

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 28 February 2017 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Marcia Cameron (Substitute), Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Nigel Haselden, Councillor Diana Morris (Deputy Chair), Councillor Joanne Simpson and Councillor Clair Wilcox (Chair)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Bernard Gentry and Councillor Mohammed Seedat

1. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Joanne Simpson stated that while application 16/00795/FUL (36-46 Albert Embankment) was located in her ward, she had no interest to declare.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 February 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. 36-46 ALBERT EMBANKMENT (PRINCES) 16/00795/FUL

Case No 16/00795/FUL (agenda item five, page 77 of the agenda pack, page 13 of the addendum and page five of the second addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included the information included in the agenda pack and subsequent addenda which had been published on Friday 24 February and on the day of the meeting. Members were advised of the material planning considerations which included the proposed uses, layout, access and servicing including new build element and the reconfiguration of Vintage House, the creation of new housing, the provision of children's play space and the creation of new public realm space. The Committee was shown the proposed elevations, materials, plans and views from key locations. Members were advised of the clarifications included in the first and second addenda and the additional comments from Councillor Amos.

Following the officer's presentation, objectors raised the following points:

- There was an over-reliance on the precedent set by nearby tall buildings. The proposal was in a unique area between long-standing residential communities and conservation areas. The development would have a greater impact on the local area than nearby tall buildings.
- Policy Q26 was not followed as the proposal would have an impact on the nearby Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens. The proposal would overshadow and dominate the area.
- There would be a significant reduction in daylight to the Vauxhall Gardens Community Centre, impacting on artists' studios and dance halls. BRE guidance could be applied to non-residential uses.
- The top floor of the community centre was used as artists' studios.

The representatives of the applicant then spoke in support of the application, stating that:

- The site was unique and significant time had been spent developing a suitable design.
- There would be a substantial contribution to affordable housing, with 29% of the on-site accommodation being affordable.
- The ground floor would double the usable employment space compared to the current usage.
- Over 20 meetings had been held by the applicant to consult with residents.
- The reconfiguration of Vintage House would provide affordable housing with views of the Thames.
- The design would reflect the history of the area, with cantilevered forms and patternation inspired by the area.
- The public realm space would help to link Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens and the Albert Embankment.

At this point Members and officers viewed the model of the proposal. Following questions from Members, officers stated that:

- The location of the community centre had been clarified.
- Glasshouse Walk was one-way for vehicles heading west with a footpath on both sides of the road.
- The public realm space would be a recessed area, allowing pedestrians to cut the corner, improving flow. There would be some soft landscaping.
- A waste management plan was required in conditions. The residential accommodation would have waste chutes and bins would be moved along the service road to Glasshouse Walk by the property management company.
- Management of residential recycling waste would be part of the waste management arrangement.
- A servicing management plan and construction management plan would be required. As Glasshouse Walk was one-way, servicing vehicles would have to use local roads to access the service road. A banksman would control marshalling.
- There would be fewer vehicle movements associated with the proposal than in the existing use.

- Larger vehicles such as HGVs would use Albert Embankment but some smaller vehicles would use local roads. Ideally as many journeys as possible would be on the Transport for London Route Network (TLRN).
- There were four or five filling stations within a reasonable drive, but work into detailed routing had not been done. It was unlikely that motorists would use local roads to find an alternative filling station.
- Before the redevelopment of the Albert Embankment, there were 1960s office blocks of uniform height, creating a wall of development. There was guidance to prevent the creation of a wall of tall buildings along Albert Embankment. There would be gaps between buildings and variation in building heights to meet this guidance.
- The western side of the Vauxhall Gardens Community Centre had fewer windows than the southern and eastern sides, reducing the impact on daylight and sunlight. The ground floor of the centre was a large dual aspect room which would have no noticeable change in daylight and sunlight levels. There was also no noticeable change on the light levels of the large room on the second floor. There were three smaller rooms which would have a change in light levels, but the levels would still exceed standards for bedrooms. The roof amenity area would meet BRE guidance.
- A contamination assessment had been done as part of the application and remediation would be required.
- There was a condition to require approval of the commercial usage. Extractions of fumes from any restaurant use could not be through the roof because of the design and extraction was proposed to be at the rear of the site at fascia level. Any associated work, such as duct work and filtering, would have to be approved by Environmental Health. The site was adjacent to Network Rail track at the rear, preventing adverse impact of fumes on neighbours or the public thoroughfare.
- The service road would be gated to prevent unauthorised access. Only cyclists accessing the cycle parking and management staff would use the service road.
- Three areas of playspace for under 11-year-olds would be provided on site. Provision for older children would be off-site and funded by s106 payments. While a location was not specified, it was likely to be in a nearby park.
- There would be nine affordable rent units and 39 intermediate units provided on site, with 29% of the on-site provision being affordable. A payment would be made to reach the equivalent of 40% affordable housing (66 units) as required by policy. The payment was financially neutral to the developer.
- The council could spend the money in areas of the borough with lower property values, which could provide more affordable housing than if the provision had been solely on-site. A better tenure mix could also be provided off-site.
- The affordable housing would be in Vintage House, with a mix of two, three and four bedroom flats, each with a private balcony.
- The CIL contribution could be used for public realm or highway improvements as there was no justification to seek a s106 planning contribution with all aspects e.g. servicing, mitigated via planning conditions whilst noting the move to sustainable modes (away from vehicular based movements) in this highly accessible.

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

- The report included a lot of detail on the design, such as the reference to the 'botanical cabinet of curiosities' and Royal Doulton. The designs should be secured to ensure they would be included as part of the development.
- Local roads had significant issues with construction vehicles and more should be done to prevent vehicles using local roads wherever possible.
- Concerns regarding the form, massing, impact and nature of the scheme had been addressed. Detail on how value could be cascaded through the neighbourhood would be beneficial.
- The increase in employment floorspace was commendable.
- There were concerns at the amount of affordable housing to be provided on-site, although the provision was an improvement on the original offer.
- The s106 wording should be amended to add that the review mechanism is to be triggered if there is public subsidy.
- An informative should be added to limit the use of local streets for construction purposes.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Haselden, **SECONDED** by Councillor Cameron and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the officer's report and subject to a section 106 agreement as outlined in the report and the following:

- i. An amendment to the s106 agreement to require a review mechanism if there is public subsidy for affordable housing
- ii. An informative limiting the use of local streets and to use Albert Embankment wherever possible for construction purposes.

4. EUROPARK CAR PARK, DOON STREET AND CORNWALL ROAD (BISHOPS) 16/06590/FUL

Case No 16/06590/FUL (agenda item three, page 11 of the agenda pack, page one of the addendum and page one of the second addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included the information included in the agenda pack and subsequent addenda which had been published on Friday 24 February and on the day of the meeting. Members were advised of the material planning considerations which included the temporary erection of a marquee, the impact on the surrounding area and the s106 contributions to be made. The proposed elevations and layouts were shown to the Committee.

Following the officer's presentation, the agent spoke in favour of the application, stating that:

- The location of the application was a car park which had been used intermittently for events for a decade.
- The s106 contribution of 1% of turnover was in line with the SPD requirements.

- The benefits of the application included the creation of 21 jobs, the diversification of the cultural and artistic offering of the area and the contribution to the local economy.
- There had been no objections from the Council's Highways team. A construction management plan would be in place.
- There was sufficient space within the site to allow queuing with no impact on the public highway. Eating and drinking would be prohibited in the exhibition, limiting the amount of litter that would be created.
- The proposal was sustainable and in line with planning policy.

Officers stated the following in response to questions from Members:

- There would be no live or loud music, although there could be some music at corporate events. A noise survey had been conducted. Any licensing requirements were not part of this application.
- When the event was over for the evening, all lights on site would be switched off. There was street lighting in the area.
- There was a pre-existing two-metre tall wooden fence on the site, with metal security fencing at the rear.
- There would be two security staff on site during the day, and one at night.
- While there were no limits on the number of tickets that could be sold, selling tickets on half-hour slots would prevent overcrowding and long queues. The exhibition could not accommodate more than 200 people. The operations statement prevented queuing on the public highway. The maximum number of attendees for corporate events was to be 100.
- The applicant was willing to have a condition limiting the number of attendees to 200 per half hour.
- The construction management plan could be amended to require liaison with other developers in the area during the dismantling of the marquee.
- The level of harm to the Grade II listed National Theatre was judged to be less than substantial due to the temporary nature of the application. There were limited spaces where the view of the National Theatre would be impacted by the marquee. The space was currently a car park and did not enhance the setting.
- Conservation officers had had some concerns regarding the length of the event but had decided that the harm was less than substantial. Temporary applications were common on the site.
- The temporary nature of the application made the branding acceptable. The surrounding area was vibrant and unusual temporary structures had been erected in the area.

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

- There had been initial concerns about potential impact on heritage listed buildings. However, the temporary nature of the application and the lack of impact on views of listed buildings meant that there would be less than substantial harm.

- The application would have positive benefits and would be an addition to a creative and cultural area.
- There were concerns that a construction that would be in place for nine months could be considered temporary.
- There should be discussions on what could be considered 'temporary' and the long term plans for the South Bank.
- The application was an improvement on the current site.
- There should be an amendment to the construction management plan to require working with the Waterloo construction group.
- The number of visitors could be capped at 200 per half hour and the number of attendees to corporate events could be capped at 100.
- The balance between what could be considered branding and art was fine in this case.
- While images showed a pristine fence, the existing wooden fence was messy. An informative could be added requesting the applicant to pay some regard to how the application appears to the street.

Officers stated that a section 215 notice could be used in enforcement regarding the appearance of the fencing.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Wilcox, **SECONDED** by Councillor Simpson and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the officer's report and subject to a s106 agreement as outlined in the report and the following:

- An additional informative requesting that 'the applicant should pay regard to how the development presents itself in terms of boundary treatment'.
- Condition 9 to be amended to include 'the applicant shall liaise with the other developers in the area to ensure that they take into account the wider South Bank area when removing the marquee from the site'.
- An additional condition to read 'no more than a maximum of 200 tickets to be sold per each half an hour slot and no more than 100 people to be at a corporate event at any one time'

5. 190 STOCKWELL PARK ROAD (FERNDALE) 16/05183/FUL

Case No 16/05183/FUL (agenda item four, page 35 of the agenda pack and page five of the addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included the information included in the agenda pack and subsequent addendum which had been published on Friday 24 February. The initial report referred to social rent, but the development would provide homes for affordable rent. Members were advised of the material planning issues for consideration which included the provision of 18 affordable rented housing units and the redevelopment of a currently vacant building. The site context as well as existing and proposed site

plans, elevations and materials were shown to the Committee.

Following the officer's presentation, the agent spoke in favour of the application, stating that:

- SW9 was a community-based housing association based on the Stockwell Park Estate and was established following the transfer of housing stock from the council.
- The existing building had been vacant for five years and there had subsequently been anti-social behaviour associated with the building.
- Permission for residential accommodation had been secured in 2013 and the current application provided an improvement of the housing quality compared to the original application.
- The scheme would remove an eyesore and all of the housing would be affordable. The accommodation would meet guidance, ten units would be wheelchair accessible and a three-year car club membership would be provided to residents.

In response to questions from Members, officers and the agent explained that:

- Bicycle storage would be provided outside the building and alongside the servicing area inside the building. There was reference to the usability of the cycle storage in the additional informative.
- Guidance on daylight and sunlight stated that existing obstructions, such as eaves, had to be considered. When the eaves of a neighbouring building were considered, the loss of daylight and sunlight was acceptable. The affected properties were dual aspect.
- The consulted organisations were selected based on the ward that the application was based in. Site notices were put up and letters to neighbours were sent to maximise opportunities to provide responses. It was also noted that a separate public consultation had been sent by the applicant prior to submission of the application.
- There was a pedestrian thoroughfare between the proposed building and existing buildings to the southeast and southwest. There would be soft landscaping to limit overlooking on lower floors.
- While the amenity space on the ground and top floors was significantly larger than on other floors, it had to be considered that the proposal was in an infill site in a constrained area. There was public amenity space elsewhere on the Stockwell Park Estate to offset this.
- There was not a local lettings policy for the scheme and there had been no allocations yet. The applicant would be willing to have such a policy.
- Other than two parking spaces for wheelchair users, future residents would not be able to apply for parking spaces.

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

- It would be beneficial to have a local lettings policy, where local residents who had gone through the inconvenience and impact of redevelopment would be given first priority to the new homes. The Legal Advisor stated that it would be most appropriate to include

this policy in the s106 agreement, which would be negotiated between the Council and the applicant. It would not be included as a condition as it was not enforceable.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously

To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined in the officer's report, subject to the s106 agreement as outlined in the report.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm

CHAIR
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Tuesday 7 March 2017

Date of Despatch: Wednesday 8 March 2017

Contact for Enquiries: Maria Burton

Tel: 020 7926 8703

Fax: (020) 7926 2361

E-mail: MBurton2@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk