



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - SECOND ADDENDUM PUBLISHED 28 NOVEMBER

Date: Tuesday 28 November 2017

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 Liz Atkins (Substitute), Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Diana Morris, Councillor Joanne Simpson (Vice-Chair) and Councillor Clair Wilcox (Chair)

Substitute Members

Councillor Liz Atkins, Councillor Anna Birley, Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Councillor Tim Briggs, 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: (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.

AGENDA

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

		Page
		Nos.
6.	Second Addendum	1 - 6



PAGE NO REPORT CHANGES DECISION LETTER CHANGES

ITEM 3

74 Roupell Street (Bishops) 17/01398/FUL & 17/01399/LB

Page Number	Report Changes	Decision Letter Changes
27	In response to the following paragraph in Historic England's initial comments on page 27:	N/A
	We remain of the view that the loss of the existing open courtyard arrangement and the visibility of the attractive 19th century elevations could be considered to cause harm to the listed building and the character of the conservation areas, albeit that harm would be considered less-than-substantial.	
	COMMENT: Historic England have stated that the loss of the existing open courtyard arrangement and the visibility of the attractive 19th century elevations could be considered to cause some harm to the listed building and the character of the conservation areas, albeit that harm would be considered less-than-substantial. Officers agree that there is limited harm to the conservation areas with the loss of the later courtyard, but would disagree that the limited visibility of inner courtyard facades causes harm to the listed building. There will still be views of the inner courtyard.	
33	Paragraph 4.4.1 is to be amended as follows:	N/A
	A total of 32 residents were consulted on the applications on 10.04.2017. Two site notices were posted outside the property on 19.04.2017 and the application was advertised in the local paper on 21.04.2017. $\frac{500}{511}$ comments have been received at the time of writing this report -24 in support and $\frac{498}{507}$ objections.	
33	Amend Paragraph 4.4.2 to read as follows:	N/A
	Comments in support of the application are summarised as follows:	
	A perfectly intelligently designed addition to a quite lovely but perfectly ordinary street remarkable simply for its preservation in such a central area of London.	

	This building will enhance the streetscene.
	 The proposal is an exemplary piece of small-scale architecture which should be a model for similar fine-grain
	interventions not just in Lambeth, but anywhere requiring contextual architecture in a historic environment.
	 The formal requirements of the brief have been achieved without compromising the possibility of re-instituting
	the urban qualities which once characterised the site.
	 The diamond pattern of the street façade is a reminder of the geometry of the roofscape of Roupell Street; the
	use of brick is a nod to the 19th century housing and the infants' school which once extended to the street
	<u>line.</u>
	 The street line has been strengthened and restored, but not in a way that disrupts the architectural integrity of
the whole.	
	 This proposal is an example of architectural modesty, where dimensions and proportions have been made
	subservient to the existing context, while still producing what is clearly a contemporary addition with its own
	complementary architectural character.
	It is the successful combination of new and old which make this project, though of small scale, a model which
	should be emulated in those parts of London requiring a strong but sensitive hand.
	 Proposal has designed a high quality and attractive building that fits in with surroundings.
34	In a set multiple this etions within table we don Danaguagh A.A.A. or fallows.
34	Insert public objections within table under Paragraph 4.4.4 as follows:
	While myself and 11k other residents and Whilst a petition was received for the
	those in favour of conservation have signed previous application (15/03847/LB), no
	a petition, this has been completely ignored petition has been received for the current
	by the Council. applications.
	EF Foreign Language school, has been This is incorrect. Officers have made a
	given permission by Lambeth Council to go recommendation to the Planning
	forward with a complete extension and Committee for approval. Should
	renovation of the Victorian school and Committee Members agree with the
	property. recommendation, the application will then
	be approved. Should they not agree, the
	application will be refused.

the Infants' School; however, the courtyard was originally three sided until the addition of the Infants' School and this state was restored following its demolition. All the elevations are as one composition with a hierarchy of detail from the street facing	Officers agree that there is a hierarchy of detailing on the building, with the gable ends being more highly decorative. The reinstatement of the courtyard on the footprint of the former Infants Hall is considered to be acceptable in principle by the Georgian Society and the Victorian Society.	
linked by its architecture and historic use. It is clear that these buildings were meant to be seen together. Together with the philanthropic flats, this represents an	The proposed extension would only visible for a limited range of vantage points close to the site itself given the linear nature of the street, its narrowness and the limited 2 storey scale and set back building line of the proposal.	
There is no greater education capacity and nothing to suggest that the school would be unviable without the extension or that there is any risk to the listed school building.	To clarify, the public benefit arising from the proposal is the rationalisation of the existing building which would improve the overall quality of the educational accommodation (including classrooms), which acts as a clear benefit to the quality	

	The suggestion in the report that the host building would be enhanced as a heritage asset by the proposal as a result of the reenclosure of the courtyard is not adequately justified. The building was listed after the loss of the infants' wing.	of teaching and learning that takes place on site. The school is optimising its viable use without harm the special interest of the site. Officers have stated that the proposed extension will return the listed building closer to its original plan form and is a heritage benefit. The Georgian Society and the Victorian Society consider the reinstatement of the plan form acceptable in principle.	
	The amenity societies and Historic England all agree to a greater or lesser extent that the proposals are overly dominant and assertive in the street scene and would cause harm to heritage assets.	Officers disagree and believe this is a good contemporary contextual response to the listed site and the setting of the two conservation areas. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Roupell Street CA and Waterloo CA – due weight has been afforded and this identified harm is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. This is addressed in Sections 6.2.76-6.2.94 of the report.	
53	and Design Officer has noted that the courtyard Conservation Area and make a positive contribuidentified within the Waterloo Conservation Area	re contribution to the Waterloo Conservation Area. The Conservation is one of a number of courtyards located within the Waterloo ution to the Waterloo Conservation Area. The other open spaces are St John's, Hatfields and Peabody Estate between Henry Hout paragraph 2.15 of the Conservation Area statement notes:	

	"that private open space in the form of private gardens or communal gardens is very limited within the conservation area and is thus a scarce resource which should be retained not just for the wellbeing of residents but also for the character of the conservation area, important examples can be found within the Peabody Estate between Henry House and Edward Henry House. Trees are an important visual amenity within the conservation area, there are two important groups of trees – St johns courtyards and the open space at Hatfield." The Waterloo Conservation Area Statement further states at paragraph 2.20 that: "the only open space St John's Churchyard is shabby and requires work." The demolition of the existing post-war railings and front boundary treatments are not considered to result in harm to the Waterloo Conservation Area.	
61	Amend and clarify Paragraph 6.2.81 as follows: The rationalisation of the internal layout of the school would be-result in a more functional space, improving the overall layout of the school and improved social space for its students, enhancing the internal academic environment. • The extension to the school would provide a qualitative improvement to the teaching facilities already provided by the school to allow for the continued improvement of educational provision, rather than a quantitative increase in classroom numbers or student numbers; • The proposed extension to the school allows for the improvement of teaching spaces and the improvement and provision of support and ancillary spaces which are necessary for the school to function; • The proposed extension provides space for ancillary support facilities such as the café to move from the existing building, freeing up space to allow the improvement of teaching spaces / classrooms. For example, on the second floor, 13 classrooms are currently provided, by freeing up space within the existing building, only 11 classrooms now need to be provided within the same floorspace, and the 2 additional classrooms have been moved to space previously used for support / ancillary uses. This acts as a clear benefit, improving the quality of educational teaching spaces, and in conjunction the overall educational experience. The total number of teaching spaces and classrooms remains the same – but the size of the spaces / rooms can be increased as part of the proposed development to create higher quality teaching accommodation. • Alongside an increase in the size of classrooms (resulting in an increase in teaching space from 826sqm to 947.58sqm), the quality of the space provided has also been enhanced, through improvements to ventilation of the spaces;	N/A

	The extension also allows for further improvements to the staff areas, including lesson preparation areas to teachers. This clearly acts as a further benefit.	
	While the existing building is satisfactory, the proposed development seeks to improve the overall quality of the educational accommodation (including classrooms), which acts as a clear benefit to the quality of teaching and learning that takes place on site.	
61	Amend Paragraph 6.2.82 as follows:	N/A
	The use of the site as a school has benefits for the wider area, including student / staff spend, and the provision of high quality educational services. The proposed extension would ensure that the original use of the site (Use class D1 – school) would be retained on the site. school would be able optimise the viable use of the building.	