PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 18 April 2017 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Ben Kind (Substitute), Councillor Diana Morris (Vice-Chair), Councillor Mohammed Seedat and Councillor Clair Wilcox (Chair)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Bernard Gentry and Councillor Joanne Simpson

ALSO PRESENT:

1. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS
   In relation to applications 16/07054/FUL and 16/07055/LB (Lambeth Palace), Councillor Nigel Haselden stated that a relative of his worked for a company involved in the application, but that it did not amount to a pecuniary interest. He had had no discussions on the application with the family member.

   Regarding applications 16/07054/FUL and 16/07055/LB (Lambeth Palace), Councillor Clair Wilcox stated that she was a communicant member of the Church of England, but that this was not a pecuniary interest.

2. MINUTES
   RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 March 2017 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

   The Chair announced a provisional timetable for the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 9.9.1.

3. 41-45 ACRE LANE (BRIXTON HILL) 16/03327/FUL
   Case No. 16/03327/FUL (agenda item three, page 11 of the agenda pack and page one of the addendum).

   The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included a summary of the report and subsequent addendum that had been published on Thursday 13 April. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included/and noted that the demolition of the existing building, the erection of an up to six storey mixed use development, the provision of affordable and shared ownership homes, the previously
refused application and the impact on nearby heritage assets and on Sudbourne Primary School. Members were shown views of the existing site, the proposed floor plans, elevations of the proposed and a rejected scheme and elevations of the wider area.

Following the officer’s presentation, the objector raised the following concerns:

- Nearby residents were not opposed to development in principle, but to this application. 92% of residents who submitted responses objected to the application.
- The majority of nearby homes were three storeys and a basement and neighbouring retail units were low rise.
- The proposal was out of keeping with the area.

The architect then provided the following information in support of the application:

- Following the rejected application the design had been reconsidered. The design had been reduced in size.
- The roof would be set back on the north side.
- It was important to emphasise the corner of the site and the design achieved this.

Officers then provided the following information in response to questions from Members:

- The nearby retail uses would not meet current design standards and it was key to reflect the existing context and establish a future context.
- Ivor House to the east of the site was four storeys with a mansard roof and Sandhurst Court to the west was having an additional floor added. While there were two storey villas, these were anomalous.
- Corner buildings were often taller than neighbouring buildings.
- Contrasting roof elements were included to contrast with the brickwork.
- When balcony space was included with communal amenity space, there was more amenity space than required by policy. All flats would meet minimum standards.
- Developer profit levels of 17-20% were towards the higher end of London Plan guidance. The viability of the proposal had been independently assessed.
- For community safety reasons, separate access to the affordable housing units was required. In addition, providing access from the affordable units to communal areas would raise issues of charging for that access.
- There was a condition in place relating to cycle storage.
- The retail units were of a typical size of the area and would be serviced from Acre Lane. Providing three smaller units, rather than one large unit, gave greater flexibility. Viability of retail units was not a material planning consideration.
- Permitted Development rights only applied to offices in office use in 2013 and did not apply to new offices.

The committee considered points raised by speakers and information provided by officers in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:

- The concerns from the 2015 application had been addressed.
- It was not clear that there was sufficient argument for 20% profit for
the developer or that there had been enough pressure on the developer to achieve an acceptable level of affordable housing provision.

- There was an overbearing nature of the massing.
- While the application was a clear improvement on the earlier application, it was not clear that the existing building line was adequately referenced.
- There was variety of building heights and styles in the area. The application was simplified and more uniform than the previous application.
- The need to replicate retail space was not clear, as this was not in a primary shopping area.
- The corner treatment did not meet expectations.
- The application should be refused based on the treatment of the corner element, the bulk, scale and massing, and the relationship to the surrounding area presently and in the future.

It was MOVED by Councillor Wilcox, SECONDED by Councillor Clark, and RESOLVED, by five votes to one

To REFUSE planning permission against officers’ recommendations for reasons related to the following:

i. Failure to meet Policy Q7 (i)
ii. Failure to meet Policy Q7 (ii)

To delegate the detailed formulation of the reasons to the Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development

It was then RESOLVED, unanimously

In the event that there is an appeal, to delegate to the Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development 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.

4. LAMBETH PALACE, LAMBETH PALACE ROAD (BISHOPS)
   16/07054/FUL AND 16/07055/LB

Case No. 16/07054/FUL and 16/07055/LB (agenda item five, page 81 of the agenda pack and page four of the addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included a summary of the report and subsequent addendum that had been published on Thursday 13 April 2017. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included the erection of an up to nine-storey building, the provision of a new library for Lambeth Palace, the impact on heritage assets, views and the garden, and the public benefits of the scheme.

The applicant and architects then provided the following information in support of the application:

- The Library was one of the country’s oldest public libraries and was of national and international significance. It held some of the most important religious collections in Europe and had large collections on social history.
• The Library was an integral part of Lambeth Palace, but was currently in unsuitable accommodation, including provision off-site. The application would protect and conserve the collections for the future on the Lambeth Palace site.
• The proposed block would echo the style of the fifteenth-century Morton’s Tower.
• There would be limited harm to heritage assets and any harm would be outweighed by the public benefits. Historic England was supportive of the application.
• The application would provide better disabled access to the collection and would raise the public profile of the collection.
• The applicant had worked with the Council and TfL on vehicle servicing. The servicing area would be able to accommodate Transit-size vehicles and refuse would be collected from Lambeth Palace Road.
• Blue badge parking would be provided and there would be 26 spaces for cycle parking.
• Two trees were proposed to be removed and there would be three replacement trees.

Members of the Committee viewed a model of the proposal. The Planning Officer gave Members an explanation of the wider context of the area.

Officers then provided the following information in response to questions from Members:
• The upper floor and terrace would primarily be used for seminars and lectures. Currently the only space in the Palace suitable for lectures was the Great Hall, which was not appropriate for smaller groups.
• Library events were primarily lectures and were generally held in the early evening. Condition 19 would require noise levels to be measured from the nearest sensitive receptor to prevent harm to neighbouring properties.
• No additional street lighting would be provided.
• The upper floor would have a capacity of approximately 60 people. There were no anticipated issues with the highway network as the majority of visitors would walk, cycle or use public transport.
• There would be early evening seminars approximately once per month. There was an aim to open the library to the public periodically to raise money for charity, as was currently done with the garden.
• Following an assessment of pedestrian crossing facilities, officers had concluded that there was no need for additional provision. There was a signalled pedestrian crossing 150 metres from the proposed library entrance and kerbs by the informal pedestrian island crossing would be dropped to improve accessibility.
• The design of the application had incorporated concepts of the Palace, such as hand cut red bricks. While the proposal was large and near heritage assets, the Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings supported the application and the design was of high quality.
• The top floor would not be lit.
• Replacement trees would be of a mixed age and size to reflect the existing trees. The replacement trees would reach maturity in 10-15 years.
• The view of Lambeth Palace from Victoria Tower Gardens would
not be harmed by the application.

- An informative could be used to request that bricks currently used in the wall between the Palace gardens and Archbishop’s Park be retained and reused.
- Officers could work with the applicant on a visitor management plan, rather than cap the number of evening events. This should be done through an amendment to the s106 agreement.
- The application would not meet the tests to require a s106 obligation regarding employment and training. The Palace currently worked with Camberwell College to provide trainee conservator posts and intended to continue this arrangement.

The committee considered points raised by speakers and information provided by officers in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:

- While the proposal was bulky, it had been designed to minimise harm.
- A different design could have better mitigated impacts on heritage and conservation.
- There was a lack of restrictions on the usage of the top floor.
- The application would achieve the aims of preserving the archive and keeping it on site.
- The public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets.
- The application would enhance the skyline of the area.

It was MOVED by Councillor Wilcox, SECONDED by Councillor Haselden, and

RESOLVED, by five votes to one

To GRANT planning permission subject to any direction that may be received following referral to the Mayor of London and subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as outlined in the officer’s report and published addenda and the following:

i. With regard to the Visitor Management Plan, which is to be included within the Section 106 Agreement, to include details of evening events (with details provided of number of events per annum, number of people attending and duration) and monitoring of the amenity impact;

ii. An informative requesting that the applicant retain and reuse bricks which were currently in the wall separating the Palace Garden and Archbishop’s Park.

To agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Development:
To finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning, Transport and Development (in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair) considers reasonably necessary; and
To negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in this report pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, including adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms as the Director of Planning, Transport and Development (in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair) considers reasonably necessary.
To delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning and Development to refuse planning permission in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed (by 30th May 2017) on the grounds that the development would have an unacceptable impact on – transport and highways; street-trees, visitor management, sustainability and local labour in construction.

It was then MOVED by Councillor Wilcox, SECONDED by Councillor Clark, and RESOLVED, by five votes to one abstention

TO GRANT Listed Building consent subject to conditions as outlined in the officer’s report.

To agree to delegate authority to the Interim Director of Planning, Transport and Development to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning, Transport and Development (in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair) considers reasonably necessary.

5. COUNTY HALL RIVERSIDE BUILDING (BISHOPS) 17/00311/FUL AND 17/00312/LB

Case No. 17/00311/FUL and 17/00312/LB (agenda item four, page 57 of the agenda pack, page one of the addendum and page one of the second addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included a summary of the report and subsequent addenda that had been published on Thursday 13 April and the day of the meeting. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included the change of use for part of the third floor, the provision of 2,776m2 of office space and the bringing back into use of a currently unused space.

Officers then provided the following information in response to questions from Members:

- The lifts would not be replaced.
- The same company would manage the main office space and the co-working space.

The committee considered information provided by officers in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:

- Previous concerns regarding the appearance of the roofscape had been addressed through screening of plant.
- The addenda included conditions that would ensure that there was no harm to heritage assets.

It was MOVED by Councillor Kind, SECONDED by Councillor Clark, and RESOLVED, unanimously

1. To grant planning permission, subject to the satisfactory completion of a section 106 agreement and conditions as set out in the officer’s report.
2. Agree to delegate authority of the Director of Planning and Development to:
a. Finalise the recommended conditions; and
b. Negotiate, agree and finalise the recommended planning obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning and Development to refuse planning permission in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed on the grounds that the development would have an unacceptable impact on local labour in construction.

It was then MOVED by Councillor Morris, SECONDED by Councillor Haselden, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To GRANT Listed Building consent subject to conditions as set out in the officer’s report.

To delegate authority of the Director of Planning and Development to finalise the recommended conditions.

6. **SOUTHBANK CENTRE, BELVEDERE ROAD (BISHOPS) 17/00910/FUL, 17/00911/ADV AND 17/00912/LB**

Case Nos. 17/00910/FUL, 17/00912/ADV and 17/00913/LB (agenda item six, page 159 of the agenda pack, page seven of the addendum and page two of the second addendum).

Members agreed to forego the officer’s presentation as the Committee was familiar with the application and the site.

Officers provided the following information in response to questions from Members:
- There would be access to the riverside and this had been clarified in the first addendum.
- The large panel would be the same as the previous year’s, with the festival logo and the sponsor.

The committee considered information provided by officers in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:
- The application was largely the same as the previous year’s and early concerns had been addressed.

It was MOVED by Councillor Wilcox, SECONDED by Councillor Seedat, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined in the officer’s report and published addenda.

It was then MOVED by Councillor Clark, SECONDED by Councillor Seedat, and

RESOLVED, unanimously
To grant Listed Building consent subject to conditions as outlined in the officer’s report.

It was then MOVED by Councillor Morris, SECONDED by Councillor Haselden, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To GRANT Advertisement consent subject to conditions as outlined in the officer’s report.

7. HUNGERFORD COACH PARK, SOUTH BANK (BISHOPS)
17/01183/FUL AND 17/01184/ADV
Case Nos. 17/01183/FUL and 17/01184/ADV (agenda item seven, page 185 of the agenda pack, page 10 of the addendum and page four of the second addendum).

The Chair explained that as the Committee was familiar with the site and there were few differences to previous years’ applications, there would not be an officer’s presentation.

Officers provided the following information in response to questions from Members:

- The inconsistency of phasing dates had been addressed in the addenda. The first phase would start on 19 April.
- The tent would be the same as had been used in previous years, without the legs or udders. It would be blue, not purple as previously.
- Following the Westminster terror attack, officers had requested further security details and the applicant had had discussions with the Police. There would be a concrete barrier behind the hoarding.
- The applicant took security very seriously and the level of risk had not changed. There was a large amount of CCTV in the area and there would be CCTV within the site.

The committee considered information provided by officers and the applicant in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:

- There had been some concerns around security but these had been mitigated.
- The use of Metropolitan Open Land was not compliant with policy but the report had justified this exception.

It was MOVED by Councillor Seedat, SECONDED by Councillor Haselden, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined in the officer’s report and published addenda and the following:

i. Amendment to Condition 1 to include the correct start date.
It was then MOVED by Councillor Kind, SECONDED by Councillor Haselden, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To GRANT advertisement consent subject to conditions as outlined in the officer’s report.

8. **PLANNING APPEAL AND ENFORCEMENT DECISIONS DECEMBER 2016**

Members noted the results and thanked officers for their effort in defending the Council’s decisions. The Chair advised Members to read the appeal decision for 124 Dalberg Road, which had been rejected by the Committee but allowed at appeal.

The Chair thanked Councillor Morris for her work as Deputy Chair and Chair of the Committee.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm
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