) and comprises relatively updated equipment for all ages;
 - There is also a sports ground and Durham Fields to the south of the application site.
- 8.127 It is considered that Goldsmiths Community Centre would have the greatest impact of the facilities mentioned above, given its close proximity to the site. Therefore it is intended that some of the financial contributions sought to negate the impact on community facilities would be directed towards this centre.
- 8.128 Not mentioned on this (APL0034) additional drawing however, is Hazelbank Road allotments to the northeast of the application site. The allotments are approximately 3 minutes walk away from the site. Allotments are becoming more attractive to individuals and the Council has a duty to provide additional allotments for the increasing population. Therefore, as the population of the estate will increase, so will the necessity to ensure that adequate allotments are available and thus a financial contribution will be secured to aid the achievement of this.
- 8.129 The proposed living roofs are not intended for use as outdoor amenity spaces.
- 8.130 As previously mentioned, additional information pertaining to the location, size and nature of the play spaces and details of the existing surrounding play spaces, was requested in the stage one report from the GLA.
- 8.131 In the first instance, the proposed development comprises a considerable amount of houses, all of which have their own private amenity space. Therefore, whilst the proposal falls short of providing designated child play space, (policy requirement 1,580m², scheme proposes 931.25m² creating a 648.75m² deficit), there is enough garden and doorstep play for children under five years of age. Further, children over 5 years old will be able to use the Forster Memorial Park 320 metres west from the centre of the site to supplement the on site local playable and youth play space. Other existing play spaces within 800 metres of the site include the Goldsmith Community Centre, the white foot Lane Sports Field, the Durham's Fields and the Hither Green Cemetery. As such, the officers consider the proposed quantum of on site play space to be acceptable.
- 8.132 Whilst the provision of publically accessible amenity does not appear obviously generous within the application site, weight has to be given to the amount of private amenity space provided in the scheme which is in accordance with policy, combined with the close proximity of relatively recently improved local leisure facilities within such close proximity of the site. That said, as identified within the

contributions section of this report, contributions will also be secured with regard to improving local community facilities.

- 8.133 Lastly, the applicant submitted preliminary landscaping details pertaining to types of soft landscaping and planting. The Council's Tree Officer confirmed that many of the species proposed were inappropriate. However, details of landscaping can be secured by way of conditions and therefore further negotiation to this regard can be left post the Council's decision about the remainder of the scheme.
- 8.134 To conclude the applicants propose a limited amount of public space to the north western corner of the site adjacent to the bungalows fronting Baudwin Road. There is also a small provision of public amenity space running parallel on the perimeters of the spine road running through the site, which will have sporadic seating areas. The flatted units all have balconies or access to some form of outside space, whilst all of the gardens have their own gardens.

Sustainability

- 8.135 UDP policy URB 3 refers to the contribution that developments make to energy and natural resource efficiency. Other UDP policies relating to energy in the Environmental Protection chapter of the plan have been deleted. Paragraph 2.4 of the Council's Residential Standards SPD encourages the inclusion of energy efficient and renewable energy technology and design. The SPD also refers to London Plan (pre-2008 version) policies regarding energy efficiency, renewable energy, water supplies and sustainable design and construction. These policies have been revised and strengthened in the extant (2008) London Plan – policies 4A.3, 4A.4, 4A.6, 4A.7, 4A.9, 4A.10, 4A.14, 4A.16 and 4B.1 are considered to be of most relevance to this case. In particular, policy 4A.7 Renewable Energy states that boroughs should “adopt a presumption that developments will achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 20% from on site renewable energy generation... unless it can be demonstrated that such provision is not feasible”. London Plan policy 4A.1 (Tackling climate change) establishes an energy hierarchy based around using less energy, in particular by adopting sustainable design and construction (being ‘lean’), supplying energy efficiently, in particular by prioritising decentralised energy generation (being ‘clean’) and using renewable energy (being ‘green’).
- 8.136 In the first instance, the layout of the proposed development is such that the orientation of the houses are predominantly east/west which allows for a double exposition and solar gain in the morning and evening. This is passive design which is a design feature encouraged by policies within the London Plan.
- 8.137 The blocks of flats will individually benefit from a gas-fired communal heating system supplemented by solar thermal to provide 40% of the energy requirements for direct hot water. Roof mounted solar thermal panels will be located on the roof space of each block.
- 8.138 The proposal will meet the requirements of Code Level 4 rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes assessment scheme and incorporates a number of additional sustainable measures such as various SUD (Sustainable Urban Drainage) methods including underground attenuation storage, water butts and living roofs. These measures will reduce the surface water run-off discharge rate from the site by 50% compared to the existing situation.

- 8.139 Further, the new buildings themselves include a collective of on-site renewable energy provision which will reduce the CO2 emissions of the proposal by 39% compared to building regulations requirements, but by 13% through the use of onsite renewable technologies. All residential units will also achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.
- 8.140 Flats will have a dedicated recyclable waste storage unit, which will provide facilities for recycling household waste and composting. Houses and bungalows will have storage bins for recyclable waste and composting. These facilities will aim to provide storage to enable the recycling of at least 35% of household waste.
- 8.141 In line with policy requirements, the proposed development will be achieving the 20% reduction in CO2 derived from renewable technologies (alone) on the site such as the use of solar thermal panels. This will be secured by way of a conditions to the decision notice should members be mindful to grant planning permission.

Site contamination

- 8.142 National planning policy relating to contaminated land is set out in PPS 23. UDP policy ENV.PRO 10 Contaminated Land is also relevant.
- 8.143 Given that the pre-fabricated dwellings comprise asbestos, and that many of the dwellings have off street parking spaces where contaminants may have been discharged, a condition is recommended, requiring the submission of a detailed investigation and assessment of the site in relation to possible contamination, together with full details of any remediation required, and the final submission of a closure report. Although site contamination information (including details of site investigation have already been carried out at various sample sites around the site, the applicants argue that a comprehensive sample study cannot be carried out throughout the site as much of the land is still in private ownership. Therefore, the information provided thus far is not sufficient to obviate the need for an appropriate condition related to site contamination.
- 8.144 The Environment Agency has responded to the consultation and has provided advice in relation to contaminated land as well as recommending a series of conditions to be imposed on any permission granted.

Flood risk

- 8.145 The national planning policy relevant to flood risk is found in PPS 25. London Plan policy 4A.13 (Flood risk management) is also relevant.
- 8.146 Prior to the submission of the planning application, one of the occupiers of the Excalibur Estate suggested that there were 3 uncapped wells and a number of underground streams underneath the estate. From this, concerns were raised by the Council as to the amount of money that would be added to cost of any proposed redevelopment of the estate which would be needed to stabilise the ground.
- 8.147 To investigate the presence of wells underneath the application site, officers contacted the Council's historical department who confirmed that maps dating back to 1866, confirmed that there were no wells present on or around the application site. Thames Water were also contacted and their findings were the

same as the Council's officers in that they did not have any records suggesting underground wells on or around the application site. During the consultation exercise of this planning application, the Environment Agency made no reference to such wells.

- 8.148 Notwithstanding the above, the land is extremely flat and therefore it is recommend that a condition is attached requiring the submission and approval of detailed surface water assessments prior to the commencement of each phase of proposed development, and that each of these detailed assessments should include a review and update (as required) of the over-arching conceptual approach to surface water drainage of the site to demonstrate that proposals within the detailed assessments do not limit the opportunity for holistic solutions and betterment within the development site.
- 8.149 A flood risk assessment was submitted with the application to which the Environment Agency raised no objections. The only comment from the Environment Agency was the requirement to place a condition on the decision notice, should members be mindful to grant planning permission, that all flood risk measures are carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment. Officers agree with the comments and condition suggested by the Environment Agency.

Transport

- 8.150 This section of the report addresses issues relating to traffic impact and trip generation, highways works, car and motorcycle parking, cycling and cycle parking, servicing and construction traffic. National guidance on transport matters is found in PPG 13 (Transport) and PPS 3 (Housing). The most relevant general UDP policy is TRN 26 Car Parking Standards, to be read in conjunction with Table TRN 1 'which states that the Council will normally require development to make provision for off street parking in accordance with the standards set out in Table TRN 1. Exceptions may be made for people with disabilities and having regard to the level of public transport accessibility.' The table provides that for a residential (C1 use) development, maximum parking standards are 1:1.5 for 3+ sized dwellings or 1 space maximum for 1-2 bed units.
- 8.151 London Plan policy 3C.1 (Integrating transport and development) sets out a similar policy position whilst 3C.2 (Matching development to transport capacity) and 3C.3 (Sustainable transport in London) seek to ensure that development is related to transport capacity and that measures are taken to encourage movement to more sustainable modes of transport.
- 8.152 Relevant UDP policies are TRN Location of Development, TRN 2 Travel Impact Statements, TRN 3 Developer Contributions, TRN 4 Access for Public Transport, TRN 5 Green Travel Plans, TRN 10 Protection and Improvement of Public Transport and TRN 20 Improving Road Safety. Relevant London Plan Policies are 3C.9 (Increasing the capacity, quality and integration of public transport to meet London's needs), 3C.18 (Allocation of street space), 3C.20 (Improving conditions for buses), and 3C.21 (Improving conditions for walking).
- 8.153 The entire scheme is to provide 80% car parking which is acceptable in local and regional policy terms given the low PTAL rating of 1-1b in and around the

application site. Thirty-eight of those car parking spaces are to be allocated as disabled car parking bays, designed to the South East London Housing Partnership Standards. The proposed development is also to provide 100% cycle Parking.

- 8.154 With regard to the cycle parking, TfL in their comments, suggested that further designated cycle parking is provided for the family sized dwellings. However, Officers consider that for the units which benefit from private rear gardens, cycle parking would be most probable at the rear of the properties within sheds which are more secure. Therefore, in line with Council policy, the level of cycle parking proposed is considered acceptable. In addressing the types of cycle parking proposed, the Council's Cycle Officer is happy with the proposed provision of internal cycle parking within the blocks of flats and the 'D' rings to the front of the houses.
- 8.155 The density of the development is to more than double and therefore would result in the generation of additional walking and cycle trips. In light of the latter, the Council's Highways team have asked for financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the additional highway usage, improvements to local roads, and the creation and improvement of cycle and pedestrian routes within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.156 As new roads and higher densities are being proposed, the Highways team require a Waste Management Plan (WMP) to ensure the scheme can sufficiently facilitate refuse clearance and management, including re-cycling. A condition would also be placed required to ensure that private and communal bins are stored discretely around the new development.
- 8.157 To ensure that disturbance to neighbouring dwellings and traffic flow is kept to minimum, a Construction and Logistics Plan (CLP) is required which would specify how the impacts of construction activities and associated traffic will be managed. This can also be secured by way of conditions.
- 8.158 Whilst the scheme does provided relatively generous levels of car parking due to the low PTAL level of the site and the design principles set out by neighbour consultation prior to the submission of the application, it is still imperative to ensure that more sustainable modes of travel are encouraged. In this instance, this is to be achieved via the installation of Electronic Car charging points for 20% of the car parking spaces and a further 20% to be passively installed meaning that the facility would be easily available for someone who wanted to install the charging point on their property as required by Transport for London.
- 8.159 To further promote sustainable forms of travel, the Council's Highways team have requested the implementation of the Travel Plan. To measure the success of the Travel Plan and to ensure that lessons can be learned as to their effectiveness, a financial contribution towards monitoring the plan is to be sought from the applicant to ensure that it is delivered successfully to new residents.
- 8.160 An obvious mode of sustainable transport, and to accommodate the upper age ranges of residents, the bus stops located on Baudwin Road will be pivotal to promoting more sustainable modes of transport. It has been suggested by neighbours that the existing bus route (124) which runs through the site is often at capacity during rush hour times. However, TfL have not requested any

contributions from the development to ease this, but have rather requested that the bus stops are upgraded to ensure easier access to and from their busses. To achieve this, TfL have asked for a financial contribution.

- 8.161 In addition to this, to ease congestion at the location of the existing bus stops, a lay by will be provided so that buses and other vehicles can pass each other more freely.
- 8.162 Contributions are also to be allocated to undertake reinstatement/improvement works to Baudwin Road, Castillon Road and Battersby Road (following construction), together with improvements to the path that runs south from Persant Road to Boundfield Road (lighting, etc).
- 8.163 For the car parking, the applicant will be required to submit a Parking Management Plan (PMP) to be secured by way of a planning condition. The plan is to provide details of measures to prevent unauthorised parking throughout the site.
- 8.164 To conclude, given the low PTAL rating of the application site and surrounds of 1-1b, the proposed level of 80% parking provision, and 100% cycle parking is considered acceptable.

9.0 Planning Obligations

- 9.1 Paragraph B5 of Circular 05/2005 sets out a number of tests that must be met by any item to be included as a planning obligation in a Section 106 Agreement, namely that a planning obligation must be (i) relevant to planning; (ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; (iii) directly related to the proposed development; (iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and (v) reasonable in all other respects.
- 9.2 UDP policy IRM3 Community Benefit and Planning Loss and London Plan policies 6A.4 (Priorities in planning obligations) and 6A.5 (Planning obligations) set out the Council's approach to planning obligations. Whether a development makes appropriate provision for, or contribution towards, requirements that are made necessary by, and are related to, the proposed development will be a material consideration relevant to the planning application being considered. Negotiations should seek a contribution towards the full cost of all such provision that is fairly and reasonably related in scale and in kind to the proposed development and its impact on the wider area. Planning obligations should reflect strategic and local needs.
- 9.3 Given that the applicants propose works to public highways, agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (with LB Lewisham, LB Greenwich and Transport for London) would also be necessary, in addition to the Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms set out below.

Planning Obligations (Section 106 Agreement)

- 9.4 Circular 05/05 states that in dealing with planning applications, local planning authorities consider each on its merits and reach a decision based on whether the application accords with the relevant development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where applications do not meet these requirements, they may be refused. However, in some instances, it may be

possible to make acceptable development proposals which might otherwise be unacceptable, through the use of planning conditions or, where this is not possible, through planning obligations.

9.5 Paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (April 2010) sets out that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is –

- (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

9.6 As discussed throughout the body of this report, officers have negotiated obligations that they consider are necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development as set out below:-

Education

Nursery £82,136

Primary £140,933

Secondary £0

16 + £137,876

Health £140k

Allotments £13,618

Transport £145k (including the requirement to pay £20k to TfL)

Employment & Training £69,204

Community Facilities £63,766

Policy compliant % of the units to be provided as affordable housing

100% of the units to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard

Development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4

10% of the units to meet the SELHP Wheelchair Homes Design Guidelines (August 2009) with the units allocated to affordable housing to be fitted out

All dwellings to achieve a minimum reduction of 20% in CO2 emissions from on-site renewable energy generation.

The use of local labour on-site

Meeting the Council's legal, professional, and monitoring costs associated with the drafting, finalising and monitoring of the Agreement.

9.7 Officers consider that the proposed 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).

10.0 Conclusion

10.1 The principle of the demolition of the Excalibur Estate has been considered by officers as acceptable as the redevelopment of the estate is considered to represent a substantial public benefit which outweighs the loss of the majority of the estate.

10.2 The scale of the proposed development raises a number of questions, such as the impact that the development would have on the setting of nearby historic buildings; the accessibility of the scheme; the impact the development would have on the occupiers of surrounding properties; and the ability to deliver an environmentally sustainable development.

10.3 The proposed development would provide much needed housing and affordable accommodation and would substantially improve the living conditions of the current occupiers, whilst achieving a density which utilises the sizeable piece of land more efficiently and in line with current local and national policies and guidance.

10.4 It has been demonstrated that the development will provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and overall, the buildings are attractively designed and of an acceptable scale for this locality.

10.5 Officers consider that, with the recommended planning conditions and obligations in place, the scheme is broadly consistent with local and national policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

11.0 Summary of Reasons for Grant of Planning Permission

11.1 The Local Planning Authority has considered the particular circumstances of the application against relevant planning policy set out in The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) and 'extended' policies in the Council's Unitary Development Plan (2004). The Local Planning Authority has further had regard to the Mayor of London's Supplementary Planning Guidance and Best Practice Guidance; as well as the Local Planning Authority's Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006); and Government Planning Policy Guidance and Statements, and all other material considerations including the obligations that are to be entered into in the planning agreement in connection with the development and the conditions to be imposed on the permission. The Local Planning Authority considers that:-

- (1) The site is an appropriate location for a development of the density proposed in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.3, which seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, identified design principles and public transport capacity;

- (2) The provision of residential accommodation at the density proposed at this site is in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.3 which seeks to maximise the potential of sites; and with Lewisham UDP policy HSG 2 which promotes the development of housing on previously developed land.
- (3) The layout of the site, the design of the development, and the provision of housing is in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.5 which seeks to achieve a range of housing choice; and with Lewisham UDP policy HSG 5, which requires that all new residential development is attractive, neighbourly and meets the functional requirements of its future inhabitants.
- (4) The proposed dwelling mix and provision of affordable housing, which is controlled by planning obligations agreed as part of the permission, is in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.10 regarding the provision of affordable housing and achieving the maximum reasonable amount taking account of targets and the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development; with Lewisham UDP policy HSG 6 which seeks a mix of dwelling sizes determined by reference to the housing needs of the area, the nature of the development and its proposed relationship to the surrounding area; with Lewisham UDP policy HSG 14 which seeks the provision of affordable housing including on mixed use sites and with Lewisham UDP policy HSG 15 which seeks the affordable housing contribution to be provided in a way which assists in securing a more balanced social mix.
- (5) The provision of new public realm and publicly accessible open space, and mitigation secured through planning obligations, is appropriate and complies with London Plan policy 4B.3 which seeks high quality and accessible public realm; with Lewisham UDP policy URB 12 which requires the inclusion of landscape proposals for all areas not occupied by buildings and with London Plan policy 3D.13 and Lewisham policy LCE 4 which seeks to provide attractive, safe and accessible places for children to play.
- (6) The energy demand of the proposed development has been assessed in accordance with London Plan policies 4A.1, 4A.4 and 4A.6 and the proposals regarding renewable sources of energy are in general accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.7 which requires major development to generate a proportion of the site's electricity or heat needs from on-site renewable technologies.
- (7) The proposed highway works including provisions for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users and the overall traffic impact of the development have been assessed in accordance with Lewisham UDP policy TRN 2, and the identified highway impacts and proposed mitigation measures secured by planning conditions and obligations, are considered acceptable in accordance with Lewisham UDP policies TRN 4, TRN 5, TRN 10, TRN 14, TRN 15, and TRN 16 which require major schemes to provide access that take account of the requirements of public transport providers as well improvements to public transport and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians.
- (8) The proposed level of cycle parking and associated measures to reduce car use are in accordance with Lewisham UDP policies TRN 5 and TRN 14, and the related Table TRN 2, which require the provision of off street bicycle parking in accordance with specific standards and encourages the drawing

up of Travel Plans. Measures to reduce car use, provide off-street parking, provide 'car club' spaces and membership and to submit Travel Plans are proposed to be secured by planning obligations agreed as part of the permission.

(9) The community benefits inherent in the scheme and the financial contributions towards achieving other planning policy objectives is in accordance with Lewisham UDP policy IRM 3 which seeks the inclusion of community benefits as part of development proposals and London Plan policies 6A.4 and 6A.5.

11.2 Consideration has also been given to the objections made to the proposed development, as set out in this report. It is considered that none of the objections are considered sufficient to outweigh the reasons for granting planning permission.

11.3 There is no requirement to refer the application to the Secretary of State at the appropriate regional government office (the Government Office for London) under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009.

12.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 RECOMMENDATION (A)

Agree the proposals and refer the application and this report and any other required documents to the Mayor for London (Greater London Authority) under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (Categories 1A and 1C of the Schedule of the Order).

12.2 RECOMMENDATION (B)

Subject to no direction being received from the Mayor of London, 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 (as set out in more detail in part 8 of this report), including such other amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development:-

Contribution towards Nursery places of £82,136

Contribution towards Primary places of £140,933

Contribution towards 16 + places of £137,876

Contribution towards Health Care of £140k

Contribution towards Allotments of £13,618

Contribution towards Transport of £125k (plus the requirement to pay £20k to Transport for London)

Contribution towards Employment & Training of £69,204

Contribution towards Community facilities of £63,766

Policy compliant 61% of the units to be provided as affordable housing

100% of the units to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard

The development is to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4

10% of the units are to meet the SELHP Wheelchair Homes Design Guidelines (August 2009) with the units allocated to affordable housing to be fully fitted out for wheelchair occupiers

All dwellings to achieve a minimum reduction of 20% in CO2 emissions from on-site renewable energy generation.

The use of local labour on-site

Meeting the Council's legal, professional and monitoring costs associated with the drafting, finalising and monitoring of the Agreement.

12.3 **RECOMMENDATION (C)**

Subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement, authorise the Head of Planning to **GRANT PERMISSION** subject to conditions and informatives set out in the following paragraphs and such amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development.

12.4 **Conditions**

The Planning Conditions referred to in Recommendation C are as follows:-

Time Limits and Reserved Matters

1. Three Year Time Limit

Phase 1 must be begun not later than three years from the date of the grant of this permission.

2. Time limit of outline element

(a) Applications for approval of Reserved Matters pertaining to landscaping and scale and massing (height) must be made not later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date of the grant of this planning permission, and

(b) The development to which this outline permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 2 years from the final approval of the Reserved Matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved

3. Reserved Matters details for Phase 2

No Phase of the development shall be commenced until layouts, plans, sections, elevations and other supporting material for that Phase detailing:-

- i) design of the buildings (including internal layouts);
- ii) external appearance (including samples of the materials and finishes to be used for all external surfaces and including but not limited to roofs, elevation treatment, glazing);

- iii) landscaping of all public and other areas (including locations of trees and play equipment).
- iv) scale and massing of all buildings including their heights

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the development shall in all aspects be carried out in accordance with the details approved under this Condition 3.

4. Detail for both Phases

No Phase of the development shall be commenced until details of the following matters in respect of that Phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:-

1. footpath layout, including all surface treatments;
2. hard and soft landscaping and planting;
3. site boundary treatments;
4. foul and surface water drainage, including on site and off site connections/improvements;
5. daylight and sunlight information for all habitable room windows (except for those in Phase 1);
6. detailed elevation drawings and sections to a scale of 1:50 and 1:100 and;
7. details of compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes standards Level 4.

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

5. Phase 1 - compliance with approved application details

Unless minor variations are otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application documents, plans and drawings hereby approved and listed below;

APL0001, 0002, 0003 Rev B, 0004 Rev F, 0005, 0006 Rev A, 0007, 0008, 0009, 0010, 0011, 0012, 0013, 0014 Rev B, 0015 Rev A, 0016 Rev A, 0017, 0018, 0019, 0020 Rev B, 0021, 0022 Rev A, 0023 Rev A, 0024 Rev B, 0025, 0026 Rev A, 0027 Rev B, 0028, 0029, 0031, 0032, 0034, 0035, 0036, 0037, 0038, 0039, CBA7569.02, Planning Statement (bptw November 2010), Transport Assessment & Appendices (Scott Wilson November 2010), Residential Travel Plan (Scott Wilson November 2010), Air Quality Impact Assessment (Scott Wilson November 2010) PPG 24 Noise Impact Assessment (Scott Wilson November 2010), Code For Sustainable Homes (Eight Associates 16 /11/10), Sustainability Statement (Eight Associates 16 /11/10), Statement of Community Involvement (L & Q, received 15/3/11), Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment (Scott Wilson Nov 2010), Design & Access Statement (hunters, November 2010) Heritage Statement (Alan Baxter Nov 2010), Sunlight, Daylight and Shadowing (BLDA Consultancy 19/11/10), Preliminary Phase II Initial Geo-environmental Assessment Report (NLM November 2010), Appendix 1 – Revision A (16/2/11) Accessibility Statement,

Energy Assessment (Eight Associates 16/11/10), Energy Statement Addendum (Eight Associates 22/02/2011), Phase 2 Design Code (Hunters February 2011), Arboricultural Development Statement (CBA Trees, November 2010), Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Purcell Miller Tritton, January 2011) and Economic Viability Appraisal Report (Jones Lang La Salle November 2010)

Environment - General

6. Detailed Waste Management Plans

- (i) A detailed waste management plan (WMP) (to include details for the disposal, processing, recycling and storage of waste and for the provision of composting facilities) for each building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority no later than three months from the commencement of a particular building.
- (ii) The development of each building shall be carried out and operated in accordance with the approved WMP relating to that building unless minor variations are otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

7. Living Roofs

- (i) Details (including sections, details of proposed substrate, plant species and management, and confirmation that the roofs shall not be used as outdoor amenity spaces) of the living roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority not later than three months from the commencement of construction of each building to which they relate.
- (ii) Prior to the occupation of a building, the approved details and sections relating to that building shall be implemented.
- (iii) Thereafter the roofs shall be retained in accordance with the approved details and sections for the building to which they relate.

8. Bird and Bat Boxes

- (i) Details of bird and bat boxes to be provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the building on which they are to be located.
- (ii) Thereafter the approved bird and bat boxes shall be retained in accordance with approved details.

9. Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- (i) Full particulars of electric vehicle charging points to be provided on site and a programme for their installation and maintenance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the building at which they are to be located.
- (ii) The said electric vehicle charging points shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved particulars and programme of installation and maintenance.

Flood Risk Management

10. Flood Risk Assessment

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application.

Drainage

11. Surface Water

- (i) No Phase shall commence until details of impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure (to determine the magnitude of any additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point) and of a scheme for complying with the surface water management measures hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Thames Water.
- (ii) Each Phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for that Phase and thereafter the approved scheme is to be retained in accordance with the details approved therein.

12. Waste Water

- (i) No development of the relevant phase as approved within condition 38 of this decision notice shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the sewerage undertaker.
- (ii) No foul or surface water from the development shall be discharged into the public system until the drainage works referred to in an approved strategy have been completed.

Contamination and Risks to Controlled Waters

13. Contaminated Land

- (a) Post demolition, no construction of any phase as referred to and approved by condition 38 of this decision notice shall take place until each of the following has occurred:-
 - (i) a site investigation of the land within that Phase has been carried out to survey and assess the extent of potential contamination (including contamination of, and risks to, groundwater abstraction) and its effect (whether on or off site);
 - (ii) a report comprising the results of that site investigation and recommendations for treatment of any contamination (whether by remedial works or not) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council; and
 - (iii) all measures or treatments identified in that report as being necessary or desirable for the remediation of the site have been implemented in full at the land within that Phase.

- (b) If during any works at the site (whether pursuant to paragraph (a) of this condition ["paragraph a,,"] or implementation of this planning permission generally) contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified ("the new contamination,,"), then paragraph (a) shall apply to the new contamination and no further development of that Phase shall take place until the requirements of paragraph (a) have been complied with in relation to the new contamination.
- (c) The development within that Phase shall not be occupied until a closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The closure report shall include details both of the remediation (including waste materials removed from the site, an audit trail demonstrating that all imported or reused soil material conforms to current soil quality requirements as approved by the Council) and any post-remediation sampling that has been carried out, and details of measures to ensure contamination from other Phases cannot migrate into the Phase that is the subject of the closure report.

Trees and Hedges

- 14. L01 Planting, Paving, Walls Etc
- 15. L02 Detailed Tree Layout
- 16. Trees – Protection During Construction

No development of any Phase shall commence on site until adequate steps have been taken in accordance with Section 8 of BS 5837 Trees to safeguard all trees to be retained within or adjacent to that Phase against damage, prior to or during building works, including the erection of fencing. These fences shall be erected to the extent of the crown spread of the trees, or where circumstances prevent this, to a minimum radius of 2 metres from the trunk of the tree and such protection shall be retained until the development has been completed. No excavations, site works, trenches or channels shall be cut, or pipes or services laid in such a way as to cause damage to the root structure of the trees.

17. External Lighting

- (i) Details of all external lighting to be installed within each Phase as approved by condition 38 of this decision notice, including details of directional hoods and measures to prevent light spillage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority not later than six months from the commencement of works in that Phase.
- (ii) All such external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details before any dwelling in the relevant Phase is occupied and, thereafter any external lighting (including any directional hoods) shall be retained in accordance with the approved details.
- (iii) Details submitted for approval pursuant to paragraph (i) of this Condition, shall be accompanied by a supporting statement which demonstrates that the proposed lighting is the minimum needed for security and working purposes and that the proposals minimise pollution from glare and spillage.

Highways and Transport

18. Use of Car Parking

All car parking spaces within the development shall be reserved for and used by vehicles of the occupiers or users of the development only.

19 Cycle Parking

- (i) A minimum of 371 cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development.
- (ii) No Phase shall be occupied until the cycle parking spaces to be provided within that Phase have been provided and made available for use. Thereafter, such spaces shall be retained and used only as cycle parking for use as provided for in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of this Condition.

Construction Management

20. Code of Construction Practice

- (i) No works (including demolition and construction) shall commence until a code of construction practice (CoCP, incorporating a Construction Environmental Management Plan) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (ii) No such works shall be carried out other than in accordance with the approved CoCP.

21. Construction Traffic Management Plan

- (i) No works (including demolition and construction) shall commence in a particular Phase until a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) (incorporating a Construction Logistics Plan) for that Phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All CTMPs shall set out proposals to reduce the impact of construction traffic, including proposed lorry routeing.
- (ii) No such works shall be carried out other than in accordance with the relevant approved CTMP.

22. Archaeology

No development shall take place on the site until the applicant, or any successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, observation and recording which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Neighbouring amenity

23. Extensions

No extensions or alterations to the houses, whether or not permitted under Article 3 and Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted

Development) Order 1995 or any subsequent re-enactment thereof, shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

24. Telecommunications and satellite equipment

No telecommunications or satellite equipment shall be installed on any of the buildings hereby approved, whether or not permitted under Article 3 and Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any subsequent re-enactment thereof, shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

25. N10 Dust Minimisation Scheme

26. Delivery Hours

No deliveries to or from the site in connection with construction works shall take place outside the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and no such deliveries shall take place at all on Sundays or public holidays.

27. Deliveries and Servicing

No work shall commence on site until a Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

28. B09 Plumbing or Pipes

29. Highway Works

The buildings completed within each phase as approved under condition 38 of this decision notice shall not be occupied until the vehicular access and highway works are completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

30. Maintenance

No development of the relevant phase as approved within condition 38 of this decision notice shall commence on site until a schedule of maintenance, relating to the proposed communal amenity space on the application site, for a minimum period of five years and including detailed arrangements for its implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The whole of the proposed communal amenity space, as shown on the approved plans, shall be retained permanently for the benefit of the occupiers of the residential units hereby approved and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

31. No development of the relevant phase as approved within condition 38 of this decision notice shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

32. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water or sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the relevant water or sewerage undertaker. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.
33. Development of the relevant phase as approved within condition 38 of this decision notice should not be commenced until: a) full details, including anticipated flow rates, and detailed site plans have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water) b) Where this development forms part of a larger development, arrangements have been made to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority (in consultation with Thames Water) for the provision of adequate water supplies for the whole of the development.
34. Notwithstanding the submitted Design Code, further information confirming the parameters of the Design Code shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
35. No development of the relevant phase as approved by condition 38 to this decision notice shall commence on site until detailed plans of the appearance, location and a specification of the equipment comprising renewable energy and ventilation systems which shall include measures to minimise their visual impact, alleviate noise, vibration have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The systems shall be installed in accordance with the approved plans and specification before the development hereby permitted first commences and shall thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved specification.
36. No development of the relevant phase as approved within condition 38 of this decision notice shall commence until a report has been submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority which includes details and drawings demonstrating how the development will achieve a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions utilising renewable energy technologies. The agreed measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing.
37. No works (including demolition) shall commence on site until detailed demolition, construction and first occupation phasing schedules, of each phase are submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and carried out in accordance with the approved phasing schedule unless the local planning authority agree to any variation in writing.

Reasons

1. To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. In order that the local planning authority is satisfied with the details of the proposed development.
4. In order that the local planning authority is satisfied with the details of the proposed development.
5. To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and acceptable to the local planning authority.
6. To ensure that waste is minimised as far as practicable and managed in an environmentally sustainable way and to comply with Policy 4A.21 (Waste strategic policy and targets) in the London Plan.
7. To ensure that the development enhances biodiversity and complies with Policy OS13 (Nature Conservation) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and Policy 3D.14 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) in the London Plan.
8. To ensure that the development enhances biodiversity and complies with Policy OS13 (Nature Conservation) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and Policy 3D.14 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) in the London Plan.
9. To reduce pollution emissions in an Area Quality Management Area in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.19 (Improving air quality).
10. To ensure the development is designed safely in reference to flood risk in accordance with Policy ENV.PRO 15 (Sustainable Surface Water Drainage in New Development) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and Policy 4A.13 (Flood risk management) in the approved London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (February 2008)).
11. To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality in accordance with Policy ENV.PRO 15 (Sustainable Surface Water Drainage in New Development) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and Policy 4A.12 (Flooding) in the approved London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (February 2008) and ensure that water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with additional demand.
12. To ensure that the development does not lead to sewage flooding and that sufficient drainage capacity is made available to cope with the development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact.
13. To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied that potential site contamination is identified and remedied in view of the historical use(s) of the site, which may have included industrial processes and to comply with policies ENV.PRO 10 Contaminated Land and ENV.PRO 17 Management of the Water Supply in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
14. L01R
15. L02R

16. L08R
17. To ensure that the lighting is installed and maintained in a manner which will minimise possible light pollution to neighbouring properties and to comply with Policies ENV.PRO 12 Light Generating Development and HSG 4 Residential Amenity in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
18. To ensure the permanent retention of the space(s) for parking purposes, to ensure that the use of the building(s) does not increase on-street parking in the vicinity and to comply with Policy TRN 26 Car Parking Standards in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
19. In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policies TRN 14 (Cycle Parking) and TRN 15 (Provision for Cyclists and Walkers) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
20. To ensure that the demolition and construction processes are carried out in a manner which will minimise possible noise, vibration, dust and mud pollution and minimise disturbance from road traffic and safeguards road safety in accordance with Policies ENV.PRO 9 Potentially Polluting Uses, ENV.PRO 11 (Noise Generating Development) and HSG 4 (Residential Amenity) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
21. To ensure that the demolition and construction processes are carried out in a manner which will minimise possible disturbance from road traffic and safeguards road safety in accordance with Policies ENV.PRO 9 Potentially Polluting Uses, ENV.PRO 11 Noise Generating Development and HSG 4 Residential Amenity in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and that all reasonable measures have been taken to improve construction freight efficiency by reducing CO2 emissions, congestion and collisions in accordance with Policy TRN20 (Improving Road Safety) in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and Policy 3C.25 (Freight Strategy) in the approved London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (February 2008)).
22. To ensure adequate access for archaeological investigations in compliance with the advice contained in the Department of the Environment's Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, entitled "Archaeology and Planning" and to comply with Policy URB 21 Archaeology in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
23. In order that, in view of the nature of the development hereby permitted, the local planning authority may have the opportunity of assessing the impact of any further development in accordance with HSG 4 Residential Amenity and HSG 12 Residential Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
24. In order that, in view of the nature of the development hereby permitted, the local planning authority may have the opportunity of assessing the impact of any further development.
25. N10R

- 26 & In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupants at unsociable
27 periods and to comply with Policies ENV.PRO 9 Potentially Polluting Uses,
ENV.PRO 11 Noise Generating Development and HSG 4 Residential Amenity
in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
28. B09R
29. In order to ensure that satisfactory means of vehicular and pedestrian access
is provided and to comply with the Policies in Chapter 6 Sustainable Transport
& Parking in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
30. In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the amenity
space provision in the scheme and to comply with Policies HSG 4 Residential
Amenity and HSG 5 Layout and Design of New Residential Development in
the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
31. The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient
capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to
avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community. Should the Local
Planning Authority consider the above recommendation is inappropriate or are
unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local
Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Control
Department (telephone 01923 898072) prior to the Planning Application
approval.
32. The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water and
sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local
underground water and sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is
advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to
discuss the details of the piling method statement.
33. To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope
with the/this additional demand.
34. To ensure that the proposed development does not compromise the setting of
the retained Listed Buildings and their historic character and the surrounding
area generally and to comply with Policies URB 3 Urban Design and URB 18
Preserving Listed Buildings in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July
2004).
35. To safeguard the visual amenities of the proposed and existing properties and
the area generally and to comply with Policies URB 3 Urban Design,
ENV.PRO 20 Renewable Energy and HSG 4 Residential Amenity in the
adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
36. In the interests of promoting sustainable forms of developments in accordance
with London Plan policy 4A.7 Renewable Energy.
37. In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of
the phasing schedule and to ensure that the proposed works are not
detrimental to the amenities of the locality.

12.5 Informatives

1. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. 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 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
2. Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.
3. Applicants should be aware of their responsibilities under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to ensure that human health, controlled waters and ecological systems are protected from significant harm arising from contaminated land. Guidance therefore relating to their activities on site should be obtained primarily by reference to DEFRA and EA publications.
4. Your attention is drawn to comments provided by Thames Water on regarding drainage, infrastructure capacity and the location of mains.
5. Your attention is drawn to Construction Sites Code of Practice or any other such codes applicable at the time of construction.