

# Officer Update Report

For Planning Committee

## Document Index

Section 1	Site location map
Section 2	Application Summary
Section 3	Officer report
Section 4	Decision notice detail
Section 5	Appendices

## Stakeholders

Planning Case Officer	Mr Andrew Mulindwa
Applicant	Access Self Storage Limited
Agent.	Mr T Johnstone - The London Planning Practice LLP4 Goodwin's Court Covent Garden WC2N 4LL
Application Reference	07/04998/FUL

## Document Information

Version	1.1
Date Report approved	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2008
Author	Mr Andrew Mulindwa
Tel	020 7926 1214
Email	almulindwa@lambeth.gov.uk



Lambeth Planning  
Phoenix House  
10 Wandsworth Road,  
London  
SW8 2LL

Telephone 020 7926 1180  
Facsimile 020 7926 1171  
[www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning)  
[lambethplanning@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:lambethplanning@lambeth.gov.uk)

Section 1 – Site Location Map

LAMBETH PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
COMMITTEE



Case Number :	07/04998/FUL
Application Address :	516 - 522 Streatham High Road SW16 3QF



Based on the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

L.B. Lambeth LA 100019338 2005

**Section 2 – Application Summary**

<b>Location</b>	516-522 Streatham High Road London SW16 3QF
<b>Ward</b>	Streatham South
<b>Proposal Application</b>	Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a 5 storey building comprising 8,155sqm of self-storage floorspace (Use Class B8) and 1,839sqm of serviced offices (Use Class B1) with off street car parking spaces for 3 cars and 20 cycle storage spaces together with new vehicular access from Kempshott Road and new vehicular egress onto Penistone Road.
<b>Applicant</b>	Access Self Storage Limited
<b>Agent</b>	Mr T Johnstone - The London Planning Practice LLP 4 Goodwin's Court Covent Garden London WC2N 4LL
<b>Date valid</b>	14 December 2007
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew L Mulindwa
<b>Application Reference</b>	07/04998/FUL
<b>Recommendation(s)</b>	REF
<b>Constraints</b>	Within 100m of Trunk Road
<b>Advert Publication Date</b>	28th December 2007
<b>Site Notice posted on</b>	28th December 2007

07/04998/FUL

**1. Summary of Main Issues**

- 1.1. The principle of redevelopment and change of use of the site from general industrial use (Use Class B2) to a mixed office (Use Class B1) and storage and distribution (Use Class B8);
- 1.2. The design and appearance of the building and impact upon visual amenity;
- 1.3. Impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents;
- 1.4. Access, parking, cycle and transport implications of the proposal;
- 1.5. Sustainability and renewable energy issues and;
- 1.6. Planning Obligations

**2. SITE**

- 2.1. The application relates to a 0.38ha site, situated on the western side of the A23 Streatham High Road, between its junctions with Kempshott Road and Penistone Road. It is occupied by a 3 storey high industrial building (circa 1960) located in the southeaten corner of the site at the junction of Penistone Road and Streatham High Road. The rest of the site contains a double height workshop building fronting onto Kempshott Road and an open tarmac courtyard in the northern corner of the site, at the junction of Streatham High Road and Kempshott Road.
- 2.2. The primary frontage of the site is on Streatham High Road, on which there are two vehicular access points to the site. Further vehicular access points are located on Kempshott Road and Penistone Road.
- 2.3. The buildings are currently vacant and the site is boarded up but until recently were used by the Ministry of Defence as workshops for the repair and storage of vehicles. It is not certain when the current use of the site commenced but there is anecdotal evidence that the sited was used as a garage for the repair, servicing, display and sale of motor vehicles until the early 1970s.
- 2.4. The site adjoins terraces of two storey residential properties and their rear gardens to the west and southwest in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road, respectively. To the north the site directly faces onto the return frontage of a 4 storey with basement residential property on Streatham High Road (No. 510), a two storey residential building and a pair of bungalows in Kempshott Road (Nos. 10-16). It is bounded to the east by Streatham High Road, where properties are predominantly 3-4 storeys high and in residential use excepting the Health Centre located at the junction of Streatham High Road and Baldry Gardens. To the south at the junction of Penistone Road and Streatham High Road, the site adjoins a two storey high corner property. This building is in commercial use and marks the end of a terrace of 3 storey buildings with commercial ground and residential upper floors in Streatham High Road.

- 2.5. The surrounding area is characterised by commercial and residential properties on Streatham High Road including a Public House, a solicitors' office; a church and ancillary hall and Sainsbury's supermarket to the north, the health centre on the opposite side of Streatham High Road and a parade of shops in a designated Local Centre to the south on Streatham High Road. There is a Day Nursery on a site immediately to the northwest of the site in Kempshott Road. Elsewhere neighbouring streets are residential.
- 2.6. The site is located within a designated archaeological priority zone and has no other designation under the proposals map of the adopted UDP. However, it is within the vicinity of the designated Local Centres comprising the parade of shops between Nos. 408 and 450 and 524 and 580 Streatham High Road to the north and south respectively. The southern boundary of the Streatham Common Conservation Area (CA43) runs along the rear boundaries of properties on the northern side of Kempshott Road but turns to include Nos. 508-510 Streatham High Road. The edge of Streatham Town Centre terminates some 690m to the north.

### 3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1. The site has been the subject of a number of planning applications in the past. Those which are considered relevant to the current scheme are summarised as follows:
  - Planning permission was granted by Committee on 13/08/2002 (Decision notice dated 15/08/2002) for 'Erection of an additional floor on top of the existing single storey structure on the Kempshott Road elevation (next to no1) to existing vehicle repair workshop with infill of windows to West Streatham High Road' (ref 02/00402/FUL).
  - Planning permission was granted on 04/06/2003 for 'Replacement of existing roof incorporating rooflights to facility 1 in south west corner of site and the replacement of the existing windows throughout the site together with associated alterations, including an amendment to planning permission 02/00402/FUL dated 15 August 2002 for the insertion of rooflights in the roof slope of the building fronting Kempshott Road' (ref 03/00325/FUL).

### 4. PROPOSAL DETAILS

- 4.1. This application seeks planning permission for demolition of all buildings and hard surfaced areas on the site and redevelopment comprising a part 2, part 3, part 4 and part 5 storey building to provide 1839sqm of B1 office floorspace and 8155sqm of self-storage floorspace (Use Class B8).
- 4.2. The building would be laid out in an inverted "L" shape, with the longer frontage on Kempshott Road and the shorter one on Streatham High Road. The principal frontage would be on Streatham High Road and would turn the corners on Penistone Road and Kempshott Road to terminate along the eastern boundaries and flank walls of the properties in these streets.
- 4.3. The footprint of the building would cover most of the site with set backs on the street frontages (up to 6m from back edge of pavement) and along the western perimeter of the site where it abuts the boundary of the properties in Kempshott Road (up to 2m from flank wall of end property). As such the building would follow the building lines established by the residential

properties in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road and that of the parade of shops in the Local Centre, on the Streatham High Road frontage. To the rear and along the eastern boundary of the properties in Penistone Road, the building would follow the footprint of the existing building.

- 4.4. The building would be 2 storeys in height along the rear boundary of Nos. 2-14 Penistone Road then stepping up with a 4m set back to a 4 storey height to terminate in a slightly pitched roof with a parapet wall surround. Along the boundary with the properties in Kempshott Road the building would be 3 storeys high with a 5.6m set back from that elevation then stepping up to the 4 storey height. The 5<sup>th</sup> storey would run in a north/south direction, along the existing building line on its southern boundary with the properties in Penistone Road. This storey would be set back on the all street frontages of the building by approximately 1.4m. The 5<sup>th</sup> storey would terminate in flat.
- 4.5. The elevations of the building would be finished in a variety of materials including glazing in a frameless curtain wall system with cap detailing to the upper floors on the Streatham High Road frontage and the return corners of the building at the junctions with Penistone Road and Kempshott Road with Streatham High Road. The rest of the building would be finished in dark grey brickwork at ground level to the rear and parts of the Penistone Road and Streatham High Road elevations with insulated render cladding elsewhere. The 5<sup>th</sup> storey would be clad in a standing seam material with a zinc finish. Roof. The elevations would be punctuated by aluminium framed windows, doors and opening lights.
- 4.6. The main entrance to the B1 office units would be on the Streatham High Road frontage. Vehicular and pedestrian entrances to the self storage area would be on the Kempshott frontage. The upper floors would be accessible via both passenger and goods lifts and internal staircases. Vehicles would enter the site from Kempshott Road in a one-way route and exit via an access on Penistone Road. The building would be gated and fenced with roller shutters to the vehicle entrance and exit points and the street frontages landscaped.
- 4.7. The proposal includes 3 car parking spaces for sole use of the self-storage element, located on site on the Kempshott Road and Penistone Road frontages. No parking provision has been made for the office element. However cycle parking to accommodate 20 bicycles with shower facilities is included. Loading and unloading would take place in a service yard within the building. The service yard includes 2 designated parking spaces for vans and 2 spaces for cars and a space for an articulated lorry. Refuse storage and collection would take place within the building in the service yard area
- 4.8. The scheme would be developed by Access Self Storage. The company would have a reception office on site located at ground floor level on the Kempshott Road frontage. The B8 floorspace is intended for storage of personal items by domestic customers, archives and office equipment by small businesses and stock by retailers. The B1 office floorspace would comprise 5 small units serviced by Access Self Storage and intended for use by small to medium enterprises and new start up businesses.
- 4.9. The B1 serviced offices would be located in the corner of the building at the junction of Streatham High Road and Penistone Road at first to 4<sup>th</sup> floor levels. A further unit is located at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level but along the north/eastern

wing of the floor. The scheme includes B1 office ancillary storage space at ground floor and 4<sup>th</sup> floor level on the Streatham High Road end of the building. The rest of the building comprises B8 Storage space.

- 4.10. The proposal is for a 24 hour, 7 day week storage facility and normal office hours of work. The Access Storage office would be permanently staffed.

## 5. CONSULTATION AND RESPONSE

### Consultation

- 5.1. Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2007 and a notice was published in local press on the same date. 315 letters of consultation were sent out to residents/businesses in the surrounding area.
- 5.2. Occupiers of the following properties were consulted: 1-35 (odds) & 10-46 (evens) Kempshott Road; 2-26 (evens) & 1-17 (Odds) Penistone Road; 1-8 (inclusive) The Courts Baldry Gardens; 31-35 (odds) Buckleigh Road; 494-540 (evens) , 279, 293 & 298 Streatham High Road, 9 Voss Court, Voss Road; 20, 22, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34 Bascombe Gardens & 50-70 Ryan Court Streatham High Road. A comprehensive record of all neighbours consulted can be viewed on the planning file.
- 5.3. The following Groups/Amenity Societies were also consulted: The Streatham Society, The Streatham Conservation Society and the Streatham Vale Property Occupiers' Association. In addition these internal and statutory consultees were notified of the application: Transport & Highways, Conservation & Design, Planning Policy, Street Care, Transport for London and English Heritage (Archaeology).
- 5.4. On 5<sup>th</sup> February 2008 some 378 local residents were notified of a public meeting called by local ward councillors to discuss the proposed development. The meeting, which was held on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2008 at Immanuel and St Andrew Church in Streatham, was also attended by the applicant's agents and planning officers.

### Responses

- 5.5. The Streatham Society objected to the proposal on grounds that it was not accompanied by an environmental impact assessment. It also considered that such a development should not be permitted in proximity to the Streatham Common Conservation Area. Other grounds for objection included non-compliance with the adopted UDP in relation to the location of a large scale office development in the area; the design of the scheme and its height, bulk and massing in relation to its neighbours; loss of sunlight, daylight, privacy and views; inadequate parking, loading and unloading provision; noise and disturbance associated with vehicle movements and operation of roller shutters and gates; operation of facility on an unrestricted 24 hour basis; light pollution due to illuminated advert material; increased problems with access and egress from Kempshott Road; impact of additional traffic on the A23 Streatham High Road and local roads; and impact of additional traffic on safety of children, staff and parents who attend the nearby day nursery and primary school.
- 5.6. The chair of the Streatham Neighbourhood Watch and Residents' Association repeated the same concerns adding that the site should be

redeveloped for housing including a community hall for recreational use by young persons and senior citizens in the locality. The Association was also concerned that the application was publicised during the Christmas holiday period.

- 5.7. Councillor Malley requested officers to arrange a public meeting in order to present and discuss the proposal.
- 5.8. Councillor Heather called-in the application for consideration by the Planning Applications Committee, irrespective of officer recommendation.
- 5.9. The local London Assembly Member for Lambeth and Southwark Valerie Shawcross, objected to the proposal on grounds of the excessive scale and size of the proposed development. The building would overshadow the neighbouring residential properties and would lead to a loss of light and views over the neighbouring Common. The modern design would contrast sharply with neighbouring buildings and would appear out of keeping with the local character. The Member was also concerned that the 24/7 operation of the proposed facility would lead to unacceptable noise nuisance for neighbouring local residents. In addition she objected to the scheme on grounds that it would generate additional traffic and add to congestion of the A23 Streatham High Road. It was suggested that the height, mass and footprint of the building should be reduced as well as the hours of operation; that the frontages should be redesigned having regard to the domestic character of neighbouring residential properties and; that a more detailed study should be undertaken to assess the transport implications of the development and measures to mitigate any adverse impacts provided.
- 5.10. 167 letters of objection including a petition signed by 35 local residents have been received to date. The Table below is a summary of and a brief response to the main objections that have been raised. It is not an exhaustive assessment of the issues of concern to amenity groups, Ward Councillor(s) and local residents and should be read as part of the full report.

Objections raised	Officer response
Publicity of application during Christmas holiday season; plans were not available in a local Library or readily available on the planning website	The Council received a valid application on 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2007 and publicised the application by letter to neighbours and deposit of plans at the Local library on 19 <sup>th</sup> December. Press and site notices were published on 28 <sup>th</sup> December. The planning procedure regulations for publicity of applications require a valid planning application to be publicised on the date it is received irrespective of the time of year. Under current planning legislation the Council has no discretion over the publicity of a valid application. In this case the application drawings should have been available for viewing on the Council's Website, at the Planning offices and at the local library. When it was reported the plans were not available for viewing

	<p>at the local library in early January the period of consultation was extended to expire on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2008 and, as is common practice, the department has continued to acknowledge all letters received after the statutory deadline. It is considered that sufficient publicity, which included a public meeting for local residents and other interested parties, has been given to this application and the correct publicity procedures were followed.</p>
<p>Lack of an accompanying Environment Impact Statement (EIA)</p>	<p>The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulation 1999 requires the applicant to carry out EIA for any development listed in Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of the Regulations that is considered likely to have significant impacts on the environment owing to factors such as its nature, size and location. Schedules 1 and 2 are appendices to the Regulations.</p> <p>In Lambeth the most likely development that would require an Environmental Statement would fall within Schedule 2 (10(b)) – urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadia, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas on sites with an area of more than 0.5 hectares. Although the floor space of the proposed building is some 9994sqm the application site is 0.38 hectares and as such it is not considered to fall within this category.</p> <p>Other than the site area threshold the Regulation provide that EIA may be required for a development located wholly or in part in a ‘sensitive area’ as defined in regulation 2 (1) (paragraph 36). It is officers’ opinion that the site is not located within a sensitive area as defined by the Regulations and as such an environment impact assessment would not be required.</p>
<p>Non-compliance with UDP policies in respect of location of large scale office development.</p>	<p>The relevant policy of concern is Policy 21 [Location and Loss of Offices] of the adopted UDP which states in part (a) that development, extension or refurbishment of large-scale offices will</p>

	<p>only be permitted in the Waterloo Office Regeneration Area, on Albert Embankment or in the major town centres of Brixton and Streatham. Under this policy “development of over 1000sqm will be regarded as constituting large scale office development irrespective of location”.</p> <p>The Council’s Planning Policy team have advised that this aspect policy applies to office floorspace housed in a single building footplate and/or occupied by a single occupier. Moreover Policy 21 permits smaller scale offices if the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the public transport accessibility and character of the area. More specifically if the offices proposed are: “in district centres; or schemes of less than 200sqm as part of a mixed-use scheme”. The proposed office floorspace comprises 5 small incubator business units with floor space of no more 203sqm each (3x203sqm, 1x135sqm &amp; 1x155sqm) and such complies with the Policy. A more comprehensive assessment of the principle of development is contained within a subsequent section of this report dealing with land use.</p>
<p>Inaccurate address of application site. The address should be 512-522 Streatham High Road</p>	<p>The application address on the planning forms and on Ordnance Survey Maps is 516-522 Streatham High Road. This is the publicised address. Although it is noted that the site would include what would have been the site of No. 512 Streatham High Road in sequence of addresses, this area has no building and it would appear the address became redundant over time. It is therefore considered that the application was properly publicised and the application site is cleared edged in red on the submitted plans.</p>
<p>Un-sympathetic design, massing, scale, height and choice of materials in relation to neighbouring properties in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road and the adjacent Conservation Area</p>	<p>Officers consider that a well designed building with a five storey frontage on Streatham High Road would not be out of character with the streetscene. However it is agreed that the proposal is unsympathetic in its scale, height and massing in relation to neighbouring residential properties and has been recommended for refusal partly on</p>

	these grounds.
Loss of outlook/views; creation of a sense of enclosure	The application is also being recommended for refusal on grounds of creating a sense of enclosure. Whilst views are not specifically protected by policy it is acknowledged that occupiers in Penistone Road and Kempshott Road would suffer additional loss of views of the sky. In addition the open aspects of the site at the corner of Kempshott Road and Streatham High Road currently enjoyed by the neighbouring residents in Kempshott Road would be obscured by the new building. It is not however considered that this latter part of the impact of the development on visual amenity can be sufficient grounds alone to refuse the application.
Loss of privacy	The proposal would not lead to a loss of privacy. None of windows on the buildings would result in incidences of unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties.
Loss of sunlight and daylight.	The BRE tests undertaken by the applicant and assessed by officers indicate that the occupiers of properties in Penistone Road and Kempshott Road, who stand to be affected the most by the development, would not suffer a noticeable loss of sunlight or daylight. However the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the basement level dwelling at No. 510 Streatham High Road would not suffer a significant loss of sunlight and/or daylight. The application is also being recommended for refusal on these grounds.
Noise, pollution and general disturbance associated with the 24/7 operation of the facility	<p>The applicant commissioned a noise impact assessment, which was undertaken by 'MoirHands' consultants in acoustics, noise and vibrations. The report was referred to the Council's Noise and Pollution Team, which has raised no objection to the proposal in principle.</p> <p>Nevertheless officers share local concerns about the 24/7 operation of the site and would require more details on predicted trip generation associated with the development. Were the application to be supported it would be the LPA's recommendation to restrict</p>

	<p>the operation of the site to more socially acceptable hours so that operations do not take place late at night or in the very early hours of the morning. In addition the use of the building would be restricted as a condition of approval to self-storage only and not for other warehousing purposes falling within the B8 use Class.</p>
<p>Inadequate car parking and loading provision and poor access and egress arrangements leading to adverse parking and highway conditions in the area.</p>	<p>The Council's parking standards require maximum of 1 car parking space per 1600sqm gross floor area (GFA) at ground floor level and 1 space per 1500sqm GFA on upper stories. The applicant proposes 3 car parking spaces plus 2 car loading bays. A total of 5 parking spaces is proposed which meets the Council's maximum parking standards, although there are aspects of the transport and parking implications of this development that need to be resolved.</p> <p>With regards to highway conditions on the A23 Streatham High Road, Transport for London (TfL), who are the responsible authority for this road, are satisfied that the proposal would not have a negative impact on the efficient and safe operation of their road network. However, in relation to the local residential streets and the ingress and egress arrangements. The Council's transport officers have not been able to make a full assessment of the transport implications of the scheme because the information contained in the applicant's transport statement is considered inadequate. The application is therefore being recommended for refusal on these grounds.</p>
<p>Light pollution due to illuminated advertisement material</p>	<p>The application does not include proposals for the installation of advertisement materials on the building. A separate application for advert consent would be required for any illuminated materials under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007.</p>

- 5.11. The Council's transport and highway officers have been unable to make a thorough assessment of the transport implications of the proposed development as they consider the transport assessment submitted with the

planning application to be inadequate. In particular, officers would require full details of the proposed traffic generation for the Access Self Storage facility, including lorry movements; improved access arrangements; a detailed site management plan; suitable and comparable TRAVL sites to allow a full assessment of trip generation; details of the proposed operation and use of the B1 (office and ancillary storage) element of the development; and a parking survey to assess impact on parking stress in the area.

- 5.12. Transport for London (TfL), who are the highway authority for the A23 Streatham High Road, consider that the proposal would not have an adverse impact of the Transport for London Road Network subject to a s278 agreement requiring reinstatement of the footway on the A23 Streatham High at cost to the applicant and conditions to ensure that the highway is not unduly blocked during construction or the free flow of traffic on it impeded by parked vehicles when the development becomes operational.
- 5.13. Detailed comment on the transport statement submitted with the application is contained in the transport subsequent section of this report.
- 5.14. The Council's Conservation and Design officers consider the principle of redevelopment acceptable including the general form of having a large block fronting Streatham High Road. However, they have raised concern that given the proposed scale, bulk, massing and overall height of the building, it would be likely to have some impact upon the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area (although not necessarily a negative impact) and, wish to see a building in this location that made a positive contribution to the local streetscape. For these reasons they have objected to its overall height, bulk, massing, materials, architectural detailing and landscaping including boundary treatment. These issues are explored further in the Conservation and Design section of this report.
- 5.15. The Planning Policy section supports the principle of retaining and maximising employment floorspace on the site. As the site was previously in employment generating use, the proposal is considered consistent with the objectives of Policies 21 and 23 of the Lambeth adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
- 5.16. The Council's Regulatory Services Team raised no objection to the proposal on noise and/or pollution grounds and supported the conclusions contained in the Noise Assessment report, which accompanied the application.
- 5.17. The Council's Streetcare section has not responded to consultations on these proposals.
- 5.18. English Heritage (Archaeology) assessed the archaeological desk-based report, which accompanied the application as well as their records and advised that the proposal is unlikely to impact upon significant archaeological remains. They confirmed that no further archaeological work would be necessary.

## 6. RELEVANT POLICIES

### National and Regional Guidance

- 6.1. Central Government advice is contained in a range of Government Circulars, Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) and/or Planning Policy Statements (PPS). These contain general policies which aim to guide the

local planning authority in securing good local planning policies based on real and sound objectives and the need to provide high quality, well thought out and sustainable developments, which make a positive contribution to the locality and which help to protect or enhance the environment.

- 6.2. The following national guidance is considered particularly relevant to this application:

PPS 1 [Delivering Sustainable Development]  
PPG 4 [Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms]  
PPG 13 [Transport]  
PPG15 [Planning and the Historic Environment]  
PPG 24 [Planning and Noise]

- 6.3. The London Plan was adopted in February 2004, and provides strategic planning guidance for development and use of land and buildings within the London region. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies.

- 6.4. The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

Policy 3B.2 [Office demand and supply]  
Policy 3B.5 [Strategic Employment Locations]  
Policy 3C.2 [Matching development to transport capacity]

Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007)

- 6.5. The current up to date statement of the Council's planning policies is contained in the Replacement Lambeth UDP adopted on 6th August 2007. Together with the London Plan, this forms the statutory development plan for the Borough and is now used to determine all planning applications.

- 6.6. The following policies are considered particularly relevant to this application:

6	Redevelopment of Brownfield Sites
7	Protection of Residential Amenity
8	Accessible Development/ Integrated Transport
9	Transport Impact
10	Walking and Cycling
11	Management of Road, Bus, and Freight Networks
14	Parking and Traffic Restraint
19	Active Frontage Uses
21	Location and Loss of Offices
23	Protection and Location of Other Employment Uses
31	Streets, Character and Layout
32	Community Safety and 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
47	Conservation Areas
48	Archaeology: Recording and Analysis of Buildings
53	Infrastructure and Utilities
54	Pollution, Public Protection Health and Safety
56	Waste
57	Planning Obligations

## 7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

### Land-use Issues

- 7.1. One of the Government's key aims is to encourage continued economic development in a way which is compatible with its stated environmental objectives. To this end PPG4 requires that land in urban areas once previously used for industrial purposes but now lying vacant or under-used should be brought back into optimal beneficial use. However, it is recognised that this should not be at the expense of the residential amenity of adjoining properties.
- 7.2. PPG4 advises that planning permission should not be withheld unless there are specific and significant objections, such as a relevant development plan policy, unacceptable noise, smell, safety, and health impacts or excessive traffic generation. The fact that an activity differs from the predominant land use in any locality is not a sufficient reason, in itself, for refusing planning permission.
- 7.3. The Mayor, under Policy 3B.2 [Office demand and supply] of the London Plan, seeks a significant increase in current office stock through changes of use and redevelopment of vacant brownfield sites and, the provision of a variety of type, size and cost of office premises to meet the needs of all sectors, including small and medium size enterprises. Under Policy 3B.5 [Strategic Employment Locations] the London Plan encourages local planning authorities to develop policies for employment sites outside strategic employment locations, having regard to environmental impacts, transport accessibility and suitability of site to purpose.
- 7.4. Policy 6 of the adopted UDP positively encourages the redevelopment of previously-used urban land (Brownfield sites) in the interests of sustainable development. Policy 23 seeks to safeguard the use of land or building in current or previous employment use for employment generating purposes unless a proposal under consideration would exacerbate or create unacceptable servicing problems or harm residential amenity. The objective of the policy is to protect existing employment land and floorspace so that other firms in need of premises can use it. Under this policy employment uses are defined as "B Class uses, A2 uses (other than in shop premises)... and all other uses providing a significant levels of employment..."
- 7.5. The established use of the site is for employment purposes under Use Class B2 (General Industrial) of the Uses Classes Order 2006. This was established even before the MoD occupied the site. This application represents an intensification of the use of the site for employment purposes by redevelopment of a brownfield site. It includes the creation of 1839 sqm of Class B1 (office) floorspace of which 940 sqm would comprise ancillary B1 storage space. The rest of the site would consist of 8155 sqm of B8 (warehousing) floorspace.
- 7.6. The applicant estimates that the B1 (office) floorspace would generate up to 100 employees on the site and the B8 storage units would be serviced by 6 employees. Whilst the estimated number of employees associated with the B1 office floorspace is questionable, it is evident that there would be a net increase in the amount of B Class floorspace of some 6000sqm. (The existing building is estimated to provide 4000sqm; the proposal is for 9994sqm). The intensification of use of the site is considered acceptable in

land use terms. The proposal would also bring back into active use a vacant site with a modern building capable of accommodating small scale class B1 (office) uses and class B8 self-storage. The proposal therefore complies with PPG4, Policies 3B.2 and 3B.5 of the London Plan and Policies 6 and 23 of the adopted UDP.

- 7.7. There has been strong local objection to the proposal as it is seen to introduce “large-scale offices” contrary to Policy 21 [Location and Loss of Offices] of the adopted UDP. Part (a) of the policy states that the development, extension or refurbishment of large-scale offices will only be permitted in the Waterloo Office Regeneration Area, on the Albert Embankment or in the major town centres of Brixton and Streatham. Under this policy “development of over 1000sqm will be regarded as constituting large scale office development irrespective of location”.
- 7.8. This aspect of Policy 21 applies to office floorspace housed in a single building footplate and/or occupied by a single occupier. Policy 21 permits smaller scale offices if the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the public transport accessibility and character of the area. More specifically if the offices proposed are: “in district centres; or schemes of less than 200sqm as part of a mixed-use scheme”. The proposed office floorspace comprises 5 small incubator business units with floor space of no more 203sqm each (3x203sqm, 1x135sqm & 1x155sqm).
- 7.9. In addition, supporting text to Policy 21 refers to the Employment Demand Study for Lambeth by consultants GVA Grimley (June 2001), which found that small office units need to be retained and encouraged in Lambeth, where start-up rates are relatively healthy compared to other areas.
- 7.10. In term of its location, whilst the site is not within the boundaries of Streatham Town Centre, it is 690m to the south of the defined edge of Streatham Town Centre; one of the strategic centres of the Borough and a focal point for shopping, commercial, cultural, entertainment and community activities in the north of the Borough. The site is also located 500m to the east of Streatham Common Station, which provides overland railway services to Brixton and Central London and Croydon and its hinterland. Furthermore, it is served by several bus routes and, has a good public transport accessibility level (PTAL =4/5). As such the proposed B1 office floorspace is considered appropriate in terms of the public transport accessibility of the site.
- 7.11. With regards to the character of the area, it is noted that the western side of Streatham High Road is characterised by commercial premises consisting of disparate shop parades fronting residential streets. The site is part of this predominantly commercial frontage of Streatham High Road between Nos. 408-580, which includes defined Local Centres consisting of retail shop units, Public Houses and a firm of solicitors. Sainsbury’s supermarket and Immanuel and St Andrew Church are located to the north within the same frontage. The proposed development would present a commercial frontage on the High street and as such would maintain the established commercial character and function of the area.
- 7.12. In general conformity with PPG4, neither Policy 21 nor Policy 23 of the UDP seek to unreasonably restrict commercial and industrial activities of an appropriate scale - particularly on existing employment sites, which would not adversely affect residential amenity. This issue is discussed in detail in a

subsequent section of the report. It is therefore considered that the redevelopment and change of use of the site from general industrial use (Use Class B2) to a mixed office (Use Class B1) and storage and distribution (Use Class B8) is acceptable in principle.

Design and Conservation

- 7.13. Guidance given in PPS1 states that good design is indivisible from good planning, with high quality and inclusive design being the aim of all of those involved in the development process. PPG15, which deals with development in areas of historic or architectural interest and/or their setting states that new buildings do not have to copy their neighbours, noting that most interesting streets include a variety of building styles, materials and forms of construction.
- 7.14. Policy 31 [Streets, Character and Layout] requires that new developments should where possible retain or contribute to a clear urban grain and follow appropriate block widths, gaps and spaces between buildings thereby helping to add to the connectivity of street blocks. In terms of character, new buildings should respond to and enhance the architectural character of the area, having regard to its overall character. Individual buildings should address the street with frontages and entrances and should create or enhance views and vistas.
- 7.15. Policy 33 [Building Scale and Design] seeks to ensure that a high quality of design is created in new development in terms of scale, character, historic street layout and uses, having regard to the adjacent townscape. Major development should in addition seek to improve a sense of legibility, and define edges by retaining characterful buildings, appropriate building lines and frontages.
- 7.16. In designing within existing mixed use areas, Policy 38 requires the protection of any attractive prevailing character and appearance of the area especially in conservation areas. In general conformity with PPG 15, Policy 47 [Conservation Areas] requires that new developments should preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and/or its setting.
- 7.17. The principle of demolition and redevelopment of the site is not objectionable and, the general approach of having a larger frontage block onto Streatham High Road with diminishing elevations/blocks to the return street frontages is considered acceptable. The proposed building is of a modern utilitarian design that would stand apart from the wider townscape but would emphasise the commercial nature and variety in design of the other buildings that front Streatham High Road.
- 7.18. It would follow the established building lines on the street frontages thereby completing the block width on the Streatham High Road frontage in accordance with Policy 31 of the UDP. The 4 storey height with a 5<sup>th</sup> set back storey is also considered acceptable along the Streatham High Road frontage subject to appropriate detailing including agreed set-back depths and elevational treatment.
- 7.19. The building heights along Streatham High Road range from 4-5 storeys including the Health Centre directly opposite, converted property immediately to the north of the site (Nos. 508-510 Streatham High Road) and the residential block adjacent to Immanuel Church. It is therefore considered that a well modelled 5 storey frontage at this location would not

appear out of character nor detract from the setting of the adjacent conservation area.

- 7.20. However, it is considered that the building fails to relate satisfactorily to the scale, height, massing and form of the surrounding area, particularly in relation to the domestic scale of the neighbouring properties in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road. Design and Conservation officers are of the opinion that the stepped massing to the Kempshott Road return frontage appears to be contrived in order to achieve a four storey-height along the length of the building whilst that on to Penistone Road appears excessive in scale and is overly dominant in the streetscene.
- 7.21. The flank elevations in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road are unduly oppressive when viewed from neighbouring residential properties, particularly the bungalow properties located directly opposite in Kempshott Road and the two storey dwellings in Penistone Road. The building would be monolithic in appearance within Kempshott Road. These effects are exacerbated by the choice of a uniform and regimented material palette, poor fenestration design and lack of articulation to the elevations. The architectural character of the building would benefit from improved modelling, including further articulation to break up its bulk and mass, and changes in the finishing materials.
- 7.22. The Streatham High Road elevation, which is the principal frontage elevation to the building, contains a small, modest entrance which is subsumed by the unrelieved monotony and scale of the 5 storeys of this elevation. As such the entrance is not deemed to be particularly legible which is a significant failing for such a large building on a busy thoroughfare as an entrance should be clearly recognisable and appropriate to the size of building that it serves.
- 7.23. The proposal would benefit from an entrance that makes a presence in the street and announces the office use of the building to passers-by. The internal planning and elevational treatment of the building exacerbates this lack of engagement with the street and lack of animation as there are only limited areas of activity generating space at ground floor and the curtain walling, brickwork & cladding to ground and upper floor B1 storage office space fails to animate this elevation. It would be much more beneficial to have ground floor office uses, which would provide an active frontage and passive surveillance of the surrounding streets.
- 7.24. Officers are also not satisfied that the building successfully “turns the corner” as a result of lack of architectural features or treatments at the corners of the building and as such the proposal fails to make a suitable transition between the frontage building and the rear return. The application fails to draw from the examples of various schemes contained in their Design and Assess Statement, which have been used or approved elsewhere to frame entrances to streets and turn corners, albeit with varying degrees of success.
- 7.25. It is therefore considered that the scheme by virtue of its height, bulk, massing, materials and architectural treatment and detailing would appear unduly prominent and overbearing in the streetscape and would present an inert frontage on the principal street contrary to Policies 31, 33 and 38 of the adopted UDP.

Amenity Impacts

- 7.26. The proposal has been assessed having regard to Policies 7, 23 and 33 of the adopted UDP, which among other things seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents from un-neighbourly development. In this respect policy seeks to ensure that new development does not materially or adversely affect adjoining properties in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy and overshadowing or create an increased sense of enclosure.
- 7.27. The majority of neighbouring properties to this site are in residential use. The residents of these properties have objected to the scheme on the grounds that the increase in the height, bulk, massing and footprint of the building height lead to a loss of light and privacy and would create an increased sense of enclosure particularly to those properties at the rear of the site in Penistone Road and Kempshott Road.
- 7.28. The applicant has commissioned a sunlight/daylight assessment report to determine the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring buildings. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the British Research Establishment (BRE) Guidelines: 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (1991).
- 7.29. The scheme has been assessed the BRE guidelines, which are referenced in Policy 33 of the adopted UDP. The guidelines state that when assessing applications which propose new buildings or structures that would sit directly opposite existing habitable windows, the highest part of the new building should not subtend an angle greater than 25 degrees as measured from the mid point of the lowest window of the affected neighbouring residential property. If the new building does subtend that angle there is likely to be a noticeable loss of daylight.
- 7.30. BRE has developed a series of tests for daylight, which if all are failed, the development would be considered unacceptable in terms of loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. The test 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".
- 7.31. The ground floor windows of 10-16 Kempshott Road on the opposite side of the site and the windows in the rear elevations of No. 1 Kempshott Road and No.2 Penistone Road and the lowest windows to the Health Centre/Ryan Court, which face directly onto the site, have been assessed for daylight as they stand to be affected the most. Existing and resulting VSC values have been compared. The findings have established that in all cases neighbouring properties would not experience a reduction in daylight in excess of the 27% value. The set back of 2m between the site and No. 1 Kempshott Road and removal of end gable walls to pitched roofs of the existing double height of the adjoining workshop building would make for a slight improvement in daylight received at No1. Kempshott Road.
- 7.32. Measurements show the new building would not subtend an angle greater than 25 degrees to the horizontal drawn from the lowest windows of the Health Centre and those at Nos. 10-16 Kempshott Road. For the same reasons none of the residential properties on the opposite side of Penistone

would be affected. Daylight to these properties would therefore not be affected.

- 7.33. It is however noted that the applicant's sunlight and daylight report does not include an assessment on the basement dwellings at No. 510 Streatham High Road, which have south facing windows to habitable rooms that would face directly onto the proposed 5 storey part of the building in Kempshott Road. Officer measures show that a small part of the 5<sup>th</sup> storey would subtend an angle greater than 25 degrees drawn in accordance with the BRE guidelines. It is therefore likely that the basement level dwelling(s) in this property would notice a reduction in daylight. A daylight assessment needs to be undertaken in this case to establish whether these properties would experience a reduction in excess of the recommended values.
- 7.34. BRE tests for sunlight are only required where an existing building has a 'Window wall' (a wall with a window serving a habitable room) within 90 degrees of due south. The test for sunlight are met if the window wall faces within 90 degrees of due south and no obstruction measured in the section perpendicular to the window wall, subtends an angle of more than 25 degrees from the horizontal measured from a point 2m above ground. The sunlight test requires that the minimum level of sunlight received by affected windows should not be less than 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours, of which 5% should be in the winter months.
- 7.35. The same properties identified above have been tested for sunlight. In all cases the tests demonstrate that the new building would not transgress the 25 degree angle and where it does the sunlight level would not be less than that requires under the BRE guidelines. However, the basement properties at 508-510 Streatham High Road were not tested. These properties have "window walls" and the new development would transgress the 25 degree angle. Officers consider that the building would be likely to overshadow these dwellings and therefore detract from the living conditions of residents there.
- 7.36. The proposed development has no windows in any of its elevations that would lead to a loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties. The windows in the Streatham High Street elevations face onto the Health Centre, which is not in residential use and Ryan Court and Bascombe Gardens, which are. The occupiers of Ryan Court would not be overlooked to any greater degree than they currently are. Other residential properties in Streatham High Road, including Bascombe Gardens would be overlooked across the A23 dual carriageway, from a distance of over 34m. In relation to properties in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road, the windows in the proposed building service staircases or are high levels windows to storage areas. There are no windows in the rear and flank elevations, facing onto the rear gardens of these properties.
- 7.37. The application has also been assessed in terms of its height and proximity to neighbouring residential properties in Kempshott Road and Penistone Road. The properties in Penistone Road have rear gardens measuring some 12m in depth. The proposed building would follow the footprint of the existing building at ground floor level, where it is separated from the rear boundary walls of these properties by the width of an alleyway (measuring about 1m in width). Whereas the proposed building would be set back at second floor by some 4m from the elevation facing onto the rear gardens of properties in Penistone Road, it would present as a 4 storey high flat roofed

building. This additional height would seem from a distance of 17m from their rear windows of the adjacent properties in Penistone Road.

- 7.38. The rear gardens of these properties would be further enclosed by a 5 storey high wall along their northeastern boundary. This additional height and bulk to the north and east would represent an overall increase of up to two storeys in height over and above the existing situation, when the development is viewed from the rear gardens of these properties. Views of the sky towards the northwest in particular would be further restricted.
- 7.39. In relation to the properties in Kempshott Road the proposal would present a 3 storey high flat roofed aspect then a 4 storey aspect, set back some 7.6m from the flank wall of the end of terrace property (No. 1 Kempshott Road). The existing workshop building presents a double pitched gable wall in a two storey high building to these garden. The new building when viewed from these gardens would constitute an additional storey over above the exiting situation, albeit set 2m back from the boundary of No. 1 Kempshott Road.
- 7.40. It is considered that in the circumstances the proposal constitutes an un-neighbourly form of development, which would cause occupiers of these properties to suffer an increased sense of enclosure. With regards to the properties on the northern side of Kempshott Road, which are either one or two storeys in height, the proposed building with its monolithic part 3, part 4 storey elevation to Kempshott Road would appear unduly oppressive. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 7, 23, 33 and 38 of the adopted UDP.
- 7.41. Local residents expressed concern over noise and general disturbance associated with the operation of the facility on a 24 hour/7day basis including movements of vehicles and use of roller shutters at the entrance and exit points. The applicant has commissioned a noise impact assessment, which was undertaken by MoirHands consultants in acoustics, noise and vibrations. The report was referred to the Council's Noise and Pollution Team, which has raised no objection to the proposal in principle.
- 7.42. The consultants have had regard to the proximity of neighbouring residential properties and have concluded that the operation of the site would not generate noise levels over the existing ambient noise levels associated with vehicle movements on the A23 Streatham High Road and the mixed commercial/residential nature of Streatham High Road. Loading and unloading would take place within an enclosed space within the building and in order to minimise reverberation noise the consultants have advise the ceiling above the access and loading areas to be treated with acoustically absorbent materials.
- 7.43. However, officers share local concerns about the 24/7 operation of site and would require more details on predicted trip generation as described in the following section of transport. Were the application to be supported it would be recommended to restrict the operation of the site to more socially acceptable hours so that operations do not take place late at night or in the very early hours of the morning. During the public meeting, the applicant indicated that they would concede to this restriction.
- 7.44. In addition the use of the building would be restricted to self-storage only and not for other warehousing purposes, which could generate different

traffic profiles. The applicant has indicated in supporting statements that the majority of their customers (70%) domestic users for storage of personal items. The rest of their customers are local small businesses/retailers for storage of archives, office equipment and stock.

#### Transport and Highway Considerations

- 7.45. The proposal includes 3 car parking spaces for sole use of the self-storage businesses. No parking provision has been made for the office element. However cycle parking to accommodate 20 bicycles is proposed. Loading and unloading would take place in a service yard within the building. The service yard includes 2 designated parking spaces for vans and 2 spaces for cars and a space for articulated lorries. Access to the site from the A23 Streatham High Road would be via a one-way route with ingress on Kempshott Road and egress on Penistone Road
- 7.46. The site is on major bus route, is located within 500m of Streatham Common Station and has a good public transport accessibility level (PTAL =4/5). It is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The proposal has been assessed against Council Policies 9 [Transport Impact], 11 [Management of Road, Bus, and Freight Networks] and 14 [Parking and Traffic Restraint] having regard to PPG13 [Transport] and Policy 3C.2 [Matching development to transport capacity] of the London Plan. These policies seek to ensure that proposals for development have a minimal impact on the performance and safety of the highway network and that sufficient and appropriate car parking and cycle storage is provided whilst meeting objectives to encourage sustainable transport.
- 7.47. The Council's Transport officers have not been able to fully assess the traffic and transport implications of the proposed development with regard to its impact on Kempshott Road and Penistone Road, in particular with regard to traffic generation, site operation and management, vehicular access, highway safety, obstruction of traffic, impact on parking, and resulting impact on residential amenity because information submitted was not considered adequate to address these matters.
- 7.48. The Transport Assessment (TA) which accompanied the application does not make reference to the number of movements by lorries, including Heavy Goods Vehicle's and Articulated vehicles. Whilst HGV's and Articulated vehicle tracking plots and parking facilities have been illustrated on the submitted plans and contained within the Transport Statement, no raw data has been provided to ascertain the number of larger vehicles that would be associated with the proposed development.
- 7.49. The information provided refers to research into traffic generation at various other Access Storage sites but does not include any base data. This information is particularly important as both Kempshott Road and Penistone Road are residential roads. Similarly, no reasoned assessment of traffic generation on an hourly basis has been made, as would normally be expected for a development of this nature. Despite the reference to surveys of other Access storage sites none of the survey information has been provided.
- 7.50. No information has been provided regarding where larger vehicles will park and wait to access the site. A waiting area clear of the public highway would be needed to ensure vehicles do not wait on Kempshott Road to access the proposed development. Information relating to smaller vehicles

(Car's/Van's) has been submitted, and it is proposed that there will be approximately 5 two-way movements per hour (although the base information that this is based on is not included in the TA). However, without details of the larger vehicles it is impossible to assess fully the full impact of the development on the operation of the surrounding highway network.

- 7.51. It is also evident that where an HGV or Articulated vehicle is parked in the designated holding area and in the process of unloading, the other parking bays for vans and cars within the development would not be operational. This action could result in vehicles being parked on Kempshott Road. At present there are no details to suggest how this situation would be managed to reduce negative impact on Kempshott Road.
- 7.52. It should be noted that there are no Red Route parking bays on Kempshott Road between the A23 and the access to the site. Therefore any waiting vehicles would either be parked in a location that is specifically prohibited by double red lines or parking would take place on Kempshott Road. This has the potential to lead to vehicles reversing or manoeuvring on the highway to try to access the site, to the detriment of highway safety. In addition, the two car parking bays located parallel to Kempshott Road are located in a position where either driving in (eastern bay) or driving out (western bay) may be problematic and in any case could only be used by car drivers.
- 7.53. Furthermore the submitted articulated vehicle tracker plots show that when entering Kempshott Road from Streatham High Road there would be limited space (width of 1m) between the swept path and the off-side kerb. This would impact on vehicles turning from Kempshott Road onto Streatham High Road. At the egress point, when articulated vehicles exit the site on to Penistone Road there would be less than a metre between the path of an articulated vehicle and the parking bays located at the eastern end of Penistone Road. This would leave extremely limited room for driver error or a poorly parked vehicle within the parking bay. Also the proposed vehicle path would effect the movement of vehicles trying to enter Penistone Road from Streatham High Road.
- 7.54. The applicant has not made an assessment on the impact of the proposal on parking stress in the surrounding streets. The surrounding highway network is not located within a CPZ so there is the possibility that future employees would drive to the site and park on the surrounding highway network. Vehicles associated with the self-storage facility might also park on Kempshott Road and carry items into the proposed development, when loading bays are blocked by other users. Were the application to be supported a condition could be imposed stating that no loading or unloading is to take place from anywhere except within the curtilage of the site, however there are questions about how enforceable this would be in practice.
- 7.55. A large number of the B1 trip generation data included in the transport statement is from sites located in Central London, which is not comparable to the application site. Others are located close to tube stations which offer a much higher frequency of service, have significantly different numbers of staff, are located in CPZs, etc. In addition not all of the General Industry (Use Class B2) sites, which the applicant's transport consultants have used to estimate possible vehicular trip generation associated with the previous use the site, are comparable sources of raw data. It is therefore not

considered appropriate to use these sites to predict trip generation to this location as they are likely to lead to erroneous results.

- 7.56. It is recommended that planning permission be refused on grounds that inadequate information has been submitted to allow the Council to fully assess the traffic and transport implications of the proposed development with regard to its impact on Kempshott Road and Penistone Road, in particular with regard to traffic generation, site operation and management, vehicular access, highway safety, obstruction of traffic, impact on parking, and resulting impact on residential amenity. An informative stating that this reason for refusal could be overcome through the submission of additional information is recommended.
- 7.57. At present TfL do not object to this application and consider that the proposed development would not impact negatively on the operation and safety of the Transport for London Road Network. A recommendation for refusal based on the traffic impact on the A23 Streatham High Road could therefore not be sustained. Were the application recommended for approval conditions would be imposed to ensure that the A23 highway is not unduly blocked during construction or the free flow of traffic on it impeded by parked vehicles when the development becomes operational.
- 7.58. With regards to refuse, Policy 56 [Waste] of the adopted UDP seeks to ensure that adequate, safe and secure refuse and recycling storage is provided. Refuse collection would be undertaken from within the service yard. If the application was recommended for approval details of this aspect of the development would be reserved by condition.

#### Renewable Energy and Sustainable Development

- 7.59. The government has set a national target to reduce carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions by 20% by 2010 and 60% by 2050. There is scope to achieve this target by ensuring that new buildings are designed to conserve fuel and power and sited to reduce the need to travel and, restraint measures are adopted to encourage more sustainable means of transport. The Mayor's Energy Strategy has set a target of 10% of energy to come from renewable sources.
- 7.60. Policies 34 and 35 of the adopted UDP encourage the use of energy-conservation technologies; use of renewable power sources; and design, layout and orientation of buildings to minimise energy use. Policy 35 states that development of this nature should show, by means of a sustainability assessment, how they incorporate sustainable design and construction principles. This should include, among other things, utilising environmentally friendly specification and materials and specifying the use of sustainable sources.
- 7.61. The applicant recognises the importance of sustainable design, construction and management and has commissioned an Energy Report and provided a Energy Statement. The statement states that sustainability and carbon reduction has informed the design process and, the fabric of the building has been developed in order to create the optimum balance between minimising heat loss through insulation, utilising passive heat from the sun, maximising daylight penetration. The applicant proposes to use energy efficient lighting and appliances.

- 7.62. The energy report investigates options available for provision of renewable energy technologies on site and outlines those that are most appropriate, feasible and affordable. The options examined include wind turbines, Biomass heating and solar photovoltaics. The preference expressed in the statement is for bio-fuel boiler, which can offset 26% of the predicted carbon dioxide emissions and would provide all space heating and hot water demand with the B1 office element. The proposal is therefore consistent with Policy 34 of the adopted UDP.

Planning Obligations

- 7.63. Under Policy 57 (Planning Obligations) of the adopted UDP, the Council will, where appropriate, enter into legal agreements with developers, and seek the attainment of planning obligations, having regard to any Government guidance and supplementary planning guidance. Planning obligations may be sought in respect of sports facilities, improvements to open spaces, environmental improvements, improvements to the public realm, particularly for pedestrians, highway improvements.
- 7.64. In this case TfL has requested a s278 agreement to be completed requiring reinstatement of the footway on the A23 Streatham High at cost to the applicant. As the application is being recommended for refusal, there is no requirement to enter into the agreement.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1. Refuse planning permission

**Date of Application:** 14.12.2007 **Date of Decision:**

1. The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, massing, external materials and detailed architectural treatment, would appear unduly prominent and overbearing within the streetscene. In addition the proposed architectural treatment, by reason of its design, external materials, lack of an active frontage at ground floor level and lack of articulation, would result in a building of monolithic appearance detrimental to the quality of the streetscene. As such, the proposed development is considered to run contrary to Policies 31, 33 and 38 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).
2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, height, massing, and proximity to the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings in Penistone Road and Kempshott Road, would create an unacceptable increase in a sense of enclosure and an overbearing impact to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of those dwellings. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 7 and 33 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).
3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate supporting information to allow Council Officers to fully assess whether the proposal, by reason of its height, scale, massing and proximity to neighbouring properties, would lead to a loss of amenity to neighbouring residential occupiers from loss of sunlight and daylight and visual domination. As such, the proposed development is considered to run contrary to Policies 7 and 33 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).
4. The proposed development fails to provide adequate supporting information to allow Council Transport Officers to fully assess the traffic, transport and highway safety implications of the development. As such the proposed development is considered to run contrary to Policies 9 and 14 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2007).

**Informatives**

1. With regard to the third reason for refusal (Traffic, transport and highway safety implications) the applicant is advised to contact the Council's Transport Planner (Mr. Rob Heslop) on 020 79260208 or rheslop@lambeth.gov.uk to discuss this reason for refusal and to agree a way forward to resolve these issues to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

**Proposed Development At:** 516-522 Streatham High Road London SW16 3QF

Section 5 - Appendices

**Appendix 1 - List Of Internal Consultations, Statutory Bodies And Local Amenity Groups Consulted.**

Transport/Highways Ext 60208  
Conservation And Design Ext 61215  
Planning Policy Ext 61212  
Streetcare Ext 63030  
English Heritage 020 7973 3000  
Transport for London Integration Dept  
Streatham Society  
Streatham Conservation Association  
Streatham Vale Property Occupiers Assoc  
COUNCIL  
Worksheet  
Regulatory Services Noise Pollution Ext 66132

This page is intentionally left blank