

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

[REDACTED]
(By email)

Our Ref: MGLA120719-7393

3 September 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request for information which the GLA received on 11 July 2019. Your request has been dealt with under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) 2004.

Our response to your request is as follows:

1. *Request for any information relating to pre-application discussions regarding development of the former Woodlands Nursing Home, Dugard Way, Lambeth, London, SE11 from January 2019 to present.*

The GLA has previously disclosed the information within scope of your request for the period January 2019 to 7 April 2019

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information/foi-disclosure-log/eir-woodlands-nursing-home-lambeth-3>

Therefore, for the purpose of your request we are focusing on the period 8 April to 10 July 2019. Please find attached a copy of the pre-application letter and report dated 21 May 2019 which is the information we have identified as within scope of this part of your request.

2. *Request for any information relating to the GLA loan to developer Anthology (or its associated companies) in relation to development of the former Woodlands Nursing Home, Dugard Way, Lambeth, London, SE11.*

In addition to the information available on the above link, the GLA holds three further email chains dated between 28 June and 4 July 2019 and falls under the exception to disclose in Regulation 12 (4)(e) (internal communications) and 12 (5)(e) (confidentiality of commercial or industrial information) of the EIR.

- Regulation 12(4)(e) Internal communications

This exception applies to communications explicitly whereby GLA officials have engaged in free and frank discussions on matters pertaining to the Anthology loan. The exception is engaged in order to protect the necessary space to explore ideas in private against the backdrop of a project which is under great public, media and political scrutiny.

- Regulation 12 (5)(e) Confidentiality of commercial or industrial information

Applying the four-stage test from *Bristol City Council v Information Commissioner and Portland and Brunswick Squares Association* (EA/2010/0012, 24 May 2010):

1. The information is commercial or industrial in nature.

The information withheld from disclosure details ongoing negotiations regarding the planning application for the site. The information can therefore be considered as commercial or industrial in nature.

2. Confidentiality is provided by law.

These negotiations are ongoing and highly confidential and would be likely to prejudice outcome of these discussions for both parties and therefore protected by the common law of confidence.

3. The confidentiality is protecting a legitimate economic interest.

Disclosure would cause harm to the commercial interests of Anthology and the GLA and these are considered as legitimate economic interests. In relation to the legitimate economic interests, the Information Commissioner's guidance states:

'Legitimate economic interests could relate to retaining or improving market position, ensuring that competitors do not gain access to commercially valuable information, protecting a commercial bargaining position in the context of existing or future negotiations, avoiding commercially significant reputational damage, or avoiding disclosures which would otherwise result in a loss of revenue or income'.

Disclosure would also prejudice the GLA's position in delivering more genuinely affordable homes and in negotiating future transactions.

4. The confidentiality would be adversely affected by disclosure.

Disclosure of the information would inevitably harm the confidential nature of it and therefore the exemption at Regulation 12(5)(e) is engaged in respect of disclosure of the redacted information.

- Public interest

The regulations listed above constitute as qualified exemptions from our duty to disclose information under the EIR, and consideration must be given as to whether the public interest favouring disclosure of the information covered by this exemption outweighs the public interest considerations favouring maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.

The GLA acknowledges that there is a public interest in the activities being undertaken with regards to the Anthology Loan and a specific public interest in the transparency of the GLA's achievement in delivering Mayoral commitments.

However, it is not in the public interest to prejudice third party negotiating position and the request comes at a time where the developer is yet to commence commercial negotiations with contractors.

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely



Information Governance Officer

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY

Development, Enterprise and Environment

Our ref: GLA/4963/HS01

Date: 21 May 2019

[REDACTED]
Tp bennett LLP
One America Street
London
SE1 ONE

Dear [REDACTED]

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Act 1999 & 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008

Woodland and Masters Site
London Borough of Lambeth
Our reference: GLA/4963

Further to the pre-planning application meeting held on 24 April 2019, I enclose a copy of the GLA's assessment which sets out our advice and matters which will need to be fully addressed before the application is submitted to the local planning authority.

The advice given by officers does not constitute a formal response or decision by the Mayor with regard to future planning applications. Any views or opinions expressed are without prejudice to the Mayor's formal consideration of the application.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
John Finlayson
Head of Development Management

cc

[REDACTED] TfL

21 May 2019

Woodlands and Masters Site

in the London Borough of Lambeth

The proposal

Redevelopment of the site to deliver a residential-led scheme with the retention of the Cinema Museum.

The applicant

The applicant is **Anthology**, the architect is **Rolfe Judd** and the agent is **tp bennett**

Context

- 1 On 24 April 2019 a follow up pre-planning application meeting was held at City Hall.
- 2 The advice given by officers does not constitute a formal response or decision by the Mayor with regard to future planning applications. Any views or opinions expressed are without prejudice to the Mayor's formal consideration of the application
- 3 This advice should be read in conjunction with that previously issued on 6 February 2019.

Summary of meeting discussion

- 4 Following a presentation of the updates to the proposed scheme by the applicant team, meeting discussions covered strategic issues with respect to the principle of development, urban design and energy. GLA officer advice in respect of these matters is set out within the sections that follow.

Principle of development

Cinema Museum

- 5 An update was sought by GLA officers on the engagement to date of the applicant with the Cinema Museum.
- 6 The applicant underlined their commitment to supporting the future of the Cinema Museum at the meeting. This is welcomed and GLA officers would want to be satisfied that the final arrangement in terms of the lease arrangement and running of the Cinema Museum are robustly secured as part of any future planning application to secure the future of the Cinema Museum.
- 7 A meeting between GLA cultural and housing officers, the applicant and the Cinema Museum will be arranged to take this forward and agree on acceptable terms for all parties.

Urban Design

Proposed tower

8 The applicant presented illustrations of the full appearance of the tower for the first time. A building up to 29 storeys with two distinct elements is proposed. The two elements of the tower are distinguishable but relate to one another which is welcomed in terms of the architectural composition. However, given the sensitive site context, which contains nearby heritage assets, an immediate context of lower prevailing building height and a tight relationship with neighbouring buildings, further modulation of the building elements and elevational treatments to reduce the apparent bulk of the building should be explored in order to reduce the impact of the overall height on views and heritage assets. The impact of the development on Lambeth Council's selected local views should be tested by the applicant in any future application. The Sepia tone of the detailed design is preferred to the initial black tone as it appears less dominant in the architectural surroundings.

9 The full length of the tower appears closer to houses on Castlebrook Close (to the north). The dramatic step up in scale between these two storey buildings and the tower must be carefully managed through ensuring sensitive proximities and elevational treatments. The aerial view from the south provided at the meeting is useful. A view from the north should also be provided to help clarify how the building height and mass relates to its immediate context and at lower levels.

Site layout

10 The north east to south west pedestrian connection works well across the site, tying into surrounding sites, and providing more space and presence to the area under and around the tower.

11 The north east site entrance has been improved with increased footway and reconfigured cycle storage to the north corner (previously this lined the northern boundary of the site, further restricting the residential garden space around the tower). The north and west resident yards/access route to dwellings now reads as a more private space, away from the main diagonal route.

12 Play areas appear generally acceptable apart from the under 5 doorstep play within the simple pedestrian square. This area does not appear well placed or defended with the uses that surround it, including car parking, cycle, waste and refuse points, and vehicular access.

Block A

13 The above described layout and uses that are incorporated into block A group together to form an inactive frontage to the public realm. Careful detailing of materiality can help this, but it should first be considered if the massing and building lines can be neater. The residential entrance is prominent, which is encouraged, but it does not have an active relationship with the south elevation and the under-5 play space/public square.

14 The extension of single storey rear mass to block A creates restricted space for the proposed trees and vegetation to form a buffer to Renfrew Road and garden space is also lost by this arrangement. Access and maintenance may also be more difficult with the trees planted, as such a boundary is needed to soften the introduction of the building here. The applicant should explore moving the building line back in this location to address these issues.

15 To improve the relationship of block A to Renfrew Road the building is proposed at 3 storeys to the rear, stepping up away from Renfrew Road. The building line would be 20 metres from the original line of houses (not including extensions). This distance can be acceptable where other elements are developed, e.g. the hit and miss brick work and inset layout for balconies would help to improve privacy conditions on the boundary with these neighbours.

16 Advice provided on heritage in the pre-application report of 6 February 2019 still stands.

Energy

17 The updated GLA Energy Assessment Guidance provides details on the information that should be provided within the energy assessment to be submitted at stage 1. See link for the latest guidance published in October 2018: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/planning-applications-and-decisions/pre-planning-application-meeting-service-0>

18 The following targets are in effect for all Stage 1 schemes received by the Mayor as set out in the guidance:

- Residential – Net zero carbon with at least an on-site 35% reduction in carbon emissions beyond Part L of 2013 Building Regulations.

19 The applicant proposes to achieve at least an on-site 35% reduction in carbon emissions beyond Part L of 2013 Building Regulations; this is welcomed.

20 The carbon emission figures should be reported against a Part L 2013 baseline. Carbon emissions for domestic and non-domestic elements of the development should be presented separately.

21 From January 2019, and until central Government updates Part L with the latest carbon emission factors, applicants are encouraged to use the SAP 10 emission factors for referable applications when estimating CO2 emission performance against London Plan policies. The applicant has provided an assessment of CO2 emissions using both SAP 10 and SAP 2012 emissions factors; this is welcomed. A spreadsheet has been provided for this purpose and the applicant should submit this alongside their application. Applicants will still need to provide an assessment of CO2 performance using SAP 2012 emission factors to enable a comparison to be made. Applicants proposing to only use SAP 2012 emission factors will need to provide a justification for this.

Be Lean Demand Reduction

22 The applicant should commit to meeting Part L 2013 by efficiency measures alone as a minimum. Applicants should note the new draft London Plan Energy Efficiency targets which set out the GLA's expectation for levels of improvement achievable for new developments:

- o Residential – 10% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations from energy efficiency

23 The applicant suggests that they are expecting to achieve an improvement on 2013 Building Regulations from energy efficiency of approximately 6%; they should demonstrate that they have fully exploited the opportunities for energy efficiency measures.

24 The applicant is proposing to exceed the default thermal bridging value assumed in Building Regulations, which is welcomed. They should demonstrate that the proposed thermal bridging assumption is achievable with the proposed concrete frame construction with aluminium cladding.

25 Sample SAP full calculation worksheets (both DER and TER sheets) and BRUKL sheets including efficiency measures alone should be provided to support the savings claimed.

26 Information on the development's total energy demand (MWh/year) for each building use and the total Part L Fabric Energy Efficiency Standard (FEES) should be reported.

Cooling and Overheating

27 The domestic overheating checklist, included in the Energy Assessment Guidance, should be completed at pre-application stage and used to identify potential overheating risk and passive responses early in the design process.

28 The applicant proposes a significant number of single aspect dwellings due to the site constraints – this number should be minimised, and the applicant should consider that single aspect dwellings may require additional passive measures compared to dual aspect dwellings.

29 Evidence should be provided on how the demand for cooling and the overheating risk will be minimised through passive design in line with the Cooling Hierarchy. Dynamic overheating modelling in line with CIBSE Guidance is recommended (TM59 and TM49 for residential and TM52 and TM49 for non-residential). The applicant is undertaking dynamic overheating modelling of apartments in line with TM59, which is welcomed.

30 The area weighted average (MJ/m²) and total (MJ/year) cooling demand for the actual and notional building should be provided and the applicant should demonstrate that the actual building's cooling demand is lower than the notional.

Be Clean Heating Infrastructure

31 The applicant suggests that the site is remote from any existing heat networks, however this will need to be demonstrated. The applicant should investigate opportunities for connection to nearby existing or planned district heating (DH) networks, including SELCHP, SBEG and VNEB. Evidence of communication with the relevant parties (i.e. stakeholders, local authority energy officers) should be provided, and include confirmation or otherwise from the network operator that the network has the capacity to serve the new development, of the connection distance, and if feasible with supporting estimates of the CO₂ emission factor, installation cost and timescales for connection. Connection to district heating should be prioritised.

32 The site should be served by a single energy centre and the applicant should commit to providing a site wide heating network where all buildings/uses on site will be connected; relevant drawings/schematics for the energy centre and the site-wide network should be provided.

33 The applicant should provide information confirming that the development is future proofed for connection to wider district networks now or in the future.

34 Should CHP be proposed, applicant will be expected to provide sufficient information to justify its use and ensure that the carbon and air quality impact is minimised. See Appendix 3 of the Energy Assessment Guidance (October 2018) for further details. It should be noted that gas-engine CHP is not supported for small/medium developments. The applicant has proposed two options:

- Central gas boilers and CHP – this is not supported
- Central Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) and gas boilers – this is welcomed; see Be Green section for further comments.

Be Green Renewable Energy

35 The GLA expects all major development proposals to maximise on-site renewable energy generation. This is regardless of whether the 35% on-site target has already been met through earlier stages of the energy hierarchy.

36 The applicant intends to install Solar PV, which is welcomed; this should be maximised. A plan showing the proposed location of the installation should be provided and the applicant should demonstrate that the roof's potential has been maximised for the installation.

37 The applicant is encouraged to pursue the central Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) and gas boilers strategy and they should assess this as part of the Be Green element of the energy hierarchy. Their main concern with this strategy is a perception this might lead to a higher cost of energy for occupants. The available evidence and our wider experience suggests the operational cost difference between CHP and heat pumps will not be significant if the scheme is well designed, built, commissioned and operated. For more information on heat pump strategies and related impacts, the applicant is encouraged to review: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/low_carbon_heat_-_heat_pumps_in_london_.pdf

Carbon Offsetting

38 Applicants are expected to maximise carbon emission reductions on-site. Where it is clearly demonstrated that no further carbon savings can be achieved but the site still falls short of the carbon reduction targets, applicants are required to make a cash-in-lieu contribution to the relevant boroughs' carbon offset fund using the boroughs' carbon offset price.

39 Energy strategies should provide a calculation of the shortfall in carbon emissions and evidence of discussions with the borough agreeing the offsetting approach.

Monitoring

40 The energy strategy should include information on how the building's energy performance will be monitored post-construction to enable occupants to monitor and reduce their energy use.

Conclusion

41 The proposal is generally supported, however this is subject to securing the future of the Cinema Museum, exploring further modulation of the tower elements to reduce the apparent bulk of the building, and further detail testing in terms of the impact of the development proposal on heritage assets and the existing and future residents' amenity. The applicant is encouraged to continue to engage with the Council to address these issues.

for further information, contact the GLA Planning Team:

John Finlayson, Head of Development Management

██████████ ██████████ @london.gov.uk

██████████, **Team Leader, Development Management**

██████████ ██████████ @london.gov.uk

██████████ **Case Officer**

██████████ ██████████ @london.gov.uk
