

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 19 December 2017 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

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

APOLOGIES: Councillor Mohammed Seedat and Councillor Joanne Simpson

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Jack Hopkins

1. **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were none.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 November 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. **VAUXHALL BUS STATION, BONDWAY (OVAL) 17/04741/FUL**

Case No. 17/04741/FUL (agenda item three, page seven 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 Friday 15 December 2017 and the day of the meeting. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included the wider regeneration to Vauxhall, the consultation process, the impact on heritage assets and the conservation area, the impact on interchange and bus journey times, the reconfiguration of bus stops on Bondway and Wandsworth Road and the public benefits of the application. In addition, the Officer explained that while the changes to the gyratory and the creation of public space were not part of the application, for context purposes the wider changes to the area were necessary to understand the rationale for the application. Members were shown images of the boundary of the planning application, views of the existing and proposed site, the location of heritage assets, proposed elevation and CGI views and proposed materials.

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

- Air pollution led to 320 deaths per year in Lambeth and Vauxhall had particularly poor air quality. No consideration had been given to the effect on air quality and no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had been conducted.
- An air quality monitoring station should be installed.
- The consultation was inadequate in its process and scope. Objectors had offered to pay for posters and flyers but Transport for London (TfL) had refused this. Objections had been raised at all public meetings on the proposal.
- Freedom pass holders and commuters from out of London had not been consulted.
- The application would result in longer crossing times for pedestrians. Maintaining a unified bus station was important for bus users, especially those with mobility issues.
- Introducing two-way traffic was unsuitable in an area with high air pollution.
- The application would reduce the size of the bus station and would penalise public transport users.
- The proposed changes to the gyratory did not necessitate the removal of the existing bus station.
- The report contained an error as not all groups listed as consultees had been consulted.

The applicant, agent and architect then provided the following information in support of the application:

- The design would be of high quality and would be a significant investment to the area. It would contribute to the development of Vauxhall as a district centre.
- The new layout would be a safer, more pleasant experience for pedestrians and cyclists. It would be the most accessible bus station in London.
- The wider scheme had received a 60% positive response during consultation carried out by TfL.
- The design was consistent and would be integrated with the surroundings. The customer experience would be improved, with integrated information for all transport modes.
- The proposed development was designed to be resilient to future growth.
- The design was a modern response to the architecture and history of Vauxhall.
- The clock tower would enhance the presence of the bus station and would improve wayfinding.

Councillor Jack Hopkins then spoke as Ward Councillor for Oval, raising the following points:

- The current road layout was unpleasant and dangerous and the proposals would make Vauxhall safer.
- The applicant had responded well to concerns from residents, councillors and businesses.
- Conditions should come back to the Committee for approval, rather than being approved under delegated authority.

Officers then provided the following information in response to questions

from Members:

- The proposed canopy area was shorter but wider than the existing and all bus stops would be covered.
- The wider traffic impact was not a material planning consideration, but would be considered separately under the gyratory proposals.
- A Construction Management Plan (CMP) was required and in it construction vehicles would be required to use TfL roads where possible. At the peak of activity, there would be a maximum of 22 HGV movements per day.
- The southern canopies had to be separated to allow maintenance without needing to close bus stops.
- Informal usage of the public space had been considered, as well as use of it as an interchange.
- The proposal would be designed subject to the latest bus station guidance to ensure that it would be accessible.
- Air quality would depend more on the cleanliness of the bus fleet, rather than the configuration of the bus station. While alternative designs had been considered, the differences in air quality impact between designs had not been assessed.
- All crossing would be signalised and would have dropped kerbs.
- The draft CMP had indicated a two-year construction period and that interim bus stops could be placed on Bondway.
- One of the objectives of the application was to create public space and a district centre, which the introduction of the clock tower would help to achieve. There was a long history of transport interchanges having clock towers.
- The lighting of the clock tower would aid wayfinding at night.
- The design of the pissoir was at an indicative stage, and it was understood that the applicant was considering different approaches. Condition 7 required details of the pissoir to be submitted, and these could be amended to include details of the planters.
- The materials had been selected to meet the design life of the bus station and final materials would be subject to condition. There would be access to the roof for maintenance.
- Benches would be placed near bus stops to maximise accessibility. The canopies would have lowered edges to provide additional shelter against wind and rain.
- The proposal would offer more protection against wind and rain and would be more attractive at night.
- A Waste Management Plan had been submitted and deemed acceptable. There would be double the required waste capacity and waste would be collected twice per week. The Waste Management Plan was an approved document and could be enforced if necessary.
- If the proposal was agreed, a stage 2 referral would then be made to the Mayor of London. The PAC Chair could be consulted on any changes requested from the Mayor of London by the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development and could refer any deemed fundamental changes to the Committee for approval.

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

- It was unclear why the proposal had come to the Committee without plans on the interim bus stop arrangements.

- It appeared that there would be an improvement to interchange times for bus users.
- Conditions 19 and 20 should return to Committee for approval. If the Mayor made significant changes in a mayoral direction, these should be considered by the Committee.
- The change to the streetscape necessitated a new bus station. Members expressed concerns regarding the design of the application, the height of the clock tower and potential accessibility issues.
- An informative should be added to condition 10 to request that wayfinding signage be provided.
- The public realm improvements should make the interchange easier to navigate, and would be able to accommodate increased usage in the future.
- Although TfL had its own skills programme, it should be encouraged to engage with local sources of labour and apprenticeships.
- The design of the proposal would assist with placemaking and would be vibrant and colourful.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously

1. To APPROVE the grant of planning permission subject to referring the application to the Mayor of London and any subsequent direction by the Mayor of London and the conditions as outlined in the officer's report and published addenda and the following:
 - i. Conditions 19 and 20 to come back to Committee where recommended for approval.
 - ii. Condition 25 be amended to include detail on bins being returned to the store outside of collection times, with exact wording to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development in consultation with the Chair.
 - iii. Condition 7 be amended to include 'and does not contribute to littering or anti-social behaviour (ASB)'.
 - iv. Condition 19 be amended to include reference to construction vehicles using TfL roads.
 - v. An informative requesting that TfL engage with sources of local labour and apprenticeships.
 - vi. Condition 10 be amended to include explicit reference to the requirement for provision of effective wayfinding around the bus station.

2. To delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development to:
 - a. Consider any direction from the Mayor of London and to make any consequential or necessary changes to the recommended conditions as set out in this report;
 - b. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Assistant Director of Planning and Development considers necessary; and
 - c. Issue the permission.

4. GARAGES AT WALCOT SQUARE (PRINCE'S) 17/01956/FUL & 17/01957/LB

Councillor Wilcox stood down as the Chair for the remainder of the meeting due to illness. It was proposed by Councillor Wilcox, and agreed unanimously, that Councillor Morris chair the remainder of the meeting.

Case No. 17/01956/FUL and 17/01957/LB (agenda item five, page 141 of the agenda pack and page nine of the addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included a summary of the report and subsequent addenda that had been published on Friday 15 December 2017 and the day of the meeting. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included the erection of five two-storey plus basement mews houses and a detached house, the removal of the trellis from listed walls, the location of the site within the Vauxhall Square conservation area, the site being bounded by private residential gardens, the provision of three parking spaces, waste and cycle storage, and the amenity impact. Members were shown images of the existing site, access routes, proposed floorplans, elevations, materials and views.

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

- Policy Q14 stated that gardens were not appropriate development sites, and part of the site was a garden. The proposed houses were too tall and too close to neighbouring houses, and would not be subordinate.
- The loss of openness and of landscaping would alter the character of the conservation area.
- The report stated that the minimum distance from properties on Walcot Square would be 18 metres, but on the ground floor the minimum distance would be 13.7 metres.
- The full height windows and balconies on the first floor would overlook living rooms and bedrooms.
- Access to the parking spaces would require complicated manoeuvres. The London Plan encouraged car-free developments.
- There was nothing to prevent the homes from being used as houses in multiple occupations (HMOs).
- The draft conservation statement stated that there were no significant development opportunities within the conservation area.
- The proposal breached policies EN1 (c), Q5, Q10, Q14 (e), Q20 and Q22 (a) with regard to the bulk, the loss of local distinctiveness, the harm to heritage assets and the harm to biodiversity.
- Historic England and the Georgian Group had objected to the application.
- There were no public benefits to outweigh the harm to heritage assets.

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

- The applicant was a charity that had operated since the 17th century and only operated within Lambeth. It allocated £2 million in grants each year and the development was crucial to the charity continuing its work in the borough.
- The application would bring underused land into constructive use

and would directly fund the Foundation's work.

- The application was the result of five years' work, with extensive advice being taken from officers.
- The application would provide low density, low rise housing in an increasingly high density area. The houses would be subordinate to existing buildings.
- The development would replace nondescript garages and would not harm heritage assets.
- The site was not backland so policy Q14 did not apply. Minor departures from policy did not warrant refusal.
- There were sufficient conditions to address any issues.

A resident then read a statement from Councillor David Amos, Ward Councillor for Prince's:

- Efforts to mediate between residents and the applicant had not been successful.
- There had been 129 public objections, as well as an objection from the Georgian Group.
- The application contravened the draft conservation area statement and the Local Plan.
- Gardens were not potential development sites, and the proposed houses were too bulky and tall. The application would result in the loss of residential amenity and privacy.

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

- Party wall arrangements were not a material planning consideration. In this case the applicant also owned the land that would be subject to the party wall agreement.
- The site did not fit easily within the definition of backland or garden sites and as such it had been considered against policies Q14 (a) and Q14 (c).
- Gardens and allotments did not constitute brownfield land, so some of the site was not classified as previously developed.
- As the majority of trees in the backland element of the site would be maintained, the environmental value would be maintained.
- Three parking spaces, including one disabled parking space, would be provide on-site. The on-street disabled parking space would be moved as a result of the application and would be reprovided.
- The applicant had provided diagrams demonstrating how vehicles would enter, access spaces and exit the site. A 7.5 tonne van would be able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.
- The existing character of the area was relatively dense, with most houses having small gardens. At their closest, the proposed homes would be 15.4 metres from the homes on Walcot Square and 26 metres from homes on Kennington Road. The proposal would sit comfortably within this context.
- The applicant had provided sample materials, with the colours and materials selected to complement existing buildings. The proposed brick was a contemporary version of a London stock brick used widely in the area. Cladding would contribute to screening along Kennington Road and would give the houses a more lightweight appearance.
- The applicant would be encouraged to view the proposed materials on site to compare them with neighbouring buildings.

- The Section 106 agreement would secure the permit-free parking element of the development.
- There were 26 garages on the site. If all of the garages were used, there would be sufficient capacity on local roads to accommodate the displaced vehicles.
- The existing London Plan allowed up to one parking space per dwelling, but as the Census had shown that there were on average 0.5 cars per household in the area, providing three spaces was deemed appropriate.
- The garden house had been designed to fit within the garden context while being subordinate to surrounding buildings. The proposed materials responded to materials used elsewhere in the conservation area.
- Resident cycle parking would be within the boundary of the houses. Visitor cycle parking would be provided on-site.
- The London Plan stated that 90% of homes must be adaptable, and 10% must be accessible, for wheelchair users. However, these policies could only be enforced for social or affordable housing units, and the policy would normally only be applied to developments proposing 10 or more units. The garden house could be easily adapted for wheelchair users due to its large ground floor, and as such a condition would not be necessary.
- Permitted development (PD) rights could be removed if there was a planning justification. In this case, removing PD rights to extensions could be justified due to the small plot sizes. However, it would be harder to justify removing PD rights to change usage from C3 (dwellinghouses) to C4 (homes of multiple occupancy), as government guidance stated that this change was generally acceptable and the size of the houses would naturally limit the number of occupants.

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

- The intensification of use would have an impact on neighbouring amenity. However, the proposal was modest and high quality.
- The proposal would not harm the heritage setting of the conservation area.
- Some Members felt that the garden house breached policy Q14 (c) ii as it had two storeys and was a garden development.
- Permitted development rights should be removed.
- It was difficult to use policy to require any fully accessible homes in the development due to the small number of homes to be provided.
- The choice of the materials, and the introduction of green roofs, was welcome. The final selection of bricks would be key to whether the development would sit comfortably within the context.

[At 22:00 the Committee elected to proceed with the meeting for a further 45 minutes in order to conclude the remaining matters of business.]

17/01956/FUL:

It was MOVED by Councillor Morris, SECONDED by Councillor Kind, and

RESOLVED, by four votes to one

1. To APPROVE planning permission subject to a Section 106

Agreement and the conditions as outlined in the officer's report and published addenda and the following:

- i. A restriction to Permitted Development rights regarding extensions.
 - ii. An informative requesting that bricks and pointing match those of the surrounding properties.
2. Agree to delegate authority of the Director of Planning and Development to:
- Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report; and
 - 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.

17/01957/LB:

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

RESOLVED, unanimously

To APPROVE listed building consent.

**5. SLADE GARDENS, STOCKWELL PARK ROAD (VASSALL)
17/02279/FUL**

Case No. 17/02279/FUL (agenda item four, page 83 of the agenda pack and page seven of the addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation which included a summary of the report and subsequent addendum that had been published on Friday 15 December 2017. Members were advised of the key material planning issues for consideration which included the demolition of the existing community hub, the erection of a new community hub and two flats, and the two additional conditions included in the addendum. Members were advised of the site constraints and shown images of the existing site, proposed site plans, floorplans and elevations.

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

- The current community hub was primarily used by the adventure playground and one o'clock club, although there were other uses such as youth groups, business away days and a small number of social events. The proposed conference centre would only be used in the daytime.
- The site needed to be self-sufficient, and the application would allow this.
- The vast majority of visitors to the community hub arrived by public transport.
- An analysis of suitable routes for construction traffic had not yet taken place. Officers and the applicant would seek to protect local amenity where possible during construction.
- There would be safe access to the green roof for children to enjoy. The application would provide a net increase of open space.
- A travel plan would be required through the s106 agreement, but had not yet been completed. Although not included in the officer's report, the monitoring cost should be included alongside the travel plan.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously

1. To APPROVE the grant of planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as outlined in the officer's report and published addenda including the following:
 - i. The two additional conditions included in the addendum regarding the living walls and the waste management strategy.
 - ii. The requirement for a travel plan and monitoring costs, and the removal of right to parking permits for the residential dwelling in the Section 106 agreement.

2. Agree to delegate authority of the Director of Planning and Development to:
 - i. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report and;
 - ii. 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.

6. APPEAL AND ENFORCEMENT DECISIONS SEPTEMBER 2017

Members thanked officers for their work defending Council policies, particularly Policy ED7 regarding the location of takeaways near schools.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

CHAIR
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Tuesday 23 January 2018

Date of Despatch: Thursday 04 January 2018

Contact for Enquiries: Maria Burton

Tel: 020 7926 8703

Fax: (020) 7926 2361

E-mail: MBurton2@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk