



## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - SECOND 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](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov)

### **Members of the Committee**

Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Bernard Gentry, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Diana Morris (Deputy Chair), Councillor Luke Murphy (Substitute), Councillor Mohammed Seedat 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](mailto: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.

## AGENDA

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

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
<b>8. Second Addendum</b>	1 - 20

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

Page No(s).	Report Changes / Additional Information			Decision Notice changes
	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Application &amp; Description</b>	<b>No. of Rooms</b>	
	10 <sup>th</sup> December 1975	Established use of hotel at No. 81	Not stated	
	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2002	Excavation of self-contained basement flat involving the installation of lightwells and entrances to property at No. 79.  (01/02087/FUL)	Application refused. No information on existing rooms.	
	14 <sup>th</sup> July 2003	Appeal allowed for conversion of basement to 4 bedrooms and creation of ancillary basement storage  (01/02206/FUL & 01/02208/FUL)	Inspector stated 32 existing bedrooms  4 new room permitted in basement  Total = 36 bedrooms	
	2005	Conversion of basement storage space permitted under 01/02206/FUL to create 4 new bedrooms	Existing bedrooms =36  Creation of 4 extra bedrooms in basement  Total = 40 bedrooms	
	25 <sup>th</sup> August 2009	Appeal dismissed for application (08/04053/FUL)  Proposed conversion of No.79 to 12 bedrooms in hotel use	The appeal decision stated that No. 79 had 16 bedrooms  No details of how many bedrooms in Nos. 80 & 81	

	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2010	Certificate of lawful use for 79-81 for the use of the properties as a hotel  (09/04045/LDCE)	Floor plans indicate 47 bedrooms over Nos. 79, 80 and 81  Noted that whilst no basement plans submitted – the basement had been converted into 8 bedrooms in 2005.  Total = 55 bedrooms		
	14 <sup>th</sup> December 2011	Application proposed new 3-storey building (10/04155/FUL)  Appeal dismissed	Proposed new building indicated 15 bedrooms  No information on existing rooms		
	15 <sup>th</sup> November 2011	Demolition of structures in the rear yard  (11/01762/CON)	No information on existing rooms		
	18 <sup>th</sup> May 2012	Retention of canopy in yard  (12/00508/FUL)	No information on existing rooms.		
	2013	Kitchen and dining facilities moved to rear structures under approval of 12/00508/FUL. Internal subdivision of former storage areas to provide 4 additional rooms	Increase in bedrooms to 59  Total = 59 bedrooms		
	January 2015	Internal subdivision of existing bedrooms and conversion of storage areas to ground floor level to create 4 additional bedrooms	Increase in bedrooms to 63  Total = 63 bedrooms		

	Current number of bedrooms at July 2016 = 63	
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; <del>A 110 001 Rev P2;</del>  <b>A 110 001 Rev P3</b> &amp; A 100 001 21/09; A 100 001 28/09</p> <p>Revised drawing A 110 001 Rev P3 removed annotation referring to existing front lightwell railings.</p>	Update approved documents
31	<p>Submitted documents have been amended as indicated in bold:</p> <p>Application Form; Design &amp; Access Statement (Dexter Moren Associates), Transport Statement February 2015; Cover Letter 24<sup>th</sup> February 2015; Construction Management Plan (Stapleton Long); letter dated 13<sup>th</sup> February 2015; On-Street Parking Assessment January 2016; Transport Statement Extract 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2015; Email dated 27<sup>th</sup> September 2016; <b>Email dated 06.10.2016</b></p>	Update approved documents
43	<p>A further letter of objection has been received on behalf of local residents. This raises the following issues:</p> <p><b>Unbalanced summary of relevant previous decisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2003 appeal decisions (for applications 001/02206/FUL &amp; 01/02208/FUL) should not be given any weight in terms of the level of development at the hotel or the acceptability of the impacts on surrounding areas;</li> <li>• The ancillary storage area has since been converted to bedrooms;</li> <li>• Report fails to mention application 01/02087/FUL – conversion of 79 Clapham Common South Side to create a self-contained flat at basement level. Refused due to over-intensive use of the site, lack of daylight to the unit and harm of the proposed lightwell railings on the Conservation Area;</li> </ul>	

- Concern about approval of 12/00508/FUL was under delegated authority and reliance on the presence of the structures in the rear yard to play down the significance of further development and loss of rear garden area to the property;
- 2009 Appeal decision for application 08/04053/FUL the Inspector stated *'I have also assessed whether UDP policy 28 provides sufficient justification for the proposal. While good public transport links are clearly close at hand, I accept the Council's view that the location does not fit comfortably into any of the three categories of appropriate locations referred to in the policy'*. The location remains inappropriate for a hotel development and the officer recommendation contradicts the approach taken in 2009. This appeal also does not relate to the creation of new floorspace and the inspector's comments in terms of external impacts must be read in that context. The Inspector appears to be under the impression that coach parking was acceptable on Clapham Common South Side;
- Lack of enforcement of development at the site – has allowed the additional bedrooms and illegal structures to become lawful.

*Officer Response:*

The Appeal decision for applications (001/02206/FUL & 01/02208/FUL assessed the impacts of having bedrooms at basement level and determined that there would be no harm to the residential amenity or occupiers of the bedrooms. Whilst it is recognised that the hotel at that time did not have the same number of rooms as at present the Appeal decision is considered to be relevant in that it establishes that the provision of basement rooms is acceptable at the application site.

The subdivision of the basement storage to bedrooms does not require planning permission.

The application 12/00508/FUL was assessed under delegated authority as the application was not called in to Committee by Members. As such, the application was correctly assessed. It is further noted that the delegated report has assessed the impact of the structures based on the 'loss of garden area' and noted that the rear yard had been in hard surfacing for a number of years, therefore no loss of green space would occur.

Whilst it is noted that the application 01/02087/FUL was refused and was not included in the history of the application sites, the proposal was refused prior to the Appeal permitted on 14.07.2003 for

applications 01/02206/FUL & 01/02208/FUL in respect of basement development Furthermore, 01/02087/FUL was an application for a proposed self-contained flat within the basement of 79 Clapham Common South Side. It is noted that whilst proposing accommodation in the basement, a self-contained flat would be required to meet different standards to that of a hotel expansion.

Whilst it is noted that the Inspector agreed with the Council that a hotel development was not considered to be acceptable at 79 Clapham Common South Side as per the requirements of the UDP policy 28, the current proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Lambeth Local Plan Policy ED12. The application site is PTAL 4 and the proposals relate to an established existing hotel use. The impact of coach parking is discussed further below.

With regard to enforcement matters in respect of the structures in the rear yard, the Officers have confirmed that they were not made aware of the breaches and as such the extensions became lawful due to a passage of time. It is noted that enforcement action could have prevented the expansion of the hotel following the 2009 decision however a certificate of lawful development has since been granted and this use is now lawful.

#### **Compliance with Key Development Plan Policies**

- The hotel does not comply with Policy ED12 – it is not located in the Central Activities Zone, Vauxhall and Waterloo Opportunity Areas or the Brixton and Streatham Town Centres;
- Requirements in Policy ED12 that must be met in respect of any new visitor accommodation;
- Fails to comply with London Plan Policy 4.5c (London’s Visitor Infrastructure) – should be located on the fringe of the CAZ and note that it states that “*further intensification of provision in areas of existing concentration should be resisted, except where this will not compromise local amenity or the balance of local land uses*”;
- Departure from the development plan and should be refused on the basis that the proposal is new visitor accommodation.

*Officers Comment:*

It is noted that whilst the application site is not located in the areas suggested for hotel accommodation, the application site has been in use as a hotel since at least 1975. It is further noted that the application is not for the construction of a new hotel, but an extension of an existing hotel. As such, it is not considered relevant that the application site is not located within one of the suggested areas.

Policy ED12(a) is considered relevant. It is considered that the transport impact of the proposed modifications have been sufficiently addressed within the On-Street Parking Assessment and would not unacceptable harm the balance and mix of the uses in the area. The assessment is considered acceptable with regard to the small-scale nature of the proposal.

The requirements set out in (b) and (c) are considered to be an assessment for new development. This application is considered to be a modification to an existing hotel use.

Policy ED12(d) is considered relevant. The policy requires that proposals that modify existing visitor accommodation will only be supported if it provides standards of accessibility and design expected of new build accommodation, subject to feasibility and viability. It is noted that the proposal is considered to be a small-scale modification to an existing hotel use which already has restricted accessibility. The modification to the existing hotel would be provided at basement level and would not be accessible to a wheelchair user. It is not considered feasible to request that the proposed basement extension is wheelchair accessible. It is noted that there are existing bedrooms at ground floor level of the hotel that are more easily accessible. Furthermore, the design of the proposal has been assessed and it is noted that due to the flush front lightwell and the location of the lightwell to the rear of the site, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of design and would not impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding Clapham Conservation Area.

It is noted that the comment regarding the further intensification of areas of existing concentration is in relation to hotels that are located within the fringe of the CAZ. As such, it is not considered that this aspect of the Policy 4.5 is relevant to this scheme. It is considered that the conditions proposed in this application would help to protect the amenity of the surrounding residential properties. It is not considered that the proposed extension to the existing hotel is a departure from the development plan.

**Conservation Area and Impact**

- Comments relate to physical design/appearance and do not consider the overdevelopment of the hotel;
- Overdevelopment of the hotel will impact on the character and amenity of the area;
- Proposal would result in loss of front garden and rear garden – further erode the pattern;
- Permanent basement structures would compromise the ability of plants or trees to ever grow again in this location and therefore the third criterion of policy Q11(i)(iii) is thus not met.

*Officers Comment:*

The comments provided by the Conservation Officer were provided in relation to the design and appearance of the proposed lightwell railings and it is considered that these are acceptable. The proposed lightwell railings were originally considered to be out of character with the surrounding Conservation Area which would have visually impacted on the Conservation Area. Now that the proposal is for a pavement grille, it is considered that this would no longer impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. While it is noted that there is development in the front and rear yard, the application site has not been subject to a 'typical' front and rear yard for a number of years. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would considerably alter the existing situation at the application site.

It is noted that Policy Q11(i)(iii) states that a basement development would be unacceptable where this would result in development below a garden that would severely compromise the ability for trees or plants to thrive without irrigation. The forecourt to the front of No.79 is not a residential garden, and has been a paved parking area since at least 2008. The character of the front area is therefore a hardstanding area as is that of the adjacent frontage at Nos 80-81. Furthermore, the

applicant has proposed planters within the forecourt area and as such a soft-landscaping plan to ensure that soft-landscaping is made available for this forecourt area.

**Parking, Highways and Servicing Issues**

- Parking stress is high in the vicinity of the site with commercial vehicles parking overnight – this is an issue during a weekday evening after the CPZ restrictions have been lifted;
- Local residents request that urgent consideration is given to amending the CPZ restrictions so that vans, minibuses or commercial vehicles are restricted 24 hours per day;
- The coach picture shows the coach outside of the parking bay and is not parked legally. Cautley Avenue is an unsuitable location for coach parking;
- The proposal does not provide one coach parking space as per the London Plan requirements;
- Not sufficient space for the services in the rear yard of the site – no room for parking, bins and cycles;
- Servicing to the rear harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and amenity of adjoining residents;
- Area to rear of hotel originally a garden

*Officers Comment:*

The On-street Parking assessment undertaken by the applicant noted that there would be 162 car parking spaces remaining on a week night. As such, it is considered that there is sufficient remaining parking spaces to serve the residents within the assessment area. As noted above, anyone is entitled to park in the bays on the streets once the CPZ restrictions have been lifted and as such any type of car is permitted, whether associated with the hotel or not. Vans are also permitted to park in these bays once the restrictions have been lifted. Whilst it is possible to seek

amendments to the CPZ restrictions this is a separate process from the consideration of this planning application.

The photograph of the coach shows that the coach is unable to fit within the parking bay on Cautley avenue. It is noted that there is no evidence that this coach was directly associated with the Euro Hotel. However, should a coach be able to fit within the bays along these roads and adhere to the restrictions then it can legally do so. If a coach is parked illegally within these areas this is a matter for parking enforcement. The Agent has stated that coach parking is not encouraged and in their email dated 06.10.2016 it has been stated that the Euro Hotel group have a framework that restricts coach parking. The Hotel does not accept bookings from outside of the agreed framework and as such cannot take coach bookings.

The Transport Officer has noted that there is no issues with the rear yard for the use of services. The application is for the creation of 4 new bedrooms and multi-purpose room – it is not considered that this would result in a significant increase in servicing for the application site over and above what already exists.

The proposed servicing activities to be undertaken in the rear yard will be screened from public view by the existing fences and gates. As such, it is not considered that there would be any harm to the visual amenity arising from the retention of servicing to the rear of the site.

Whilst it is noted that the three properties, 79, 80 and 81 Clapham Common South Side, were originally three residential houses which would have had traditional rear gardens, the use of these properties has been established as a hotel since at least 1975. As such, the character of this site and the rear yard of these properties are considered to be of a hotel use. It is considered that the proposed changes would be in accordance with the character of the site and the rear service yard and as such the introduction of a rear lightwell to this area is not considered to be out of character with this area. The visual impact of the proposals within the rear yard are screened from public view due to an existing high level brick boundary wall. As such, the visual impact of the proposal is not considered to impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding Conversation Area.

**The Multi-purpose Room**

- Conditions on the use of this room are inadequate as the use has not been properly defined;
- The activities undertaken within the room should be restricted as well as restricting the hours of operation of the room and preventing use of room as a bar, or for functions involving the sale of alcohol to members of the public;
- Condition to cap rooms at 67 is noted but the existing situation with 63 rooms is considered to be overdevelopment;
- Red line of development incorrect – appears to only cover area for extension.

*Officers Comment:*

Whilst it would be difficult to enforce controls on the hours of use of the room by hotel guests the applicant has agreed to the imposition of a condition to control the hours of use for any functions at which members of the public are in attendance. A further condition is recommended to this effect. The sale of alcohol to members of the public is regulated through Licencing provisions and provided the use of the room is ancillary to the hotel the provision of bar facilities would not fall within the scope of planning control. The proposed condition restricting the use of the room to ancillary hotel activities is considered to be acceptable and enforceable. It is further considered that the proposed noise condition will allow for the monitoring of any activity that is undertaken in this room.

Officers have assessed the proposals in the context of the existing lawful use and the additional impact of the proposals which form the subject of this application. It has been concluded that the impact of the current proposals would be acceptable however it is considered appropriate to cap the number of rooms to 67 to ensure that the impact of any further development is assessed through a planning application.

	<p>The red line for the development is correct and surrounds the whole application site – 79, 80 and 81 Clapham Common South Side as shown on plan A 000 001 Rev P0. As such, any conditions that are imposed would be for the site as a whole.</p>	
	<p>A further letter of objection has been received from objectors. This raises the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with recommendation as the proposal will result in a loss of amenity to surrounding residential properties;</li> <li>• Enforcement issues with the rear structures;</li> <li>• Hotel rear yard used for storage of rubbish bins, laundry and old furniture;</li> <li>• Following “canopy” extension cannot access side wall to maintain and repair;</li> <li>• Rubbish bins are overflowing and block neighbouring properties access ways;</li> <li>• Increased pressure in car parking;</li> <li>• Hotel is densely packed.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officers Comment:</i></p> <p>Enforcement issues with regard to the rear structures have been addressed in 4.27 of the Committee Report (page 47). It is further noted that the structures have planning permission (apart from the small store room) or have been deemed lawful due to passage of time. Whilst planning permission was permitted for the retention of the canopy, matters relating to boundary walls and maintenance of boundary treatments are subject to the Party Wall Act and are a civil matter.</p> <p>Issues relating to rubbish and servicing of the rear of the site have been addressed through the requirement for a servicing and management plan condition. It is not considered that the addition of 4 bedrooms would result in a significant increase to the car parking within the surrounding area. The hotel has 63 bedrooms and the addition of 4 more rooms is not considered to result in a level of overintensification of the site that would result in the loss of amenity to surrounding residential properties.</p>	
	<p>An email was received by an objector on 11.10.2016 noting the following:</p>	

1. It is not made clear that the parking stress % figures given are for the wider area covered by the survey which also includes spaces within roads on the other side of Clapham Common South Side. The issues that have been raised by local residents relate primarily to Cautley, Lessar and Lynette Avenues and in relation to the former two roads relate particularly to the parking of commercial vehicles overnight in the northern halves of those streets and the impact that has on the street (and the conservation areas and the listed building opposite the hotel) visually and in terms of its character and feel plus the “corridor” of vans effect which causes issues in terms of safety and sight lines and obviously finally local residents having to park further away from their homes. The evening/overnight parking stress levels for these streets (Lessar Avenue up to 91% and the survey recorded 99% - 107% (although I am unclear how the latter is possible) on Lynette Avenue) are much higher than the figures you have cited in the addendum and even the highways officer acknowledges within the report that overnight parking stress levels in are high. The diagrams attached to the parking assessment show clearly how commercial vehicles appear overnight at the northern ends of both Cautley and Lessar Avenue.
  
2. The amendments do not mention that the figures for commercial vehicles you refer to (i.e. 4 parked overnight) are based upon an oral sample of interviewed hotel guests on the days in question. It is therefore not correct to state that there were only 4 commercial vehicles parked overnight on 5th November 2016 connected with the hotel. What the assessment says is that of the sample asked (53% of the guests on an evening where the hotel had 10 rooms vacant), 4 admitted to parking vans overnight. The applicant’s own parking assessment acknowledges that there are typically 14-21 commercial vehicles parked on the streets surrounding the hotel overnight (with the plans showing they are primarily parked at the top end of Cautley and Lessar Avenues adjacent to the hotel) and on the 5th November the study recorded 16 such vehicles parked on Cautley, Lessar and Narbonne Avenues even though the hotel was clearly not full as there were 93 guests as opposed to 127 on the Saturday. Please can you ensure that this is pointed out to members at committee so that there is no suggestion that the figures are being downplayed. The typical figure of 14-21 commercial vehicles overnight cited by the applicant’s consultants appears to me to be very much in line with the numerous accounts and the photographic evidence submitted by my clients.

*Transport Officers Response:*

Over the 4 periods surveyed across two days the Area Parking Stress level varied between 52% and 76% for Residents Only bays within 200m of the site. However, within the survey area certain roads suffered significantly higher levels of parking stress. The highest parking stresses (within Residents Only and combined P&D / Residents' Bays) for individual roads were: Lynette Avenue – 99% & 97% during the overnight surveys; Lessar Avenue – 88% and 85% overnight; and Narbonne Avenue - 85% overnight.

The roads most likely to accommodate vehicles generated by the hotel are the closest: Lessar, Cautley, and Narbonne Avenues. The surveyed levels of parking stress (within Residents Only and combined P&D / Residents' Bays), and the number of available parking spaces for each of these roads are summarised below.

		Lessar Avenue		Cautley Avenue		Narbonne Avenue		Total spare spaces on roads closest to hotel
		Parking Stress	Spare spaces	Parking Stress	Spare spaces	Parking Stress	Spare spaces	
Thurs 5 Nov 2015	00:00hrs	88%	10	64%	32	78%	17	59
	13:00hrs	74%	22	42%	52	80%	16	90
Sat 7 Nov 2015	00:00hrs	85%	13	37%	56	85%	12	81
	13:00hrs	55%	39	39%	54	54%	36	129

The below summarises the numbers of commercial vehicles parked on Lessar, Cautley, and Narbonne Avenues (taken from the Parking Surveys).

		<b>Lessar, Cautley, and Narbonne Avenues</b>	
<b>Thurs 5 Nov 2015 (53 rooms occupied)</b>	<b>00:00hrs</b>	16	
	<b>13:00hrs</b>	3	
<b>Sat 7 Nov 2015 (61 rooms occupied)</b>	<b>00:00hrs</b>	11	
	<b>13:00hrs</b>	11	
<p>Final Transport comments received from TfL Road Network 10.10.2016:</p> <p>As it is clear that the applicant will not remove the existing crossover on the A24 Clapham Common South Side, TfL reiterates that they do not need to enter into a s278 agreement with TfL.</p> <p>The vehicle tracking diagram that has been submitted is welcomed. TfL is satisfied that the diagram demonstrates that cars using the forecourt car park are able to turn on site to exit / enter the A24 Clapham Common South Side safely in forward gear.</p> <p>TfL would accept points 5 (cycle parking), 7 (refuse collection), 8 (Construction Management Plan) and 9 (Underground tunnel) of the initial comments as conditions. It is requested that the following should apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For Cycle Parking, the number of cycle parking spaces required by the London Plan should be quoted in the condition which is 1 long-stay space per 20 bedrooms and 1 short-stay space per 50 bedrooms. Amend condition 13 to include required spaces as per London Plan.</li> <li>2. Refuse collection would be acceptable to be addressed as it stands through a condition of a Service and Delivery management plan to secure that refuse collection will be undertaken on Cautley Avenue.</li> <li>3. The final Construction Management Plan should be updated and secured by condition. It is requested that TfL is consulted for the discharge of this condition.</li> </ol>			

	<p>4. A condition requiring details of the proposed works is submitted to London Underground to ensure that the proposal will not impact on the Northern Line Tunnel.</p> <p>The following informative is requested to be added to any decision notice:</p> <p>a. The applicant is still advised to contact London Underground Infrastructure Protection in advance of preparation of final design and associated method statements with regard to: excavation; and construction methods. They can be contacted via email on SMBLocationEnquiries@tfl.gov.uk</p> <p><b>Subject to the above conditions being met, TfL has no objection to the proposal.</b></p>	
53	<p>Add text following paragraph 6.21:</p> <p>The store room to the rear of the boiler room has not previously received permission and as such has been shown on the plans to regularise the development. As noted on the original site visit undertaken on 05.07.2016 and the Members site visit on 08.10.2016, the store is used for the storage of paint/construction materials/etc. The structure is located within a small courtyard area along the boundary shared with 82-84 Clapham Common South Side. The store is not visible from the public realm. There is no objection to the store room in view of its modest scale and limited visual impact. It is considered that the structure would have a neutral effect upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and would not affect the setting of any listed buildings as it is located at least 30m from the Dutch House (78 Clapham Common South Side). As such, it the retention of this structure is considered acceptable.</p>	
53	<p>Amend paragraph 6.22:</p> <p>Overall, the proposal is considered to have a minimal impact on the host building, the grade II listed building located at 78 Clapham Common South Side (<u>known as the Dutch House</u>) and the wider Clapham Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Clapham Conservation Area, <u>the setting of the listed building at</u></p>	

	<u>78 Clapham Common South Side (known as the Dutch House)</u> and is in accordance with Policy Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).	
59	<p>Amend condition 3 to read as follows:</p> <p>Notwithstanding the approved drawings, prior to the commencement of works, detailed <u>drawings and details of materials / finishes</u> for the proposed lightwell grille and <u>balustrade to the rear lightwell</u>, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be thereafter built in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory and that it protects the character and appearance of the Clapham Common Conservation Area (Policies Q2 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).</p>	Amend Condition 3 of the decision notice
61	<p>Amend condition 13 to read as follows:</p> <p>13 Prior to first occupation of any of the hotel rooms hereby permitted, details of the provision to be made for cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall demonstrate that a minimum of 5 secure and easily accessible cycle spaces will be provided (<u>1 long-stay space per 20 bedrooms and 1 short-stay space per 50 bedrooms</u>). The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter be retained for its designated use during the duration of the hotel use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with London Plan 2015 Policy 6.9 'Cycling' and Table 6.3, Policy T3 and T6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).</p>	Amend Condition 13 of the Decision notice
63	<p>Additional condition:</p> <p>The multi-purpose room hereby permitted shall not be used for functions attended by members of the public other than within the following times:</p> <p><i>0900 Hours to 2300 Hours – Monday to Thursday</i></p>	

	<p>0900 Hours to 0000 Hours – Fridays and Saturdays 1000 Hours to 1800 Hours – Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that no nuisance or disturbance is caused to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of the area generally (policy Q2 of the London Borough of Lambeth Local Plan (2015)).</p>	
--	--	--

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**

<b><u>South Bank Winter Festival 16/04445/FUL, 16/04446/ADV, 16/04447/LB</u></b>		
166	<p><b>There is a typographical error in the published addendum in respect of Condition 4.</b></p> <p><b>The wording of Condition 4 should be retained as shown in the published officer report (p166). This is the same noise condition that has been used for the previous Winter Festivals in 2015 (ref: 15/04149/FUL) and 2014 (14/04471/FUL).</b></p> <p>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>	YES

This page is intentionally left blank