



## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – SECOND ADDENDUM (PUBLISHED 14 MARCH 2018)**

Date: **Wednesday 14 March 2018**

Time: **7.00 pm**

Venue: **Committee Room B6, Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton Hill SW2 1RW**

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 Nigel Haselden, Councillor Diana Morris, Councillor Mohammed Seedat, 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:  
Henry Langford, Telephone: 020 7926 1065; Email: [hlangford@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:hlangford@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.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SECOND ADDENDUM – 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

**Land at Clarence Avenue, Poynders Road, Atkins Road, Kings Avenue, New Park Road and Streatham Place including Clapham Park Estate Adjacent Land and Agnes Riley Gardens**

**17/03733/FUL**

Page no.	Amendment	Change to decision notice?																																																																
3	<p>To correct an error, update the ‘Completed site area’ table as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="315 619 1541 1054"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">Tenure</th> <th colspan="8">Accommodation Schedule</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Studio</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5"><b>Completed site area</b></td> <td>Private</td> <td>8</td> <td>617</td> <td>942</td> <td>300</td> <td>25</td> <td>15</td> <td></td> <td>1,907</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable rented</td> <td>8</td> <td>423</td> <td><del>640</del> 638</td> <td>518</td> <td>84</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>1,675 (41.1%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intermediate</td> <td></td> <td>211</td> <td>253</td> <td>31</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>495 (12.1%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall affordable</td> <td>8</td> <td>634</td> <td>891</td> <td>549</td> <td>84</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>2,170 (53.2%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>16</b></td> <td><b>1251</b></td> <td><del>1835</del> 1833</td> <td><b>849</b></td> <td><b>109</b></td> <td><b>19</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>4077</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Tenure	Accommodation Schedule								Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	<b>Completed site area</b>	Private	8	617	942	300	25	15		1,907	Affordable rented	8	423	<del>640</del> 638	518	84	4		1,675 (41.1%)	Intermediate		211	253	31				495 (12.1%)	Overall affordable	8	634	891	549	84	4		2,170 (53.2%)	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1251</b>	<del>1835</del> 1833	<b>849</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>4077</b>	No
	Tenure			Accommodation Schedule																																																														
		Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																									
<b>Completed site area</b>	Private	8	617	942	300	25	15		1,907																																																									
	Affordable rented	8	423	<del>640</del> 638	518	84	4		1,675 (41.1%)																																																									
	Intermediate		211	253	31				495 (12.1%)																																																									
	Overall affordable	8	634	891	549	84	4		2,170 (53.2%)																																																									
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1251</b>	<del>1835</del> 1833	<b>849</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>4077</b>																																																									
24	<p>Update paragraph 3.4 (Proposals) to read as follows:</p> <p>3.4 The proposed masterplan is residential-led. The application seeks full planning permission for <del>2,532</del> 2,535 new homes, replacing the 864 homes to be demolished and creating a net addition of <del>1,668</del> 1,771 homes.</p>	No																																																																
75/76/77	<p>Additional comments received from the Thornton Ward Councillors, set out below:</p> <p><i>Retail provision</i>  <i>You will have noted that in the officers’ report that the loss of shops at Poynders Parade effectively removes this as a Local Centre, shifting the Local Centre to Kings Avenue. You will also have noted that this is a proposal in the Local Plan Review</i></p>	No																																																																

*with the results of consultation on the proposal still being reviewed by officers. Members should be aware that to agree to the elimination of Poynders Parade is therefore a high order planning decision – effectively making a Local Plan Review decision as part of a development management decision – and should be approached with all the seriousness that such a decision requires.*

*In the discussions we have had with the applicants during the development of this application, it has been suggested that some of the ground floor space at the Clarence Avenue end of the scheme could be converted to commercial space without drastically affecting the proposals as a whole. We would welcome such flexibility. Unfortunately it doesn't seem to have been carried forward in the proposals that are before you.*

*Play space*

*We ask that the committee satisfies itself that the access to a range of play facilities in all parts of the estate does not involve crossing busy roads. Condition 48 might need strengthening in this regard.*

*Agnes Riley Gardens*

*We are pleased that officers are now recommending an uprated S106 contribution to the park and would encourage the committee to endorse that approach. We are also pleased that officers are recommending a diagonal crossing across the Clarence Avenue/ Poynders Road/Atkins Road junction reflecting desire lines. However, we would not want the trigger for the S106 to be tied to building C01. We see this as too late in the development process.*

*Health facilities*

*We would suggest that the space for a health facility is retained until a review much further into the development programme shows that it is not needed.*

*Construction Management and Logistics*

*There should be full notification to residents both on and off the estate of disruptive activities and provision of responsive communication channels. The conditions call for the identification of sensitive receptors. This should be widened to include vulnerable residents who will need to be warned of noisy phases in the development process.*

*We would ask that the committee requires the CEMP at each phase to be returned to committee for deliberation following local consultation.*

*Transport/Highways*

*We ask that there should be a management plan for the bus stands that would prohibit idling. In asking for this we are responding to the concerns expressed by residents about the noise that this practice generates. But idling should of course not be tolerated for air quality reasons.*

*We note that officers refer to the need to ensure that permeable routes through the estate are maintained throughout the construction (para. 7.5.4) but we are not sure that this is given adequate expression in the proposed phasing condition (3) nor in the reasons for its imposition.*

*We support the officers' proposals to ensure accessible and useable cycle parking securing them through condition 41.*

*Design detailing, daylight and sunlight*

*We wonder whether some further levelling of the Zone E site might reduce the heights at the boundary to good effect, in terms of the sense of enclosure experienced by surrounding properties. But whatever is decided on that score, there should be very clear guidance that if planning consent is granted strict adherence to datum levels is guaranteed.*

*We have not been able to find any assessment of the impact on 84 Kings Avenue and the development to its rear. We are concerned about any potential impact on the amenity space at the back of this housing association accommodation which is also bordered by the new Glenbrook primary school buildings.*

*In respect of daylight and sunlight impacts on Site A - We would ask the committee to consider whether there may be some minor amendments to this part of the proposed development that would mitigate these impacts.*

*Waste*

*The detail of the waste arrangements are to be secured by condition (38). We feel strongly that the application for discharge of that condition should be accompanied by a study of the efficacy of the current underground facilities and their contribution to the recycling rate.*

*Trees*

*And as with all developments we would like to see any replacement trees being as mature as is consistent with arboricultural practice.*

*Provision of elderly accommodation*

*Site C07 is proposed to include provision for retirement living. We welcome this as compensation for the loss of the Langholm Close sheltered accommodation. However, it is not clear to us that there is a requirement, in the way that the permission is proposed to be framed, to provide this replacement. We think that there should be such a requirement in order that all generations are adequately catered for on the redeveloped estate.*

79	<p>Update table at paragraph 6.48 to reflect 4 additional comments and/or letters of objection were received since publication of the first addendum. Responses are provided below where these raise issues in addition to those already identified:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="353 258 1845 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="353 258 1070 296">Summary of Objections</th> <th data-bbox="1070 258 1845 296">Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 296 1070 331"><b>Design / Amenity</b></td> <td data-bbox="1070 296 1845 331"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 331 1070 507">The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent are too high and the change in the architectural language for the new blocks reduces the quality of the space and coherence of the design vision.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 331 1845 507">In relation to design: please refer to 7.7 (d)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 507 1070 673">The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent will block light into the park which diminishes its usability. I would wholeheartedly support the proposals if these elements were reconsidered.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 507 1845 673">In relation to daylight/sunlight impacts on amenity spaces: please refer to 7.6 (g)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 673 1070 708"><b>Other</b></td> <td data-bbox="1070 673 1845 708"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 708 1070 817">Metropolitan's responses to the loss of leasehold properties have been inadequate.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 708 1845 817">Whilst officers have encouraged positive dialogue between residents and Metropolitan, this is not a material planning consideration.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 817 1070 1066">Issues relating to the loss of leasehold properties.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 817 1845 1066">Whilst the relocation of existing market sale accommodation tenants is not a material consideration in relation to the planning application, officers are aware that the proposed development makes provision for intermediate accommodation, which officers understand will include shared equity options for existing leaseholders. The Section 106 Agreement will secure the provision of these intermediate units.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 1066 1070 1158">Insufficient time to comment following publication of the committee report.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 1066 1845 1158">The LPA has carried out consultation in excess of statutory requirements on the planning application.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 1158 1070 1401">Requests for deferral of the item at committee on the basis of additional information being uploaded online on 6<sup>th</sup> March. Further time required to assess this information.</td> <td data-bbox="1070 1158 1845 1401"> <p>The new drawings uploaded to the public access system this week reflect minor amendments to the scheme listed on page 53 of the committee report at paragraph 3.204.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18 of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement states that where an application has been amended, the Council will decide whether further publicity and consultation</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Summary of Objections	Response	<b>Design / Amenity</b>		The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent are too high and the change in the architectural language for the new blocks reduces the quality of the space and coherence of the design vision.	In relation to design: please refer to 7.7 (d)	The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent will block light into the park which diminishes its usability. I would wholeheartedly support the proposals if these elements were reconsidered.	In relation to daylight/sunlight impacts on amenity spaces: please refer to 7.6 (g)	<b>Other</b>		Metropolitan's responses to the loss of leasehold properties have been inadequate.	Whilst officers have encouraged positive dialogue between residents and Metropolitan, this is not a material planning consideration.	Issues relating to the loss of leasehold properties.	Whilst the relocation of existing market sale accommodation tenants is not a material consideration in relation to the planning application, officers are aware that the proposed development makes provision for intermediate accommodation, which officers understand will include shared equity options for existing leaseholders. The Section 106 Agreement will secure the provision of these intermediate units.	Insufficient time to comment following publication of the committee report.	The LPA has carried out consultation in excess of statutory requirements on the planning application.	Requests for deferral of the item at committee on the basis of additional information being uploaded online on 6 <sup>th</sup> March. Further time required to assess this information.	<p>The new drawings uploaded to the public access system this week reflect minor amendments to the scheme listed on page 53 of the committee report at paragraph 3.204.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18 of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement states that where an application has been amended, the Council will decide whether further publicity and consultation</p>	No
Summary of Objections	Response																			
<b>Design / Amenity</b>																				
The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent are too high and the change in the architectural language for the new blocks reduces the quality of the space and coherence of the design vision.	In relation to design: please refer to 7.7 (d)																			
The height of the blocks to the south east of the crescent will block light into the park which diminishes its usability. I would wholeheartedly support the proposals if these elements were reconsidered.	In relation to daylight/sunlight impacts on amenity spaces: please refer to 7.6 (g)																			
<b>Other</b>																				
Metropolitan's responses to the loss of leasehold properties have been inadequate.	Whilst officers have encouraged positive dialogue between residents and Metropolitan, this is not a material planning consideration.																			
Issues relating to the loss of leasehold properties.	Whilst the relocation of existing market sale accommodation tenants is not a material consideration in relation to the planning application, officers are aware that the proposed development makes provision for intermediate accommodation, which officers understand will include shared equity options for existing leaseholders. The Section 106 Agreement will secure the provision of these intermediate units.																			
Insufficient time to comment following publication of the committee report.	The LPA has carried out consultation in excess of statutory requirements on the planning application.																			
Requests for deferral of the item at committee on the basis of additional information being uploaded online on 6 <sup>th</sup> March. Further time required to assess this information.	<p>The new drawings uploaded to the public access system this week reflect minor amendments to the scheme listed on page 53 of the committee report at paragraph 3.204.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18 of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement states that where an application has been amended, the Council will decide whether further publicity and consultation</p>																			

		<p>is necessary, taking into account the public interest in the initial application and the nature and scale of the amendment relative to the initial application.</p> <p>In this instance, officers consider the amendments, as depicted in the revised drawings and set out within the revised documents, to be minor in nature and scale relative to the initial application and to any public interest in the application. None of the amendments result in an increase in the scale or massing of the proposed buildings to that proposed in the initial application. Officers therefore do not consider that any further consultation is necessary in this instance.</p>	
96	<p>Update paragraph 7.1.31 to read as follows:</p> <p>7.1.31 The section 106 relevant to this application is awaiting completion, subject to completion of a Development Agreement. Should this not happen <del>, the allocation will remain in place (pursuant to the 2008 outline planning permission)- and the decision is not issued,</del> <u>the provisions in the 2008 Section 106 Agreement will need to be carried over into the new agreement to ensure any future education provision is secured on this site.</u></p>		No
102	<p>Update the section regarding Agnes Riley Gardens. Delete paragraph 7.1.61 and replace with the following text:</p> <p>7.1.58 Agnes Riley Gardens A contribution of £150k towards Agnes Riley Gardens was secured under the 2008 outline planning permission. The contribution was to be spent wholly on the park. The payment was index linked and was payable prior to commencement of Phase 2. As of December 2017 the contribution stood at £205,921.</p> <p>7.1.59 Following the adoption of the Lambeth Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule in 2014, new development is bound by the provisions in the CIL regulations, specifically regulations 122 and 123. Under regulation 123, the Council has published a list setting out the types of infrastructure projects that the Council intends "<i>will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL</i>". The list includes "<i>improvements and maintenance of existing parks and open space</i>" under the Public Realm Improvements heading.</p> <p>7.1.60 Officers <u>still</u> consider that the improvements to Agnes Riley Gardens are fundamental to the delivery of the wider open space strategy to ensure high quality open space is provided to all new and existing residents across the estate.</p>		No

	<p><del>7.1.61 The park is located within the development red line and is therefore directly linked to the development. As a result officers consider the contribution would satisfy the three tests in regulation 122 in that is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development, and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The existing contribution should therefore be included in the new Section 106 Agreement, starting at £206k and subject to indexation. The trigger for payment is indicatively prior to first occupation of Block C01, which is closest to the park.</del></p> <p><u>7.1.61 In order to secure this contribution under Section 106 in accordance with regulation 122, an application for a separate Deed of Variation has been made in order to bring the contribution forward into Phase 1 (Section 1) of the development (ref. 18/01174/S106). The Phase 1 obligations (also referred to as Section 1) in the 2008 Section 106 Agreement will remain in place upon completion of the new S106 Agreement (unless where otherwise specified). The trigger for the payment is to be agreed, but would be linked to earlier of either the completion of the Phase 1 development or a specific time period elapsing.</u></p>	
107	<p>Update paragraph 7.2.20 to read as follows:</p> <p>7.2.20 The proposed development provides an uplift of 529 affordable housing units, i.e. those units are not replacing those which have been demolished. Of those 495 <u>383</u> are intermediate,...</p>	No
173	<p>Update 7.6.31 to make reference to block E01C as opposed to E03C.</p>	No
183	<p>Additional sentence to be added at 7.6.70 in relation to Victoria House:</p> <p><u>Officers conclude that there would be no harm to the listed building.</u></p>	No
195	<p>Insert new bullet point under 'Community Facilities' head of term, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land for educational purposes to be transferred to the Council and a financial contribution of £2.25m.</li> </ul> <p>This ensures that if the current application for the new Primary School on New Park Road is not issued, the provisions remain in place as per the 2008 Section 106 Agreement and 2008 outline planning permission.</p>	No
196	<p>Delete the fourth bullet point under 'Parks, open soaces and public realm' head of term, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Contribution of £206k towards Agnes Riley Gardens — prior to first occupation of block C01.</del></li> </ul>	No

	This reflects the agreement to secure this contribution via a Deed of Variation under Phase 1 of the development.																	
197	<p>Insert new bullet point under 'Reduction in carbon emissions' head of term, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to deliver the district heating and energy centre to link up the estate in accordance with the timing set out in the approved Energy Strategy.</li> </ul>	No																
204	<p>Amendment to condition 5 as follows, as it is not possible for C08 to be delivered prior to the demolition of the southern section of Site C01 and officers consider that suitable local centre provisions can otherwise be made available.</p> <p>5. Retention of Local Centre</p> <p>The southern section of Site C01 of the development hereby permitted, including demolition of Poynders Parade, shall not be commenced prior to the occupation of Site D <del>and C08</del>.</p> <p>Reason: To maintain the presence of a Local Centre within the estate (Lambeth Local Plan (2015) Policy ED10).</p>	Yes																
216	<p>Design and Access Statement, prepared by PRP Architects (July 2017), <u>with additional amendments indicated in the drawings listed where appropriate;</u></p> <p>Sustainability Statement, prepared by Greengage (July 2017), <u>with additional information where appropriate;</u></p> <p>Energy Assessment, prepared by Greengage (July 2017), <u>with additional information where appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>Utilities Assessment, prepared by Hoare Lea (July 2017); and</u></p> <p><u>AA6200 – Clapham Park – Schedule of Accommodation, dated 22/01/2018 rev. T.</u></p> <p><u>Outline Construction Management / Logistics Plan (July 2017)</u></p>	Yes																
217	<p>The following drawings are updated to reflect changes described in paragraph 3.204 of the report:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="315 1129 1715 1383"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4"><b>Masterplan drawings (Site Elevations / Sections)</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ZZZZ West Elevation - Clarence Avenue</td> <td>CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02200_P02</td> <td>A0</td> <td>P01 P02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ZZZZ East-West Elevations - Green Avenue 1</td> <td>CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02201_P02</td> <td>A0</td> <td>P01- P02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ZZZZ East-West Elevatons - Green Avenue 2</td> <td>CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02202_P02</td> <td>A0</td> <td>P01 P02</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Masterplan drawings (Site Elevations / Sections)</b>				ZZZZ West Elevation - Clarence Avenue	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02200_P02	A0	P01 P02	ZZZZ East-West Elevations - Green Avenue 1	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02201_P02	A0	P01- P02	ZZZZ East-West Elevatons - Green Avenue 2	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02202_P02	A0	P01 P02	Yes
<b>Masterplan drawings (Site Elevations / Sections)</b>																		
ZZZZ West Elevation - Clarence Avenue	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02200_P02	A0	P01 P02															
ZZZZ East-West Elevations - Green Avenue 1	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02201_P02	A0	P01- P02															
ZZZZ East-West Elevatons - Green Avenue 2	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02202_P02	A0	P01 P02															

	ZZZZ East-West Elevations - South Circular-Green Avenue 3-Crescent	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02203_P02	A0	P01 P02		
	ZZZZ North-South Elevations - Central Park	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02204_P02	A0	P01 P02		
	ZZZZ East Elevation - Kings Avenue	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02205_P02	A0	P01 P02		
	ZZZZ North-South Elevations - Crescent	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02206_P02	A0	P01 P02		
	ZZZZ South Elevation - South Circular Road	CP-PRP-ZZZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02207_P02	A0	P01 P02		