

1. Summary Of Main Issues

This “steer” report seeks to inform Members of the Planning Applications Committee of the considerations arising from this development which is of such strategic and local importance as to warrant this form of referral. Members’ comments and resolutions are sought on the following issues:

- 1.1. The acceptability of total demolition of the existing buildings on site;
- 1.2. the principle of a tall building on this site;
- 1.3. the acceptability of a tall building 149m tall on this site;
- 1.4. the acceptability of the height, scale, bulk and design and impact on views across London, river views, the World Heritage Site of the Palace of Westminster the impact on listed buildings, local conservation areas and Vauxhall Park;
- 1.5. the regeneration benefits of the proposed development for the Vauxhall area;
- 1.6. the acceptability of the mix of land uses within a residentially led development;
- 1.7. the level of private amenity and children’s play space within and outside the development;
- 1.8. the significance of incorporating the adjoining plot into the scheme to provide additional open amenity space for future residents of this and other proposed schemes;
- 1.9. the impact of the development on the amenity of occupiers of the residential properties in the area, including the loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing and a sense of overbearing;
- 1.10. the acceptability of the highways proposals and public realm improvements;
- 1.11. the level of s106 Agreement obligations and financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the development at local and wider levels.

2. Site Description

- 2.1. The site lies immediately to the south of the Vauxhall Cross transport interchange. It is bounded to the north by Parry Street and to the west by Bondway. The elevated mainline railway line into Waterloo Station forms the eastern boundary of the site. A parcel of land, currently used as storage space and parking for commercial premises in the arches under the railway line, forms the southern boundary of the site. The site extends to 0.29 of a hectare (2,873m²).
- 2.2. The main building on the site is a late 19th Century warehouse. It comprises approximately 6,317m² Gross External Area (GEA). The original building was built in approximately 1885 and the building was then altered

and extended over the course of the last century, to include a three storey wing to the north, fronting Parry Street (built, c.1950s) and a new sixth storey roof level and five storey additional east wing (built c.1960s)., between the existing building and railway viaduct The roof was reconstructed in the post war period, including the additional sixth storey. The forecourt canopy structure, fronting Parry Street, was built c.1970s.

- 2.3. The building is currently used for storage (Use Class B8) and general office space available in the form of a business centre for small businesses (Use Class B1). At present, not all of the space is occupied and it is understood that owing to the nature of the small businesses using the business centre, it has never been fully occupied.
- 2.4. The surrounding area is mixed in use and character, reflecting the changing nature of Vauxhall and its history. The north of the site is dominated by the main Vauxhall transport interchange (including buses, London Underground and mainline railway services), alongside a row of buildings to the east of Bondway, used for office, retail and residential purposes. The area to the west consists mainly of employment uses, notably those at Market Towers and the CLS site on the other side of Bondway. A mix of uses is also found to the south, including offices, storage and distribution, a Sainsbury's superstore and residential, including the Wyvil Road Estate opposite.
- 2.5. The area on the opposite side of the mainline railway, to the east of the site, is predominantly residential in character and scale, although some employment and retail uses are located along South Lambeth Road and Miles Street. Vauxhall Park, a 20 acre park which provides a large area of local amenity space with a children's play area, is located approximately 200m to the east, accessed via Miles Street.
- 2.6. Other notable local landmarks in close proximity to the site include St George Wharf, the Oval Cricket Ground, Covent Garden Market (within the London Borough of Wandsworth) and the River Thames, which is a 5 minute walk to the west. The site lies approximately 1.9km (1.1 miles) upstream from the World Heritage Site comprising the Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including St Margaret's Church.
- 2.7. The site is highly accessible due to its position next to a key transport node in Central London. London Waterloo is approximately 10 minutes by train and London Victoria is also approximately 10 minutes away by London Underground. The site benefits from a range of public transport choices, which include the Vauxhall mainline railway station, which serves London Waterloo to the north and the entire south west overland railway network, Vauxhall Underground station, which directly connects to the Victoria Line, and Oval Underground station, which directly connects to the Northern Line of London Underground, and both stations provide indirect connections to the remainder of the London Underground network. Also, there is the Vauxhall bus terminus, which connects a total of 11 bus routes across London (including 3 which operate as 24 hour services); as well as pedestrian and cycle links across in the immediate area.
- 2.8. The accessibility of the site is reflected by its high Public Transport Accessibility Rating (PTAL) rating of 6A "Exceptional", which is the highest accessibility band.

- 2.9. With regard to the designation of the site, it is identified as a 'Major Development Opportunity' site (MDO 81 "Parry Street East") within the adopted Unitary Development Plan and forms part of a designated Key Industrial and Business Area. It is also an area within the draft Vauxhall Area Supplementary Planning Document as suitable for redevelopment and within the northern part of a comprehensive regeneration area defined in the draft Vauxhall / Nine Elms / Battersea Opportunity Area Planning Framework, as designated by the Greater London Authority.
- 2.10. It is not in a conservation area nor does it immediately adjoin any listed buildings, although Brunswick House, which is a Grade II* listed building is approximately 200m to the west, adjacent to St George Wharf. Vauxhall conservation area does however lie to the east, beyond the railway line, and does contain a number of listed buildings.
- 2.11. These designations, together with the obligation to consider the impact on the World Heritage Site, form a crucial basis for the assessment of the proposals as the site is clearly a key strategic site within the northern part of the Borough.

3. Planning History

- 3.1. There is no relevant planning history concerning either the use or redevelopment of this site.
- 3.2. Planning History of Neighbouring Sites
- 3.3. As stated above the site lies in an area within the draft Vauxhall Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as suitable for redevelopment for tall buildings. Also, it is within the northern part of a comprehensive regeneration area defined in the draft Vauxhall / Nine Elms / Battersea Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), as designated by the Greater London Authority (GLA). Within these designated areas, there has been much pre-application discussions take place with the Council for the redevelopment of other sites and the regeneration of Vauxhall generally but to date only one scheme has come forward as a formal planning application and that relates to 143-161 Wandsworth Road, a site to the south west of this application site on the corner with Wyvil Road.
- 3.4. That application, known as "Vauxhall Sky Gardens", was approved on 5 November 2008. It proposed the redevelopment of the site involving the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a part three storey, part six storey and part thirty five storey plus basement building to provide a mixed use development. It comprises ground floor commercial units (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3 and D1) totalling 229msq, 8975m² of office floorspace (B1), 178 private and affordable units (comprising 82 x 1 bed, 72 x 2 bed, 14 x 3 bed and 10 x 4 bed), 2105m² of amenity space and landscaping at 3rd, 6th, 8th and 34th floor levels. 37 car parking spaces would be provided together with 326 cycle parking spaces. Refuse storage, public realm improvements at street level and the formation of new vehicular access from Wyvil Road were also approved.
- 3.5. Consideration of this Bondway application should have regard to the St. George Wharf development fronting the river which importantly includes

the consented Vauxhall Tower which would be 180m in height. This tower has technically been implemented and can be built out to its approved height.

4. Scheme Details

- 4.1. The proposal involves the demolition of all existing buildings on site and the erection of a 42 storey building plus 2 basements to provide a residential-led mixed use development. The building would be 149m at its maximum height.
- 4.2. This would comprise commercial units (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3 and A4) totalling 288m² GEA at ground floor, subsidised start-up commercial units (Use Class B1) of 5,564m² GEA at first, second and third floor and 376 residential units at fourth to fortieth floors. The residential accommodation provides a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom flats and would be in both private and affordable tenures.
- 4.3. The scheme would also provide 671m² internal residential amenity space at thirty-sixth floor as a dedicated “amenity floor”. The building form allows for winter gardens and generously sized protected terraces where it tapers in alternate directions.
- 4.4. Also proposed are 25 car parking spaces and 22 motorbike parking spaces located in the 2 basements, 568 cycle parking spaces (360 located in the basements, 156 located in storage units on floors 4 to 16 and 52 at ground floor level.
- 4.5. There would be two levels of plant at forty-first to forty-second floors. Public realm improvements / landscaping at street level together with refuse/recycling provision and the formation of a new vehicular access from Bondway, with realigned vehicular access from Parry Street are also proposed. In brief, the public realm improvements would include refurbishment and visual improvements to the adjoining footways and railway arches in Parry Street and Miles Street together with tree planning both on and off site (along Bondway).

5. Consultation and Views Expressed

- 5.1. Members should be aware that the applicant undertook extensive pre-application consultation with officers of the Council and those of the Greater London Authority (GLA). The scheme has twice been presented to the design review panels of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), and also to English Heritage and Westminster City Council.
- 5.2. In conjunction, the developer has carried out extensive consultation and engagement with the local community. The applicant, Vauxhall Bondway Ltd., held a public exhibition to present the submitted proposals to the local community on 15 and 16 June 2009 at the Parco Café in Vauxhall Park. It is a highly accessible venue to all members of the public and is approximately 200m from the application site. Approximately 10 days prior to this exhibition, a newsletter was distributed to residents and commercial occupiers in a large catchment area extending from the river to The Oval, along the Embankment to Kennington Lane and south as far as Wilcox

Road, off Wandsworth Road. This consultation area also extended into LB Wandsworth. It covered approximately 2,000 local residents, business and key stakeholders. The Statement of Community Involvement, submitted with the application states that 120 local residents attended the exhibition over the 2 days, including members of Viva Vauxhall. Questionnaires were available for residents to comment and offer feedback and all responses have been incorporated into the evolution of the scheme through to its formal submission

- 5.3. Following the submission of the planning application on 18 May 2009, an extensive consultation exercise was undertaken to include all relevant statutory bodies, external agencies as well as local residents and occupiers and their representative groups. In excess of 4,100 letters of notification were sent to local residents and occupiers and 6 site notices were posted on and around the site. The application was also advertised in the local press.
- 5.4. The statutory bodies and external consultees were the Greater London Authority, English Heritage, the Commission for the Built Environment, Transport for London, London Underground, Network Rail, Highways Agency, LFCD Authority and the Environment Agency.
- 5.5. The amenity societies and residents' associations for both the Prince's and Stockwell wards were consulted, namely the Kennington Association, Regents Bridge Gardens Ltd, Vauxhall Neighbourhood Housing Forum, Vauxhall Society, Vauxhall Gardens Estate Residents and Tenants Association, Vauxhall St Peters Heritage Centre, Wyvil Tenants Association, Association of Waterloo Groups, Waterloo Action Centre, Waterloo Community Development Group, Fentiman Road, Richborne Terrace and Dorset Road Residents Association and the Mursell Estate Group. The Councillors for these 2 wards have also been consulted.
- 5.6. The adjoining boroughs of Southwark, Wandsworth and Westminster City Council were also consulted.
- 5.7. Internally, the following department and teams were consulted: Conservation and Design, Planning Policy, Performance Strategy and Regeneration, Transport Planning, Crime Prevention Unit, Regulatory Services (Noise and Pollution) Housing, Housing (Housing Association s106), Implementation Team and Parks and Open Space .
- 5.8. For the purposes of this "steer" report, Members' attention is drawn the comments and representations received from the key external consultees as well as the local occupiers and residents together with their representative agencies. Of the responses received to date, Members' attention is specifically drawn to the following bodies.
- 5.9. The Greater London Authority
- 5.10. The GLA submitted its Stage 1 referral report in July 2008 and at that time resolved that the scheme complied with some, but not all relevant London Plan policies but acknowledge that possible remedies could address the identified deficiencies. The GLA has resolved that the principle of a residential-led mixed use development in the central activities zone is compliant with the Plan. The principle of a 149m tall building has also been

agreed. It is resolved that the proposal is of high architectural quality and its impact on strategic views broadly accords with policy. The provision of Lifetime Homes and wheelchair accessible units accords with London Plan policy. However, it has been identified that the scheme proposes no on-site children's play space which does not accord with policy. Concern has been raised having regard to climate change adaptation measures and some aspects of the transport assessment are insufficiently detailed to ensure compliance with the full range of London plan transport policies

- 5.11. The GLA has identified various changes which would remedy these deficiencies to may make the scheme as a whole compliant with the London Plan. These are the need for more detailed design to demonstrate how the proposed shared surface will ensure the safety of all users; a children's play space strategy should be submitted in line with GLA's SPG; modelling work needs to be carried out to demonstrate the development's baseline energy demand and CO2 emissions and that s106 financial contributions are sought towards pedestrian safety improvements and mitigation of the impact of the development on the local and strategic transport network.
- 5.12. The applicant has been working closely with officers at the GLA and TfL with regard to addressing these Stage 1 concerns and developments in these areas, together with the level of affordable housing which this scheme may reasonable maximise (which remains under scrutiny by the Council's viability consultants) will be reported at stage 2.
- 5.13. English Heritage
- 5.14. English Heritage welcomes the reduction in height of the building from 175m and state that it is supportive of good quality contextual modern architecture. However, there is significant concern about the impact of the proposed development on longer views towards Parliament Square from Whitehall. It is contended that the built form of the tower would be a significant visual entity in views from the Banqueting House and Cenotaph, changing the character of the view from an open aspect to an enclosed one by development. Also, concern is raised regarding the impact of the development when viewed from Hungerford Bridge in the winter.
- 5.15. At local level, English Heritage considers that the development would have a significant impact on the setting of several conservation areas, in particular Kennington and Albert Square conservation areas in Lambeth and Pimlico conservation area in Westminster. Concern is raised to the alleged adverse impact on a number of local listed buildings (Woodstock Court and St Stephen's Terrace)
- 5.16. Concern is also expressed about the effect on the Grade II* listed Battersea Power Station and the Grade II* registered Battersea Park historic park and garden. The tower would appear between the iconic chimneys of the power station.
- 5.17. Concern is also expressed that the proposed tower will impact upon the existing open view towards the abutment obelisks to Lambeth Bridge which is Grade II listed.

- 5.18. Finally, English Heritage are “disappointed” that the scheme has not considered adaption of the existing building which is considered to still make a positive contribution to the streetscape and is one of the last vestiges of the past industrial landscape of Vauxhall.
- 5.19. The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
- 5.20. In its formal response to the planning application, which followed to 2 design panel review meetings held at pre-application stage, CABA consider this to be “an exciting and interesting scheme. The elegant massing and good proportions have produced a successful form and we are satisfied, in principle, that the proposed height could be appropriate”.
- 5.21. The principle of a cluster of tall buildings in this location is supported, but CABA considers that this scheme must be of excellent quality to justify its impact on local and distant views. Despite some reservations about the form-driven design and the potentially wall-like appearance of the east and west elevations, CABA is of the opinion that the form and massing to be well considered. The stepped massing is considered to skilfully break down the scale of the building when viewed from the north and south.
- 5.22. CABA considers that the layout of the base of the tower and the surrounding public realm have not been fully integrated. The Council is urged to ensure that the public realm is well designed, carefully integrated with adjacent new buildings and offers significant amenity to local residents. Disappointment is raised that it has not been possible to integrate the triangular plot of land immediately adjoining the site to the south to provide as this would have helped to contribute to amenity space for future residents.
- 5.23. Conditions are recommended to ensure a high quality of detailed design and use of appropriate materials.
- 5.24. City of Westminster
- 5.25. Objection is raised to the scheme by reason of its height and scale and as such harm views from the City and in particular from a number of the City Council’s conservation areas including Whitehall, Westminster Abbey and Parliament Square, St James’ and Pimlico.
- 5.26. In particular, strong objections are raised to the impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site in views from Parliament Square and Whitehall. It is also considered that to detrimentally impact upon the settings of the Buxton memorial (Grade II*), the terraced houses (Grade II) and Westminster Abbey (Grade I).
- 5.27. London Borough of Wandsworth
- 5.28. No objection is raised but wish to emphasise the importance of safeguarding important views of Wandsworth and for a higher contribution to the much needed transport improvements locally to benefit the local area.

5.29. Ward Councillors

5.30. Councillors Banks and Sawdon have both raised concerns to the overall height, scale and bulk of the development and are equally concerned about the impact on local roads and public transport.

5.31. With these concerns in mind, Councillors Banks, Sawdon and Gray consider that a comprehensive and full s106 agreement is negotiated to mitigate against these impacts.

5.32. Councillor Akhtar considers this to be a very positive scheme but only if there is a very good provision of affordable housing for low income families.

5.33. Local Occupiers and Residents

5.34. At the time of writing, over 120 objections from local residents and commercial occupiers have been received. In addition, 10 letters of support and observations have been submitted.

5.35. Objections

5.36. For the purposes of this “steer” report, a list of the themes of objection are set out below for Members’ attention. When the application is returned to PAC for determination, all these objections will be tabulated and addressed in turn following the normal procedures for a PAC report.

5.37. Townscape, Heritage and Design Objections

- Loss of existing building which is considered to be a architectural merit;
- Excessive height, scale and bulk;
- Over-domination of local residential properties;
- Out of character with character and scale of the area;
- Proposed height would set an unwelcome precedent for the area;
- Proposed architecture and detailed design is poor quality;
- The impact of this development should not be seen isolation of other sites;
- Prejudice future development of adjoining site;(CLS site)
- Detrimental impact on Vauxhall Park;
- Detrimental impact on Vauxhall Grove;
- Detrimental impact on Bonnington Square;
- High level living and terraces are not appropriate for families.

5.38. Amenity related Objections

- Loss of daylight and sunlight;
- Unacceptable overshadowing of nearby residential properties;
- Loss of view;
- The influx of more residents and workers would generate more noise and pollution;
- Inappropriate residential environmental environment due to poor air quality;
- Wind tunnelling will create a poor residential environment;

5.39. Highways and Transportation related Objections

- Increased on street car parking pressure on local streets;

- Need for additional car parking spaces within the development;
- Existing transportation infrastructure would not be able to cope with such an increase in residents and workers within the development;
- Increased pressure and overcrowding on local public transport;
- The increase in population would increase the number of cars in the area which in turn would increase the risk to pedestrian and highway safety;
- The increase in the number of servicing vehicles would also be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety;
- Reliance on the use of bicycles is “ludicrous” given the nature of Vauxhall Cross and its gyratory;

5.40. Other Objections

- A lack of affordable housing;
- Disruption during the demolition and construction phase;
- The development would be dangerous (not specified why).

5.41. Comments in Support of the Scheme

- The redevelopment would regenerate Vauxhall;
- This location is very suitable for a cluster of tall buildings;
- The scheme will bring Vauxhall up to standard of Zone 1;
- Improve the opportunities for local inward investment;
- The scheme would enhance the local area;
- The provision of the subsidised start-up units is welcomed
- The area desperately needs more residents and restaurants/coffee shops.

5.42. Observations on the Scheme

- No objection subject to adequate traffic and car parking management;
- No objection provided that the scheme would not affect existing local businesses.

5.43. At the time of writing, a number of the other consultees, but not all, have commented on the proposal. These are typically on specific areas of detail, which if Members resolve to support the submitted scheme, may be adequately addressed through the s106 agreement of by the imposition of condition. As such, officers consider that for the purposes of this “steer” report these areas of specific technical detail should not affect Members’ consideration of the key consideration on which their opinions are sought. Should Members resolve to support the submitted scheme, all these additional comments will be set out in full when the application is returned to PAC for determination. Similarly, any subsequent representations received will be similarly reported.

6. Policy Context

6.1.1. National Policies

6.1.2. Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) sets out the Government’s policy to provide for sustainable development through the planning system. PPS1 provides that planning authorities should:

6.1.3. “promote urban and rural regeneration to improve the wellbeing of communities, improve facilities, promote high quality and safe development and create new opportunities for the people living in those communities...” (para 27(ii));

6.1.4. “Focus development that attracts large numbers of people, especially retail, leisure, and office development, in existing centres to promote their vitality and viability, and more sustainable patterns of development...” (para27 (vi)); and,

6.1.5. “Promote the more efficient use of land through higher density, mixed use development and the use of sustainably located previously developed land and buildings...” (para 27(viii))

6.1.6. PPS1 further states, “Good design ensures attractive usable, durable and adaptable places and is a key element in achieving sustainable development. Good design is indivisible from good planning.... Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.” (para 33 and 34)

6.1.7. PPS3 (Housing) specifies a number of outcomes that the planning system should deliver and in determining planning applications, including a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households such as families with children, single person households and older people. It also states that “Good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing, which contributes to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.” (para 12)

6.1.8. Specifically relating to affordable housing, PPS3 states that Local Planning Authorities should “Set out the approach to seeking developer contributions to facilitate the provision of affordable housing. In seeking developer contributions, the presumption is that affordable housing will be provided on the application site so that it contributes towards creating a mix of housing. However, where it can be robustly justified, off-site provision or a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision (of broadly equivalent value) may be accepted as long as the agreed approach contributes to the creation of mixed communities in the local authority area.” (para 29)

6.1.9. PPG4 (Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms) emphasises that the planning system should adopt a positive approach to commercial development in order to encourage continued economic development, which at the same time is compatible with environmental objectives. It also encourages new commercial development in locations, which minimise the number and length of vehicular movements with particular emphasis on locations well served by sustainable transport.

6.1.10. PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres) provides the Government policy for the planning and assessment of town centres type uses, which include retail, office and leisure uses. The Guidance provides relevant tests for the location and assessment of these types of uses including: assessing the need for the development; securing the appropriate scale of development; applying the sequential approach to site selection; assessing impacts; and ensuring locations are accessible.

6.1.11. PPG8 (Telecommunications) largely provides guidance on planning for telecommunications development; however, it also clarifies guidance about the need to ensure that new buildings of any kind do not interfere with reception of television or

radio signals. The PPG states that “there is clear evidence that large, prominent structures such as tower blocks...can cause widespread disruption to television and other telecommunications services due to the physical obstruction or reflection of the wanted signals. Local planning authorities will need to satisfy themselves that the potential interference has been fully taken into account into the siting and design of such a development, since it would be more difficult, costly and sometimes impossible to correct the problem after the event...”.

6.1.12. PPG13 (Transport) deals specifically with transport, particularly the way in which transport integrates with planning. It seeks to promote sustainable transport choices; promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking, and cycling; and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The Guidance encourages the location of traffic generating uses close to public transport, to encourage sustainable transport modes. Furthermore, PPG13 provides for a reduction in the quantum of car parking in new development, to reduce reliance on the private car and promote sustainable transport. PPG13 also encourages the production of travel plans to raise awareness regarding the impacts of travel decisions.

6.1.13. PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) states that the objective of the planning process should be to reconcile the need for economic growth with the need to protect the natural and historic environment. In exercising conservation area controls for schemes outside but affecting a conservation area, the local planning authority is required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the setting of conservation areas.

6.1.14. With respect to the setting of listed buildings, the guidance sets out that in “considering applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works which affect a listed building to have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building”. It goes on to state that “a proposed high or bulky building might also affect the setting of a listed building some distance away, or alter views of a historic skyline.” In terms of conservation areas, the guidance states that “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should be...a material consideration in the planning authority’s handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area.”

6.1.15. PPG16 (Archaeology and Planning) sets out the Government’s policy on archaeological remains and how they should be preserved or recorded. It is expected that local authorities properly consider archaeological matters and address them from the beginning of the development control process.

6.1.16. PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) states that “The aims of planning policy and flood risk are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas at highest risk.”

6.1.17. Regional Policy; The London Plan

6.1.18. The London Plan (February 2004) provides the strategic policy for London. It is the Mayor’s spatial strategy, which seeks to accommodate significant growth in ways that respect and improve London’s diverse heritage while delivering a sustainable world city. It proposes to achieve this through sensitive intensification of development in locations well served by public transport.

6.1.19. The Plan sets out the Mayor's design principles for a compact city, which seek to ensure that developments: maximise the potential of sites; create or enhance public realm; provide or enhance a mix of uses; are accessible, useable and permeable for all users; are sustainable, durable and adaptable; are safe for occupants and passers-by; respect local context, character and communities; are practical and legible; are attractive to look at and, where appropriate, "inspire", "excite" and "delight"; respect the natural environment; and respect London's built heritage.

6.1.20. The Plan seeks maximum provision of additional housing in London in order to deliver an output of 30,000 additional homes per year. The Mayor's policies are aimed at meeting and exceeding the minimum target of 23,000 additional homes in London per year. The Mayor's strategic target for affordable housing seeks to ensure that 50% of provision should be affordable and, within that, the London-wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision, and the promotion of mixed and balanced communities.

6.1.21. Relevant policies in the London Plan include: -

- Policy 2A.1, Sustainability criteria
- Policy 2A.2, The spatial strategy for development
- Policy 2A.5, Opportunity areas
- Policy 2A.6, Areas for intensification
- Policy 3A.1, Increasing London's supply of housing
- Policy 3A.2, Borough housing targets
- Policy 3A.5, Housing choice
- Policy 3A.9, Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3A.10, Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes
- Policy 3B.1, Developing London's economy
- Policy 3B.2, Office demand and supply
- Policy 3B.3, Mixed use development
- Policy 3C.1, Integrating transport and development
- Policy 3C.2, Matching development to transport capacity
- Policy 3C.9, Increasing the capacity, quality, and integration of public transport to meet London's needs
- Policy 3C.19, Local transport and public realm enhancements
- Policy 3C.21, Improving conditions for walking
- Policy 3C.23, Parking strategy
- Policy 4A.3, Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 4A.4, Energy assessment
- Policy 4A.5, Provision of heating and cooling networks
- Policy 4A.6, Decentralised Energy: Heating, Cooling and Power
- Policy 4A.7, Renewable energy
- Policy 4A.14, Sustainable drainage
- Policy 4B.1, Design principles for a compact city
- Policy 4B.2, Promoting world-class architecture and design
- Policy 4B.3, Enhancing the quality of the public realm
- Policy 4B.5, Creating an inclusive environment
- Policy 4B.9, Tall buildings – location
- Policy 4B.10, Large scale buildings – design and impact
- Policy 4B.11, London's built heritage
- Policy 4B.12, Heritage conservation
- Policy 4B.14, World Heritage sites
- Policy 4B.15, Archaeology

- Policy 4B.16, London view protection framework
- Policy 5E.1, The strategic priorities for South West London
- Policy 5E.2, Opportunity areas in South West London
- Policy 5G.2, Strategic priorities for the Central Activities Zone
- Policy 5G.3, Central Activities: offices
- Policy 5G.5, Predominantly local activities in the Central Activities Zone
- Policy 6A.4, Priorities in planning obligations
- Policy 6A.5, Planning obligations

6.1.22. In addition to the above, the London View Management Framework was adopted as supplementary planning guidance in July 2007, and is also of relevance. The Framework focuses on the protection of strategically important views in and across London and includes designated views. The application site falls within the Background Assessment Area of the Strategic View of the Palace of Westminster from Parliament Hill. There are also new directions pertaining to 'Protected Vistas' issued by the Secretary of State in May 2007. In association with the LVMF, the GIA is evolving its opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) for the Vauxhall / Nine Elms area which identifies this location as appropriate for a cluster of tall buildings.

6.1.23. Adopted Unitary Development Plan (August 2007)

6.1.24. The following policies of the adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007) are considered relevant to this application:

- 2 London South Central
- 3 Central London Activities Zone
- 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
- 8 Accessible Transport/Integrated Development
- 9 Transport Impact
- 14 Parking and traffic Restraint
- 15 Additional Housing
- 16 Affordable Housing
- 19 Active Frontage Uses
- 20 Mixed-use development
- 21 Location and Loss of Offices
- 23 Protection and Location of Other Employment Uses
- 26 Deficiencies in Community Facilities
- 27 Hotels and Tourism
- 30 Arts and Culture
- 31 Streets, Character and Layout
- 32 Community Safety/Designing out Crime
- 33 Building Scale and Design.
- 34 Renewable Energy in Major Development
- 35 Sustainable Design and Construction
- 38 Design in Existing Residential/Mixed Use Areas
- 39 Streetscape, Landscape and Public Realm Design
- 40 Tall Buildings
- 41 Views
- 42 The River Thames – River and Riverside Protection, Use and Access
- 47 Conservation Areas
- 48 Archaeology
- 50 Open Space and Sports Facilities
- 53 Infrastructure and Utilities
- 54 Pollution Public Health & Safety
- 56 Waste

- 57 Planning Obligations
- 58 Albert Embankment
- 77 Vauxhall – Urban Design and Public Realm Improvements.

6.1.25. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

6.1.26. The following adopted SPDs are relevant:SPD:

Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions.
Safer Built Environments.
Sustainable Design and Construction.
S106 Planning Obligations.

6.1.27. The Council's 'Waste & Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements: Guidance for Architects and Developers' (2006) is also considered relevant.

7. Planning Considerations

7.1. Heritage, Conservation and Design Considerations with regard to Tall Buildings

7.1.1. It is considered necessary for the purposes of this report to set out this framework in detail as officers are of the view that the impact of a tall building here is perhaps the most important consideration of this scheme. As such, this section seeks to ensure that Members are fully briefed on the existing and emerging policy and guidance for tall buildings both within the London-wide context and specifically with regard to Vauxhall.

7.1.2. This section of the report seeks to place the development firstly in the context of national policy and guidance having regard to the principles relating to the siting and design of tall buildings and then distil these principles to the London-wide context before then considering the impact of this development on this part of Lambeth, its affected conservation areas, listed buildings and wider townscape, including Vauxhall Park.

7.1.3. National Policy and Guidance

7.1.4. PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) cites sustainable development as the core principle underpinning the planning system. Promoting good design is also cited as a central aim of the planning system. It acknowledges the importance of good design, adding that 'design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character or quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted'. It continues by stating that good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process and should be encouraged everywhere.

7.1.5. PPS3 (Housing) seeks to promote good quality housing. This is a 90% residentially led scheme. PPS3 notes that good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing. When assessing the quality of proposals, it asks if the proposals are well integrated with and complement neighbouring buildings and the local area in terms of scale, density, layout and access; and seeks to create or enhance a distinctive character.

7.1.6. PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) states that the objective of the planning process should be to reconcile the need for economic growth with the

need to protect the natural and historic environment. In exercising conservation area controls, Section 72 of the Act requires the local planning authority to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas and their setting when a scheme lies adjacent to a conservation area.

7.1.7. The Guidance goes on to state that “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should also, in the Secretary of State’s view, be a material consideration in the planning authority’s handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area”, which is the case here.

7.1.8. With respect to the setting of listed buildings, the guidance states that in “considering applications for planning permission or (listed building consent) for works which affect a listed building to have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building”. In paragraph 2.17, the guidance states that “a proposed high or bulky building might also affect the setting of a listed building some distance away, or alter views of a historic skyline.”

7.1.9. With specific regard to World Heritage Sites it makes the point that comprehensive management plans are needed for each site and that one of the things that should be covered is protecting the site and its setting from damaging development. It points out that the sites have been designated for their outstanding universal value and local planning authorities should place great weight on the need to protect them for the benefit of future generations as well as our own.

7.1.10. DCLG’s Protection of World Heritage Sites Consultation Paper (2008)

7.1.11. This draft planning circular recognises, in national policy, the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Sites and the need to protect and enhance these sites and their settings. It reminds readers that World Heritage Sites’ interest is defined by UNESCO as “cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and of importance for present and future generations of all humanity. Such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate”.

7.1.12. DCLG/CABE’s ‘By Design: urban design in the planning system: towards better practice’ (2000).

7.1.13. This guidance promotes higher standards in urban design and provides sound practical advice to help implement the Government’s commitment to good design as set out in PPS1. It states that the scale, massing and height of proposed development should be considered in relation to that of adjoining buildings and the general pattern of heights in the area. The character of a skyline is composed of the massing of blocks and the shape of roofs, as well as by the height of buildings. A building should only stand out from the background if it contributes positively to views and vistas as a landmark. There is also the reminder that urban design is often a matter of adopting good manners, recognising that every building is part of a greater whole and not seen in isolation.

7.1.14. English Heritage/CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings (2007)

7.1.15. This document provides good practice and criteria for evaluating tall buildings. Some of the criteria include the relationship to context, including topography, scale, height, urban grain, streetscape and built form, open spaces, rivers and waterways, important views, prospects and panoramas, and the effects on the skyline.

7.1.16. The Guidance continues. “The effect on historic context, including the need to ensure that the proposal will preserve and/or enhance historic buildings, sites, landscapes and skylines. Tall buildings must address their effect on the setting of, and views to and from historic buildings, sites and landscapes over a wide area including;

- World Heritage Sites
- Scheduled ancient monuments
- Listed buildings
- Registered parks and gardens; and registered battlefields
- Archaeological remains
- Conservation areas

7.1.17. The Guidance states that with regard to the effect on World Heritage Sites, the Government has an international obligation to protect the outstanding universal value of world heritage sites as set out at the time of inscription in the statement of significance. Part of this obligation is the adoption of a management plan for each world heritage site by stakeholders, including if necessary a buffer zone or equivalent to protect the setting. The statement of significance and the management plan are material considerations in the planning process”

7.1.18. Furthermore, it says that the architectural quality of the building including its scale, form, massing, proportion and silhouette is a criterion for evaluating a proposal. It says that the design of the top of a tall building will be of particular importance when considering the effect on the skyline. The design of the base will have a significant effect on the streetscape and near views.

7.1.19. Westminster World Heritage Site Management Plan (2007)

7.1.20. This document is a material planning consideration and sets out the Outstanding Universal Value and the reason for the UNESCO inscription. Its significance here is architectural (as well as political, religious and symbolic). It explains: “The 19th Century Palace of Westminster is also a masterpiece of Victorian Architecture, with its internationally recognised form and skyline. The use of the Victorian Gothic style for these buildings had an international influence on the architecture and taste of their day and therefore on the history of the architecture and the decorative arts”.

7.1.21. The document deals with views of the form and skyline and states that there are important views beyond the World Heritage Site (WHS). Particularly famous views of features include ‘Big Ben’ from all angles and in particular from...Trafalgar Square and when travelling south down Whitehall.

7.1.22. It explains that it is important to understand something of the immediate environs of the WHS because this helps inform considerations of protecting its setting. Whitehall is one such area. It goes through the pressures on the setting and views which are part of the architectural significance of the WHS. It states that “There is currently no buffer zone....which would help to sustain the special qualities of the setting of the WHS. Without appropriate consideration of the sensitivities of the WHS and its setting, development beyond the boundary of a large scale may pose risks to this key element of the Outstanding Universal Value. Any changes to the style or backdrop of the WHS from many angles, must be carefully balanced against the need to preserve the iconic value of the site”.

7.1.23. London-wide Policy and Guidance

7.1.24. The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) was published by the Mayor in February 2008.

7.1.25. This following section seeks to expand on the relevant policy references referred to above with specific reference to the Mayor's consideration of tall buildings and the impact they have both across London, the World Heritage Site, river views and within boroughs.

7.1.26. Policy 4B.2 'Promoting world-class architecture and design'; The Mayor will seek to promote world-class high quality design, by collaborating with partners to encourage contemporary and integrated designs for the built environment.

7.1.27. Policy 4B.9 'Tall buildings – location'; states that the Mayor will promote the development of tall buildings where they create attractive landmarks enhancing London's character, help to provide a coherent location for economic clusters of related activities and/or act as a catalyst for regeneration and where they are also acceptable in terms of design and impact on their surroundings.

7.1.28. Policy 4B.10 'Large scale buildings – design and impact'; Boroughs should ensure that all large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design.

7.1.29. Policy 4B.11 'London's built heritage'; states that the Mayor will work with strategic partners to protect and enhance London's historic environment.

7.1.30. Policy 4B.12 'Heritage conservation'; states that Boroughs should ensure the protection and enhancement of historic assets.

7.1.31. Policy 4B.14 'World Heritage Sites'; refers to the implementation of management plans for World Heritage Sites, in order to protect their historic significance and safeguard, and where appropriate enhance their settings.

7.1.32. Policy 4B.16 'London View Management Framework'; (see below) says that the Mayor will designate a selection of strategically important views which will be managed in accordance with Policy 4B.17 and assessed against Policy 4B.18 (see below). These designated views are classified in four ways; London Panoramas, Linear Views, River Prospects and Townscape Views.

7.1.33. Policy 4B.17 'View management plans'; it is the Mayor's responsibility to prepare and review management plans for designated views identified under Policy 4B.16. The management plans should seek to enhance and protect views by identifying Strategically Important Landmarks and other landmarks, preventing damage to the view by intrusive and overly dominant development that detracts from identified landmarks.

7.1.34. Policy 4B.18 'Assessing development impact on designated views'; states that if new development falls within the assessment areas of a designated view the development should be assessed against general principles of good design set out within the London Plan, local urban design policies, and the management principles in Policy 4B.17.

7.1.35. GLA's London View Management Framework (2007)

7.1.36. This is Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Mayor's London Plan. Policies 4B.16, 4B.17 and 4B.18 of the London Plan establish the London View Management Framework (LVMF), which seeks to designate, protect and manage twenty-six views of London and some of its major landmarks. The principal role of the LVMF is to preserve and enhance London's character and built heritage. It outlines the policy framework for managing the impact of development on designated views. It states that regard should be had to the appropriate World Heritage Site Management Plan for further visual management guidance in views including a World Heritage Site. It states that all new development which impacts on any of the views designated in the London Plan must form attractive features in their own right and their bulk and their shape should not be based solely on the parameters set by the Geometrically Defined view protection. Otherwise this could have the undesirable consequence of producing a proposal that is irregular or odd in shape and a roofline that does not relate to its context. One of the key messages of the document is strengthening the protection of the World Heritage sites (WHS) and other landmark views. It does however acknowledge that a cluster of tall buildings above 80-90m may emerge at Vauxhall.

7.1.37. Lambeth Policy and Guidance

7.1.38. The Adopted Lambeth Unitary Development Plan

7.1.39. Turning now to specific reference to the Council's adopted policies regarding tall buildings, their location and impacts, the following policies are of direct relevance.

7.1.40. Firstly, Policy 40 "Tall Buildings" states that tall buildings should enhance and not detract from London's character, and should enhance the skyline, respecting its historic character. A tall building should carefully relate to its surroundings and should not be located where it would harm the character or setting of:

- Conservation areas
- Listed buildings
- Riverscape and Townscape
- Strategic views and locally significant views
- The Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey World -- Heritage site. (plus other categories).

7.1.41. Policy 40 goes on to state that the proposal will need to enhance the skyline through profile and use of materials.

7.1.42. Policy 41 "Views" states that permission will not be granted for developments which detract from important views, backdrops or settings of, listed buildings, conservation areas, landmark buildings and the Thames, its embankments and bridges. It continues that in assessing visual impact on views and whether the impact detracts from it, regard will be had to the degree to which the proposal blocks clear sky against which landmark structures are seen.

7.1.43. Policy 45 "Listed Buildings" states at criterion (f) that development which adversely affects the setting of a listed building, or significant views of a listed building, will be refused.

7.1.44. Policy 47 "Conservation Areas" Development outside conservation areas should not harm the setting of the area or harm views into or from the area.

7.1.45. Policy 33 “Building Scale and Design” is also relevant in that it requires development to be of high quality design and contribute positively to its surrounding area. Infill development should be compatible with ;

- i. the site, context and historic development of the area;
- ii. existing topography, landscaping and boundary treatments;
- iii. prevailing building lines and plot sizes;
- iv. the height, massing and scale of neighbouring buildings,
- v. roof profiles and silhouettes of adjoining buildings;
- vi. colour, type, source and texture of local materials;
- vii. architectural compositions including patterns and rhythms and set pieces of townscape; and
- viii. established gaps and open spaces, views and skylines.

7.1.46. And it continues that in all cases development should not unacceptably overbear on surrounding development..... For development affecting conservation areas or listed buildings (or their setting), protecting or enhancing their character and appearance takes precedence.

7.1.47. The UDP identifies this site a Major Development Opportunity site (MDO80 – Parry Street West) which, together with 3 immediately adjoining sites that it can be developed comprehensively.

7.1.48. Draft Vauxhall Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) 2008

7.1.49. The emerging draft SPD sets out an overall vision and approach for the future development of the Vauxhall Area supported by area specific proposals and development principles. The draft SPD was approved for consultation on 28 July 2008 and was out at public consultation from October to December 2008. Whilst the emerging draft SPD remains a work in progress, it is held in abeyance pending the development of the GLA’s OAPF and at this time has very little weight for development control purposes. The emerging draft SPD identifies four character areas known as quarters, each with their own unique identity and qualities. This site is located within the “Vauxhall Heart” quarter. The emerging draft SPD states that for this quarter, opportunities for intensification will be promoted to deliver a cluster of high quality taller buildings and that development contributions will be sought at a reasonable level to ensure that a step change is delivered in the quality of the public realm in the heart of Vauxhall. The methodology employed in the emerging draft SPD to establish appropriate building heights within the tall buildings cluster identifies this site has having a maximum height of 80m with heights rising on sites closer to the river reaching a maximum of the already consented Vauxhall Tower at 180m. Notwithstanding this methodology, the emerging draft SPD does recognise that there could be an exception to this aspiration should a scheme be submitted which is considered to be of such high architectural and design quality.

7.1.50. This Scheme in Detail

7.1.51. The proposals have been the subject of extensive negotiations with Council officers, the GLA and have been to 2 CABA design review panels for consideration. Members will note that CABA support the application. In order to integrate best into the local landscape, the developer has sought to design the scheme to have a different outline from each direction which then responds to its relative surroundings. The scheme, which has been reduced from an initial 177m tall, has resulted in a stepped profile with the tallest sections being centrally located to assist in addressing the future cluster of other tall buildings then stepping down to the north and south to

relate more sympathetically to the existing local townscape. This has resulted in a tower rising from 83m at the northern end of the site (Parry Street and facing Vauxhall Cross transport hub) to a maximum height of 149m in the centre of the site before stepping down to 46m to the south (Miles Street).

7.1.52. The design concept has been developed from an interpretation of Lambeth terraces into a stepped high rise arrangement and adjusted, for a quality residential environment, to ensure that the quiet spaces of one flat are adjacent to similarly sensitive spaces of the adjoining unit. This linking of similar functions allows a broader expression of the façade which, to address issues of bulk and massing, has been broken down into 8 façade units which are read as 4 pairs. At the top of the building, the building profile is further articulated by the incorporation of the dynamic slope to each terrace unit. Alternating between an easterly and westerly direction, the development seeks to combine the city outline with the paired façade units to soften the stepped profile and create a cascade down into the small-scale parts of the adjoining townscape to the south. The application is accompanied by a comprehensive Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment which provides a thorough and skilled analysis of this impact. A significant number of these visualisations will be incorporated into the presentation for Members' consideration to assist them in forming their opinions on the scheme as a whole. These visualisations have also been presented to CABE as part of the applicant's presentation to its design panel review meetings.

7.1.53. Cutting across the terrace units and the façade expression is the 36th floor which is a dedicated amenity floor for future occupiers. This is expressed a single horizontal band, visible and legible from all directions. The start-up B1 floorspace is located on the lower floors and is articulated as a single texture. This texture reflects the intended flexibility of function inside and helps to create a base to the building above.

7.1.54. At street level, entrance canopies indicate the front doors to the uses above, assist in providing shelter from the wind and the rain and help in further articulating the building at ground level. The plane of the canopy which is angled to reflect the design of the top of the building slopes and rises to up to 5 floors above.

7.1.55. Turning to the public realm around the building, it is acknowledged that the building occupies most of the site and that as a consequence ground level amenity space is limited. The developer acknowledges this and in an attempt to mitigate it, it is proposed to carry out various improvements in the immediate vicinity which would serve to contribute to the step change in the local public realm as required by the emerging draft SPD as well as to enhance the setting of this development. At present the site is bounded to the north by a fence and to the west by a building line. Closed roller shutters and a blank wall comprise the ground level Bondway façade. The proposed scheme would be set back at ground level to create a new pedestrian arcade populated by the entrances to the residential and commercial accommodation above as well the 2 proposed active ground floor uses units. A new service road would be created from Bondway to Parry Street which serves to separate all servicing from the main public realm. This would also allow for the public to move along the eastern façade between it and the railway viaduct thereby improving the permeability on and around the site This space would then be re-landscaped accordingly to reflect its improved public use.

7.1.56. Beyond the application site, the developer is proposing additional improvements to the public realm. These include an upgraded pedestrian crossing between Bondway and Vauxhall station, a new shared surface along Bondway and

Miles Street leading from Parry Street to South Lambeth Road, new tree planning planting to Parry Street and the shared surface and enhancements to the Parry Street and Miles Street railway arches.

7.1.57. Similarly, landscaping possibilities within the site are limited and restricted to new paving around the base of the building and to the planning of a small cluster of ornamental cherry trees to the north-east corner of the site i.e. between the building and the railway viaduct. The developer is also proposing to plant a further line of trees along the Bondway frontage, down into Miles Street, through the railway tunnel to the junction with South Lambeth Road. This additional tree planting would be secured via the s106 Agreement.

7.1.58. Officers' Comments

7.1.59. The site is recognised in the UDP (Policy 77, MDO 83) as being one appropriate for redevelopment. The policy states that the retention of the mid-Victorian building on the site will be addressed in the "Vauxhall Area Action Plan". The draft emerging Vauxhall Area SPD has not, in fact, addressed the issue, but in pre-application discussions with the developer it has consistently been acknowledged that the warehouse is not listed nor in a conservation area. Officers are of the opinion that, whilst it has some intrinsic merit, it is not of sufficient architectural value to justify its retention (especially given the raft of regeneration benefits that would be derived from its comprehensive redevelopment). As such the principle of its demolition and thus re-development of the site are considered to have been established.

7.1.60. With regard to an assessment of the principle of a tall building on this site, officers recognise that the London Plan and the GLA's Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) identify Vauxhall as a location for a cluster of tall buildings. The latest proposed revisions to the GLA's Local View Management Framework have also acknowledged this. For instance in the River Prospect 17A : 300 states that incremental change to development in the background of the river frontage is acceptable provided each addition to the view contributes positively to the composition. The LVMF states that it should be noted that new clusters of tall buildings may emerge at Vauxhall, Nine Elms Opportunity Area. Tall building proposals in that area should be designed to relate to and strengthen the composition of the emerging cluster of tall buildings. The background study to the emerging draft Vauxhall SPD also favours an approach of graduating the emerging skyline from east to west towards the high point of the consented St George's Vauxhall tower (approx. 180m). The consented Sky Gardens is approx 120 metres and will be between this Bondway proposal and Vauxhall Tower. However, as stated above, the emerging draft SPD recognises that a scheme of architectural and design quality could be an exception to this aspiration to graduate the heights. Officers are of the opinion that the principle of a tall building on this site is therefore also established.

7.1.61. The question is, therefore, what do Members consider to be an appropriate height, scale, bulk and quality of architecture and what would be the material additional harm created by a building 149m. tall as opposed to one at, say, 80m as suggested in the emerging draft SPD, particularly given the GLA's OAPF analysis which identifies an acceptable height as being 150m. Members are advised that, just as there has to be conformity between the London Plan and the Council's UDP, there has to similar consistency between the OAPF and our SPD.

7.1.62. Turning firstly to the height, the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges that there is an impact on the Westminster World Heritage Site with a view down Whitehall of the top of the tower. However, notwithstanding Westminster City Council's objections, officers are mindful of a subsequent Inspector's conclusion in a recent appeal at 81 Black Prince Road about a proposal's distance behind the World Heritage Site, and consider that this would appear to be too distant to be harmful. Also the internationally known skyline and Big Ben's clock tower would not be affected. Officers are of the opinion that the long distance views of the proposal are broadly acceptable, but that some of the more local ones are problematic and could be considered to be likely to cause harm subject to the issue of design quality.

7.1.63. Members will be aware that the issue of harmful impact on the local townscape, conservation areas and Vauxhall Park has raised much objection from residents and their representative groups. However, a tall building, enabled by GLA and Council policy and guidance, will always be visible. Visibility does not necessarily result in harm, particularly if the building is of high quality architecture and detailed design, which this scheme is generally considered to be.

7.1.64. In terms of listed buildings within Lambeth, Woodstock Court, Newburn Street, which is Grade II*, would be adversely affected by the scheme. The applicants have a wire line visualisation of this relationship within their Impact Assessment and their conclusion is that there would be a slight adverse effect. In other local views, the potentially harmful impact becomes apparent on the Vauxhall, St Mark's and Albert Square conservation areas. It is acknowledged that there are additional impacts on other streetscenes and conservation areas, including the impact on Lansdowne Gardens conservation area.

7.1.65. The effect on Vauxhall Park and its environs is shown in the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment to which officers wish to draw attention to Members. The impact on the park from the width and the height of the proposal may be argued as being considerable and potentially overpowering. This is considered to be a crucial impact of the development on the Vauxhall conservation area and wider local townscape and Members views on this is sought. Again, Members may wish to consider this issue in light of the GLA and UDP policy and guidance which enable tall buildings in this location.

7.1.66. This is a tall building that will be prominent in some views from conservation areas, including the Vauxhall conservation area and within the setting of some listed buildings including the Grade II* listed Woodstock Court and St. Stephen's Terrace within the Albert Square conservation area. However, the proposed building is of world class design and will appear as a backdrop in these views. The building will cause a degree of harm to the conservation area and in the setting of these listed buildings but its excellent design will lessen this harm and, in officers' opinion this harm would be slight. Officers further consider that the benefits of the scheme in terms of the regeneration of an under utilised site within a MDO where tall buildings are considered acceptable in principle, together with the accompanying provision of housing (including affordable housing) and jobs, outweighs the slight harm to heritage assets that would result.

7.1.67. With regard to the public realm, the emerging draft SPD sets out emerging guidance for the public realm and organisation of routes. The section on the Vauxhall Heart, and elsewhere within the document states that all tall building proposals will be expected to provide sufficient high quality public realm and amenity space. Officers consider that it is a positive aspect of the scheme that active ground floor uses are being proposed here and that the site would be much more permeable

given the creation of the route between the eastern façade and the railway viaduct, which is in line with the emerging draft SPD. Significant improvements to the railway arches in Parry Street and Miles street are also proposed and welcomed. Members are asked however to consider whether the overall size and scope of the public realm improvements are sufficient both to mitigate the impact development and having regard to the wider strategy as set out in the emerging draft SPD.

7.1.68. In conclusion, to inform Members in their decision making, it is considered important to repeat that there is clear policy, plan-led support for tall buildings in this location and that there will necessarily be a significant impact from the arrival of any tall building in this location. The viaduct though has been recognised as a demarcation point for character zones as stated in the draft Vauxhall SPD and mentioned too by an Inspector in a very recent appeal decision (81 Black Prince Road). The design quality of the proposal has been recognised by CABI who support the scheme. A building of this height, indeed one at 80m as suggested in the emerging draft SPG will have an impact; in that it would inevitably be seen. The question to Members in this "steer" report is whether those impacts are necessarily harmful to justify refusal. The emerging SPD does clearly acknowledge that any potentially harmful impacts can be mitigated by good design and the stepping of the proposal and its vertical divisions are a design response to break down and articulate the width of the site. The policy framework is permissive and it may be reasonably argued therefore that the potentially harmful impacts have been mitigated by good design.

7.2 Land Use

7.2.1 This scheme involves the demolition of the existing buildings on site and the erection of a 42 storey building (149m tall) with 2 basements to provide a mixed use development comprising commercial active ground floor frontage units (Use Classes A1/A2/A3 and A4) at ground floor level measuring 288msq Gross External Area (GEA), commercial (Use Class B1) units at first, second and third floors (5,564msq GEA) and 376 residential units from fourth to fortieth floors in mixed tenure,. There would also be a residential amenity space on the thirty sixth floor (671msq) and the top two floors would be for the requisite plant to service the building. The following paragraphs expand on each of these elements in turn. The 2 basements would accommodate the 25 car parking spaces, 22 motorcycle spaces, some of the bicycle racks and the servicing arrangements for the building.

7.2.2 Ground Floor Uses

7.2.3 Policy 20 of the UDP refers to mixed use development and states that a mix of compatible land uses should be retained and enhanced in the development of all sites in the Central Activities Zone, the Thames Policy area, in town centres, and all major sites. Particular attention is also paid to design, disposition and servicing of mixed-use developments, which should achieve a satisfactory relationship between individual units and uses in terms of their layout, stacking and protection of the amenity of adjoining and proposed residents. Similar requirements are reiterated in Policy 3, which requires the promotion of activities that contribute to London's role as a World and Capital City and an active Central London Activity Zone.

7.2.4 Policy 19 also requires active frontage uses within the Thames Policy Area. The appropriate mix of uses in an active frontage is defined as A and D class.

7.2.5 At street level, activity would be achieved by combining the commercial units with the residential entrance and commercial lobbies to ensure that the frontage

is animated at all times, not just when the commercial units are open. There would be 2no. A1/A2/A3/A4 units which would be located at the northern and southern end of the building which would help in activating the street level frontage along Parry Street and Bondway. The servicing arrangements and storage provision for these commercial units would be at the rear of the development set towards the railway viaduct to ensure that the more public areas of the ground floor are not compromised by utilitarian dead frontage. Officers are of the opinion that the proposed ground floor uses together with their layout, arrangement and interaction with the entrance lobbies for the other occupiers are well considered.

7.2.6 However, following the submission of the application and as part of the consultation undertaken on it, the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) has made representations with regard to mitigating the impact of development on local policing. The scheme has been assessed having regard to national, regional and local plan policy and guidance and have three direct requests of the developer which are set below.

7.2.7 Firstly, it is stated that that it is “essential” that the scheme make appropriate provision for police facilities given the proposal will have a material impact upon policing provision in the local area. “Accordingly any approval should include a commitment to providing appropriate policing facilities in consultation with the MPA prior to the commencement of any development to be secured either by the imposition of planning conditions or as part of a s106 agreement”. It is anticipated that a development of this scale is likely to generate floorspace of approximately 90msq to accommodate a neighbourhood police base.

7.2.8 It is also requested that the floorspace will be required to be provided to shell to core and at peppercorn rent for a minimum period of 25 years.

7.2.9 The requests of the MPA are brought to Members’ attention as officers consider that the implications of its request could have significance on the acceptability of the scheme specifically on land use grounds both from a Council and developer’s perspective. Concern is raised about what may be regarded as an incompatible use at street level for a mixed use building in this location. The reduction in the floor area available for the A Class uses would be reduced which in turn could detrimental affect the vitality and viability of the development at street level. If the MPA were to take some of the B1 floorspace on the upper 3 floors, it would inevitably reduce the floor area available for the employment generating commercial uses which has been specifically designed and provided to improve the employment opportunities for local businesses. This may be seen as being detrimental to the aims and expectations of providing employment in the local area. Concern has also been raised to the impact of a peppercorn rent may have on the wider viability of the scheme, particularly as the relatively low level of affordable housing is presently under scrutiny by the Council’s independently commissioned financial appraisers. It is understood that discussions between the developer and the MPA are ongoing.

7.2.10 Members’ opinion is therefore requested as to whether the introduction of a Police presence within the development would be supported, or whether the potentially detrimental impact in land use, and arguably in visual and perception terms set against the wider need to provide for local policing should take precedence.

7.2.11 Employment Generating Uses: Floors 1-3

7.2.12 The existing building is currently used for storage (Use Class B8) and general office space available in the form of a business centre for small businesses (Use Class B1). This provides a total of 6,316msq of existing employment generating floorspace. However, at present, not all the space is occupied and it is understood that owing to the nature of the small businesses using the business centre, the numbers of workers operating from the business centre fluctuates. The storage accommodation although large in area generates very few employees given the inactive nature of its operation.

7.2.13 It is proposed to provide a total of 5,852msq of Use Class B1 accommodation within the proposed building on first to third floor levels. This would therefore result in a net loss of 464msq of employment generating floorspace.

7.2.14 The site is within the designated MDO 80 (Parry Street West). The designation requires at least one third of the floorspace on the site should be provided for employment needs, unless it can be demonstrated that this can be provided for on MDO sites 80, 82 and 83 (which immediately adjoin the application site). Although the site is also within a Key Industrial and Business Area (KIBA), the requirements are less relevant in this case, as Policy 22, which outlines the requirements for KIBAs, states that MDO designations take priority. It is however important to note that development within KIBAs should improve land in employment uses and increase employment levels and access to employment, through such measures as the provision of incubator or start-up increases as these increase the opportunities for small businesses. In addition, Policy 22 permits the provision of light industrial B1 premises for small to medium enterprises providing that it is appropriate to the character of an area and sufficient servicing arrangements can be provided that do not conflict with residential amenity.

7.2.15 The scheme is proposing to provide subsidised start-up office floorspace; it is not therefore speculative office accommodation available for corporate occupation. With a dedicated ground floor public entrance on Bondway and a separate service entrance accessed via from the building's main servicing arrangements, located facing the railway viaduct, the subsidised accommodation would provide a self-contained working environment able to accommodate a variety of unit sizes and configuration dependant on individual occupier requirements. It is envisaged that that the occupants of the accommodation would be small start-up workshop type businesses on a relatively short term lease and sharing common facilities. It is anticipated that this form of office floorspace would attract local businesses within Lambeth. The question for members, therefore, is not one of the quality or appropriateness of the Use Class B1 floorspace, rather it is the quantum of such provision.

7.2.16 Using English Partnership's guidance note on employment densities for offices and storage space (one job per 19msq and 80msq respectively), the number of people that could be permanently employed on the site at the present time works out as approximately 180. The developer has been in discussions with the centre manager who considers this figure to be broadly correct for current occupancy levels. However, it was considered that the number of office employees might be higher than estimated owing to the offices being used as a business centre, rather than conventional offices, and the number of employees associated with the storage business might be lower.

7.2.17 Applying English Partnership's guidance with regard to the potential number of jobs that could be created on site, the full time employment potential works out as 262 jobs; an increase of 62 jobs beyond the existing potential maximum.

7.2.18 Therefore, on the one hand, by providing only 10% of the proposed floorspace for B1 use, the scheme fails the MDO requirement of seeking one third employment generating floor area. Yet on the other, there would be net increase of 62 jobs in full time jobs being available.

7.2.19 In acknowledging the apparent shortfall, the developer has put forward a case to justify this lack of provision. Firstly, as a matter of fact the scheme does propose employment floorspace and therefore the requirement to provide some commercial floorspace is achieved. Also, it is alleged that, as the design of the proposal for a tall building has evolved, significant practical issues of accommodating the requisite amount of employment floorspace within the building have been experienced. These include the provision of necessary servicing and lift cores, resulting in an inefficient building that was ultimately unviable. Furthermore, the type of accommodation that is proposed replaces and increases the serviced business accommodation that presently exists. What is proposed is in the form of small business suites that can be increased or decreased in size to meet the specific needs of future businesses which would assist in supporting local businesses in the accordance with the Council's employment objectives. Moreover, further Use Class B1 floorspace would be expected to be provided on the adjoining MDOs 80, 82 and 83 upon their redevelopment which would further boost the employment floorspace in this part of Vauxhall. This justification for the acceptability the 10% level of provision is further reinforced by the increase in jobs that would be derived if the scheme as proposed is brought forward.

7.2.20 Members' attention is drawn to the fact that this level and nature of provision has been the subject of much discussion between the developer and officers. Officers consider that the flexible subsidised start-up accommodation as proposed would be more attractive to local business and as such would assist in meeting the goals of Lambeth's Economic Development Strategy (2070-2010) (2007) in respect of increasing investment in Lambeth, tackling worklessness and supporting enterprise within the borough. Equally, the English Partnership's modelling which identifies that there would be an obvious increase in the number of full time jobs available on site is acknowledged.

7.2.21 Whilst officers consider the case made for the justification of 10% employment provision is well reasoned, particularly when seen in the full context of the development and the other additional regeneration benefits that the scheme would derive, it is considered necessary, however, for the purposes of this "steer" report to have Members' views on this level and nature of provision.

7.2.22 Residential Accommodation: Floors 4-40

7.2.23 Housing targets for London are set out in policies of the London Plan and there is the associated requirement to maximise the potential of sites. This will be achieved by requiring development proposals to achieve the "maximum intensity of use in line with local context, the design principles in Policy 4B.1 and with public transport capacity". The Mayor is entitled to refuse applications that do not maximise the potential of a site. With regard to affordable housing provision, the London Plan requires such housing should be provided on scheme of 10 dwellings or more.

Boroughs are required to take account of regional and local assessments of need, the Mayor's strategic target for affordable housing provision of 50% and within that, 70% should be for social housing and 30% Intermediate provision, as well as the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. That said, the London Plan does acknowledge that the maximum provision of affordable housing within development proposals should be realistic given the need to encourage, not restrain, development proposals. The London Plan states that boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, taking account of site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements.

7.2.24 The UDP housing policies are compliant with the London Plan. Policy 15 states that the Council will promote a range of new housing development to meet different needs and demands including that for affordable housing. Part C of the Policy seeks a mix of different types, affordability and size on schemes, again, of 10 dwellings or more. The mix should have regard to local circumstances, and the site characteristics to meet assessed housing need. As with the London Plan, Policy 16 seeks the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing, from housing developments of appropriate size and suitability and again, as with the London Plan, the normal expected level of provision will be 50% of habitable rooms assuming a public subsidy, or 40% with no such subsidy. Similarly the same 70%/30% tenure split is expected.

7.2.25 The scheme is residentially led. It proposes a total of 376 units of which 60% would be private (265no.) and 30% would be for affordable housing (111no). The affordable units would be split between 59% (65no) social rented units and 41% (46no) Intermediate units.

7.2.26 The affordable units would be located on the fourth to sixteenth floors and the private units would be between seventh to fortieth floor levels. With the affordable mix, the social rent units are located from fourth to tenth floor levels with the Intermediate units being on the eleventh to sixteenth floors. The tenures have their own dedicated entrances and servicing strategies. The scheme has two residential cores with the northern core serving the private units with 4 lifts and the southern core serving the affordable flats with 3 lifts. All units are designed to the same standards and there would be no visible differentiation between the different tenures within the building.

7.2.27 In order to achieve a balanced residential community within the development, a wide mix of units is proposed for both the private and affordable elements of the scheme. The units range from 1 to 4 bed units. It is not possible to provide any separate dwelling houses on site and no studios proposed. For ease of reference the table below sets out the overall unit mix.

	Private	Affordable	Total
1 bed	88 (33%)	51 (46%)	139 (37%)
2 bed	153 (58%)	34 (31%)	187 (50%)
3 bed	24 (9%)	20 (18%)	44 (12%)
4 bed	-	6 (5%)	6 (2%)
TOTAL	265 (100%)	111 (100%)	376 (100%)

7.2.28 The London Plan and the UDP regard family sized accommodation as being 2 bed and larger units. This scheme would bring forward 63% of such accommodation.

7.2.29 Internal layout/Room Sizes

7.2.30 The residential units of the scheme have been designed to comply with the Supplementary Planning Document for Housing Development, which sets out guidance and standards for new build developments such as this.

7.2.31 Each floor will have a mixture of accommodation types from 1-bed units to 4-bed family homes, to encourage a diverse grouping of residents. Each residential floor is grouped around the central lift core which also serves residents with important amenities of refuse and recycling facilities and bicycle stores. Individual flats are designed to maximise space, views and natural daylight. All units would be dual aspect – there would no single aspect units – with many being triple aspected.

7.2.32 The units are stacked according to their room type and the plans suggest compliance with the minimum overall floor areas and room sizes set out within the SPD guidance. The internal layout also comply with minimum room size standards and sizes as a satisfactory internal layout can be provided.

7.2.33 Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Standards

7.2.34 Policy 33 makes reference to the London Plan and states that all new housing should be built to ‘Lifetime Homes’ standard and that 10% of new housing be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The scheme is compliant with this expectation.

7.2.35 Affordable Housing: Viability Assessment of Provision

7.2.36 As stated above, Policy 16 of the UDP states that the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing will be sought and secured from housing developments. The normal expected level of provision will be 50% of habitable rooms or 40% with no public subsidy “unless it is demonstrated and independently validated that a scheme would not be economically viable unless there is a lower level of provision, having regard to transport and other significant planning obligations necessary for the scheme to go ahead and the level of subsidy to the affordable housing proposed by the developer”.

7.2.37 The developer has submitted a financial appraisal to justify the level of affordable housing within the scheme. This has been submitted confidentially and has been passed to independently commissioned financial appraisers to determine whether the affordable housing offer as proposed has been optimised.

7.2.38 The developer has used the GLA’s 2008/09 “Development Control Toolkit Model” (DCTM), commonly known as the Three Dragons Toolkit, to appraise the scheme. This is an accredited and widely used methodology. This toolkit allows the user to define costs or provides costs benchmarks for specific London boroughs. The DCTM is regularly used on a site specific basis to attempt to identify the level of affordable housing that a particular development proposal might be able to sustain, whilst providing an adequate level of profitability to the developer and a sufficient value to landowners that will encourage them to bring forward the scheme.

7.2.39 Using the toolkit the developer has compared the residual value of the proposed scheme with the existing use value of the site and assessed a number of toolkit scenarios which demonstrate that the scheme would be unable to support a policy compliant level of affordable housing (i.e 50% affordable housing split

70%/30% social rented to Intermediate housing). Using the toolkit, the developer alleges that the submission establishes that the scheme is viable on the basis of a 23% affordable housing provision (by habitable room) split 70%/30% social rented and Intermediate housing. However, the developer is confident that the residential market will recover in the short to medium term and, with the support of Social Housing Grant for the affordable housing, is seeking planning permission for a scheme which will set a target for a 30% affordable housing provision split 59%/41% social rented to intermediate housing. The developer is proposing the inclusion of an Affordable Housing Review Mechanism which, on agreement with the Council, would seek to determine the level of affordable housing that the scheme could actually support at the point when development commences.

7.2.40 The Council's independently commissioned consultants have now considered submitted financial appraisal, and whilst negotiations between the developer, the Council's independently commissioned consultant, together with the Council's Housing officers and those from the GLA, are on-going, two key conclusions have been reached.

7.2.41 Firstly, with regard to the viability of the scheme, it is considered that the assumptions made by the developer in the submitted appraisal are fair and reasonable, including the choice and level of viability benchmark. However, concerns have been raised regarding the private residential sales values and an RSL's offer for the affordable housing element. Bringing these two inputs in line with what the Council considers to be reasonable produces a residual value in excess of the benchmark thus making the scheme viable. It is also concluded that the review mechanism is a sensible and reasonable approach given the uncertainty in the market at present. Indeed, should the market recover sufficiently it may result in the Council receiving considerable additional affordable housing provision by way of commuted payments. However, the Council's consultants consider that a bottom line guarantee of provision should be included to protect the Council's position. It is also considered that the review mechanism allows for the entire appraisal to be reviewed rather than a limited number of the variables within the appraisal.

7.2.42 As stated above, it must be stressed that negotiations are on-going and as such the final level of affordable housing provision and how that can be fully maximised has not as yet been concluded.

7.2.43 **Given that this remains work in progress, Members' steer on their expectation of the level and split of provision is recommended so that it may be factored into future negotiations.**

7.3 Provision of Amenity Space, Open Space, Playspace and Landscaping.

7.3.1 Amenity space provision within the building

7.3.2 The amenity space provision within the building falls into 2 forms; an "amenity floor" and terraces/winter gardens for each flat.

7.3.3 It is proposed to dedicate the 36th floor as an "amenity floor" which would provide recreational facilities available to all residents in the development. Proposed facilities include a games room containing equipment including table-tennis and snooker tables, a gym, a business centre (for residents' management meetings etc) and a function room with direct access to a large roof terrace. This floor would be externally articulated with a deep band of horizontal glazing which would maximise the panoramic views across London as well as externally visually defining this floor.

7.3.4 All the residential units would have a winter garden. These range in size from 6msq to 12 msq. These spaces are divisible from the main living space and have been designed to ensure that residents have a space specifically available for the enjoyment of additional amenity. In addition, the majority of the larger, 3 bed units also benefit from an external terrace which for all such units benefits from a south facing aspect. These terraces range in size from 12msq to 30msq and provide a significant amenity space for those occupiers. The terraces are an integral part of the building structure, protected from the wind, and have been designed to accommodate external furniture and planting, creating a meaningful, attractive and useable external amenity space for residents.

7.3.5 In total, this provision of external amenity space equates to 2,436msq of winter gardens and 835msq of terraces, totalling 3,271msq.

7.3.6 The Council's SPD on amenity space provision within developments requires that a minimum of 10msq per flat is provided be that in the form of a balcony, terrace or consolidated within communal space. Exclusive of the amenity floor, this level of provision works out as approximately 9msq per flat. When the amenity floor is included (an additional 671msq) the level of amenity space provision is comfortably in excess of the SPD's requirements.

7.3.7 Amenity and Open Space outside the Building

7.3.8 Both the GLA's SPG and the Council's SPD regarding amenity and open space require the provision of children and young person's play space ideally on site. Off site provision may be considered acceptable in certain circumstances dependant on the age of the children occupying the development and proximity of any local parks for example. In order to calculate the requisite amount of play space to be provided, it is necessary to estimate the number of children that would live in the development. This is done by using the formula contained in the GLA's SPD on Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation. The Council's SPG follows this methodology. The developer has employed this formula and derives a child yield of 117 children that could live in the development. This is not contested.

7.3.9 Both the GLA's SPG and the Council's SPD require 10msq of play space per child. This therefore generates a total play space requirement of 1,170msq or 0.11 of a hectare.

7.3.10 The application site extends to 0.29 of a hectare, so the requisite on site provision would therefore cover a third of the site. The developer argues that if this requirement had to be adhered to, a redevelopment scheme such as that proposed would simply be neither feasible nor viable.

7.3.11 However, mindful of this requirement and in attempt to go some way to providing on site play and open space on site, the developer had been in negotiations over many months with Network Rail/Spacia prior to formally submitting the application to use the storage/car park immediately adjoining the site to provide a "pocket park" serving both the development and the wider community. Regrettably, it has not been possible to reach an agreement with Network Rail/Spacia and as such the provision of this open amenity space has not been realised. For these reasons, the developer has sought to maximise the level of amenity space for children and young persons within the development, hence the generously sized terraces, winter gardens and the provision of the amenity floor.

7.3.12 Officers are aware of the significance of this plot of land in providing quality open amenity space for the future occupiers of this and other new re-development schemes in this vicinity. Officers consider that a case could be made to use the Council's powers to assist in the assembly of the land to provide a local pocket park. This would only be on the basis of such a proposal being cost neutral to the Council. This avenue of investigation is, however, at a very early stage of development.

7.3.13 Members' resolution is sought as to whether they consider it to be an appropriate course of action for officers to pursue the acquisition of the land for this public benefit, if it is indeed available to the Council. If Members resolve that this initiative should be supported as part of their support for the scheme as a whole, it can be advanced concurrent with the continued assessment of the application.

7.3.14 The developer does acknowledge that the level of open play space does not meet the policy requirements. In attempt to mitigate this, reference is made to the proximity of Vauxhall Park which is 200m to the east and is easily accessible from the development. It is proposed to offer a financial contribution to be used to improve facilities in the park. Whilst negotiations on the contributions to be agreed for the s106 Agreement remain on-going, the Council's s106 Toolkit derives a sum of £103,711.50. Whilst the final sums for this and all other contributions are still being negotiated, there is the expectation that the developer will be obliged to significantly financially contribute in lieu of on site provision, a point which is fully acknowledged by the applicant.

7.3.15 Turning to the public realm around the building, the proposals step the building back significantly from the pavement edge to create a generous pavement width which would allow pedestrians and occupiers of the building to enjoy an increased public realm around the entire boundary of the site. It is also proposed to the road surfaces on Bondway and, subject to on-going negotiations with TfL and our highway engineers, to include improvements to Miles Street in order to improve the public realm of the setting of the site.

7.3.16 Additional improvements under discussion include the upgrade of the railway arches at Parry Street and Miles Street thereby improving the public experience of these spaces which are currently unwelcoming and unsightly.

7.3.17 Member's steer is sought on whether they consider the approach taken to amenity and open play space is considered acceptable when in the context of the scheme as a whole.

7.4 Amenity Considerations

7.4.1 Daylight and Sunlight

7.4.2 Adopted UDP Policy 33 requires consideration of the impacts of new developments upon the amenities of existing and adjoining residential occupiers. Policy 40 also requires consideration of sunlight and shadowing.

7.4.3 In assessing daylight and sunlight impacts of the proposed development upon existing residential neighbours, Policy 33 states that regard will be had to the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight Sunlight.'

7.4.4 The BRE has developed a series of quantitative tests for daylight, which if all are failed, the development would be considered unacceptable in terms of loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. One of the tests used in this case is the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), which measures the amount of available daylight from the sky received at a particular window. It states that “If the Vertical Sky Component, with the new development in place, is less than 27%, and less than 0.8 times its former value, then occupants of the existing building will notice a reduction in the amount of skylight”. If the remaining vertical sky component (VSCs) is greater than 27% then enough skylight should still be reaching the windows of the existing building. The maximum VSC value obtainable at a flat window in a vertical wall is 40%.

7.4.5 If a development fails the VSC test, a 'Daylight Factor' (ADF) test should be undertaken. The BRE guidelines suggest that a minimum daylight factor (df) of 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1.0% for bedrooms should be achieved in order for satisfactory levels of interior daylighting to be maintained in existing neighbouring properties.

7.4.6 The submitted Environmental Statement (ES) provides an analysis of daylight, sunlight and shadow on nearby existing residential properties, and any overshadowing impacts to amenity areas and open space around the site.

7.4.7 A daylight and sunlight Report has been commissioned and forms part of the submitted ES. In brief, it concludes that there are two residential properties which would suffer a loss of daylight, 56 Parry Street and Hilden House. The analysis demonstrates, however, the level of retained light will be sufficient for these properties in this central urban location as not to justify refusal. The BRE analysis concludes that there would be no loss of sunlight to any property.

7.4.8 Overshadowing

7.4.9 Members will be aware that concern has been raised by a number of residents and their representative groups that a building of this height, scale and bulk would result in significant overshadowing of their homes and gardens.

7.4.10 **The BRE report concludes that there would be no material overshadowing of properties in the area, but given the concern expressed locally, Members steer is sought as whether they wish to question the veracity of the analysis in this regard.**

7.4.11 Privacy, Outlook and Sense of Enclosure

7.4.12 Policy 33 requires that development protect residential amenity of future residents by ensuring acceptable standard of privacy and not creating an undue sense of enclosure

7.4.13 The closest residential accommodation is the properties on the northern side of Parry Street, all of which have habitable rooms facing the application site. The separation distance between the existing and proposed building would be 18m across Parry Street, a distance typical across London streets. It is also a similar distance to the separation distance between the consented Vauxhall Sky Gardens development and residents in the Wyvil Road Estate opposite in Wyvil Road.

7.4.14 Given the analysis and consideration undertaken by the Council and GLA that went into designating the site as appropriate for redevelopment for a tall building, the separation distances between the site, the closest residential properties in Parry

Street and the wider area would have been taken into account and considered to be sufficient, subject to detailed design of a new building, to offset any harmful impact in this regard.

7.4.15 Noise Impact

7.4.16 The ES includes an assessment of potential noise and related vibration impact associated with the development. The assessment considers the suitability of the site for a residentially led mixed use development, The assessment considers the impact of noise on both adjacent occupiers who may be impacted upon by the development and given the location of site what measures need to be incorporated into the design to ensure that the future occupiers are not detrimentally affected by the proximity of the gyratory and elevated railway lines.

7.4.17 Externally, noise generation could be attributed to the increase in people into the area using the proposed retail/commercial facilities. Any potential for undue noise emanation could be controlled by condition should planning permission be granted (control on opening hours, no amplified music audible outside premises etc).

7.4.18 Internally, sound and vibration insulation measures have been incorporated into the detailed design and specification of the building to provide future residents with peaceful domestic environment. The developer has confirmed that these measures would comply with all relevant British Standards.

7.4.19 There is also the potential for noise disturbance during the demolition and construction phases. The ES also contains a Construction and Environmental Management Plan to control these works and to ensure that they are within restricted operating hours. Again, these matters can be controlled by appropriate conditions if Members resolve that the scheme is acceptable.

7.4.20 Other Environmental Impacts.

7.4.21 The ES also contains assessments addressing light and solar glare, air quality and dust control, electrical interference, aviation considerations and wind tunnelling. The ES as a whole has been referred to Regulatory Services (Noise and Pollution) and relevant external agencies for consideration. The ES remains under their consideration and as such their comments are awaited; however, should it be resolved that these assessments together with the relevant specifications and mitigation measures are considered to be acceptable, conditions would be imposed as appropriate and necessary to ensure full compliance with the relevant British Standards.

7.5 Highways and Transportation Issues

7.5.1 Transport for London (TfL) is the public transport authority and the Highway Authority for the major road network in the vicinity of the site. The Council is the local highways authority for Bondway and the immediately adjoining secondary roads.

7.5.2 Policy 9 of the UDP seeks to ensure that development proposals do not have an adverse impact upon traffic safety and do not lead to an increase in parking stress and traffic congestion within the Borough. Policy 10 states that new developments should have full cycle access and facilities. Policy 14 sets out maximum car-parking levels and minimum cycling-parking levels.

7.5.3 In January 2002, the Council formerly adopted revised parking standards which are now included within Policy 14 of the UDP. These standards have been drawn up in light of Government guidance, primarily PPG13. The aim of these standards is to reduce the level of off-street parking provision in Lambeth and lower traffic congestion and the reliance on private vehicles as a means of travel. The standards are expressed as a maximum allowance and Vauxhall falls within an Area of Strict Traffic Restraint. Therefore under the revised standards the proposal should provide a maximum of spaces for the site as a whole.

7.5.4 An analysis of the traffic and transportation matters which Members need to be aware of are set out below.

7.5.5 The scheme has been the subject extensive negotiation over many months with both Council highways engineers and officers of Transport for London (TfL) prior to the submission of the application. The outcomes from these meetings have informed the subsequent submission both in terms of the level of car parking provision, access and servicing etc on site and the nature and extent of improvements to the wider public realm. It is acknowledged by both the Council and TfL that the public transport infrastructure at Vauxhall Cross is nearing full capacity and given the increased numbers of residents and commercial occupiers that this scheme will create, together with the cumulative impact of additional trip generation when other schemes come forward, the negotiations have also sought to ensure an appropriate financial contribution via the s106 agreement to mitigate against this increase in capacity.

7.5.6 Highway Status

7.5.7 Bondway is a Borough road at this location although north of the junction with Parry Street it is part of the TLRN network and Vauxhall bus terminal. Parry Street is also part of the TLRN which TfL are highway controlling authority over, and is a major four lane one-way westbound route linking South Lambeth Road with Wandsworth Road. The site is located outside the London Congestion Charging Zone (CCZ), the southern boundary of which runs along Vauxhall Bridge and Kennington Lane 200m north of the site.

7.5.8 Accessibility & Density

7.5.9 The site is located within an area of excellent public transport accessibility (PTAL score of 6a). This PTAL score reflects the site's extremely close proximity to Vauxhall Cross interchange, a 2 minute walk to the north of the site. Vauxhall Interchange provides high frequency Victoria Line Underground Services from Vauxhall Station, mainline rail services (South Western Trains) and interchange for many high frequency and night bus routes. As a result, the site is within an area where high density residential development is encouraged. Current peak time capacity constraints on both the Victoria Line and Mainline rail services are acknowledged as an issue however.

7.5.10 Vehicular Access

7.5.11 The scheme proposes separate ingress/egress and a proposed northbound one-way route through the site. The current vehicular crossover is proposed to be stopped up and relocated to the southern end of the site further along Bondway, and will serve as the sole vehicle access point for both the residential basement car park and servicing area. The vehicle exit point is proposed to be relocated to the east of the current vehicle crossover on Parry Street, further away from the railway viaduct

thus providing enhanced visibility for exiting vehicles. The proposed vehicle crossovers, access to the basement car park and servicing areas are discussed in more detail below.

7.5.12 Pedestrian Access and Movement

7.5.13 Numerous pedestrian entrance points are proposed at ground floor level, with access to ground floor retail premises proposed on both the Bondway and Parry Street frontages. The office and residential floors will be accessed from separate lobbies and will both have direct access off Bondway, with separate stairwells and lift cores for the office and residential uses. All pedestrian access points are proposed to be recessed from the property boundary thus providing substantial ground floor circulation space and ensuring there will be no overcrowding of the footway and proposed public realm within the curtilage of the site.

7.5.14 The footways along both Parry Street and Bondway are to be widened, and a pedestrian forecourt area is proposed in front of the building along Bondway in conjunction with the office and residential lobbies.

7.5.15 The Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the application states improvements to the crossing facilities on Parry Street are proposed, and are based on the recent accident history and the increase in pedestrian movements across Parry Street associated with the scheme. Improvements will comprise improved signage, the removal of guard-railing, new markings and possible footway widening.

7.5.16 The TA also includes a 'Fruin' analysis based on pedestrian surveys of pedestrian flows along Parry Street and the surrounding highway network, along with taking into account the pedestrian trip generation associated with the scheme. The analysis predicts that the scheme will generate 284 two-way pedestrian movements in the AM peak hour and 277 in the PM peak hour. Based on the proposed increased capacity of the footways and public realm there is considered ample capacity to cater for the expected increase in pedestrian movements, with an excellent level of service provided for pedestrians.

7.5.17 It is noted however that the surrounding footways are of poor quality and are proposed to be upgraded to higher specification to ensure that the safety and amenity of the pedestrian environment is improved.

7.5.18 Cycling Networks

7.5.19 Access for cyclists to the cycle storage areas will be via cycle lifts on the eastern side of the building, and will be accessible from both Parry Street and Bondway. As part of the proposed Bondway highway works, a contra-flow northbound cycle lane linking Parry Street with Miles Street is proposed and will improve the connection between South Lambeth Road and the established cycle route on Meadow Road with the Vauxhall interchange.

7.5.20 In addition, area wide improvements to the cycle network are required, namely on Fentiman Road (which links to Miles Street) and Wheatsheaf Lane, and these would need to be secured via s106 agreement.

7.5.21 Trip Generation

7.5.22 (i) Residential Trips

The applicant has consulted the TRAVL database to determine trip generation rates for the residential use. Sites with a similar PTAL score to that of the application site have been selected as a basis for determining trip generation, however given the limited number of large mixed-use sites of this nature within the TRAVL database it is difficult to determine whether the scheme will have a similar trip generation rate to those selected. There are also a number of other contributing factors aside from PTAL that influence trip generation and modal split, namely:

- Parking availability and CPZ restrictions;
- Socio-economic factors, including household income;
- Ward vehicle ownership;
- Bias towards certain public transport modes based on location;
- Surrounding amenities, shops and community facilities;

7.5.23 The four sites selected for comparison however are considered to largely reflect the local context, particularly the St George Wharf affordable housing scheme as it is also served by Vauxhall Interchange. The four sites from TRAVL providing base trip generation data and modal split are Coopers Court, Leathermarket Court, Putney Wharf and St George Wharf. The total number of two-way trips across all modes during the AM peak is estimated at 246 movements, with 231 movements expected during the PM peak. Given the very limited parking provision for the residential units (25 spaces for 376 units) and proposed permit-free nature of all units, total vehicle trips are estimated at less than 10 during both the AM peak and PM peak. The residential trip generation figures are accepted.

7.5.24 (ii) Office Trips

The total number of two-way trips across all modes during the AM peak is estimated at 147 movements, 155 movements expected during the PM peak. Total vehicle trips are estimated at less than 10 during the AM peak and PM peak reflecting proposed servicing vehicle trips. Again, this is accepted.

7.5.25 Total Trip Generation

The total number of two-way trips across all modes for both the residential and commercial components of the scheme during the AM peak is estimated at 393 movements, with 386 movements estimated during the evening peak. The vast majority of trips will be by public transport and walking, and a smaller amount by cycling. The total number of vehicle trips during peak times is expected to be less than 20.

7.5.26 Given the retail tenancies will not be 'destination' stores, they will largely serve demand generated by the office and residential uses. The majority of trips associated with retail uses will therefore be combined with trips already counted in association with the residential and office uses, and are therefore not considered to be in addition to these.

7.5.27 On-site Parking Provision

The scheme proposes 25 parking spaces in total for the residential use and none for the office or retail facilities. The number of parking spaces equates to a ratio of 0.07 spaces per residential unit, which is well within the maximum standards of both the Lambeth UDP and London Plan. In addition, all residential units will be permit-free, meaning owners and occupiers will not be able to apply for residential parking permits, making the scheme virtually car-free.

7.5.28 12 of the 25 parking spaces are laid out in accordance with disabled parking standards, more than meeting the UDP minimum of 10% disabled parking provision.

7.5.29 Basement Car Park

The two-level basement car park will be accessed by a vehicle lift located at the rear of the building and will be operated via a signalised lift system. A designated off-street waiting area will be provided ensuring vehicles accessing the basement car park will not be forced to queue on the highway. There is also sufficient circulation, turning and manoeuvring space in the basement car park to ensure vehicles will be able to enter and exit the basement lift in a forwards gear.

7.5.30 Overall, the basement car park layout allows for safe and convenient vehicle circulation and is considered by officers to be acceptable.

7.5.31 Impact on Parking Stress

7.5.32 The scheme is situated within the 'Kennington K' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The scheme will not generate any additional parking demand on the surrounding highway network as it is proposed to be permit free, secured by s106 agreement.

7.5.33 Traffic Impact

The TA includes a full summary of the current morning peak and evening peak traffic flows along with Saturday peak hour flows. Combined with the trip generation data as set out above, this allows an accurate assessment of the likely traffic impact of the scheme. Given the scheme is virtually car-free, the number of additional vehicle trips on the surrounding highway network will be negligible and the scheme will have a minimal impact on the surrounding local and TLRN highway network in terms of traffic generation.

7.5.34 Public Transport Impact

The impact on public transport services has been assessed by TfL. It is noted that there is a recognised capacity issue at Vauxhall Underground Station and that TfL will be seeking a contribution towards this and other measures to increase public transport capacity in the Vauxhall area. The proposed improvements to pedestrian accessibility in particular to the crossing on Parry Street will also improve public transport accessibility.

7.5.35 Servicing

Site servicing is proposed via two servicing bays located at the rear of the building, accessed via the new proposed vehicle crossover on Bondway and exiting via the proposed realigned crossover onto Parry Street.

7.5.36 A servicing strategy is set out in the TA and includes a calculation of the estimated number of servicing movements along with servicing requirements, requirements for loading/unloading areas, delivery routes to and from the service area and a swept path analysis for all likely delivery vehicles. The servicing strategy also deals with the estimated waste generation, management regime and proposed storage facilities. The scheme is consistent with policy 14 (i) of the UDP, which states: "Servicing – Business premises should have proper servicing facilities. On-street servicing is discouraged where this would interfere with pedestrian or cycle movements or would lead to traffic or safety problems."

7.5.37 The scheme is estimated to generate 46 servicing movements per day including a total of 6 servicing movements between 9-10am weekday mornings. Deliveries are expected to be made by rigid vehicles up to 10m in length, and articulated lorries are not expected to service the scheme.

7.5.38 In order to accommodate the estimated number of servicing movements two loading bays are proposed, one 10m in length and the other 6m in length. Vehicles will access the loading bays from the crossover on Bondway and exit via Parry Street. Given the proposed one-way circulation, turning and manoeuvring will be kept to a minimum and allow service vehicles will be able to enter and exit the site in a forwards gear.

7.5.39 The proposed servicing bays will also be located within very close proximity to both the commercial and residential refuse storage areas thus ensuring there will be no refuse transfer outside of the designated servicing area.

7.5.40 A dedicated loading bay manager is proposed, or dockmaster, who will be responsible for managing deliveries and directing drivers and courier staff to the relevant tenant. A Delivery Management Plan will also be secured via condition to ensure deliveries are co-ordinated and service vehicles do not end up queuing for the loading bays.

7.5.41 Cycle Storage

7.5.42 A total of 568 secure and sheltered cycle storage spaces are proposed. Designated cycle storage areas are proposed on each of the two basement levels and in storage units on floors four to sixteen, providing a total of 516 cycle parking spaces for the residential units and employees. The proposed number of cycle storage spaces exceeds the minimum requirements of both the Lambeth UDP and London Plan.

7.5.43 Travel Plan

Preparation and implementation of a comprehensive travel plan for the scheme (or any subsequent scheme) is required, and any travel plan should be prepared in accordance with TfL's latest travel plan guidance or subsequent amendment, namely 'Guidance for residential travel planning in London'; TfL, March 2008, and 'Guidance for workplace travel planning for development'; TfL, March 2008

7.5.44 A draft travel plan for both the residential and commercial components of the scheme has been included within the TA and this sets out appropriate objectives and targets, the management approach, the strategy for promoting sustainable transport modes, and monitoring and review measures. The Travel Plan will need to be further developed, submitted, and approved prior to occupation.

7.5.45 Streetscape and Public Realm Improvements

A comprehensive redevelopment of Bondway is proposed between Parry Street and Miles Street, incorporating a 'shared surface' carriageway design, new footways and a contra flow cycle lane. This is considered necessary given the scale of the proposed scheme, and will greatly improve both the accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and general amenity of the area. Improvements to the Miles Street and Parry Street railway arches are also proposed which will greatly improve amenity and connectivity with surrounding areas.

7.5.46 S106 Contributions

If Members resolve that the scheme may be recommended for approval, it is considered that there would have a series of mitigation measures and appropriate financial contributions secured to mitigate the impact of the development on the local area. It is considered that the following matters/works would need to be included as part of any s106 agreement for the scheme or any subsequent scheme proposed for the site:

1. Given the scale of the scheme and the expected multi-modal trip generation, £1,000,000 is sought for the complete redevelopment of the section of Bondway between Parry Street and Miles St, incorporating a shared surface carriageway layout, new footways, a contra flow cycle lane, and changes to TMO's, in addition to streetscape improvements along Miles St;
2. £246,000 is sought for the refurbishment of the railway arches on Parry Street and Miles Street;
3. £50,000 is sought for the upgrading of cycle routes on the surrounding highway network, namely Fentiman Road and Wheatsheaf Lane adjacent to South Lambeth Road;
4. All residential units will need to be permit free, meaning owners and occupiers will be unable to apply for residential parking permits;
5. Subject to negotiation, £900,000 is sought for public transport capacity and accessibility improvements at Vauxhall Underground Station and Interchange; and
6. A Travel Plan for both the residential and commercial component of the scheme.

7.6 Other Matters

7.6.1 There are a number of other material considerations which Members should be briefed on as they may influence their assessment of the scheme. These are set out in brief below, primarily as the related observations from the relevant consultees remain outstanding at the time of writing this “steer” report,

7.6.2 Sustainability

7.6.3 Policy 4B.6 of the London Plan seeks to achieve sustainable design and construction in accordance with the ultimate aim of reducing carbon dioxide emissions set out in Policy 4A.1 of the London Plan. Alterations to this document include policies on reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 20% through the use of on-site renewable energy generation for new development. Policy 34 of the UDP requires all major development to incorporate equipment for renewable power generation so as to offset at least 10% of carbon production. Policy 35 states that development proposals should demonstrate how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

7.6.4 The applicant has sought throughout the project to comply with the Mayor's Energy Hierarchy and achieve at least a 20% reduction in carbon emissions. The design of the building is intended to be energy efficient and be fully Part L (Building Regulations) compliant. The applicant has prepared a comprehensive Energy Strategy which appraises a range of energy technologies as potential on site energy generation sources. In addition, an Eco-Homes pre-assessment has been carried out which confirms that with the energy efficiency measures proposed the scheme would be able to achieve a “Very Good” Eco-Homes rating. The Council's Environment Development – Housing team are at present assessing these documents and its comments are expected soon; they should therefore form part of the report when the application is reported back to Committee for determination. Any

approval would be subject to a condition and/or a s106 obligation securing these provisions.

7.6.5 Refuse and Re-cycling

7.6.6 The application is accompanied by a detailed Environment Statement which seeks to identify, address and mitigate against all the environmental impacts that a scheme of this scale would generate. Whilst much of this document has been referred to above in the section on the amenity related impacts of the scheme, there is also detailed analysis on refuse generation both during the demolition/construction phase as well as what measures would be necessary upon occupation of the building. This has been referred to the Council's relevant departments (Streetcare and Regulatory Services) for their assessments and comment. The ES is to read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement.

7.6.7 These comments have not as yet been received but should they be positive and conclude that there are no objections to this strategy, again, it would be reasonable and appropriate to impose conditions to ensure compliance with policy 56 of the UDP and the Council's guidance for "Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Requirements" which is comprehensive guide to waste storage provision.

7.6.8 Water Resource and Flood Risk

7.6.9 The submitted Environmental Statement considers the impact of the scheme in terms of flood risk and on surface water, groundwater and existing drainage.

7.6.10 In terms of flood risk, the site lies within Flood Zone 3, which indicates a probability of flooding greater than 0.5% from tidal sources. In light of this and that the building would have 2 basements, the Environmental Statement has addressed what measures would be necessary to adequately mitigate this risk. The Flood Risk Assessment also addresses directly surface water runoff and foul drainage. This has been referred to Environment Agency but at the time of writing its comments have not been received. As with sustainability issues above, it considered that subject to what the Environment Agency and Thames Water conclude on the proposed flood risk mitigation measures and drainage systems as a whole conditions could be imposed to secure those provisions, should Members resolve to support the scheme.

7.6.11 Archaeology

7.6.12 In accordance with PPG16, Policy 4B.14 in the London Plan and Policy 48 of the UDP, the application is accompanied by a desk-top archaeological assessment undertaken by the Museum of London Archaeology service. The site does not contain any nationally designated (protected) sites, such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings or Registered Parks and Gardens. The site lies within the London Borough of Lambeth Archaeological Priority Area, which includes the historic core of Lambeth village and the entire Thames foreshore environs within the Borough.

7.6.13 The proposed development includes basements, piles and foundation beams. The 2 basements run across the site. Remains dating from the Mesolithic to the modern period could potentially remain although it is acknowledged that previous development would have had a seriously detrimental impact on the potential for artefacts to remain on site and at best on fragmentary remains are likely to be present.

7.6.14 English Heritage (Archaeology) have advised that a condition should be attached to any planning permission that requires the applicant to implement a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a scheme for investigation prior to any development taking place.

7.6.15 Secure by Design

7.6.16 Policy 32 of the AUDP seeks to ensure that proposed developments enhance community safety and do not create opportunities for crime or result in an increase in the risk of public disorder.

7.6.17 The Design and Access statement addresses Secured by Design. It states that integration of the buildings and landscape into their wider setting was considered at an early stage of the project.

7.6.18 There would be controlled access entry to the car park and the cycle parking which would be secure and managed. Access to the commercial and residential uses would be from within the building and via secure lobbies at ground floor level, the frontage to which has been designed to avoid any recesses or unnecessary structures behind which people to hide or congregate. It is proposed to refurbish and upgrade to the 2 adjacent railway arches in Parry Street and Miles Street which are presently unsightly and somewhat intimidating. Given this and the overall improvements to adjacent public realm, it is reasonable to conclude that this scheme would bring forward significant improvements with regard to crime prevention. These improvements should, however, also be considered in light of the alleged requirements of the Metropolitan Police Authority.

7.6.19 The Crime Prevention Officer has been consulted but has yet to provide comments but these will be available when the application is reported for determination. If it were to be recommended for approval, a condition would be recommended requiring details of how the scheme would comply with Secure By Design principles.

7.7 Community Facilities and Planning Obligations

7.7.1 As set out in the body of the report, the complexity and scale of the application proposal results in various impacts of the development that need to be mitigated through a range of planning obligations. ODPM Circular 5/2005 states the intention of planning obligations is to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. It goes on to set out the appropriate tests for seeking planning obligations, as follows:

- relevant to planning
- necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms
- directly related to the proposed development
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and
- reasonable in all other respects.

7.7.2 Council UDP Policy 26 (D) Deficiencies in Community Facilities states that, in major developments, as here, where the development exacerbates an existing shortage of community facilities (such as by increasing the residential population) then new facilities, or contributions towards improving facilities, will be required. Such community facilities could include healthcare provision, library facilities and education (school places). In compliance with this policy, financial

contributions will be secured via a legal agreement to ensure the provision of the community facilities detailed above.

7.7.3 Policy 57 Planning Obligations states at that in cases such as this, the Council will enter into legal agreements (the s106 agreement) with developers and seek the attainment of planning obligations, having regard to current Government guidance.

7.7.4 The Heads of Terms of a S106 legal agreement have not as yet been finalised and remain under active negotiation. The figures put forward by Council officers are derived from the formula approach in accordance with the adopted S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and have been amended as appropriate following discussions with the applicant. Whilst it is anticipated that the Heads of Terms will be agreed by the time the application is reported to Members for determination, it is important to stress at this stage, the financial contributions quoted below are provisional. The table below sets out the Heads of Terms and the level of contribution sought by the Council and the amount offered by the developer to date.

Head of Term	Amount of financial contribution sought by the Council	Amount of financial contribution offered by the developer
Education	£729,605.00	£583,684.00
Health	£337,833.50	£270,267.00
Libraries	£56,558.06	£56,558.06
Indoor Sports and Leisure	£210,936.04	£210,936.04
Local Community Groups	Not formally identified	£30,000.00
Public Realm: Parks and Open Space (General)	£488,866.60	£488,866.60
Public Realm and Open Space (Young Persons)	£103,712.00	£103,712.00
Public Realm (Streetscape)	Not formally identified	£1,000,000.00
Public Art	£1,430,000.00	£300,000.00
Public Realm (Revenues)	£279,857.81	£50,000.00
Public Transport	£790,000.00	£800,000.00
Travel Plans	£1,000.00	£1,000.00
Local training in Construction	£357,500.00	£50,000.00
Employment and Training	£69,115.48	£0
Crossrail	£488,960.00	£1000,000.00
Sub Total	£5,343,944.49	£4,045,024.00
Legal Fees	£156,774.60	£20,000.00
TOTAL	£5,500,719.09	£4,065,024.04

7.7.5 The detailed breakdown of the requirements and improvements to the public realm and highway network are set out in paragraph 7.5.46 in the Highways and transportation issues section above. It should be noted that the Crossrail payment secured would be put towards strategic transport improvements in the Vauxhall area and not specifically towards Crossrail.

7.7.6 Members' resolution is sought on the acceptability of the overall level of financial contributions that the Council will seek to mitigate the impact of the development and whether Members consider the proposed offer to be sufficient.

7.8 Conclusion

7.8.1 For the purposes of this "steer" report, officers acknowledge that this is a development of strategic as well as local importance. As such, it is considered imperative that it is brought before Members at this stage, prior to determination, for their comments and resolutions on the key issues which this report highlights. Members' resolutions will then inform the content and focus of the on-going dialogue and negotiations between the developer and officers of the Council and the GLA and the council's appointed valuers.

7.8.2 The application is residentially led. It would provide a total of 376 flats of which 265 would be private units and 111 would be affordable housing units. This level of provision would significantly contribute towards meeting the Council's housing needs targets. It would also provide over 5,500msq. of subsidised flexible start-up Use Class B1 floorspace which would be available for local businesses; this would positively contribute to the Council's over-arching principle of reducing worklessness in the borough although this has to be weighed against the identifies shortfall in the quantum of floorspace.. The developer is proposing to undertake improvements to the local public realm and offer a raft of financial contributions to mitigate against the impacts of the development. Officers argue that it is reasonable to conclude that this scheme would bring forward significant regeneration benefits for Vauxhall. However, Members views are sought on the balance of the proposed land uses.

7.8.3 However, it is a 149m tall building and as such has London-wide as well as local impacts. GLA and Council policies and guidance have acknowledged this site as being one appropriate for tall buildings and the principle of such is established. The GLA's OAPF identifies that in the heart of Vauxhall "buildings in the region of 150m" are appropriate. Notwithstanding the Council's emerging draft SPD identifying a maximum 80m height, it does allow for exceptions if they are particularly high quality architecture. Members will note CABE's support of the scheme. Yet, Members will also be aware of English Heritage's objection, supported by Westminster City Council amongst others on what are considered to detrimental impacts on views and vistas across London. Members' ruling on these heritage and townscape impacts across London together with those on the impacts on the local townscape, particularly Vauxhall conservation area and Vauxhall Park are therefore sought.

7.8.4 Members' resolution is also sought on their consideration of the amenity impact of the development on both adjacent and future residents. Also, resolution is sought on their consideration of the levels of amenity and play space provision as well as the highways and public realm works and improvements.

7.8.5 Whilst the s106 Agreement has not as yet been agreed, Members conclusions on these negotiations are sought as they will inform further negotiations with the developer to reach an acceptable level of mitigation, should of course Members be minded to grant planning permission at a later date.

7.8.6 For ease of reference, the table below sets out various considerations that Members' resolution is sought.

Paragraph	Consideration for Resolution
7.1.61	The principle of a tall building in this location.
7.1.61	The quality of architecture and detailed design.
7.1.61	The acceptability of height, scale and bulk of this 149m tall building on both London-wide and local heritage assets and townscape.
7.1.65	The impact on Vauxhall conservation area and Vauxhall park.
Various: Sections 7.1 & 7.7	The extent and quality of public realm improvements.
7.2.10	The principle of a Metropolitan Police base within the building.
7.2.21	The quantum and nature of provision of subsidised start up B1 floorspace.
7.2.43	The level and split of the proposed affordable housing provision.
7.3.13	The pursuit of the acquisition of the adjoining site for a public open space ("pocket park").
7.3.17	The acceptability of the amenity and open play space provision.
7.4.10	The veracity and detail of the submitted daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing studies.
7.7.6	The acceptability of the overall level of financial contributions the Council should seek to mitigate the impact of the development and whether the applicant's proposed offer is sufficient.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That Members note the issues raised in the report and inform officers of their resolutions on them and direct officers to enter into further negotiations as necessary with the applicant to ensure that all their resolutions are addressed before the application is returned to the Planning Applications Committee for determination.