



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - ADDENDUM

Date: **Tuesday 11 October 2016**

Time: **7.00 pm**

Venue: **Main Hall - Karibu Education Centre, 7 Gresham Road, SW9 7PH**

Copies of agendas, reports, minutes and other attachments for the Council's meetings are available on the Lambeth website. www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov

Members of the Committee

Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Bernard Gentry, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Diana Morris (Deputy Chair), Councillor Mohammed Seedat, Councillor Joanne Simpson and Councillor Clair Wilcox (Chair)

Substitute Members

Councillor Liz Atkins, Councillor Anna Birley, Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Councillor Tim Briggs, Deputy Mayor Marcia Cameron, Councillor Jane Edbrooke, Councillor Robert Hill, Councillor Ben Kind, Councillor Luke Murphy, Councillor Louise Nathanson, Councillor Jane Pickard and Councillor Sonia Winifred

Further Information

If you require any further information or have any queries please contact:
Maria Burton, Telephone: 020 7926 8703; Email: MBurton2@lambeth.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting. If you have any specific needs please contact Facilities Management (020 7926 1010) in advance.

Queries on reports

Please contact report authors prior to the meeting if you have questions on the reports or wish to inspect the background documents used. The contact details of the report author are shown on the front page of each report.

Digital engagement

We encourage people to use Social Media and we normally tweet from most Council meetings. To get involved you can tweet us @LBLDemocracy.

Audio/Visual Recording of meetings

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press please contact the Press Office). Please note that the Chair of the meeting has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons including disruption caused by the filming or the nature of the business being conducted.

Persons making recordings are requested not to put undue restrictions on the material produced so that it can be reused and edited by all local people and organisations on a non-commercial basis.

Representation

Ward Councillors (details via the website www.lambeth.gov.uk or phone 020 7926 2131) may be contacted at their surgeries or through Party Group offices to represent your views to the Council: (Liberal Democrats 020 7926 2028) (Conservatives 020 7926 2213) (Labour 020 7926 1166).

Security

Please be aware that you may be subject to bag searches and asked to sign in at meetings that are held in public. Failure to comply with these requirements could mean you are denied access to the meeting. There is also limited seating which is allocated on a first come first serve basis, you should aim to arrive at least 15 minutes before the meeting commences. For more details please visit: [our website](#).

Please contact Democratic Services for further information – 020 7926 2170 – or the number on the front page.



While the Town Hall is closed meetings will take place at the Karibu Education Centre or International House. Please refer to the front page of this agenda to see meeting location.

Karibu Education Centre, 7 Gresham Rd, London SW9 7PH

International House, Canterbury Crescent, London SW9 7QE

AGENDA

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA MAY BE CHANGED AT THE MEETING

| | Page Nos. |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 7. Addendum | 1 - 16 |

ITEM 3: 15/01219/FUL 79-81 Clapham Common South Side

| Page No(s). | Report Changes / Additional Information | Decision Notice changes |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| 31 | <p>Submitted drawings have been amended as indicated in bold:</p> <p>A 000 000 Rev P0; A 000 001 Rev P0; A 000 002 Rev P0; A 025 001 Rev P5; A 025 002 Rev P0; A 025 003 Rev P1; A 025 004 Rev P0; A 025 005 Rev P2; A 100 001 Rev P4; A 110 001 Rev P2; & A 100 001 21/09; A 100 001 28/09</p> | Update approved documents |
| 32 | <p>Update paragraph to read as follows:</p> <p>Public transport capacity is adequate with a PTAL rating of 4 which is considered to be 'Good'. The area is subject to CPZ parking controls and Clapham Common South Side is a 'Red Route.' Officers consider that the short-term parking of coaches or other vehicles, either in Cautley Avenue or on the main road frontage is unlikely to result in any deterioration in highway safety or significant obstruction to traffic. Facilities for off-street servicing exist. Parking in the side streets is lawful outside the CPZ. control hours that could be varied if necessary.</p> | N/A |
| 34 | <p>Update paragraph 1.9 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>"The site is some 340 m. from Clapham South Underground station on the Northern Line, a deep level tube. Five bus routes serve Clapham Common South Side. The site has a PTAL rating 4 'Good.' The site is subject to a TfL Tunnel Safeguarding Line. <u>This is an area designated to ensure that any development undertaken in these areas are subject to TfL consultation to ensure that development, especially that below ground level, does not impact on the existing underground tunnel networks.</u>"</p> | N/A |
| 35 | <p>Update paragraph 2.3 to further clarify the use of the multi-purpose room at the request of the Chair to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>"The multi-purpose room will be used as an overspill for dining facilities, an amenity space for guests (eg. Television room/common room/dining facilities/ internet area/storage area/ meeting room), additional office space if required. The room may also be hired out for functions/meetings and due to the size of the room at 95.5sqm (7.4m x 12.8m), attendees would be limited. The applicant has stated that the room will have a maximum capacity of 50 people and will be used for uses associated with the hotel."</p> | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|-----|
| 40 | <p>Amend paragraph 3.12 to insert the correct date of the decision to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“18th May 2015 2012. 12/00508/FUL - Retention of canopy to rear of existing hotel. The application was permitted. It is noted that the proposal included the structures that were proposed to be demolished under the application reference 11/01762/CON.”</p> | N/A | | |
| 40 | <p>Amend paragraph 4.1 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“Consultation responses and comments from the original consultation of the application undertaken 16.03.2015. <u>It is noted that when the application was originally submitted it was assessed under the policies of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan and the Core Strategy.</u>”</p> | N/A | | |
| 42 & 43 | <p>Amend the table in paragraph 4.7 to read as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="504 647 1592 1114"> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 647 1272 1114"> <p>No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the likely parking and traffic impacts are acceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Parking of vans by patrons of the hotel in the evenings has not been addressed <input type="checkbox"/> The actual impacts of vehicle movements and parking associated with the hotel have not been assessed <input type="checkbox"/> Existing conditions will be worsened by the closure of the frontage , the addition of the multi-purpose room and reduction in the size of the rear yard <input type="checkbox"/> There is inadequate provision for disabled parking <input type="checkbox"/> The London Plan requirements for coach parking cannot be met <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear why officers are not recommending that a servicing and delivery plan is not necessary </td> <td data-bbox="1272 647 1592 1114">Paragraphs 6.23 to 6.36</td> </tr> </table> | <p>No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the likely parking and traffic impacts are acceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Parking of vans by patrons of the hotel in the evenings has not been addressed <input type="checkbox"/> The actual impacts of vehicle movements and parking associated with the hotel have not been assessed <input type="checkbox"/> Existing conditions will be worsened by the closure of the frontage , the addition of the multi-purpose room and reduction in the size of the rear yard <input type="checkbox"/> There is inadequate provision for disabled parking <input type="checkbox"/> The London Plan requirements for coach parking cannot be met <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear why officers are not recommending that a servicing and delivery plan is not necessary | Paragraphs 6.23 to 6.36 | N/A |
| <p>No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the likely parking and traffic impacts are acceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Parking of vans by patrons of the hotel in the evenings has not been addressed <input type="checkbox"/> The actual impacts of vehicle movements and parking associated with the hotel have not been assessed <input type="checkbox"/> Existing conditions will be worsened by the closure of the frontage , the addition of the multi-purpose room and reduction in the size of the rear yard <input type="checkbox"/> There is inadequate provision for disabled parking <input type="checkbox"/> The London Plan requirements for coach parking cannot be met <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear why officers are not recommending that a servicing and delivery plan is not necessary | Paragraphs 6.23 to 6.36 | | | |
| 45 | <p>Amend paragraph 4.24 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“Consultation letters were re-sent to 33 adjacent properties in Cautley Avenue, Lynette Avenue, Klea Avenue, Lessar Avenue and Clapham Common South Side. Consultation was undertaken on 08.08.2016 and finished on 29.08.201629.08.2016.”</p> | N/A | | |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 47 | <p>Amend paragraph 4.27 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“Development Control Enforcement Team. The Enforcement Officer attended the site visit undertaken on 5th July 2016. The Enforcement Officer was satisfied that the extensions to the rear of the hotel have received permission under application reference 12/00508/FUL and also or become <u>became</u> lawful through passage of time. Under the 12/00508/FUL application, the store room, kitchen, office, covered dining area and a portion of the store/laundry were permitted. Since this application the laundry/store have been pushed out 1.3m to the boundary treatment shared with 82-84 Clapham Common South Side. The extension to these structures are <u>is</u> deemed to be lawful due to passage of time of 4 years. <u>Furthermore, aerial photographs taken in April 2012 show that this structure had been extended to the boundaries at this stage.</u>”</p> | N/A |
| 50 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.3 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“The use of the existing buildings as a hotel has been certified as lawful and in land use terms there are no policy objections to the creation of further hotel bedrooms and a room ancillary to the hotel. Given that the hotel exists the issue of “<i>overconcentration</i>” of <u>individual</u> hotels in the local area does not arise. Further, the site lies within an area of ‘Good’ transport accessibility, which is supported by Policy ED12.”</p> | N/A |
| 51 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.12 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“Policy Q11 (i) of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) is supportive, in principle, of the provision of new basement accommodation below existing buildings. Basement extensions are not considered acceptable if they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Entail the roofing over or inappropriate enclosure/alteration of existing basement areas;</i> • <i>Result in the loss of front gardens or entail excessive excavation which would harm the character of the locality or which would undermine the appearance of the shet <u>host</u> building (especially on heritage assets);</i> • <i>Result in development below gardens which would severely compromise the ability of trees and soft landscaping to thrive without irrigation.</i>” | N/A |
| 52 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.15 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“There are already two bedrooms built below the forecourt at Nos. 81 and part of 80 and the scheme seeks to provide two new guestrooms to the north of these towards Cautley Avenue. The walls of the light wells would be finished in painted render to match the existing basement arrangement at Nos. 80 and 81. Timber framed sash windows <u>windows</u> with a horizontal emphasis would be installed. The applicant has removed the previously proposed metal lightwell railings and replaced these with a pavement grille in order to satisfy the Conservation Officer. The pavement grille is flush with the forecourt and is proposed to be galvanised metal. It is considered</p> | N/A |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| | that a condition to secure the details of the grille will be acceptable. The existing forecourt paving would be replaced by 60 cm. x 60 cm. reconstituted stone slabs and soft landscaping in planters.” | |
| 53 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.21 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“It is further noted that the structures located in the rear garden of the application site have been permitted under application reference 12/00508/FUL or are deemed to be lawful through passage of time. It is noted that these structures were inspected on the site visit undertaken on 05.07.2016. <u>The site visit was attended by the applicant, the applicants’ agent, and an Enforcement Officer, Principal Planner and Planning Officer from Lambeth Council.</u> The amended plans received 05.08.2016 accurately represent the buildings that are located on site. The proposed lightwell and staircase are not considered to result in a significant reduction in the size of the rear yard compared with the existing situation and it is considered that there is sufficient space to the rear of the property for servicing, delivery and <u>cycle</u> parking in the remaining space.”</p> | N/A |
| 54 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.27 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“It is noted that the updated On-Street Parking Assessment has not been disputed by Council’s Transport Officer. Furthermore, it is noted that the previous Transport Assessment was not disputed and that the Officer considered that the trip generation was acceptable. It is further noted that the On-Street Parking Assessment does not adhere to the Lambeth Methodology as it was undertaken at a 200m radius as opposed to a 500m radius and was undertaken on a weekday and a weekend as opposed to two weekdays. The Council’s Transport Officer has advised that whilst not adhering to the Lambeth Methodology, the results were acceptable at a 200m radius and it was considered that a wider survey was not necessary as a wider survey of 500m would yield similar results, if not better. <u>The On-Street Parking Assessment demonstrated that the minimum parking stress was 52% on Saturday 7th November 2015 (328 car parking spaces remaining) and the maximum parking stress within the surveyed area was 76% overnight on Thursday 5th November 2015 (162 car parking spaces remaining).</u> Whilst it is noted that the parking stress was higher overnight, the CPZ restrictions end at 6pm and any person is permitted to park in this area whether a hotel guest or not. The Assessment showed that hotel guests who had parked commercial vehicles during this period equated to 4 during the day and 4 at night on Thursday 5th November 2015 and 1 for the whole of Saturday 7th November. As such, it is considered <u>that the proposed increase of 4 bedrooms would result in approximately 1 extra vehicle during the week and no increase in vehicles during the weekend period. Trips generated by guests on the survey days result in 3 cars total on Thursday 5th November 2015 and 4 cars total on Saturday 7th November 2015. It is therefore considered that the proposed increase of 4 bedrooms would result in an increase of less than 1 car for either a weekday or weekend and the impact on the overnight parking in the area is considered to be minimal.</u>”</p> | N/A |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 54 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.30 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>"In 2009, when the hotel was operating at its present size, the Planning Inspectorate found:</p> <p><i>"Neither is there any substantive evidence that the short-term parking of coaches or other vehicles, either in Cautley Avenue or on the main road frontage, has caused or is likely to result in any deterioration in highway safety or significant obstruction to traffic. In particular, I am satisfied that the approximately 8 m. wide footway adjoining Clapham Common South Side is of ample width to facilitate the unloading and collection of hotel passengers and their luggage without causing obstruction to passing pedestrians."</i></p> | N/A |
| 55 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.34 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>"The capacity of the proposed multi-function room is to be 50 people. The applicant has stressed in their email dated 27.09.2016 that the use of the multi-purpose room will be for a range of uses associated with the hotel. <u>The use has been further quantified in an email dated 06.10.2016 to state that the use of the room will be a communal space for the use of the guests for the use of internet, workspaces, ancillary dining and communal meeting area.</u> As such, it is considered acceptable for a condition restricting the use of this room to uses ancillary to the hotel (eg. Overspill dining, office space, storage) and for functions/meetings for patrons of the hotel only. Whilst it is noted that guests of the hotel may hire out the multi-purpose room for a function (eg. Wedding reception) that may also be attended by non-patrons, it is not considered that this would significantly impact on the traffic and parking arrangements of the surrounding area."</p> | N/A |
| 55 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.35 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>"It is noted that there was a photograph of a coach that had parked on Cautley Avenue submitted with an objection letter. The submitter stated that the photograph was taken 6.02pm on 01.06.2015 however no evidence was provided with the submission to state whether the passengers of the coach were guests at the Dudley Hotel. The photograph showed that the coach was parked within the Pay and Display area of the street. <u>The picture showed that the coach was too wide for the lines denoting the parking area.</u> However, it is noted that the <u>should a coach be parked within the parking lines this is</u> is <u>would be</u> parked legally and as such it is considered that if a coach was to park in the Pay and Display areas within the timeframes of the parking area there is no transport restrictions to stop this. <u>If a coach were parked in a way which did not adhere to the restrictions and limitations of the parking bays, this would be a matter for parking enforcement.</u> The applicant has stated that they will not be actively encouraging coach parties and that these will be directed to stay at other hotels. Furthermore, in the email dated 27.09.2016 the applicant stated that the three group parties that have stayed at the hotel in 2016 have all arrived by tube. It is not considered that the proposed development</p> | N/A |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | <p>of 4 bedrooms would generate additional coaches, however it is accepted that they can legally park within the parking bays along Cautley Avenue provided they pay the required fee and are parked within the allotted timeframes. It is noted that the applicant has stated that they actively discourage coach parking and any tour/coach operator that is looking to stay at a Euro Hotel contacts the head office and requests accommodation on a pre-booked arrangement. <u>The Euro Hotels framework states that the site does not have coach parking and groups may only stay if they arrive by public transport.</u> It is considered that whilst there is an ability for the coaches to park within the Pay and Display Areas that a Coach Parking Management Strategy would help to ensure that this would reduce the impact on obstructions to traffic within the area.”</p> | |
| 56 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.44 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>There is concern from local residents that the use of the ‘multi-purpose’ room is unspecified and could cause disturbance if used for functions or converted to further hotel bedrooms. It is not considered exceptional for a hotel to contain an ancillary function room. The room would be accessed internally from the remainder of the hotel and the spiral stair to the rear service yard would be a secondary access. It is considered that a condition restricting the use of the multi-purpose room to ancillary activities of the Dudley Hotel and noise conditions would be acceptable ways of resolving the residents’ concerns. The noise condition would ensure that the proposed multi-purpose room would not result in noise that exceeds background levels. A further condition relating to amplified noise would also be required to ensure that any function in the multi-purpose room would not result in noise that would disrupt neighbouring residential properties. Furthermore, restricting the subdivision of the multi-function room from being converted into bedrooms cannot be conditioned as this is not enforceable. <u>An Enforcement Officer would have to give one-days’ notice of a site visit to the applicant and in this time it would be possible for the use of the room to be reverted to the “multi-purpose” use. As such witnessing the breach of condition would almost be impossible and would render the condition unenforceable.</u> <u>It is considered that at the hotels present capacity and its increase in 4 bedrooms would not impact on the amenity or parking in the surrounding areas. As such, the proposal in its current form is not considered to result in over-intensification of the site.</u> However, from the site visit undertaken it was noted that the addition of bedrooms over and above what is proposed for this application (total of 67 bedrooms) would <u>may</u> result in a level of overdevelopment <u>over-intensification</u> on the site <u>which may impact on the amenity of surrounding properties.</u> As such, it is considered acceptable condition that there be no more than 67 bedrooms allowed at the 79-81 Clapham Common South Side. <u>This would require a planning application to be submitted to ensure that an assessment of any future proposal can be fully addressed and the impacts on amenity and parking can be further addressed.</u></p> | N/A |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 57 | <p>Amend paragraph 6.45 to read as follows [replacement paragraph]:</p> <p>“The applicant explains that trips associated with the new multi-function room are likely to arise from guests staying at the hotel and already taken into account by the predicted trip rates outlined in paragraphs 3.2.13 – 3.2.16 of the <u>On-street Parking Stress Assessment</u>. Furthermore, with the proposed condition restricting the use of the room to ancillary hotel uses and for uses to patrons of the hotel only, it is not considered that there would be a significant impact on the traffic and parking of the surrounding streets. The <u>On-street Parking Stress Survey Assessment</u> notes that there will be an overflow of parking spaces in the surrounding area available and it is noted that majority of guests to the hotel would use public transport.”</p> | N/A |
|----|---|-----|

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE NO

REPORT CHANGES

DECISION LETTER CHANGES

| <u>PAGE NO</u> | <u>REPORT CHANGES</u> | <u>DECISION LETTER CHANGES</u> |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <u>17 Newport Street</u> | | |
| 95 | Additional Document: Screening Level Air Quality Assessment dated November 2015 | Yes |
| 95 | Revise Recommendation 1 with the following: 1.Resolve to REFUSE planning permission and as listed in this report and referral to the GLA for further consideration, for the following reason The proposed development, by reason of its scale, massing and form would fail to protect the composition and character of a protected Landmark Silhouette (View (x) within Local Plan policy Q25), dominating the identified view and subjugating the Elizabeth Tower of Westminster Palace so that the latter becomes a secondary element within that view, and in doing so would also cause harm to the setting of the Kennington Conservation Area, contrary to policies Q22, Q25 and Q26 of Lambeth's Local Plan (2015). | No |
| 95 | Replace Recommendation 2 with the following: 2. In the event that Committee resolves to refuse planning permission in accordance with recommendation 1 and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers to negotiate the heads of terms of the S106 agreement as set out in this report and any appropriate conditions in consultation with the Chair of Committee. | No |
| 96 | Delete Recommendation 3 | No |
| 100 | Change Paragraph 2.5 to read as shown below (changes shown in bold) Revised wording: | No |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

| <u>PAGE NO</u> | <u>REPORT CHANGES</u> | <u>DECISION LETTER CHANGES</u> |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 131 | <p>Change Paragraph 6.10.2 to read as shown below (changes shown in bold)</p> <p>Revised wording: As shown above, each of the proposed units would provide the minimum area of private amenity space in line with Standard 26 of the London Plan Housing SPG. Furthermore, each of the proposed units would have access to a balcony or roof terrace which would face in southerly orientation. Units 1 through 11 would have sole access to balconies whilst unit 12 would have both a balcony and roof terrace. Concerns were raised about the suitability of the roof terrace as a viable amenity space with regards to wind impact. The applicant has subsequently amended the roof terrace to include a closable screen. However, further details should be submitted to show the screening would overcome these concerns. Nonetheless, should the roof terrace prove not to be suitable as an amenity area, there is sufficient balcony space for this unit. As such, Furthermore it is considered that sufficient daylight and sunlight would be achieved within the balconies to allow for excellent quality ‘outdoor’ private amenity space, which can utilise various furniture such as seating etc.</p> | No |
| 136 | <p>Change Paragraph 6.13.5 to read as shown below (changes shown in bold)</p> <p>Revised wording: As no Air Quality Assessment has been submitted as part of the application, officers cannot consider if future occupiers of residential accommodation will be exposed to acceptable air quality and the site is deemed suitable for its proposed use in this respect. This can be conditioned to be submitted and approved in writing as part of a granting of planning permission prior to commencement of works of the development. An Air Quality Assessment was submitted separately following the original submitted documents and the statutory consultation period. Officers consider that should planning permission be granted, a condition requiring further details on any air quality mitigation measures should be attached.</p> | No |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE NO

REPORT CHANGES

DECISION LETTER CHANGES

| <u>PAGE NO</u> | <u>REPORT CHANGES</u> | <u>DECISION LETTER CHANGES</u> |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 141 | Additional paragraph following 8.1 8.2 In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to officers, having regard to the heads of terms set out in the report, to negotiate and complete a document containing obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in order to meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector. | No |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE NO

REPORT CHANGES

DECISION LETTER CHANGES

| <u>South Bank Winter Festival 16/04445/FUL, 16/04446/ADV, 16/04447/LB</u> | | |
|--|--|-----|
| 144 | <p>Add the items listed below to the Documents (application ref. 16/04445/FUL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image of proposed Festival Wrap • Drawing showing details of proposed temporary shower unit (Dwg no: SCH-06-010-01 RevC) • Email confirming reduction of market stalls and details of NoFit State Accommodation Facilities (Received 05.10.2016) | Yes |
| 148 | <p>Insert details of the dimension of the Ticket Booth/Box Office proposed to be sited on Hungerford Car and Coach Park.</p> <p>Revised wording: Ticket Booth/Box Office (4L metres x 2.5W metres x 3H metres)</p> | No |
| 149 - 150 | <p>Change Paragraph 2.7 to read as shown below (changes shown in bold)</p> <p>Revised wording: The NoFit State Circus tent would replace the Spiegeltent as used at the 2015 Winter Festival and would have ancillary temporary caravan/trailer plots located on Hungerford Car and Coach Park. A Mobile ATM machine would be parked on the footpath against the Hungerford Railway Bridge Abutment adjacent to Belvedere Road facing onto Southbank Centre Square. The number of market stalls have been reduced from 50 in 2015-16 to 38 Market Stalls within the current proposal. There were a total of 48 market stalls approved for last year's winter festival 2015-2016 of which 26 were food and drink uses and 22 were craft stalls. This year's winter festival reduces the number of market stalls to 38 of which 22 would be food and drink uses and 16 would be craft stalls. The reduction in number of market stalls is due to the size and layout of the proposed NoFit State Circus tent and temporary (ancillary) accommodation area which covers a larger area than the Spiegeltent used at last year's winter festival and this layout comparison is shown at appendix 3 of the Design, and Heritage Statement. Nevertheless, officers consider that this split of uses within the market stalls is acceptable and would have a similar split as approved at last year's festival. This</p> | No |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE NO

REPORT CHANGES

DECISION LETTER CHANGES

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| | <p>proximity to the festival site that would be more suitable as performers require regular access to the main circus tent to practice in between the circus shows. The accommodation area would A toilet block which has been confirmed would be serviced in the same way as the temporary toilet blocks at the entrance to Hungerford Car and Coach Park. The accommodation area would have an enclosed purposed built shower block, a break out space with electric heaters, and a kitchen block with gas cookers. All gas bottles would be covered and secured to prevent opportunistic crime from occurring. Officers consider that temporary accommodation area is of acceptable standard and on this basis, the temporary change of use is considered acceptable.</p> | |
| 163 | <p>Change Paragraph 11.4 to read as shown below</p> <p>Revised wording: Furthermore, the circus caravans within 'Zone 1' would be secured by two security guards and would have a security hut at the main entrance. The access onto Belvedere Road would only be an emergency exit and would have a push bar fitted on its internal side. The accommodation area would be screened by a 2m high hoarding to prevent any opportunistic crime from occurring within this area. Access to the accommodation area will be controlled by a wrist band system which will have to be signed for which will prevent any unauthorised access to this area.</p> | No |
| 166 | <p>Change Condition 4 as below:</p> <p>Condition 4 reads: 4. Amplified noise levels within the festival, up to 23.00hrs shall be restricted so as not to exceed 65 dB(LAeq) over any 15 minute period when measured at any Live Band or Recorded Music.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and the surrounding area. (Policies Q2 and ED7 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 along with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016).</p> <p>Condition 4 changed to read: 4. Amplified noise levels within the festival, up to 23.00hrs shall be restricted so as not to</p> | YES |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 11 OCT 2016
AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE NO

REPORT CHANGES

DECISION LETTER CHANGES

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>exceed the background noise level L90B(A) 15 minutes, when, measured outside the window of the nearest noise sensitive or residential premises.</p> <p>period when measured at any Live Band or Recorded Music.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and the surrounding area. (Policies Q2 and ED7 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 along with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016).</p> | |
|--|--|--|