

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday 5 October 2021 at 7.00 pm

Committee Room (B6) - Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton, London, SW2 1RW

PRESENT: Councillor Scarlett O'Hara (Vice-Chair), Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Ibrahim Dogus, Councillor Mohammed Seedat, Councillor Iain Simpson, Councillor Joanne Simpson (Chair) and Councillor Becca Thackray

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor David Amos

1 Declaration of Pecuniary Interests

Councillor Joanne Simpson declared that she would stand down for Items 5 and 6, as she was the Ward Councillor where both application sites were located. Councillor Joanne Simpson declared that she would be speaking as a Ward Councillor on Item 5 only. Councillors Malcolm Clark, Mohammed Seedat and Ibrahim Dogus stated that while they did not have any pecuniary interests, there were applications that were based in their wards. However, all three Councillors confirmed they had not been involved in any discussions and would approach decision-making with an open mind.

2 Evelina Children's Hospital St Thomas' Hospital 249 Westminster Bridge Road (Bishop's) 21/01869/FUL

Case No. 21/01869/FUL, (agenda item 2, page 19 of the agenda pack, page 11 of the first addendum).

The officer introduced the application and stated that:

- The proposed site was adjacent to the existing Evelina Hospital and contained two buildings, St Thomas' House and Dunhill Fitness Centre.
- The proposal sought to demolish the two buildings and replace them with a 12-storey building with a basement and link extension to the existing Evelina Children's Hospital.
- It would provide additional children's medical services as the hospital currently cared for over 100,000 children and their families annually and more bed spaces were required.
- The hospital capacity would increase to allow more paediatric services to be delivered from one location as well as additional research capacity.
- Officers assessed that there would be six instances of a low degree of less than substantial harm to surrounding heritage assets.
- The proposal would provide 27 short stay cycle spaces, 162 long stay spaces, two accessible parking bays, and an ambulance charging bay.
- The proposal would use the existing servicing and A&E facilities of the wider hospital. There would be a 42% carbon saving, installation of ground source and air source heat pumps, an energy efficient building fabric and target of 40% reduction of water use.
- The current site had low ecological value and the proposal would provide planting, green

roofs and bird and bat boxes.

- The proposal would depart from Lambeth Local Plan policy Q26 relating to tall buildings. Officers were content that the public benefits would outweigh the identified heritage harms and this departure from development plan policy.

The following points were raised by those in support of the application:

- The proposal would improve the current hospital by providing more beds, it would also reduce waiting times and bring together local services to improve patient experience.
- It would create the equivalent of 750 full time jobs in the development and creation phase.
- The need for this proposal was due to the growing demand on the hospital's resources.
- The architecture was high quality and would benefit the health, wellbeing and comfort of the hospital. The proposal would also be net zero carbon in line with the Greater London Authority's policies.

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

- The height of the proposed building would be approximately 3 metres taller than the existing building.
- Approximately 65% of the building's whole life cycle carbon was due to operational carbon and the proposals' operational energy would reduce annually towards zero. Therefore, the whole life cycle carbon factor would reduce significantly.
- The applicant investigated alternative sites for this proposal, however due to the necessary floor space needed and the heritage impact, it was decided that this site was the optimal location.
- A s106 obligation would secure works or a financial contribution toward cycle ramps on the staircases on the Albert Embankment leading to Westminster Bridge Road.
- Historic England considered the impact of the proposal on heritage assets. They found that there would be a 'pronounced' degree of less than substantial harm on the setting of the Westminster World Heritage Site and either a 'pronounced' or 'very pronounced' degree of harm on other heritage assets.
- Officers had assessed that the harm to the setting of heritage assets would be a low degree of less than substantial and there would be no harm to the setting of the Westminster World Heritage Site.

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

- There was a clear need for the expansion of the hospital.
- The architecture was appealing, and the proposal would be well integrated into the hospital environment.
- Concerns were raised on the impact to heritage assets, but the benefits of the proposals including life improving healthcare and additional jobs, would outweigh the harm.
- The data on flood risk was adequate but there were concerns that flood risk mitigation was reliant on the Thames Barrier and that there was still a low residual risk of flooding and any additional mitigation would be welcomed.

It was MOVED by Councillor J Simpson, SECONDED by Councillor Dogus

And

RESOLVED, unanimously:

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission subject to the completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations listed in this report and any direction as may be received following further referral to the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to:
 - a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes; and
 - b. Negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
3. In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within six months of committee, delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to refuse planning permission for failure to enter into a section 106 agreement for the mitigating contributions identified in the report, addendums and/or the PAC minutes

3 Dorchester Parade, Leigham Court Road (Streatham Wells) 21/001583/FUL

Case No. 21/001583/FUL, (agenda item 3, page 139 of the agenda pack).

The officer introduced the application and highlighted that:

- The proposal sought redevelopment of the site to provide two commercial units on the ground floor with 11 residential units on the upper floors.
- The new building would be four storeys with a roof insert. The brick work would be similar to the neighbouring properties.
- The current Tudor style of the building provided a very limited contribution to the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area and the proposal was not considered to harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- The site would be the lowest density building within the area.
- The proposal would impact on daylight levels to some lower-level windows to adjoining properties, which would fall below BRE requirements.
- The S106 agreement would capture a number of mitigation measures including ensuring the development was car parking permit free, a contribution towards consultation on a future Controlled Parking Zone, and an affordable housing contribution of £200,000.

The following points were raised in objection to the application:

- The proposal would cause a loss of natural light to a resident's property, which was 17m southwest of the site.
- The proposed development would face directly onto the resident's bedroom, which would cause a loss of privacy.
- There was no capacity to accommodate more cars in the area without the local community suffering due to the gridlock that occurred during rush hour traffic.

The Committee then heard the following points in support of the application:

- The site was located within a conservation area and next to a second conservation area. The demolition of the existing building would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation areas.
- The BRE guidelines were not mandatory and could be used flexibly.
- This development would be high-quality architecture and would not result in undue harm to local amenities.

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

- The proposal would be designed in a brick box form in line with neighbour properties.
- The balconies would have privacy screens to mitigate direct overlooking to neighbouring properties. Most properties in the development would overlook the car park for 7 Streatham High Road, rather than neighbouring windows.
- Daylight to bedrooms was considered to be less important than living rooms due to the BRE guidelines highlighting the reduced usage during daylight hours.
- The recessed nature of the balconies of 7 Streatham High Road caused an existing overshadowing on the neighbouring windows and reduced available daylight levels.
- The viability consultant confirmed that an assessment had been submitted by the applicant in April 2021. In June 2021, it was confirmed that the construction cost would likely increase. This reduced the overall projected £300,000 affordable housing contribution to £200,000.
- The ceiling heights were marginally below the London Plan standards however, this was due to the need to accommodate the properties within Dorchester Parade. Officers stated that the ceiling height would still meet the standard housing requirement.
- The commercial and residential units would share one waste storage area and there would be a service management plan for the commercial units once the use had been clarified. This would be secured through a planning condition.
- Noise conditions were recommended to control noise levels from the commercial units given the residential use on the upper floors.
- Play spaces were categorised as generally publicly assessable and it would be possible to seek a contribution for a closer play space within a council estate.
- Financial contributions for off-site play space could be used for improvements to housing amenity land.
- In line with the Mayor's policies on affordable housing, there would be a review mechanism. The review mechanism would comprise of an early-stage review if the proposal wasn't implemented within 24 months as well as a late-stage review triggered at 75 per cent of sale of market units.

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

- The existing building was not of sufficient architectural merit to warrant protection; however, the proposed development could have been more sympathetic to the architecture in the surrounding area. It was noted that the restrictions on the balconies did make this difficult.
- The design of the proposal was bland and did not reflect the attractive design of other buildings within the conservation area.
- There was a negative impact on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties.
- There was an expectation that the affordable housing contribution would be more significant.
- The site was constrained so any development would cause impact to daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential properties. However, it was considered that the benefits of the development would outweigh the harm.
- The name 'Dorchester' should be reflected in the future development were permission to be granted to ensure that the local history was retained.
- The development would be beneficial for commercial businesses, and it would bring more people to that area of the parade. This could increase the security in the area as there would be more residents in the area.

It was MOVED by Councillor J Simpson, SECONDED by Councillor Seedat

And

RESOLVED with six in favour and one abstention,

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission including a Grampian condition requiring the completion of an agreement and subject to the informative listed below under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations listed in the report:
 - a. To add an informative to capture the Committee's request that consideration be given to using the off-site play space contribution for improvements to open spaces nearer to the application site such as the housing amenity land on the Sackville Estate.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to:
 - a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes; and
 - b. Negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
3. In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within six months of committee, delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning, Transport and Development to refuse planning permission for failure to enter into a section 106 agreement for the mitigating contributions identified in the report, addendums and/or the PAC minutes.

4 The South Bank Centre, Belvedere Road (Bishop's) 21/02817/FUL, 21/02819/ADV, 21/02818/LB

Case Nos. 21/02817/FUL, 21/02819/ADV, 21/02818/LB, (agenda item 4, page 177 of the agenda pack, page 12 of the first addendum).

The officer highlighted the new information that was published in the first and second addenda and stated that:

- The site was within the South Bank Conservation Area.
- Amendments had been made to the proposal that was presented to Committee the previous year.
- The proposal would have a reduction of development in the southwestern part of the site with one pop-up café/bar is proposed with a smaller seating area. A reduced number of 15 pop up stalls which would be located under the bridge.
- The conditions that control the noise impacts of the event would be the same as those agreed under previous permissions.
- The operating hours, delivery, servicing and waste management would be in line with the previous events.
- The location of commercial and artistic elements would not jeopardise the flow or safety of pedestrians and vehicles.
- No objections had been received and officers were satisfied that that there would be no impact on nearby residents.

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

- The expected number of people attending the events would likely be less than the previous events due to the pandemic and the reduction of market stalls.
- Following concerns regarding a lack of lighting under the bridge, officers stated that there would be extensive lighting from the stalls in addition to the existing lighting in the vicinity. The pop-up bar under the Hungerford Bridge access stairs would be located facing directly onto the main public walkway.
- There may be scope to reuse the vinyls however they would be provided by the artists and returned to them after the conclusion of the event.

The Chair then moved to the vote.

21/02817/FUL:

It was MOVED by Councillor J Simpson, SECONDED by Councillor I Simpson

And

RESOLVED, unanimously.

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes.

21/02819/ADV:

It was MOVED by Councillor J Simpson, SECONDED by Councillor Thackray

And

RESOLVED, unanimously.

1. To GRANT conditional express advertisements consent.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes.

21/02818/LB:

It was MOVED by Councillor J Simpson, SECONDED by Councillor O'Hara

And

RESOLVED, unanimously:

1. To GRANT conditional listed building consent.

2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes.

5 Land At Jonathan Street And Vauxhall Walk And At Orsett Street And Vauxhall Street (Princes) 20/04393/RG3

Case No. 20/04393/RG3, (agenda item 5, page 215 of the agenda pack, page 13 of the first addendum and page 9 of the second addendum).

Councillor Joanne Simpson stepped down from the Committee and Vice-Chair Councillor Scarlett O'Hara chaired the rest of the meeting.

The officer introduced the report for this item and Item 6 Land to the West Of Tyres Street (20/04423/RG3) and stated that:

- The proposal would create a new community centre and 67 homes across the two sites, with 50% being affordable.
- The Jonathan Street site would comprise of a new community centre and 29 residential units in a building ranging between five to eight storeys in height.
- The Orsett Street site comprised of 38 residential units in a building extending to seven storeys in height.
- Both sites would have associated car park facilities, cycle parking, landscaping, infrastructure works and wider public realm improvements.
- The scale of both buildings was considered to be acceptable and in line with the surrounding properties.
- The proposal was considered to be acceptable in land use terms. The affordable housing on the Jonathan Street site would comprise of 20 socially rented units and nine intermediate shared ownership units. The Orsett Street building was entirely market housing and would not include any affordable housing.
- The overall scheme provided a policy compliant level of affordable housing with no distinction between the two buildings in terms of design or internal standards.
- There would be a loss of 1,313 square metres of existing housing amenity land. However, this would be acceptable noting the public benefits of the scheme and the proposed mitigations detailed in the officer report and addenda.
- The proposals were considered to be of high-quality design. Whilst the proposal was an acceptable response to the context, the proposal would result in a low to moderate degree of less than substantial harm to the surrounding conservation areas. Officers considered that the significant public benefits would outweigh the harm identified to the designated heritage assets.
- The development would result in some residential amenity impacts to adjoining neighbouring properties. The report addresses all impacts and whilst some noticeable reductions will result to sunlight and daylight levels, officers consider that the public benefits of the scheme in providing much needed housing would outweigh this harm in the overall planning balance.
- The development would result in a loss of 16 trees, but the applicant had provided a sum of £297,641 for this loss and proposed that 27 replacement trees be planted.
- The proposal would be car free with nine disabled parking bays, 127 long stay cycle bays, 16 short stay cycle bays, cycle hire membership and a Healthy Routes contribution of £78,100.
- A range of obligations are proposed to reasonably mitigate the otherwise unacceptable

impacts secured by Grampian condition.

The following points were raised in objection to the application:

- The proposal would result in the loss of green space and require doubling the size of the community centre.
- The loss of green space would be detrimental to the 3,000 residents of the Vauxhall Gardens Estate.
- The community at Vauxhall Gardens Estate had delivered countless projects to improve the green space in the area.
- The scheme did not recognise the effort put in by VGERTA to improve the location for the local residents.
- The public consultation carried out by the applicant was inadequate and the proposal did not reflect what the residents wanted in their community.

The following points were raised in support of the application:

- The scheme would provide much needed community homes in the area and would cause minimal impacts on the surrounding properties.
- Homes for Lambeth (HfL) was a not-for-profit organisation, and any surplus money would be reinvested in affordable housing provision.
- There would be a new and enhanced community centre which would provide benefits to the local community.
- A resident indicated that the scheme would provide good sized rooms and balconies for families to live in and recognised that although there was a loss of green space, there were green spaces being put forward in the development.

Councillor David Amos and Councillor Joanne Simpson from Prince's Ward both raised the following points regarding the application:

- Local residents were seeking to be rehoused and move out of substandard and overcrowded properties. Princes Ward had 1,693 families on the housing register, the fifth highest in Lambeth, and demand for social housing continued to far outstrip supply.
- Residents were consulted on what they wanted to see in a new community centre and Ward Councillors, VGERTA and the applicant interviewed architects and formulated a business plan for the new centre. In the last year monthly meetings were held with Ward Councillors, HfL and VGERTA to discuss the project as a whole and to ensure that the homes that would be provided would be of high quality and address concerns over loss of light.
- The concerns of residents were understood but whilst there were some impacts, they were not of a scale that would be unreasonable in an urban setting. The development would provide affordable homes in Zone 1 and a brand-new community centre for residents.
- Losing green space was not ideal but this was not high quality and there would be a net increase in trees provided on site as part of a high-quality landscape scheme to invest in existing spaces.

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

- There would be an overall loss of housing estate amenity land. This was considered acceptable as the development would deliver significant public benefits and included improvements to existing amenity space at both sites and to three off site amenity spaces in the immediate vicinity at Tracey Island, Coverley Point and Venn Park, and the re-provision of the community centre secured by way of the legal agreement.
- There would be on-site amenity provision for residents and the community centre garden

ensuring that the landscaping would be varied between soft and hard landscaping which would be secured by planning condition and provided at the relevant time.

- The community centre garden would be located to the rear of the proposed centre. The community use would be kept providing a continuous provision.
- There were three additional sites at Coverley Point, Venn Park and Tracey Island which would be improved, and they would be completed at different time frames due to the need to provide a continuous community centre on site. The applicant would ensure that they were all delivered as quickly as possible with Coverley Point works coming forward at an earlier stage and Tracey Island a later stage as the temporary centre would be provided on this site preventing improvements until its removal.
- There would be no proposed improvements to Pedlars Park and anti-social behaviour was not directly assessed when considering the loss of estate amenity.

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

- It was difficult to discern between the different areas of redevelopment and the differences between them.
- The scheme would provide affordable housing which would support local residents.
- The loss of amenity space was regretful but inevitable due to the small site, and the enhancement to the community centre and public realm outweighed the loss.
- Members were satisfied with the conditions of the sequencing and delivery of the scheme.

It was MOVED by Councillor O'Hara, SECONDED by Councillor Dogus

And

RESOLVED, unanimously:

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission including a Grampian condition requiring the completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations listed in the report:
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to:
 - a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes
3. In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability, having regard to the heads of terms set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes, to negotiate and complete a document containing obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in order to meet the requirement of the Planning Inspector.

6 Land to the West Of Tyres Street (Princes) 20/04423/RG3

Case No. 20/04423/RG3, (agenda item 6, page 349 of the agenda pack, and page 13 of the second addendum).

The officer clarified that this application (agenda item 6) was separate to the application shown in item 5 (20/04393/RG3) and proposed a temporary community centre. It was highlighted that:

- The proposal would contain a single storey modular building to provide a temporary community centre during the construction of the redevelopment of the community centre in Item 5.
- The proposal would provide a comparable floorspace within a functional building that would not adversely impact on existing residents and mitigation for the loss of estate amenity which would be secured as part of a legal agreement.

Members' questions for this item were discussed within the agenda Item 5 discussion.

20/04423/RG3:

It was MOVED by Councillor O'Hara, SECONDED by Councillor I Simpson

And

RESOLVED, unanimously:

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission including a Grampian condition requiring the completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations listed in the report:
2. Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to:
 - a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes
3. In the event that the committee resolves to refuse planning permission and there is a subsequent appeal, delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability, having regard to the heads of terms set out in the report, addendums and/or PAC minutes, to negotiate and complete a document containing obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in order to meet the requirement of the Planning Inspector.

The meeting ended at 9.53 pm

CHAIR
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Tuesday 23 November 2021

Date of Despatch: Monday 8 November 2021

Contact for Enquiries: Farah Hussain

Tel: 020 7926 4201

E-mail: fhussain1@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk