

**Lambeth Replacement Unitary Development Plan
Modifications Document One**

**Response to Inspector's Recommendations
October 2006**

Lambeth Replacement Unitary Development Plan

Response to Inspector's Recommendations - October 2006

Modifications Document 1

What this document shows

Details of all Inspector's recommendations pertaining to the Lambeth Replacement Unitary Development Plan, Council's response to those recommendations and the reasons for the response.

The Council has also produced three other documents:

- Proposed Modifications to the Lambeth Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan – Modifications Document 2
- Inspector's recommendations which have not been accepted in whole or in part, and other changes initiated by the Council - Modifications Document 3
- Proposed Modifications to Maps, Diagrams and Tables – Modifications Document 4

Changes to maps and tables, including the Proposals Map

Maps showing Proposals Map changes and other UDP maps, tables and diagrams which could not be included in this document due to insufficient space may be found in Modifications Document 4 – Proposed Modifications to Maps, Diagrams and Tables.

Modification Numbers

These provide a cross-reference between the different documents.

MOD-T/ references are changes to UDP text, tables or maps (not including changes to the Proposals Map)

MOD-PM/ references are changes to the Proposals Map

Response to Inspector's Recommendations – Replacement Lambeth Unitary Development Plan, September 2006

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Part 1				
Introduction				
1.1	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
1.2	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by removing the references to RPG3 from the text of the plan where they have superseded by the adoption of the London Plan.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Remove all references to RPG3 in the Plan and update with reference to the London Plan. Therefore, changes to text at paragraphs 1.2.8, 2.4.7, 4.5.3, 4.16.4, Table 1, Table 13 and the Glossary.	MOD-T/1 MOD-T/1a MOD-T/1b MOD-T/1c MOD-T/1d MOD-T/1e MOD-T/1f MOD-T/1g
1.4	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Background and Context				
2.1	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) By ensuring that the rates of car ownership in paragraphs 2.1.7 and 4.9.1 are reconciled by amending paragraph 2.1.7 to read "About 51% of Lambeth residents have no access to a car.." (FC1)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/2

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) By expanding the section on "Environment" in Section 2.1.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: add further bullet points as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ <u>Lambeth has 60 conservation areas which makes approximately 1 third of the borough green.</u> ❑ <u>There are 450 protected trees in the borough, 2500 listed buildings and 8 historic parks and gardens.</u> ❑ <u>The whole borough is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). 90% of Lambeth's Air pollution is from vehicles and the main pollutants of concern are Nitrogen Dioxide, Fine Particulates, Carbon Monoxide and Volatile Organic Compounds.</u> 	MOD-T/3
2.2	<p>I recommend that the RDUP be modified:</p> <p>A) At paragraph 2.2 (perhaps paragraph 2.2.8), by confirming that the northern part of the borough forms part of the Central Activities Zone and is part of the Central London Sub-Region area identified in the LP. AND</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: add text to paragraph 2.2.8 as sixth bullet point – <u>'Recognising the role of the northern part of the Borough as part of the Central Activities Zone and part of the Central London Sub-Region area as identified in the London Plan.'</u></p>	MOD-T/5

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Add at the end of the bullet points in paragraph 2.2.7 the LP source of these quotes.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report. For the purpose of providing the most recent guidance, the objectives set out in the draft London Plan (the original source for this paragraph) have been carried through to its final version. This is now listed as the source. Action: add source at bottom of paragraph – 'Source: The London Plan, 2004'	MOD-T/4
2.3	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
2.4	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/6a
	A) add the word " capacity " after "need" in the last sentence of the 2 nd bullet point of paragraph 2.4.6. And			
	B) add at the end of the first sentence of the first bullet point of paragraph 2.4.6 ...for housing " and the provision of housing for the whole community, including affordable housing ".	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/6
	C) add at the end of the last sentence of paragraph 2.4.7 "of the adopted London Plan, which is part of the development plan for purposes of S38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Planning Act, 2004 when determining applications for development ".	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/7
2.6	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
2.7	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by adding a new paragraph 2.7.4 as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/8

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	2.7.4 “Lambeth is supportive of the principle of Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) as a local area management tool to enhance and add value to a locality by way of environmental improvements and services. The Council has been working with a number of local partnerships and groups in the promotion of potential BIDs within the borough, however any decisions on specific BIDs would be on a case-by-case basis.” (FC2)			
The Plan's Strategic Policies				
3.1	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
3.2	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
3.3	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as proposed in Pre-inquiry Change PI 1 (CD4/21) AND as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Amend item (D) in paragraph 3.3.1 as follows - 'The Council will seek the provision of at least 20,500 net additional dwelling homes over the period 2002-2016 (including 8,200 affordable dwellings).'	MOD-T/10
	A) Amend item (C) in paragraph 3.3.1 to read: “The Council will make best use of the borough's limited land resources and will seek to encourage, through good design, higher densities and more mixed and intensive development in appropriate locations. ”	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/9

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Amend item (K) in paragraph 3.3.1 to read: "The Council will protect and enhance the borough's built and historic environment, promote better and more sustainable design of development, and protect residential amenity"	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/11
3.4	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
3.5	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Add to the indicator/target column of the 12 th objective/strategic policy in paragraph 3.5.5, " reduction in the number of listed buildings at risk ". B) In the "indicator/target" column of the 14 th objective/strategic policy (open space), delete the text and replace with " No net loss of open space in the Borough ". (FC3)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/12
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/13
3.7	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Part II				
Core Policies (Section A)				
4.2	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by: A) Adding to the Key Diagram the Opportunity Areas and Areas for Regeneration affecting Lambeth that are identified on Maps 2A.2 and 5B.1 of the London Plan.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Amend key diagram (See Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/14a

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Substitute "Central Activities Zone" as used in the London Plan for "Central London".	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Replace reference to 'Central London' in the Key Diagram with 'Central Activities Zone' (See Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/14b
Policy 1	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) by re-locating Policy 1 and its supporting text (paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.4 to Part I of the plan. AND B) By deleting the first paragraph of Policy 1 (FC4).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: relocate Policy 1 and supporting paragraphs 4.3.1 – 4.3.4 to start of Para 3.2.1.	MOD-T/15
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Delete following text from first paragraph of Policy 1 – 'To promote sustainable development and urban renaissance by making Lambeth a great place to live, visit and work.'	MOD-T/16
Policy 2 (Para 4.4.5)	I recommend that paragraph 4.4.5 of the RDUDP be as follows: After the second sentence add: "...opportunities for development are few. However, two Opportunity Areas (Waterloo & Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea), the Central Activities Zone and a Regeneration Area, all of which are identified in the London Plan, are located within the area. These will present opportunities for Lambeth to attract much needed development."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/17
Policy 3 (& Text through UDP)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by changing the description of the Central London Policy Area to	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/18 MOD-T/19

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>Central Activities Zone wherever it occurs throughout the Plan and on the Proposals Map.</p>		<p>Action: Replace all references to 'Central London Policy Area' in the Plan and on the Proposals Map with 'Central Activities Zone.' In Table 1, remove the RPG3 source but keep table, calling it 'Activities Contributing to London's Role as World City' (being the Council's interpretation of the uses set out in London Plan Policy 5B.1). Keep Table 2. Amend Policy 3 changing (or deleting) references from 'Central London Policy Area' to 'Central Activities Zone':</p> <p>Policy 3 The Central London Policy Area <u>Activities Zone</u></p> <p><i>Activities which contribute to London's role as a World City and Capital City, are promoted (these are defined as Central London Activities and are listed in Table 1).</i></p> <p>(A) <i>Planning permission will be refused for development that results in the loss of Central London Activities in Table 1 within the Central London Policy Area Activities Zone boundary (as defined on the Proposal Map) where the activity contributes to the area's character and function.</i></p> <p>(B) <i>Development of Central London Activities within the Central Activities Zone London Area is permitted – subject to policies protecting the character and function of specific areas, local</i></p>	<p>MOD-T/20 MOD-T/1b MOD-T/1c MOD-PM/1</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><i>residential character and amenity, and promoting mixed-use and residential development.</i></p> <p><i>(C) Planning permission will be refused for development that results in the loss of Central London Supporting Activities (listed in Table 2), where the existing use contributes to the character and function of the area – unless the loss would comply with a policy specific to that use. Development of Central London Supporting Activities within the Central London area Activities Zone is permitted, and should be included within larger mixed-use schemes.</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>4.5.3. These activities are known as key Central London Activities: they are defined in Government Policy (RPG3) and contribute to London's Role as World City' and are listed in Table 1 below. These activities gain many benefits from close agglomeration. Even in an age of electronic communication the social and economic benefits of face-to-face communication is increasingly important. The ability to rapidly meet friends and business colleagues, visit cultural events and the random and creative effects of living in a vibrant, dense, multicultural city are what mark out London as a special place.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Table 1 Key Central London Activities <u>Activities Contributing to London's Role as World City</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Those connected with the State and</p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Diplomatic representations including Embassies, High Commissions and Agencies ❑ National and international headquarters and associated offices connected with finance, trade, business, professional bodies, institutions and associations ❑ Facilities and establishments connected with the communications, publishing, advertising, media and cultural sectors of regional, national and international importance ❑ Shopping – major/specialist retail outlets of regional, national and international importance ❑ Centres of excellence for higher education and research ❑ Medical establishments of regional, national and international importance ❑ Legal and professional services ❑ Arts, culture and entertainment, including museums, art galleries, libraries, theatres, concert halls and cinemas of regional, national and international importance ❑ Specialist industrial clusters associated with other central activities, including clothing, fashion trades, printing and retail services ❑ Churches and other religious centres and places of assembly of regional, national and international importance ❑ Tourism facilities including hotels and conference centres ❑ Transport facilities, particularly for public transport of regional, national and international importance ❑ Activities supporting the use and 	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>enjoyment of the River Thames</p> <p>□ Residential, including affordable housing.</p> <p>(Source RPG3 table 2.1)</p> <p>For Proposals Map, change to be carried out to Key as follows: Central London Policy Area <u>Central Activities Zone</u></p>	
Table 1	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> <p>Note: changes will be made to Table 1 in accordance with other recommendations shown under Policy 3 above.</p>	
Table 2	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 4 (& Para 4.6.4, Table 3 and Glossary) Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by: A) Amending the end of the first sentence of paragraph (A) to read: “..appropriate to the scale, role (Table 4) and character of each centre and its catchment, ” (FC7) B) Deleting the final sentence from Table 3. (FC6)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/21
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Delete following text from final sentence of Table 3 – 'The transition of Waterloo to become the Major Town centre for the north of the Borough is also supported.'	MOD-T/24

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Add to the Glossary:</p> <p>“Original Units: in the context of shopping policy (Policies 4 and 29) units as they were originally constructed with percentages applied over the centre as a whole.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/274
	<p>D) Adding at the end of paragraph 4.6.4 the following:</p> <p>“...need to be complementary. The Council, in partnership with the Mayor and other relevant stakeholders, will review retailing and town centre policy within the context of Sub Regional Development Frameworks at the earliest opportunity.” (FC8)</p>	Partly accepted	<p>Reason: The Council agrees that reviewing town centre policy and performance is an important part of monitoring the UDP. However since the Inspector's Report was received, the final Central London Sub Regional Development Framework document has been published. This does not provide for any significant changes to Lambeth town centres' role or size within the overall hierarchy. Therefore there is no need to review the UDP's town centre policy at the earliest possible opportunity. This can be dealt with as part of the normal ongoing monitoring of the UDP.</p> <p>Action: At the end of paragraph 4.6.4, add the following text - <u>'The Council will monitor this position and review opportunities for future development.'</u></p>	MOD-T/22

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Table 3	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by: A) deleting " York Road " from the description of Waterloo District Centre (4 th bullet) in Table 3 (FC5).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete 'and York Road' from fourth bullet point under District Town Centres – □ Waterloo (including Lower Marsh, The Cut and York Road)	MOD-T/23
	B) see also recommendation (B) under Policy 4 (FC6).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (see change B to Policy 4).	MOD-T/24
Policy 5	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the final sentence of the second paragraph of part (iv) of Policy 5 to read: "Developers for grouped retail / leisure / entertainment uses should be tailoring, reducing or splitting projects so that they can be accommodated in preferred areas or on existing sites including converting, upgrading or extending existing town centre buildings." (FC9)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/25
	B) Amend the first sentence of the third paragraph of part (iv) of Policy 5 to read: "In particular, developers will be expected to consider whether car parking standards should be reduced to below the maximum standards to assist the accommodation of schemes on more central sites." (FC10-amended)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/26
	C) Amend the first sentence of sub-paragraph (c) of the policy to read: ".....commitments should not have a harmful impact on the vitality and viability of major town centres....."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/27

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	D) Add to line 3 of Part (f) of Policy 5 so that it reads: "...should be accompanied by a combined retail, leisure , economic and transport assessment." (FC11)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/28
Policy 6 (Para 4.7.1)	I recommend that the first sentence of paragraph 4.7.1 of the supporting text to Policy 6 of the RDUDP be modified as follows: "...prioritises the use of previously-developed urban land (brownfield sites) over development on "greenfield" sites. Greenfield sites in an inner London Borough such as Lambeth are rare and most often limited in size. Previously used...." (FC12).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/29
Policy 7	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 8	I recommend that Policy 8 of the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the first sentence of part (b) of the policy to read: " for development which attracts a lot of people , the capacity of the public transport network, with in convenient and safe...." And Amend the final sentence of part (b) to read: "This will include securing and providing additional facilities for bus and/or railway operations where they are necessary in order to meet increased level of demand;"	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report, but with the additional reference to trams for clarification. Action: Amend the final sentence of part (b) to read: "This will include securing and providing additional facilities for bus and/or railway/tram operations where they are necessary in order to meet increased level of demand;"	MOD-T/30

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Amend part (c) to read: <p>“development which attracts a lot of people should make proper opportunity for interchange facilities between public transport modes or services and between public transport modes and walking and cycling; and”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/31
	C) Amend the first sentence of part (d) to read: <p>“Any application for development with transport implications should be supported by a Transport Assessment, and should incorporate proposed traffic reduction, restraint and management measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding road network. Measures to...</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/32
Policy 9 (& Para 4.9.7)	I recommend that Policy 9 of the RDUDP be modified as follows: <p>(A) Amend the first bullet point by deleting the reference to Supplementary Planning Guidance so that it reads: “on highway safety”. (FC13)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/33
	B) Amend the second bullet point by deleting the reference to Local Implementation Plan so that it reads: “on the environment and local road network”. (FC13)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/34
	C) Delete the text in brackets from the first sentence in the second paragraph of the policy so that it reads: <p>“Applicants will be required to submit an independent Transport Assessment (TA) for all developments which are likely to have a significant transport impact. (FC13)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/35

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>D) Add at the end of paragraph 4.9.7:</p> <p>“Further details regarding highway safety may be provided in supplementary planning guidance. Proposals in the Council’s Local Implementation Plan will also be a relevant consideration regarding the impact of development on the environment and road network.” (FC14)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/36
Table 5	<p>I recommend that Table 5 of the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend the second point to read:</p> <p>“Improvements to public transport infrastructure and integration, such as pedestrian and cycle links, bus stops, carriageway and pavement measures and bus boarders including bus stands and garages; AND</p> <p>B) Amend the third point to read:</p> <p>“Provision of covered and secure cycle parking and changing facilities and safe, direct, and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes, including consideration of safe routes to school.</p> <p>C) Amend the eighth point to read:</p> <p>“The implementation of on-street parking controls/waiting restrictions, car capped and car free housing.</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/37
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/38
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/39

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 10 (Para 4.9.14a and Proposals Map)	That the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Add a new paragraph 4.9.14a to read: "4.9.14a Lambeth seeks to create a high quality network of cycle routes to enable full cycling access to the borough. This may be achieved by providing cycling routes and facilities throughout the borough to allow comprehensive, safe direct and convenient cycling access, which will lessen reliance on less sustainable modes of transport.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/40
	E) That the Proposals Map be reviewed in terms of its scale, use of colours and notations to improve its clarity.	Accepted	To improve the visual clarity of the final Proposals Map.	MOD-PM/21
Policy 11 (& Para 4.9.15)	I recommend that Policy 11 the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Delete from the second bullet point under (A) delete the words " should have regard to highway safety/design SPG and ". (FC15)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/41
	B) Delete from the first sentence of the final bullet point under (A) the words in brackets: " (having regard to any SPG produced) " (FC15)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/42
	C) Add at the end of paragraph 4.9.15 a new sentence as follows: ...in travel behaviour. " Further details regarding road access and highway safety may be provided in supplementary planning guidance. " (FC16)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/43

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 12 (& Glossary)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) by deleting the following text from policy 12: “ and fully comply with TfL guidance (Intermodal Transport Interchange Best Practice Guidelines for London) and ILTs best practice guidance (Passenger Interchanges: A Practical Way of Achieving Passenger Transport Integration). ” (FC17)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/44
	B) Add to the Glossary of the UDP definitions of “ Transport Development Areas ” and “ Major Development Opportunities ”	Accepted	For the reasons of ease of reference and comparison set out in the Inspector's report Action: add to Glossary as follows – <u>Transport Development Areas</u> <u>Areas surrounding Strategic Transport Hubs which have potential for redevelopment.</u> <u>Major Development Opportunities</u> <u>Site specific proposals for important sites in the Borough where a land use is not normally specified.</u>	MOD-T/276 MOD-T/273
Policy 13 (& Para 4.9.27)	I recommend that Policy 13 of the RDUDP be modified: A) by deleting from the policy the final bullet point referring to the maintenance of an international terminal at Waterloo Station. (FC18)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Delete following text from final bullet point of Policy 13 – ‘Maintain international terminal at Waterloo station.’	MOD-T/45
	B) by deleting the words “ and also possibly at Brixton, ” from the final sentence of paragraph 4.9.27. (FC19)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/46

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 14 (& Para 4.9.35)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Delete the words in brackets “(see any supplementary planning guidance produced)” in the final sentence of sub-paragraph (E) of Policy 14. (FC20)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/47
	B) Add at the end of paragraph 4.9.35 an additional sentence to read: “ Further details regarding car free development may be provided in supplementary planning guidance. ” (FC21)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/48
Table 6	I recommend that Table 6 of the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend Table 6: Hotels (C) by deleting 1space/30 bedrooms in columns 3 and 4 and replace with “ assessed on a case by case basis ”.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/49
	B) Amend Table 6: Community Facilities add to columns 2, 3 and 4: “ -assessed on a case by case basis ” (LBL/14/3)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/50
Map 1	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by adding an explanation of the derivation of Map 1 and the Public Transport Accessibility Levels that it shows as follows: Add an asterisk to the term “Public Transport Accessibility Model”* in the second sentence in paragraph 4.9.3. Add as a footnote (or as an entry in the Glossary) to read along the following lines taken from Annex 4 of the LP: “ Plan Public Transport Accessibility Levels: Map 1 derives from Map 2A.3: Access to Public Transport in the London Plan. Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) have been adopted by TfL to	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Insert – <u>'Produced by Transport for London for the London Borough of Lambeth'</u> Note: the PTAL map is regularly updated and the latest version is provided here. Action: add explanatory note as footnote to 'Public Transport	MOD-T/51 MOD-T/52

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>produce a consistent London wide public transport access mapping facility to assist boroughs with locational planning and assessment of appropriate parking provision by measuring broad public transport accessibility levels. The use of PTALs in assisting the determination of appropriate development locations and parking standards requires TfL to maintain and periodically update such information. TfL will provide updated maps generally on a bi-annual basis, with interim updates for areas affected by significant schemes."</p>		<p>Accessibility Model' in Para 4.9.3.</p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Policy 15 (Table 7 & Paras 4.10.3, 4.10.5, 4.10.5a, 4.10.6 and 4.10.7)</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified in accordance with Pre-inquiry Changes PI 2-13 (CD4/21), as set out and paragraph numbered in CD/4.20 AND:</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>21</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: Amend Policy 15 paragraph (A) as follows - Lambeth will provide over the plan period to 2002-2016 sufficient additional housing to meet rates of provision in line with, and in addition to, the Borough's assessed levels within the London Housing Capacity Study 2000. The following additional housing dwelling units shall be provided:</p> <p><u>The Council will promote a range of new housing development to meet different needs and demands including that for affordable housing in order to achieve:</u></p> <p>i) <u>the provision of</u> a minimum of 20,500 (about 1400/year) net additional overall dwelling completions <u>homes</u> between 2002 and 2016; and</p> <p>ii) as part of this, the development of a minimum of 8,200 (about 550/year net) additional affordable dwelling completions between 2002 and 2016.</p> <p><i>The progress of housing completions and permissions and their relationship to housing need will be closely monitored, in line with government good practice guidance, and adjustments to the housing provision levels will be proposed where necessary.</i></p> <p>Action: Amend the following text from Para 4.10.3 as shown – 'Lambeth has radically reviewed its policy against four sources of additional housing identified in Strategic Planning Guidance (RPG3):'</p> <p>Action: Amend the following text from Para 4.10.5 as shown – 'These changes would give an estimate of about 1400 additional dwellings</p>	<p>MOD-T/53 MOD-T/54 MOD-T/55 MOD-T/56 MOD-T/57 MOD-T/58 MOD-T/59 MOD-T/60 MOD-T/61 MOD-T/62 MOD-T/63 MOD-T/65</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	A) By adding beneath the heading of Table 7: “ (net additional homes). ”	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/66
	B) By amending paragraph 4.10.6 to read as follows: “Lambeth is committed to reducing its large number of empty properties and has flexible planning policies and an Empty Property Strategy to help bring them back into use. They are now included within the allocation levels in line with Government policy. The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored. ”	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/64
Policy 16 (Para 4.10.18) Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting the second sentence in paragraph 4.10.18. (LBL/16/4)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: Delete following text from second sentence of paragraph 4.10.18 – ‘Where the policy applies to only part of a site then the proportion of affordable housing sought will be applied pro-rata, where this would be higher than that normally required’.	MOD-T/68
Policy 17 Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the second sentence of paragraph (C) of Policy 17 of the RDUDP be modified to read as follows: “Where the dwelling to be converted has a rear garden, then family units(s) (two or more bedrooms) on the ground floor/ semi -basement floor should be included, with”.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/70

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
document	B) Delete the reference to SPG in Part (C) (vi) and relocate it to the supporting text.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Note: the Council have taken the Inspector's reference as to (D)(vi) rather than (C)(vi) as this is the location of the reference to SPG in the Policy.</p> <p>Action: Amend part (D)(vi) of the policy as follows: <i>'(vi) room sizes should have regard to relevant supplementary planning guidance rooms should be of an appropriate size; and'</i></p> <p>Action: Insert new text following Para 4.10.23a: <u>4.10.23b To ensure that conversions provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future residents, rooms should be of an appropriate size, having regard to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance.</u></p>	MOD-T/71 MOD-T/73
Policy 18	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 19	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 20	<p>That the RDUDP be modified by amending paragraph (B) of Policy 20 to read as follows:</p> <p>"(B) Residential Requirement - In areas specified in (A), in addition to active frontage uses (where required), where an increase in commercial floorspace of greater than 200 sq.m. is proposed then an equal amount of floorspace of functionally independent residential accommodation with separate access should be provided. The amount of residential floorspace may be</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> <p>Note: for the purposes of clarity "public transport accessibility" will be used rather than "public transport access" as a more accurate planning terminology.</p>	MOD-T/74

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	adjusted in individual cases taking into account the site location, its physical characteristics, existing mixed use on the site which will be retained, the character and function of the area, the need to promote the regeneration of the area, public transport access , and the likely impact on sustainability, overall travel patterns and car use." (FC22-amended)			
4.12 Note: Other changes to this section are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Policy 21</p> <p>Note: Other changes to this policy and how it relates to other employment policies are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending Policy 21 to read as follows:</p> <p>ii) regard will be had to public transport. Proposals that would exceed the capacity of existing, or firmly proposed improvements to, public transport infrastructure will be resisted..." (FC23)</p> <p>iiid) proposals should include an element of small office suites on site or in the vicinity, except for sites in the Waterloo Office Regeneration Area. A significant element..." (FC24)</p>	Partly accepted	<p>Reason: The Inspector's recommendation to include consideration of firmly proposed improvements to public transport infrastructure is supported. However in the sentence before this, his recommendation has removed the word "capacity". As public transport capacity is a critical issue when considering large-scale office development, it is considered that the term should be reinstated.</p> <p>Action: Include the following text as the first two sentences of section (iia) of Policy 21: '(iia) regard will be had to public transport capacity. Proposals that would exceed the capacity of existing, or firmly proposed improvements to, public transport infrastructure will be resisted.'</p>	MOD-T/76
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/77
<p>Policy 22 (& Paras 4.12.12 and 4.12.16)</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Add a new sentence at the end of paragraph 4.12.12 to read:</p> <p>"KIBAs are Lambeth's "Locally Significant Industrial Sites" as defined in the Mayor of London's London Plan." (FC25)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/80

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Note: Other changes to this policy and how it relates to other employment policies are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document</p>	<p>B) Add a new sentence after the first sentence in paragraph 4.12.16 to read:</p> <p>“These employment sites, which are outside KIBAs, are Lambeth’s “Other Industrial Sites”, as identified in the Mayor of London’s London Plan.” (FC26)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p> <p>Note: this paragraph follows Policy 23 and is located there in the Proposed Modifications document.</p>	MOD-T/84
	<p>C) Amend the second paragraph of the policy to read:</p> <p>“Parts of KIBAs have Major Development Opportunities (as show on the Proposals Map) that are listed as Mixed-use Employment Areas and described under area headings in Section B of the Plan. Here some residential and other non-employment uses are acceptable on appropriate parts of the site. The overall development, however, should be predominantly employment-based, incorporating the maximum feasible amount of employment development-either at least 50% of the site area or 50% of the replacement floorspace should be B1/B2/B8 including the work element of any work-live scheme, unless otherwise specified in the MDO. A lower proportion will be considered for schemes predominantly of affordable housing. The scheme should include improved access for the employment uses, separate, as far as possible, from the residential access.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/78

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	D) Add, as a footnote to the policy, the explanation set out in LBL/22/2 in response to Reydene Ltd, as to how it is intended the accounting of the employment and residential elements in work/live and live/work will operate.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: Add an asterisk to the end of the policy and add as a footnote the following text –</p> <p><u>'Work-live' development, which meets the criteria in Policy 24, can be suitable in Mixed Use Employment Areas, and the work element can be counted as employment floorspace for the purposes of the 50% requirement in Policy 22. 'Live-work' development, which does not meet the criteria in Policy 24 for 'Work-live' development, can also be acceptable in Mixed Use Employment Areas - as part of the residential component - but its 'work' element would not be considered in terms of the 50% employment requirement. Both 'Work-live' and 'Live-work' development would only be acceptable if the location where it is proposed is also suitable for permanent residential accommodation, in terms of surrounding land uses and the local environment.'</u></p>	MOD-T/82
<p>Policy 23</p> <p>Note: Other changes to this policy and how it relates to other employment policies are proposed by the Council – see Proposed</p>	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Note: A change to Policy 23 is included under the recommendations for Policy 22 above.</p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Modifications document				
Policy 23A	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 24	I recommend that Policy 24 of the RDUDP be modified as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/85
	A) Amend the first sentence of Part (A) of the policy to read: "work-live development – where: the development comprises principally employment floorspace with residential accommodation with less than two bedrooms: the work..."			
	B) Add at the end of Part A the following: "In schemes where a large number of work-units are proposed, a small proportion of small family sized (2 bedroom) work-live units may be permitted, but one bedroom units would be expected to predominate."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/86
	C) Delete from the final paragraph the words: "removing permitted development rights for reversion to one or other use and for residential extension;"	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/87
D) Add at the end of the final paragraph the following: "It should be noted that there are no permitted development rights for reversion to one or other use, nor for residential extension." (FC28)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/89	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	E) Delete the final sentence and replace it with the following: "The normal affordable housing requirement as set out in Policy 16 will apply to approved live-work units" (FC27)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/88
Policy 25	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by the deletion of Policy 25.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/90
Policy 26 (& Para 4.13.7)	That the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the first sub-paragraph of part (C) of Policy 26 to read: "Protection of Community Facilities – The loss of a community use falling within the D1 use class will be resisted unless: i) A facility of equivalent functionality is replaced locally, or adequate planning obligations are secured to mitigate against its loss. This would require securing or improving facilities of equivalent functionality in the area and ensuring their long-term viability; and ii) Both the site and any buildings are unsuitable and/or unviable for redevelopment for community uses for which there is a local shortage or deficiency. (FC30 amended)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/91
	B) Within Part (C) of Policy 26, after the 2 nd paragraph, add: "The Council will support the dual use of education facilities between schools and the community." (FC29)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/92

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Amend Part (D) to read:</p> <p>“Deficiencies in Community Facilities – In developments capable of providing 10 or more residential units, or on sites of 0.1 Ha or more irrespective of the number of units, or for major developments, where the development creates or exacerbates an existing shortage of community facilities. (FC34)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/93
	<p>D) Add to the policy, after (H), a new paragraph as follows:</p> <p>i) “Proposals for new or improved education facilities will be permitted provided that the site or buildings are appropriate for their intended use, and that the nature and scale of the proposal, including hours of operation, do not unacceptably harm the amenities of the area through noise, disturbance, or traffic generation.”</p> <p>ii) “Use for Functions – Proposals for community facilities...” (FC31)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/94
	<p>E) Insert a new paragraph before 4.13.7 as follows:</p> <p>“Lambeth currently makes good provision of primary schools, however, pupil numbers will be regularly reviewed during the UDP Plan period to ensure that primary school provision remains adequate. There is currently a proposal for one new primary school arising from redevelopment of Clapham Park Estate”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/95

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>F) Delete paragraph 4.13.7 and replace it with the following:</p> <p>“Lambeth Council has set an objective of significantly increasing the proportion of Lambeth secondary-age children who are educated in the Borough to at least 80% by 2016/17 as one of the outcomes to be achieved by the Transforming Secondary Schooling Programmed. In the shorter term this will be delivered through incorporating some expansion of existing schools into Building Schools for the Future (BSF), combined with increasing the number of schools through a new school on the existing Elmcourt site in West Norwood and a new Academy. During the UDP plan period, it is expected pupil numbers will be regularly reviewed to ensure that Secondary School provision meets the needs of Lambeth parents and children.” (FC33 as amended by LBL/26/5).</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/96
	<p>G) Add another paragraph after paragraph 4.13.7 as follows:</p> <p>“The Council has no definite plans to create new Further & Higher Education provision in the near future that would require a new site.”</p>	Not accepted	Reason: the Council does not have powers for the provision of Further and Higher Education. Also statements indicating what will not happen does not add to the plan's value.	
Table 8	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 27	<p>I recommend that Policy 27 of the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>“(E) harm the architectural character of a listed or other public house of distinctive architectural character by way of extension or alteration (including, for a listed public house, its special interior character), and/or the architectural character of the street.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/97

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 28	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by replacing "Waterloo Visitor Management Area" with " Strategic Cultural Area ".	Not Accepted	<p>Reason: the London Plan's Strategic Cultural Area, shown diagrammatically in the London Plan, is similar geographically to the Waterloo Visitor Management Area, but the WVMA has other purposes. The Council will therefore add to the supporting text to say that many of the objectives of the WVMA are consistent with those of the LP's SCAs.</p> <p>Action: add text to the end of paragraph 4.14.2 – <u>'The Waterloo Visitor Management Area geographically broadly reflects the London Plan's Strategic Cultural Area but functions with a wider remit, such as e.g. management of coach parking.'</u></p>	MOD-T/98
Policy 29 (& Paras 4.14.5 and 4.14.7a)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by:</p> <p>A) Amend paragraph 4.14.5 to read:</p> <p>"This requires careful control and management, however, in order to encourage the diversity of the centre and to ensure that the benefits brought by diversification are not outweighed by the problems that may be created."</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/100

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) Amend paragraph 4.14.7a</p> <p>“Subsequent to the Licensing Act of 2003 Lambeth, like a number of other Central London Boroughs, is moving towards area based planning and licensing, a more tailored approach to hours of use etc. based on the characteristics of individual areas. The UDP will be used alongside the Borough's Statement of Licensing Policy to determine the land-use and amenity aspects of....”</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>However, as a point of clarification it is not necessary to implement the second recommended change to the paragraph in this instance as it has been accepted in part (D) (see below). 'The Borough's Statement of Licensing Policy' is captured in the reference to 'any area based supplementary and licensing guidance' as per the recommended and accepted change below. The sentence would not make sense in implementing both recommendations.</p>	MOD-T/101
	<p>C) deleting the words: “having regard to any area based supplementary planning and licensing guidance”, from the end of the first sentence of part (ii) of Policy 29 (FC35). AND</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/99
	<p>D) Amend the second sentence of paragraph 4.14.7a to read:</p> <p>“...individual areas. The UDP and any area based supplementary planning and licensing guidance will be used to determine the land-use and amenity aspects of licensing applications. (FC36)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/102

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Policy 30 (& Para 4.14.9)</p> <p>Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications</p>	<p>I recommend:</p> <p>(A) that Part B of Policy 30 of the RDUDP be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>“Commercial developments associated with arts and cultural uses will be permitted where they are ancillary and complementary to the arts or cultural use, and where there is a clear and lasting benefit to the arts or cultural use. In addition, the Council will support unrelated commercial development at the South Bank Centre only if it can be shown to meet all of the following criteria:</p> <p>i) that it is essential to the development and/or the retention of arts and cultural facilities;</p> <p>ii) that its development would not undermine the primary character and function of the South Bank Centre as an arts and cultural quarter; and</p> <p>iii) that the proceeds of any such development are applied exclusively to support and enhance the South Bank Arts and Cultural Centre.”</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> <p>Note: The first two paragraphs of Part B should be retained as they relate to other issues associated with the protection of cultural facilities.</p>	MOD-T102a
	<p>B) that the 4th sentence in paragraph 4.14.9 be amended to read:</p> <p>“...(see policies 30 and 73). Outside the South Bank Centre there is the Oval House Theatre and Community Arts Centre, the National Theatre and the National Film Theatre (which is proposing new premises).”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/103

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 31 (& Para 4.15.5)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend Parts (vii) and (ix) of Policy 31 to read: (vii) "Promote community safety. (ix) "Be designed around movement by foot, cycle and public transport, and minimise traffic conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Road and junction dimensions should be restricted in size and a flexible approach will be taken by the Council where this helps achieve good layouts." (FC37)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/104
	B) Add at the end of paragraph 4.15.5 the following: "Regard should also be had to the objectives of the "Secured by Design" programme and new residential layout should meet "Home Zone" standards as far as possible." (FC38)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/105
Table 9	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 31a (& Para 4.15.10a)	I recommend that Policy 31a and paragraph 4.15.10a of the RDUDP be modified as set out in the Council's Further Changes FC39 and FC40.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete third sentence from Policy 31a – ' In particular, developers should show how they have taken 'Secured by Design' into account. ' (FC39) Action: add additional text to paragraph 4.15.10a – <u>'Developers should show how they have taken the 'Secured by design' into account.'</u> (FC40)	MOD-T/106 MOD-T107

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 32 (& Glossary)	<p>I recommend that Policy 32 of the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>1) Amend Part A to read:</p> <p>“All development should be of a high quality design and contribute positively to its surrounding area.</p> <p>A) Infill development should be compatible with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the site, context and historic development of the area; 2) existing topography, landscaping and boundary treatments; 3) prevailing building lines and plot sizes; 4) the height, massing and scale of neighbouring buildings, 5) roof profiles and silhouettes of adjoining buildings; 6) colour, type, source and texture of local materials; 7) architectural compositions including patterns and rhythms and set pieces of townscape; 8) established gaps and open spaces, views and skylines.” (FC41) 	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/108

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>2) Add to the plan's Glossary the following definition:</p> <p>"Infill</p> <p>Infill development is the insertion of one or more new buildings within an existing townscape." (FC42)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/272
	<p>3) Change the heading of section (A1) by deleting "Larger scale or extensive development should:" and replace with "Major development should" (FC43)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/109
	<p>4) Delete Section B (FC44)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete text from Section B of Policy as follows –</p> <p>'(B) Design of Facades – new buildings should have a structure composed of:</p> <p>(iv) a base, which addresses the street with entrances at ground floor level, of human scale which closely addresses the vertical and horizontal elements on the street. Developments raised above ground floor/sub-ground floor parking decks are not acceptable;</p> <p>(v) a middle, of definite rhythm, proportions and pattern, with particular emphasis on reveals and fenestration;</p> <p>(vi) a clear upper termination of the building such as a roof, cornice, pediment or entablature, with interest and variety in the roofscape (where appropriate).'' (FC44)</p>	MOD-T/110

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 32a (Para 4.15.18b)	I recommend that: A) the RDUDP be modified by deleting the final sentence of paragraph of 4.15.18b. (FC46)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete final sentence from paragraph 4.15.18b – 'Under RPG9, local authorities are charged with using their own development control and building regulation process to seek the incorporation of appropriate renewable energy heating or power systems into the design of new development.' (FC46)	MOD-T/111
	B) Add at the end of paragraph 4.15.18b as follows: "The policy will only be applied where the installation of renewable energy generation equipment is viable given the type of development proposed its location, and design."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/112
Policy 32b	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 33 (& Para 4.15.19)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified in accordance with the Further Changes FC50 and 51 (relating to Policy 33 and paragraph 4.15.19 of the supporting text).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete text from second sentence of Policy as follows – 'Regard should be had to the additional guidance contained in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance "Guidelines for Extension and Alterations". Delete text from part D of Policy as follows - (in respect of daylight having regard to Building Research Establishment standards)' (FC50).	MOD-T/113 MOD-T/114 MOD-T/115 MOD-T/116

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>Action: add sentence after fourth sentence of paragraph 4.15.19 – <u>'In respect of daylight regard should be had to the Building Research Establishment standards.'</u></p> <p>Action: add new text to last sentence of paragraph 4.15.19 – 'Lambeth has recently adopted residential design guidance on residential alterations and extensions, <u>as supplementary planning guidance to which regard should be had</u>, which elaborates on the policies contained in this section.' (FC51)</p> <p>Note: The words "recently adopted" should be removed from paragraph 4.15.19 as these SPGs were adopted in 2000.</p>	
Policy 34	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend Part C (i) of Policy 34 to read:</p> <p>“...active building work. Displays above fascia level should not diminish from the architectural quality of the building” AND(</p> <p>B) Delete the reference to “see glossary” following “On traditional buildings” in Part A ii) of the policy.</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/118
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/117
Policy 35	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 35 to read:</p> <p>“Proposals to intensify existing residential/mixed-use areas are welcomed where this can be achieved through good design and without</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/119

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	harming local amenities. Any attractive prevailing character...."			
Policy 36 (& Para 4.15.27)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified in accordance with Further Changes FC52 and 53.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete text from final sentence of part A of Policy – ' having regard to best practice guidance such as "Streets for All". ' (FC52) Action: add text to end of second sentence of paragraph 4.15.27 – <u>',' to which regard should be had'</u> (FC53).	MOD-T/120 MOD-T/121
Policy 37 (& Paras 4.15.32 and 4.15.33)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the final sentence of the first paragraph of Policy 37 to read: "New high buildings, including extensions to existing buildings, will be permitted where the following criteria are satisfied: B) Delete the third sentence of the second paragraph of the policy. This section would then read: ".... Prominent features in the vicinity. To assist assessment, plans should be accompanied by accurate representations...." AND	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/122
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/123

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Amend the Urban Design section of the policy in accordance with Further Change 54 AND by:</p> <p>i) Amend the 2nd bullet point to read: “the development should interact with, and contribute to its surroundings, at street level.”</p> <p>ii) Amend the 3rd bullet point to read: “development should provide a proper setting and treatment, including the provision of mixed-uses, active frontage uses where appropriate, considerable improvements to the public realm, and landscaped open space.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: implement Inspector recommendations as noted and delete the second bullet point under Urban Design –</p> <p>□ ‘The site should be sufficiently large and the approach comprehensive to secure a complete and well designed setting of lower buildings and the public realm at street level.’ (FC54)</p>	<p>MOD-T/124 MOD-T/125 MOD-T/126</p>
	<p>D) Amend the final 2 sentences of paragraph 4.15.32 to read:</p> <p>...“Lambeth will support high buildings in appropriate locations and resist them in inappropriate ones. The policy protects the setting and historic skyline of the most sensitive areas whilst supporting high buildings of outstanding design where their visual and transport impact can be most easily accommodated”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/127

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>E) Add a new sentence at the end of the end of the same paragraph (4.15.32) to read:</p> <p>“The London Plan provides the strategic framework for tall buildings in the capital. Applications involving tall buildings will be referred to the Mayor for his views and over which he has a power of direction”.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Note: for clarity of London Plan's role and remit and expanded wording will be used as follows – The London Plan provides the strategic framework for tall buildings in the capital. Applications involving tall buildings <u>(over 25m adjacent to the Thames and 30m elsewhere in the Borough)</u> will be referred to the Mayor for his views and over which he has a power of direction <u>of refusal.</u></p>	MOD-T/128

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>F) Amend paragraph 4.15.33 of the plan by deleting the final 2 sentences and creating a new paragraph to follow it to read:</p> <p>“4.15.33a Lambeth will use the criteria in the policy to select areas which might be most appropriate for high buildings. These are more likely to be locations that would provide a focus and momentum for regeneration or growth or which have (or with the potential to have) high public transport accessibility and capacity. The Council, together with its partners, intends to carry out further work, in accordance with the English Heritage and CABE “Guidance on Tall Buildings” to assess if there are areas in the borough that can be specifically identified as appropriate for high buildings. Initially, it will produce development frameworks, for the Areas of Opportunity at Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea. The recommendations and conclusions of those studies will be published as Supplementary Planning Guidance (or as Supplementary Planning Documents/ Area Action Plans) as they become adopted.” In this work, the relationship and height to historic buildings and skylines will be a very important factor. (FC55 amended)</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>For purposes of clarity amended wording is proposed to make clear how this work will be progressed –</p> <p>4.15.33a Lambeth will use the criteria in the policy to select areas which might be most appropriate for high buildings. These are more likely to be locations that would provide a focus and momentum for regeneration or growth or which have (or with the potential to have) high public transport accessibility and capacity. The Council, together with its partners, intends to carry out further work, in accordance with the English Heritage and CABE “Guidance on Tall Buildings” to assess if there are areas in the borough that can be specifically identified as appropriate for high buildings. Initially, it will produce development frameworks, for the Areas of Opportunity at Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea. The recommendations and conclusions of this will provide the evidence base for the preparation of SPDs and Area Action Plans for Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms. those studies will be published as Supplementary Planning Guidance (or as Supplementary Planning Documents/ Area Action Plans) as they become adopted.” In this work, the relationship and height to historic buildings and skylines will be a very important factor.</p>	MOD-T/129

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 37a	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting the final sentence from Part (ii) of Policy 37a (FC56).</p> <p>The Council should seek to make available maps supporting the views identified in Part (iii) of the policy, as SPG, as soon as resources permit after the adoption of the plan.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete final sentence from part (ii) of the Policy – 'This will not be the case where clear sky remains on either side of the object of the strategic view to retain the sense of an uncluttered backdrop.' (FC56)</p> <p>Action: when resources permit, make available maps of important views/strategic viewing corridors.</p>	MOD-T/130
Policy 38 (& Para 4.16.4)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend sub-paragraph (b) of Policy 38 to read:</p> <p>(b) “Improvements to pedestrian crossings of the river and enhanced pedestrian priority on Thames Bridges are promoted.”</p> <p>B) Amend the 3rd sentence of Part (e) of the policy to read:</p> <p>“...to the public. The walkway should be at least 6m wide (and, where appropriate, widened to this through redevelopment), dedicated to public use and open to the public at all times.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/131
		Accepted	This was already amended in the RDUDP but not clearly visible.	MOD-T/132

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Amend the final 2 sentence of paragraph 4.16.4 to read:</p> <p>“...this through redevelopment. The proposed boundaries have been defined in line with London policy RPG3b para 3.9 following a character appraisal of this section of the river and detailed discussions and consultation with adjoining riparian Boroughs and the GLA. There was no objection to the boundaries chosen. The proposed boundaries therefore include open spaces and areas such as Archbishops Park and Spring Gardens, where the aspiration is to improve links to the River and nearby development.</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/133
Policy 39	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Table 11	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 40	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 41	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 41a (& Paras 4.17.9a and 4.17.9c)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend Policy 41a to read:</p> <p>“The Council will compile and adopt a list of buildings and structures of local historic or architectural interest.</p> <p>The Council will use development control procedures to resist proposals for the demolition of buildings or structures on the local list.</p> <p>Proposals for the alteration or extension of buildings on the local list will be expected to relate sensitively to the building or structure and respect its architectural or historic interest. The Council will seek to preserve features of such buildings which contribute to that interest.” (FC57 amended)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/134
	<p>B) Amend the final sentence of paragraph 4.17.9a to read:</p> <p>“In assessing buildings, the age, architectural or historic interest and the contribution to townscape will be important considerations as well as criteria and guidance to be produced by English Heritage.” (FC58)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, the Council will refer only to guidance produced by English Heritage rather than guidance that may in the future be produced, as the Council is unable to make tangible reference to such guidance. This sentence will therefore read as follows – ‘In assessing buildings, the age, architectural or historic interest and the contribution to townscape will be important considerations as well as criteria and guidance to be produced by English Heritage’.</p>	MOD-T/135

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	C) Add a sentence at the end of paragraph 4.17.9a to read: “Buildings on the local list will not have the full protection of statutory listing.”	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/136
	D) Delete paragraph 4.17.9c from the supporting text (FC59).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete paragraph 4.17.9c – ‘4.17.9c Alterations to buildings on the local list should have regard to the guidance on alterations to listed buildings contained in Annex C of PPG15 which should be interpreted flexibly according to the special character of the building.’ (FC59)	MOD-T/137
Policy 42 (& Paras 4.17.12-4.17.14 and Proposals Map)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Delete: i) the word “permit” in the second sentence of Part (B) and ii) delete the final sentence of Part B of the policy. (FC60)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/138
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete final sentence of Part B of Policy – ‘New development and enhancement proposals in conservation areas should have particular regard to these guidelines.’ (FC60)	MOD-T/139

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) Amend Part (C) of the policy to read:</p> <p>“The Council will resist granting consent for the demolition of a building, or a substantial part of a building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area” (FC61)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/140
	<p>C) Amend Part D of the policy to read:</p> <p>“Alteration and Extensions – Alterations to elevations of buildings in conservation areas, including window designs and shop fronts should preserve or enhance features of the original building, having regard to policy 33.” (FC60)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/141
	<p>D) Insert a new penultimate sentence in paragraph 4.17.12 so that it reads:</p> <p>“...will and will not be approved. New development and enhancement proposals in conservation areas should have particular regard to these guidelines. Design guides and directions.....” (FC62)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/142
	<p>E) Amend the final sentence of paragraph 4.17.13 to read:</p> <p>“The Council will use this power to control unnecessary demolition of buildings. Where demolition is proposed, applicants will be required to justify the demolition of a building which the Council considers makes a positive contribution to a conservation area, and have regard to paragraphs 3.16-3.19 of PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment.” (FC63)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/143

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>F) Add a sentence at the end of paragraph 4.17.14 to read:</p> <p>“...are strongly discouraged. In relation to alterations and extensions regard should be had to residential design guidance for alterations and extensions.” (FC64)</p> <p>G) Amend the Proposals Map by deleting “proposed additions” and “proposed deletions” to conservation areas from the map and notations.</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/144
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Maps 14 & 15)	MOD-PM/2
Policy 43 (Proposals Map)	I recommend that the Proposals Map of the RDUDP be modified to ensure that the notation for archaeological priority areas can be readily distinguished from other notations, but particularly the Lambeth Cycle Network.	Accepted	For better clarity of the Proposals Map notation	MOD-PM/3

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Policy 44 (Para 4.18.1 and 4.18.2)</p> <p>Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as set out in Pre-inquiry Changes PI14 to 19 (CD4.21)</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>50</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: Amend Policy 44 in accordance with the following text –</p> <p>Policy No. 44 Metropolitan Open Land</p> <p><i>Areas designated as Metropolitan Open Land are shown on the Proposals Map.</i></p> <p><u><i>These strategically important open spaces predominantly open character of these areas as open spaces is are protected and there is a presumption against inappropriate development.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Within Metropolitan Open Land, development will not be permitted be inappropriate unless it is used for any of the following purposes:</i></u></p> <p>a) <u><i>Essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, for cemeteries and other uses of land which preserve the openness of the MOL and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;</i></u></p> <p>b) <u><i>Limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings;</i></u></p> <p><i>(a) Any development is ancillary to, and does not conflict with the purposes of including the land as MOL established in strategic guidance: and</i></p> <p><i>(b) Any development is small in scale and is required to preserve or enhance activities associated with the particular open space and does not undermine its metropolitan interest.</i></p>	<p>MOD-T/145 MOD-T/146 MOD-T/147 MOD-T/148 MOD-T/149 MOD-T/150</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	AND by updating the text of paragraph 4.18.2 to: A) confirm that the regional derivation for the policy now lies with the London Plan. AND	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: amend first sentence of paragraph 4.18.2 to state – 'Metropolitan Open Land is defined by the government <u>London Plan</u> as any land ...'	MOD-T/151
	B) add the missing criterion in accordance with Further Change FC65 to be consistent with Policy 3D.9 of the London Plan.		For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: add a fourth point to paragraph 4.18.2 to include – ' 4. Land that forms part of a Green Link–Chain and meets one of the above criteria. ' (FC65 – amended by Council as advised by Inspector for consistency with London Plan).	MOD-T/152
Policy 45 (& Para 4.18.3a and Proposals Map) Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) by deleting from the Proposals Map the "Other Public Open Space" allocation on the Shell Podium site (Proposals Map 10). B) amending the Proposals Map by showing the Hungerford car park as New Public Open Space (Map A, LBL/45/1). C) Add Riverlink Square, to the north of the Royal Festival Hall (Map B, LBL/45/1), as an "Other Open Space" on the Proposals Map.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 21)	MOD-PM/25
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 1)	MOD-PM/4
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report to indicate the newly created open space (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 2)	MOD-PM/5

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	D) Amend line 3 of Part (I) of the policy to read: "... to National Playing Field Association standards will be sought, where appropriate , in residential developments". (FC66)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/156
	E) Add at the end of Part J of the policy: "...whilst taking account of nature conservation. West Norwood cemetery will be managed in accordance with conservation and ecclesiastical law ". (FC67)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/157
	F) Delete the "private playing field" notation from the Streatham Hill Reservoir site on the Proposals Map.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 3)	MOD-PM/6
	G) Add to the Proposals Map under the appropriate notation the sites of: i) the bowling green at Streatham Constitutional Club, Leigham Court Road; ii) a grass and hard court area at St Leonard's School Mitcham; and iii) the correct boundary of the site of St Leonard's Churchyard, Streatham.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for correct delineation of open space boundaries. Action: add to Proposals Map – <input type="checkbox"/> the bowling green at Streatham Constitutional Club, Leigham Court Road as 'Private or School Playing Field or Court'; <input type="checkbox"/> a grass and hard court area at St Leonard's School Mitcham as 'Private or School Playing Field or Court'; <input type="checkbox"/> the correct boundary of the site of St Leonard's Churchyard, Streatham. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Maps 4, 5 and 6)	MOD-PM/7 MOD-PM/8 MOD-PM/9

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>H) Replace the term "Green Link" with "Green Chain" where the 2 concepts are synonymous.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: replace the term 'Green Link' with Green Chain at Part C of Policy 45 – '(C) New Open Spaces, Greening, and Green Links Chains - ..' (see also change to Policy 44 above)</p>	MOD-T/155
	<p>I) Amend the second sentence of Part B of the policy to read:</p> <p>"...unenclosed space. Buildings, paving, extensions and enclosures are not permitted on commons land and on Rush Common protected land (as shown on the Proposals Map)."</p>	Partly accepted	<p>Reason: The Inspector's revision to replace the reference to 'parks' with 'commons' is accepted, however there is also a need to clarify that these provisions will only apply where any proposed buildings, paving, enclosures or extensions are actually subject to planning control.</p> <p>Action: Amend the second sentence of Part B of the policy to read: <i>"...unenclosed space. Where these are subject to planning control,</i> <i>bBuildings, paving, extensions and enclosures are will not be permitted on commons land and on Rush Common protected land (as shown on the Proposals Map)."</i></p>	MOD-T/154

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	J) Amend paragraph 4.18.3a to read: "4.18.3a Policy 45 is concerned primarily with the protection of open spaces in the borough. In the case of open space in adjoining boroughs used by Lambeth residents the Council will seek to protect it as a consultee. There is a broad range of open space types..."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/158
Table 12	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by replacing Table 12 with the updated and approved version "Developing a Strategic Approach"	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and to provide the most up-to-date version of the Council's approach to open spaces (see Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/161
Table 13	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/163
	A) By inserting the updated source of Table 13 as: "The London Plan-Table 3D.1". (FC68) AND B) Amend the heading of the Table to read: "Types of Open Space in London"	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/162
Map 2 (& Para 4.18.20)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by: A) deleting Map 2 (Open Space Deficiency Areas) and	Not Accepted	Reason: In his reasoning, the Inspector states that an alternative to deleting Map 2 from the plan would be to replace it with an up-to-date, accurate version. This is the course of action the Council intends to follow. Action: Update Map 2 (Open Space Deficiency Areas) – see Section 2 of Modifications Document 4.	MOD-T/165

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) amending paragraph 4.18.20 to refer to the Council's Open Space Strategy (CD4.13) and the broad areas of open space deficiency for each level of open space in the hierarchy that are identified within it.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete second sentence and add new text to paragraph 4.18.20 to refer to the Open Space Strategy and areas of deficiency for types of open space – <u>'The Lambeth Open Space Strategy, completed in 2004, has identified areas of deficiency for each type of open space. Whilst it is not necessary to have access to all types of open spaces in each part of the Borough, there are certain locations notably deficient in certain types. No part of the Borough should be deficient in access to at least one type of space from the hierarchy of open space types. The southern and central areas of the Borough are deficient in provision of small local open spaces, with the northern part of the Borough well provided with such open spaces but deficient in district and metropolitan level open spaces. The approach adopts a London-wide methodology which needs to be interpreted with care in Lambeth.'</u></p>	MOD-T/164
Policy 45A	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) amend the third and final sentence of the first paragraph of Policy 45a to read:</p> <p>"The retention of the historic pavilion is desirable in any scheme of redevelopment which should also seek to respect its setting and appearance. The rebuilding of other stands would be acceptable."</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/166

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Amend subsection (iv) of the policy to read: "that the operation can be accommodated wholly within the ground and without the need to use land and buildings outside the site additional to that already permitted on a temporary basis. " (FC69 amended)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/167
	C) Amend the final sentence of the policy to read: " The Council will seek to ensure that the benefits of sport and regeneration development spreads to the surrounding area. "	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/168
Policy 46 (Para 4.19.1 and new Appendix)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by adding a list of sites of nature conservation interest as an appendix to the plan and cross-referenced to the supporting text of Policy 46 as follows: Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.19.1 to read: "Sites of Nature Conservation Importance are shown on the Proposals Map and listed in Appendix 1 . They are based...."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: add Appendix 1 to the UDP to include list of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest. (see Section 2 of Modifications Document 4)	MOD-T/169 MOD-T/170
Policy 47	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 48	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Add a new paragraph to read: "4. 21.11 The Council recognises that there is a need for additional public toilet facilities within the borough. Although the Council does not have a statutory duty to provide public toilets, it is deemed to be a necessary service for the public. During the plan period, the Council will continue to address the needs of its residents and visitors by seeking to retain the existing, and increase the provision of, public toilet in the borough." (FC71)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/172
	B) Delete the words in brackets in Part (H) of the policy and add a new paragraph (4.21.12) to read: "4. 21.12 Proposals for lighting should have regard to the Institute of Public Lighting Engineers standards." (FC70 and FC72)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete text from policy – <i>(H) Light Pollution –Should be minimised, particularly late at night and close to residential properties (having regard to Institute of Public Lighting Engineers standards). Floodlighting should not lead to unacceptable intensification of use, harming residential amenity.</i>	MOD-T/171 MOD-T/173
Policy 49 (& Paras 4.22.2 and 4.22.3)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: (A) Amend Part A (iii) of Policy 49 by replacing the words "special justification" with "clear justification".	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/174

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	(B) Amend Policy 49 and its supporting text at paragraphs 4.22.2 and 4.22.3 in accordance with Further Changes FC73, FC74 and FC75. (Check that the full spelling of acronyms e.g. “Electronic Communications Code Operators” are not deleted where they appear later in the text).	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete part (v) of Policy – '(v) A signed ICNIRP certificate from the Code System Operator Electronic Communications Code Operators stipulating that the facility when operational will not exceed ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure;' (FC73)</p> <p>Action: replace reference to 'CSO' in lines 5 and 8 of paragraph 4.22.2 with 'ECCO' (in first instance give full title “Electronic Communications Code Operators”) (FC74).</p> <p>Action: replace reference to 'CSO' in lines 11 and 12 of paragraph 4.22.3 with 'ECCO'. (FC75)</p> <p>Note: deletion of part (v) refers to second occurrence of Part (v) in the policy in the current version of the RDDUDP – numbering will be rectified in the final version of the UDP.</p>	MOD-T/175 MOD-T/176 MOD-T/177
Policy 50 (&Para 4.23.5)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) In part (A) of the policy, delete the words “where appropriate” from the second paragraph.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/179

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
<p>Note: Other changes to this policy are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document</p>	<p>B) In part (B), clarify whether “treatment facilities to recover value from residual waste” is to be a complementary use to manufacturing either in the policy itself or in the supporting text</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: In part (B) of the policy, at the end of the first sentence, add the following: <i>'...are safeguarded for waste manufacturing and complimentary complementary manufacturing use, <u>including treatment facilities to recover value from residual waste.</u>'</i></p> <p>Note: The word “complimentary” in the same sentence should be replaced with “complementary”.</p>	<p>MOD-T/180</p>
	<p>C) Amend (A1) of the policy to read:</p> <p>“ Waste Strategy</p> <p>Applications for developments to collect, store, process, transfer, transport waste and /or recyclable/compostable materials must provide for the sustainable management of waste.” (FC76) AND</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>	<p>MOD-T/178</p>
	<p>D) Amend the first paragraph of part (C) to read:</p> <p>“Environmental and Access Criteria – The following criteria will be used to assess proposals for a waste-management/manufacturing facility or treatment facilities to recover value from residual waste”</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>	<p>MOD-T/181</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>E) Amend part (C) (iii) of the policy to read:</p> <p>“The proposal should be designed and operated to minimise its environmental impact. It should not give rise to unacceptable visual, odour, dust and pollution, noise, water quality and overall impact. Consideration should be give to regeneration proposals in the area and adjoining land-uses, and whether the impact can, and will be satisfactorily mitigated.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/182
	<p>F) Add a new paragraph 4.23.1a to read:</p> <p>“4.23.1a Development must provide for the sustainable management of waste with regard to relevant waste management strategies. Relevant waste strategies include: national and international policy (National Waste Strategy, European Union directives and strategies); regional and sub regional policy (The Mayor of London's Municipal Waste Management Strategy and Western Riverside Joint Municipal Waste Strategy); and the Lambeth Waste Recycling and Management Plan.” (FC77)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/183
	<p>G) Amend paragraph 4.23.5 to explain how the policy intends to deal with the gap in recycling facilities in the north of the borough.</p>	Not accepted	Reason: There are no details available at present to explain how this issue is to be dealt with. In any event it would be a matter for the Waste Disposal Authority to procure additional recycling facilities.	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>H) Add at new paragraph following paragraph 4.23.5 to read:</p> <p>“Pending the completion of the Mayor’s evaluation of the adequacy of existing waste management and disposal facilities to meet London’s future needs, the Council will safeguard all existing waste management sites, whether publicly or privately operated, unless appropriate compensatory provision is made. If, following the evaluation, it is found necessary to identify new sites for new facilities or, to include a statement of total waste arisings, then the Council will undertake a review of these topics in the UDP or its replacement document.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/185
Policy 50a (& Paras 4.24.1 and 4.24.2)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend the policy to read:</p> <p>“The Council will, where appropriate, enter into legal agreements with developers, and seek the attainment of planning obligations, having regard to current Government Guidance.” (FC78) AND</p> <p>B) Amend the beginning of paragraph 4.24.1 to read:</p> <p>“Section 3.7 of the plan sets out the measures available to the Council to secure implementation of policy. However, the UDP contains a number of policies seeking certain...”</p> <p>C) Add at the end of paragraph 4.24.1 a new sentence:</p> <p>“These may need to be secured through planning obligations.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/186
	<p>B) Amend the beginning of paragraph 4.24.1 to read:</p> <p>“Section 3.7 of the plan sets out the measures available to the Council to secure implementation of policy. However, the UDP contains a number of policies seeking certain...”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/187
	<p>C) Add at the end of paragraph 4.24.1 a new sentence:</p> <p>“These may need to be secured through planning obligations.”</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report	MOD-T/188

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>D) Amend the final part of paragraph 4.24.2 to read:</p> <p>“The policy is written in such a way that it can accommodate any review of Government Guidance relating to planning obligations. Further details regarding planning obligations may also be provided in supplementary planning guidance.” (FC79)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>For purposes of clarity and reference to the most relevant planning framework, 'supplementary planning guidance' at the end of the final sentence will be replaced with 'supplementary planning documents'.</p>	MOD-T/189
Area and Site Policies (Section B)				
5.1	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 51	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>Add a new paragraph at the end of the policy to read:</p> <p>“(E) Opportunities</p> <p>Although not identified as an Opportunity Area in the London Plan the Albert Embankment lies between those at Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms. It may present a good opportunity to extend the South Bank Strategic Cultural Area into it within a new Opportunity Area. It is already within an Area of Regeneration. The Council will explore this potential with its strategic partners in the context of the Sub-Regional Development Framework.”</p>	Partly accepted	<p>Reason: the Council can accept the recommendation if it is in the form of additional supporting text, but not as an addition to the text of the policy. There is no mention of the extension of the South Bank Strategic Cultural Area southwards in the London Plan; the Albert Embankment is not within an Opportunity Area (mention is not made of this in the Mayor of London's representation); and mention should not be made in UDP policy of the Sub-Regional Development Framework that is the realm of the London Plan, albeit with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Action: Add new paragraph following para 5.2.1, as follows: <u>‘Although not identified as an Opportunity Area in the London Plan</u></p>	MOD-T/190

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<u>the Albert Embankment lies between those at Waterloo and Vauxhall/Nine Elms, and is within an Area of Regeneration. The Council will consider the role of this area as part of the preparation of Area Action Plans for Vauxhall and Waterloo.</u>	
MDO1	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO2	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO3	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO4	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO4A	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO5	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the text of MDO5 in accordance with Further Change FC80.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: add and delete text to MDO5 as follows: “...Retention of Grade II listed original frontage building and hose-drying tower in Albert Embankment Conservation Area.... Redevelopment of 1970s control room to rear is encouraged with potential for significant new-build/extensions to side and rear of original frontage building... ”	MOD-T/191
Policy 52	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 53 (Para 5.3.18 and Proposals Map)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) By amending the 3 rd and 4 th sentences of paragraph 5.3.18 to read as follows: (3 rd sentence) "The core of the centre has a higher capacity than the edge of centre to absorb late night uses due to its...." (FC81) AND (4 th sentence) "In all cases, places of public entertainment need to be appropriately regulated and managed to ensure the safety of those using the facilities and the avoidance of unreasonable nuisance to local residents." (FC82)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/192
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/193
	B) By identifying the boundary of Brixton Town Centre more clearly on the Proposals Map.	Accepted	To better indicate the boundary of Brixton Town Centre on the Proposals Map.	MOD-PM/19
Policy 54	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 55	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 56 (& Para 5.3.26)	<p>I recommend the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Replace paragraph 5.3.26 to read as follows:</p> <p>“5.3.26 Brixton offers the potential for a series of high quality public spaces, which would be enlivened by the complexity, style and multi-cultural diversity of Brixton streets and people. Brixton could become a significant tourist destination and development sites have the potential to provide hotels as part of the mix of uses. The Brixton Oval/The Brixton Tate Library/Windrush Square public space is part of Rush Common. The landscaping and raised, planted beds here do not work as a public space. The adjoining Windrush Square was recently created through the clearance of industrial uses and celebrates the first ship of West Indian settlers in the UK.” (FC83)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report. However a minor amendment to the Inspector's wording of the final sentence is proposed for clarity.</p> <p>Action: Amend the wording of the final sentence as follows - 'The adjoining Windrush Square was recently created through the clearance of industrial uses and celebrates the <u>arrival of the first ship of West Indian settlers into</u> the UK.'</p>	MOD-T/195

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) Delete the final sentence of Policy 56 and relocate it with some further explanation to the supporting text.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete final sentence of Policy 56 – 'The Proposals should include appropriate new uses (predominantly community uses and uses that benefit from the open space location), and restoration of the listed Raleigh Hall.'</p> <p>Action: Add text to first sentence of paragraph 5.3.26 – 'Brixton offers the potential for a series of high quality public spaces <u>with appropriate adjoining uses (predominantly community uses and uses that benefit from the open space location), including the restoration of the listed Raleigh Hall,</u> which would be enlivened by the ...'</p>	<p>MOD-T/194 MOD-T/195a</p>
<p>MDO6 (& Paras 5.3.30, 5.3.31 & 5.3.32a)</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as set out in Pre Inquiry Changes PI 20 to 23 (CD4.21) AND as follows:</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of paragraph 5.3.31 to read:</p> <p>"...to recreate it as a boulevard street lined with trees, active frontages in existing buildings where feasible and improvement to the exiting open space to the front of Southwyck House" (FC84)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: amend text of section (e) as follows – '(e) The development of Pope's ... provided a significantly reduced <u>an appropriate</u> level of short-stay shoppers/visitors car parking is provided <u>on site and/or elsewhere to the satisfaction of the Council;</u>'</p> <p>Action: amend text of section (n) as follows – '(n) Improvement of Somerleyton Road as a Mixed-Use Employment Area and/or education use subject to relocation of existing uses;</p>	<p>MOD-T/196 MOD-T/197 MOD-T/198 MOD-T/200 MOD-T/199</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>Action: amend second sentence of paragraph 5.3.30 as follows – '5.3.30 There would be the potential ... in the evening, in part through demolition and replacement of the existing though retaining public lavatories.'</p> <p>Action: delete paragraph 5.3.32a – '5.3.32a Brixton has been identified as the location for a new City Academy secondary level education facility. The industrial land along Somerleyton road has been identified as a potential location for this facility. Should the development of the City Academy not come forward, however, then the site will be improved in its current use as a Mixed Use Employment Area.'</p>	
MDO7	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO10	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO11	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO12	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO13	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO15	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO16	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			Inspector's report	
MDO18	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO19	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO21	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the first sentence to read: "Retention and re-use of tramshed in such way as not to prejudice its possible use as a transport depot of any future extensions of the Cross River Tram route to Streatham." (FC85)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/201
MDO23	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO24	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting MDO24.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 18)	MOD-T/202 MOD-PM/22
MDO26	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 57 (Proposals Map)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by making clearer the edge of centre allocation for Clapham, and other centres, on the Proposals Map.	Accepted	To better indicate the boundary of Clapham and other Town Centres on the Proposals Map.	MOD-PM/20

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 58 (& Para 5.4.3)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the second sub-paragraph of Part (A) of Policy 58 to read: "Local roads crossing the Common will be closed where feasible – following consultation including with the London Borough of Wandsworth – and, where necessary, parking controls will be introduced. The outstanding setting and enclosure of the Common will be maintained. (FC87)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/203
	B) Amend the section (B) of the policy to read: "Alternative bus standing facilities should be provided in the Clapham Common area , if the current ones are to be removed." (FC86)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/204
	C) Amend paragraph 5.4.3 to read: "A masterplan is being prepared for the improvement and restoration of the common ". (FC88)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/205
MDO27	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO30	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO31	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO34	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO37	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
5.5	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
MDO39(&22) (& Paras 5.5.1 and 5.5.3)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend the final sentence of the first paragraph of MDO39 to read: "The Council will work in partnership with Clapham Park New Deal for Communities." (FC89)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete text from last sentence of para as follows – 'The Council will work in partnership with Clapham Park New Deal for Communities and will adopt (following public consultation) a detailed masterplan as Supplementary Planning Guidance'.</p>	MOD-T/206
	<p>B) Amend the final sentence of the final paragraph of MDO 39 to read:</p> <p>"..."Drive through" development, including significant retail, would be an inappropriate use of this site in an out-of –centre location."</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/207
	<p>C) Amend the second sentence of paragraph 5.5.1 to read:</p> <p>"It encompasses parts that have benefited from the gentrification of Clapham, alongside pockets of real deprivation that have not seen any significant regeneration activity"</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/208

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	D) Add at the end of paragraph 5.5.3 a new sentence to read: ...of its unique character. “Any agreed masterplan will be adopted as supplementary planning guidance.” (FC90)	Partly accepted	Reason: the reference in the Council's FC90 should have been to development planning guidelines that the Council was in the process of preparing. The masterplan was prepared on behalf of Clapham Park Homes and provided a broad strategy which the DPG has developed into more detailed guidance based on UDP policies and other relevant planning considerations. Council therefore proposes new text as follows – “... of its unique character. <u>The Council has prepared guidance to assist development at Clapham Park which will be adopted as a formal Supplementary Planning Document</u> ”.	MOD-T/209
Policy 59	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO40 (& Para 5.6.2)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting the reference to a Victoria Line extension from MDO40 and its supporting text.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete second sentence of MDO40 – 'Potential for additional station building with development over/under if it becomes a Victoria Line/Thameslink 2000 interchange.' Action: delete first sentence of paragraph 5.6.2 – 'The potential long term extension of the Victoria Line to Herne Hill is strongly desirable and would be a major interchange with the Thameslink 2000 proposals.'	MOD-T/210 MOD-T/211

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
Policy 60	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO42	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO43 (Para 5.8.2)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the second sentence of paragraph 5.8.2 to read: "If carried out according to a clear masterplan, such development would support local shops and an enhanced shopping provision and provide linked improvements to the station – including the potential for creating platforms on the South London Line..." (FC91).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/212
MDO45	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO48	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 61	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 62	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO49	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO50	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO51	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO51a	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by adding the following text: "An impact study may be required to establish the	Not accepted	Reasons: the MDO is for a new secondary school that would be a replacement for the existing school use on the site. Therefore there is	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	capacity of the local water and sewerage system to accommodate a development of this size and type."		no specific need arising from the form of the future use for an independent impact study for this site as this is also already covered by Policy 48 (D). The Inspector has recommended that the Council employ the wording proposed by Thames Water, however no reasons have been given for this specific site to be an exceptional case. The Council therefore considers that no additional provision beyond the criteria of Policy 48 are necessary as this will satisfactorily deal with any issues and concludes that no further text is necessary for the MDO.	
MDO53	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: Amend MDO53 to read: "Development of a mix of employment or mixed employment/community use. Development should have proper street frontages onto Knights Hill and Chapel Road. Wider pavement on Knights Hill. Retention and restoration of cattle trough and fountain." (FC92)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/213
MDO54	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO56	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO57	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO58	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO59	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	MOD-T/214

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	the title of MDO 59 to read: "MDO 59 Former Norwood Primary School, Gipsy Road" (FC93).		Inspector's report	
MDO60	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO61	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting MDO61.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 19)	MOD-T/215 MOD-PM/23
MDO62	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO63	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO65	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO66	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO67	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO68	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO69 Note: Other changes to this MDO are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO70	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	MOD-T/217

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	Amend the first sentence of the text to MDO 70 to read: "Part of the site, and much of the surrounding area, is in a conservation area, development should..."		Inspector's report	
MDO71	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO73	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO74	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 63	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
5.13 (Para 5.13.1)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: Amend the third sentence of paragraph 5.13.1 to read: "The Masterplan contains 3 key focus areas..... and improving the area around the former South Bank University and Larkhall Park." (FC95)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/218
MDO78	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO79	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting MDO79.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 20)	MOD-T/219 MOD-PM/24
MDO80	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting sub-paragraph b) from MDO80 (FC96).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: delete sub-paragraph b) from MDO 80 – 'b) the development includes a significant element of affordable	MOD-T/220

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			housing.'	
MDO84	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting the reference to Victorian Shops 4-12 Union Street from MDO 84.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/221
MDO86	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 65 & Para 5.15.1)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) By relocating the policy and its supporting text to the Vauxhall section (5.15) of the plan. B) Relocate paragraph 5.13.4 before paragraph 5.15.1	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Action: remove Policy 65 and supporting paragraph 5.13.4 from current location and insert at beginning of section 5.15, before Policy 69.	MOD-T/222
		Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MDO-T/222a

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Add the following after the third sentence in paragraph 5.15.1:</p> <p>“...London South Central area. Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea is identified in the London Plan as an Opportunity Area. The objective is to secure major environmental improvement with scope for intensification to provide some 1500 new homes and 7,600 new jobs in the wider Opportunity Area. This is an indicative target that the strategic plan would like to see exceeded when the Sub-Regional Development Frameworks are prepared. As part of any intensification, the strategy aims to secure improved pedestrian movement and create a stronger local sense of identity and strengthen the perceptual and visual links with the rest of Central London. The Council will work with its strategic and other partners to draw up and implement a comprehensive masterplan for the Opportunity Area.”</p>	<p>Partly accepted</p> <p>77</p>	<p>Reason: amended text is proposed to more accurately reflect the current position. The preparation of the SRDF covering the Vauxhall area has not resulted in developing these indicative figures further. The Council's intentions are to prepare a statutory Area Action Plan for the areas as indicated in its Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>Action: The Council therefore proposes to add the suggested text as set out in the Inspector's recommendation, but amended as follows:</p> <p>...London South Central area. Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea is identified in the London Plan as an Opportunity Area. The objective <u>for the Opportunity Area set out in the London Plan</u> is to secure major environmental improvement with scope for intensification to provide some 1500 new homes and 7,600 new jobs in the wider Opportunity Area. This is an indicative target. that the strategic plan would like to see exceeded when the Sub-Regional Development Frameworks are prepared. As part of any intensification, the strategy aims <u>will be</u> to secure improved pedestrian movement and create a stronger local sense of identity and strengthen the perceptual and visual links with the rest of Central London. The Council will work with its strategic and other partners to draw up and implement a comprehensive masterplan for the Opportunity Area to try to achieve this through the preparation of an Area Action Plan for the area within Lambeth.</p>	<p>MOD-T/223</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	D) Then start a new paragraph with the remainder of paragraph 5.15.1 as follows: "The focus of the regeneration effort is now shifting southwards. The great and ..."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report Note: current paragraph 5.15.1a needs to be renumbered 5.15.1b.	MOD-T/224
MDO87	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO88	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO89	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO90	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 66 & Para 5.14.3)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the second sentence of the 2 nd paragraph of Policy 66 to read: "These measures will included the narrowing of part of the dual carriageway to single carriageway, improving conditions for pedestrians and cyclists; ..."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/225
	B) Amend the second sentence of the 3 rd paragraph of Policy 66 to read: "Priority is given to improved signage and advertising, and the reduction of clutter. " (FC97) AND	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/226
	C) Amend item (a1) to read: "(a1) Northern Edge – This area has the highest number of buildings in poor condition. Improvements to the buildings will be encouraged." (FC98)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/227

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>D) Add at the end of paragraph 5.14.3:</p> <p>“...London and beyond. To assist this the Streatham Design Guide looks at how Streatham High Road (A23) can be improved between Christ Church and the borough boundary. The focus of the Design Guide is on improving the public realm of Streatham High Road. This includes the widening of the footway and narrowing of the carriageway, and reducing street clutter by focusing on paving, street furniture, trees, lighting and signage.” (FC99)</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>For purposes of clarity and accuracy, the Council recommends that the first sentence is amended and expanded to highlight that the Streatham Street Design Guide is a Transport for London initiative, for their A23 highway, to be implemented with Council cooperation. It is therefore recommended the sentence reads as follows –</p> <p>‘To assist this the Tfl's Streatham Design Guide looks at how Streatham High Road (A23) can be improved between the Christ Church Rd/Streatham Place junction and the southern borough boundary. The focus of the ...’</p>	MOD-T/228
MDO91	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 68	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO91a	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO92	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
MDO92a	I recommend that MDO 92a of the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the first sentence to read: "Redevelopment of Caesars (formerly Locarno Ballroom) and adjoining properties to the south and north to increase retail provision as part of a mixed-use scheme and re-provide retail frontage along Streatham Hill. Any development..." And	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/229
	B) Add a new penultimate sentence to read: "...Blairderry Road. The frontage building consisting of numbers 146 to 178 Streatham Hill should be retained. Comprehensive development..." (FC100)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/230
MDO93	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO94	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO96	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP, apart from correcting the MDO reference on the Proposals Map.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity of MDO boundaries and numbering on the Proposals Map. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 7)	MOD-PM/10
MDO97	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP other than securing the correct MDO number on Proposals Map.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity of MDO boundaries and numbering on the Proposals Map. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 8)	MOD-PM/11
Policy 69	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: Amend the penultimate sentence of the penultimate paragraph of Policy 69 to read:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/231

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	"Major development is contingent upon sufficient public transport accessibility and capacity . These should be coordinated in design.... (FC101)			
Policy 70 (& Para 5.15.1a)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend the final sentence of the first paragraph of the policy to read:</p> <p>"A framework will be produced to guide development in the Vauxhall/Battersea Opportunity Area.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>For purposes of clarity and accuracy, in order to refer to the appropriate planning document and its scope of coverage the Council proposes to amend the text as follows –</p> <p>'An framework Area Action Plan will be produced to guide development in the Lambeth part of Vauxhall/Battersea Opportunity Area.'</p>	MOD-T/232
	<p>B) Amend the second paragraph of Policy 70 to read:</p> <p>"Development should help create better links to, over and along the river, to and between open spaces, and through and beyond the railway viaduct. Without..." (FC102)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/233
	<p>C) Amend the third paragraph of Policy 70 to read:</p> <p>"Development should include or contribute towards the necessary shops, services and community and leisure facilities etc. as well as transport related improvements to support all the enlarged community around Vauxhall Cross. The expansion..."</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/234

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>D) Amend the second sentence in paragraph 5.15.1a to read:</p> <p>“..benefit the local community. To this end a detailed Vauxhall Cross Battersea Development Framework will be produced as an Area Action Plan for the Opportunity Area. The overall regeneration aim...” (FC103)</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>Reason: for purposes of clarity and accuracy, in order to refer to the appropriate planning document and its scope of coverage the Council proposes to amend the text as follows –</p> <p>‘..benefit the local community. To this end a detailed Vauxhall Cross Battersea Development Framework will be produced as an Area Action Plan for the <u>Lambeth part of the Opportunity Area</u>. The overall regeneration aim...’</p> <p>Note: above paragraph to be renumbered 5.15.1b.</p>	MOD-T/235
MDO98 (& Proposals Map)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend MDO 98 to read:</p> <p>“Improved tube entrance (with escalator). Part of site should be developed as open space as setting of new transport interchange. Reservation of bus-priority lane on southern part of site would be encouraged.” (FC104)</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>Reason: to improve clarity by confirming that Policy 45 on open space also applies in any development proposals for this site.</p> <p>Action: amend text as follows –</p> <p>‘Improved tube entrance (with escalator). Part of site should be developed as open space, subject to <u>Policy 45</u>, as setting of new transport interchange. Reservation of bus-priority lane on southern part of site would be encouraged.’</p>	MOD-T/236
	<p>B) Amend the Proposals Map by showing the correct MDO reference number on the site.</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity of MDO boundaries and numbering on the Proposals Map. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 9)</p>	MOD-PM/12
MDO99	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			Inspector's report	
MDO100	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO101	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the final sentence to read: "The development of the site as a whole should have a complementary mix of land uses and designs, which add variety and interest to the river frontage and provide better connections between the river and its hinterland." (FC105)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/237
MDO102	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO103	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the third sentence of the text of MDO 102-5 to read as follows: "the entire MDO site. The retention of the mid-Victorian building at 71 Bondway would be desirable , with potential for development on former filling station/smaller warehouse to front and small site to south. Redevelopment of unsightly Keybringer House encouraged. New Vauxhall...."	Not Accepted	Reason: the commitment to retention of the building would be premature. The Area Action Plan will involve an assessment of the urban character and importance of individual buildings from the point of view of conservation as well as development in a comprehensive manner. Action: amend Inspector's recommended text as follows – '...the entire MDO site. The retention of the mid-Victorian building at 71 Bondway would <u>will</u> be desirable addressed as part of the preparation of the Vauxhall Area Action Plan , with potential for development on former filling station/smaller warehouse to front and small site to south. Redevelopment of unsightly Keybringer House encouraged. New Vauxhall....'	MOD-T/238
MDO104	See recommendation in respect of MDO 103 above.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			Inspector's report	
MDO105	See recommendation in respect of MDO 103 above.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO106	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO107	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 71	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 72	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: Amend the first sentence of Policy 72 to read: "The improvement and extension of Spring Gardens (through road removal) will be pursued in partnership with local groups, including better links through the railway arches . Nearby..." (FC106)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/239
MDO109	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO109a	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO110 (& Para 5.15.11)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the boundaries of the Lambeth Walk Public Open Space on the Proposals Map as shown on Map A attached to LBL/MDO110/1.	Accepted	To correctly delineate the boundary of park (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 10)	MOD-PM/13

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Amend Part (b) of the policy to read: "former Kerrin Pont, Kennington Road. Redevelopment of Kerrin Point for social housing. Reconfiguration of street pattern to provide improved links from Ethelred Estate to Kennington Road/Cross including possible closure of Hotspur Street. Children's play and sporting facilities at Kerrin Point should be replaced." (FC107)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/240
	C) Amend part (c) of the policy to read: "(c) improving / extending / redesigning Lambeth Walk Public Open Space. Extension of open space up to Kennington Road frontage, ensuring that a contiguous local park is maintained." (FC108)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/241
	D) Add a further sentence at the end of paragraph 5.15.11 to read: "..Mayor of London. The improvement/extension/redesign of Lambeth Walk Public Open Space is to be in accordance with the Lambeth Walk Doorstep Green Masterplan. " (FC109)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/242
MDO111	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO112	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 73 (& Para 5.16.1- 5.16.7a)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified in accordance with Pre-Inquiry changes PI 24-32 and PI 34 as they appear in CD4/20, BUT amended as follows:	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report, subject to three minor wording corrections (replacing "integrating" with "integrated" in the first sentence; adding "be" at the start of part (c); and adding "and" in the second sentence of 5.16.3.	MOD-T/243 MOD-T/243a MOD-T/244 MOD-T/245 MOD-T/246 MOD-T/247 MOD-T/248 MOD-T/249

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>Action: Insert Pre-Inquiry Changes as Policy 73 (note: text below includes additional changes resulting from Inspector's Recommendations as set out in sub-sections A, B, C and D below) – <u>Policy 73 Waterloo Development Framework</u></p> <p><u>Development in the Waterloo Development Framework Area (see Map X)</u> [see Section 2 of Modifications Document 4] <u>should contribute to the comprehensive and integrated sustainable regeneration of the area in line with its Central London functions and its role as a strategic opportunity area. Development proposals should:</u></p> <p><u>(a) include a mix of Central London Activities (see Table 1), including maximising opportunities for housing and community facilities, appropriate to the size and character of the site and the scale of development proposed;</u></p> <p><u>(b) be of an appropriate scale and design for an area of world class quality;</u></p> <p><u>(c) be compatible with and sensitive to adjoining sites and the immediate area, and respect preserve or enhance the character, appearance and setting of the conservation areas in and adjoining the area;</u></p> <p><u>(d) maximise opportunities to enhance the public realm, remove barriers, and improve permeability,</u></p>	<p>MOD-T/250 MOD-T/251 MOD-T/252 MOD-T/253 MOD-T/254 MOD-T/255</p>

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>accessibility and the quality of the environment for residents, workers and visitors, as well as links to the rest of Central London; and</u></p> <p><u>(e) depending on its scale and nature, include provision for improvements to public transport and access to public transport.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.1 Waterloo is strongly linked to the Central London economy. It contains London's largest rail terminal, Waterloo, major office space, a major hospital and Lambeth Palace. The area also contains a substantial residential community, both in recent private developments and in long standing social housing estates. A substantial proportion of the area is covered by the South Bank, Waterloo, Roupell Street, Lower Marsh and Lambeth Palace conservation areas. It is noticeable for its major historic and architectural landmarks such as Lambeth Palace, the Royal Festival Hall, Waterloo Station, The National Theatre, County Hall and the London Eye. It is also strategically located adjacent to Bankside and the Elephant and Castle in Southwark and the Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea corridor in Wandsworth.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.2 Significant development pressures exist in Waterloo, and the challenge is managing such demand to achieve much needed environmental improvements and facilities for the local community, whilst ensuring that the pattern of</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>land use and transport infrastructure is a balanced one, protecting existing local residents and securing benefits for residents of the borough as a whole.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.3 The Council recognises that the Waterloo area is in need of regeneration to enable it to become a more attractive place to live, work and visit. It is recognised in the London Plan as an Area of Opportunity, within which residential and non-residential densities are expected to be maximised and carefully managed to take account of local residential amenity other needs. The indicative estimates of growth for the Waterloo Opportunity Area in the London Plan identify that the area could accommodate 15,000 new jobs and 500 new homes by the year 2016. Its highly accessible Central London location and its rich and varied mix of uses, including arts and cultural facilities of national and international importance, offer potential for regeneration and development, based on the principles of sustainability and social inclusion.</u></p> <p><u>Relocate following para (5.16.4) to immediately before para 5.16.1:</u></p> <p><u>5.16.4 The Council, in partnership with the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, London Development Agency, and Network Rail, and in consultation with all major stakeholders and the local community, will prepare a Waterloo Development Framework (WDF) to</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>guide the future development and regeneration of the Waterloo Opportunity Area, as identified in the London Plan. The WDF will seek from development a balance between opportunities for commercial and cultural development, regeneration objectives, and protection of residential amenity and character. It will set the context within which inter-relationships between individual site-specific major development opportunities in the Waterloo area can be made, and in which regeneration opportunities can be addressed.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.5 This policy sets out the overall objectives and requirements for development in the area. Policies such as for, hotels and tourism (Policy 28), and arts and culture (Policy 30), which guide particular forms of development to the 'Waterloo Visitor Management Area' will continue to apply. The policy for Central London Activities (Policy 3) will also apply with other borough-wide policies that may be relevant to the development being proposed, such as for affordable housing (16), office development (21), for conservation areas (42) and planning obligations (policy 50a). Policies 74 and 75 deal in detail with the issues of public transport and urban design in Waterloo. Policy 75 requires major proposals in the Waterloo area to contribute towards the creation of an area of world class quality. Policy 73 highlights the importance of the aspects of policy that are integral to</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>the successful sustained regeneration of the Waterloo Opportunity area, being fostering the development of appropriate uses, encouraging improvements to be made to the transport infrastructure (and prioritising programming projects), and creating a more focussed and recognised sense of place through promoting a comprehensive and connected approach to major development and excellence in urban design. When completed, the Waterloo Development Framework will provide more detailed guidance for the scale and nature of development in the area. It is intended that the WDF boundary as shown on Map X [see Section 2 of Modifications Document 4] is fluid and outward-facing, recognising the broader policy context described above, and inter-relationships between the study area, adjoining local communities, the rest of the Borough, and the adjoining Borough, Southwark.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.6 Waterloo houses the internationally-recognised South Bank Arts Complex. The strengthening and improvement of the environment and accessibility of the cultural quarter, to fully reflect its role as a truly world-class arts and cultural facility on the South Bank is supported. The introduction of new employment, education, healthcare, leisure and housing uses, including affordable housing, will also be supported. In particular, mixed-use development will be encouraged. The</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>Council will expect to work with developers, other agencies and local communities to encourage regeneration initiatives that foster social inclusion as part of new development. By providing training and support through regeneration initiatives, local people will be able to benefit from job opportunities provided in the Opportunity Area, as part of construction, and beyond.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.7 Many of the barriers to the sustained regeneration of the Waterloo area, relate to the transport infrastructure. Waterloo Station itself has a dominating presence, with its railway embankments, and the convergence of roads into central London divide the area. As a consequence, residents, commuters and visitors experience a very confusing public realm on several levels, with obvious pedestrian desire lines severed by road and railway infrastructure. The Area Framework presents an opportunity to comprehensively co-ordinate development to bring about significant improvements to public transport interchange and services, centred around a re-modelled Waterloo Station and immediate surrounds, and provide a safe and accessible environment for all users of existing and proposed public transport systems. Where appropriate, developers will be expected to contribute toward improvements to transport infrastructure. In order to ensure that intensification of development is in</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>step with public transport capacity, the Council will support the development of a transport strategy for the area and seek Section 106 agreements for pooling developer contributions in order to deliver public transport improvements in the area.</u></p> <p><u>5.16.7a Waterloo's sense of place is based on its rich and special mix of close knitted residential communities, tourists, visitors and commuters, alongside the largest concentration of arts and cultural facilities in Europe, small and large national and multi-national organisations, specialised shops and restaurants and many other uses. By granting permission for development proposals with a very high standard of design, and which achieve a high level of physical integration with adjoining sites and the surrounding area, an enhanced sense of place and identity can be achieved. The Opportunity Area Framework will set out principles which will bring about physical integration of uses, and help to achieve an attractive, safe, legible and stimulating environment for residents, commuters and visitors.</u></p>	
	<p>A) Amend part (c) of the policy to read:</p> <p>“compatible with and sensitive to adjoining sites and the immediate area, and preserve or enhance the character, appearance and setting of the conservation areas in and adjoining the area; “ (FC110)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/244

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) Amend paragraph 5.16.5 of the supporting text to read:</p> <p>“The policy for Central London Activities (Policy 3) will also apply with other borough-wide policies that may be relevant to the development being proposed, such as for affordable housing (16), office development (21), conservation areas (42 and Planning Obligations (policy 50a)...” (FC111)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/251
	<p>C) Relocate paragraph 5.16.4 of the supporting text to appear immediately following the policy, that is, before paragraph 15.16.1.</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/248

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>D) After paragraph (e) of the policy and still within the policy panel add the following:</p> <p>“In order to ensure that intensification of development is in step with public transport capacity, a transport strategy will be developed for the area, as will a Section 106 framework for pooling developer contributions in order to deliver public transport improvements in the area.”</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>Reason: The Council accepts the intent of the recommendation, however, it is not within the Council's powers to develop a transport strategy and therefore alternative wording has been put forward reflecting this but trying to secure the objective recommended by the Inspector. Similarly the wording on the approach to Section 106 has been amended to reflect the objective of securing planning obligations to deliver public transport improvements.</p> <p>Action: The Council therefore proposes to amend the suggested text as set out in the Inspector's recommendation to the supporting text of Para 5.16.7 as follows:</p> <p><u>'In order to ensure that intensification of development is in step with public transport capacity, the Council will support the development of a transport strategy will be developed for the area, as will a and seek Section 106 framework agreements for pooling developer contributions in order to deliver public transport improvements in the area.'</u></p>	MOD-T/254
Policy 74 (Para 5.16.9)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting the final sentence of paragraph 5.16.9 and replacing it with the following:</p> <p>“Bus capacity in the area is being improved in the short term by TfL by developing an interim Bus Station at Tennyson Road and reallocating road</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/256

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	space in York Road, Waterloo Bridge, Waterloo Road and Westminster Bridge Road. Pedestrian capacity has recently been improved on York Road, but the capacity and connectedness of pedestrian routes needs to be improved."			
Policy 75	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 76	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 77	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 78	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Policy 79 (& Para 5.16.37)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend Policy 79 to read:</p> <p>"There will be a presumption in favour of the retention of the London Eye. Any future proposals affecting or relating to the operation of the London Eye and its associated structures and activities must continue to ensure that:</p> <p>a) improved and acceptable measures for managing and distributing visitors and coaches are secured;</p> <p>b) the impact of associated servicing, ticketing and queuing facilities on Metropolitan Open Land is minimised; and</p> <p>c) measures are secured to control unauthorised stalls, commercial trading and hot dog stands (including dedication of Queens Walk as public highway.)" (FC112)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/257

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>B) Amend paragraph 5.16.37 to read:</p> <p>“At 135m high it is one of London's highest buildings. It was granted temporary planning permission for five years in 1998, and, in 2003, received planning permission which will enable the London Eye to be retained permanently subject to a satisfactory report on the continued acceptability of its impacts which will be undertaken after 20 years. If the review is unsatisfactory, the permission will expire in 25 years.” (FC113)</p>	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/258
Policy 80 (& Para 5.16.42)	<p>In the light of my recommendation to delete the Shell Centre podium site as “other open space” the Council should review the validity of:</p> <p>A) the second sentence of the second paragraph of Policy 80 and</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: Delete the second sentence in the second paragraph of Policy 80 - ‘The improvement and extension of Jubilee Gardens with exemplary landscape design proposals will be achieved to provide a world class park and public realm. This should include links to the West to form a proper setting for the London Eye, and a visual and pedestrian link to the Eye from Waterloo Station at ground level, across the Shell Centre podium and through the site of Elizabeth House, which offers views of the Eye. Development that generates visitors...’</p>	MOD-T/258a

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) the 3 rd sentence of paragraph 5.16.42.	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: Delete the third sentence of Paragraph 5.16.42 - 'This has been recognised in the Waterloo Development Framework. It is also the intention to form a visual link between Waterloo Station and the Eye linking the improvements to the Gardens with proposals for the Shell Centre, Elizabeth House and Waterloo Station. A Jubilee Gardens Trust has been set up....'</p>	MOD-T/258b
MDO113 (& Para 5.16.43)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend sub-paragraph (e) of MDO 113 to read:</p> <p>“(e) enable both a ground level pedestrian entrance to York Road linking to Hungerford Bridge, together with the option to retain or reinstate the high level accessible walkway from the station through the Shell site to the South Bank.” (FC115)</p> <p>B) Delete the final sentence of the first paragraph of Policy MDO113 (FC114).</p>	Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>	MOD-T/260
		Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Action: delete final sentence of first paragraph of MDO113 – 'This should be consistent with the objectives of the Waterloo Development Framework and:' (FC114)</p>	MOD-T/259

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>C) Add at the end of paragraph 5.16.43 a new sentence to read:</p> <p>“ ... is to expand transport capacity. Development should be consistent with the objectives of the Waterloo Development Framework” (FC116)</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>Reason: the purpose of this recommendation is accepted, however it needs to reflect how this issue will be addressed, therefore different wording is proposed.</p> <p>Action: amend proposed wording – ‘... is to expand transport capacity. Development should be consistent with the objectives of the Waterloo Development Framework set by the <u>planning strategy for Waterloo.</u>’</p>	MOD-T/261
MDO114	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO115 (& Proposals Map)	<p>I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) Amend MDO 115 to read:</p> <p>“MDO 115 Shell Centre Upstream, Building and Offices, 2-8 York Road-Area: 2.4Ha</p> <p>Planning permission and conservation area consent was granted in 2004 for a scheme including part demolition and the erection of a mixed-use building of some 69000sqm on the podium site. The permission maintains pedestrian access across the site between York Road and Belvedere Road and provides for the storage and relocation of the Franta Belsky fountain. A number of planning obligations stand alongside the permission. They cover a range of topics including the loss of the on-site swimming pool, the re-instatement of the high level walkway should that be necessary, transport improvements, training and improvements to the public realm. If this permission is not taken up, it is nevertheless likely provide the template for any alternative scheme to develop the site in</p>	Partly Accepted	<p>Reason: For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>Furthermore it is considered that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the UDP should not hamper options for developments within the framework of the plan and preparations for the Waterloo Development Framework and the Waterloo Area Action Plan; • the regeneration of the South Bank is a priority for the Council as well as all major stakeholders in the area; • there are sufficient UDP polices to assess alternative proposals should the existing permission for the MDO115 site lapse (specifically Policy 73 - Regeneration of Waterloo; Policy 28 - Hotels and Tourism; Policy 30 - Arts and Culture; Policy 3 - Central London 	MDO-T/262 MDO-T/262a

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	<p>terms of size, silhouette, layout, conditions, planning benefits and improvements to the public realm.</p> <p>The utilisation of basement car parking/servicing to house operational parking for the South Bank Centre, being displaced from the Hungerford car park site, as well as some parking provision for people with disabilities and some parking for tourist coaches would be encouraged in any development.”</p>		<p>Activities; Policy 16 - Affordable Housing; Policy 21 - Office Buildings; Policy 74 & 75 Public Transport and Urban Design in Waterloo; Policy 37 - Tall Buildings); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Waterloo Development Framework and Waterloo Area Action Plan will seek a balance between commercial, social, and cultural regeneration developments. <p>Additional wording is also being proposed about the potential contribution in any new development proposed of this site to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • linkages; • permeability; and • open space provision or contributions to generating improvements to open space within the wiser area, <p>should the existing planning permission not be implemented.</p> <p>Action: Revise MDO115 as follows - 'MDO 115 Shell Centre Upstream, Building and Offices, 2-8 York Road – Area 2.4 Ha</p> <p><i>Retention of original tower and lower buildings (in South Bank conservation area) with re-use of basements, but no development on or enclosure of the podium, other than very minor works associated with the improvement of the</i></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p>public open space. Remodelling of pedestrian courtyard areas with active frontage uses, including facing onto York Road. Retail development should meet demonstrable need in accordance with relevant government guidance.</p> <p>Retention or reinstatement of the high level walkway through the site in order to achieve a high level pedestrian link from Waterloo Station concourse to the South Bank.</p> <p>Retention of through visual and pedestrian links across the podium.</p> <p>Development should preserve or enhance the South Bank Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings and protect the amenities of County Hall residents.</p> <p>Compensation for loss of swimming pool and sports facilities.</p> <p>Relocation of listed statue to north east corner of site would be acceptable.</p> <p>Improvements to the podium deck and surrounding public realm, Jubilee Gardens, highways and public transport.</p> <p><u>The Council will promote the contribution this site can make to permeability and pedestrian linkages as well as to open space provision either in its own right or to generating improvements to open space within the wider area.</u></p> <p>Planning permission and</p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<p><u>conservation area consent was granted in 2004 on appeal for a scheme including part demolition and the erection of a mixed-use building of some 69,000 sqm on the podium site. The permission maintains pedestrian access across the site between York Road and Belvedere Road and provides for the storage and relocation of the Franta Belsky fountain. A number of planning obligations stand alongside the permission. They cover a range of topics including the loss of the on-site swimming pool, the re-instatement of the high level walkway should that be necessary, transport improvements, training and improvements to the public realm. If this permission is not taken up it will still be a material consideration in deciding future proposals</u></p> <p>The utilisation of basement car parking/servicing to house operational parking for South Bank Centre, being displaced from <u>the Hungerford car park site</u> Jubilee Gardens, as well as some parking, provision for people with disabilities and some parking for tourist coaches <u>will also</u> would be encouraged <u>in any development.</u>'</p> <p>Action: Insert new Para 5.16.47a following MDO115 -</p> <p><u>'5.16.47a The regeneration of the South Bank is a priority for the Council as well as all major stakeholders in the area. The UDP is not intended to hamper options for development within the framework</u></p>	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
			<u>provided by UDP policies and preparations for the Waterloo Development Framework and the Waterloo Area Action Plan, which will seek a balance between commercial, social, and cultural regeneration developments. There are a significant number of UDP polices to assess alternative proposals should the existing permission for MDO115 lapse (specifically Policy 73 - Regeneration of Waterloo; Policy 28 - Hotels and Tourism; Policy 30 - Arts and Culture; Policy 3 - Central London Activities; Policy 16 - Affordable Housing; Policy 21 - Office Buildings; Policy 74 & 75 Public Transport and Urban Design in Waterloo; Policy 37 - Tall Buildings).</u>	
	B) Amend numbering of the MDO on the Proposals Map to correspond with that used in the written statement.	Accepted	This numbering error was already amended at Revised Deposit stage	
MDO116 (& Para 5.16.49 and Proposals Map)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend sub-paragraph (a) of MDO 116 to read: "developments affecting the complex being compatible with Council's policies and proposals for Jubilee Gardens and the Hungerford car park site; ..." (FC118)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/263

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) Amend sub-paragraph (c) of MDO 116 to read: “...as an architectural group. Retaining the overall function and aesthetic success of the complex. Any replacement buildings should be of outstanding architectural quality.” (FC119, amended)	Partly accepted	Reason: Whilst the Council would agree with the Inspector that the phrase ‘unity of overall form’ is not particularly useful, it is there for the purpose of allowing the Council some degree of control over scale which it considers to be a very important consideration in any redevelopment of this site. The Council therefore proposes amending the wording of MDO116. Action: Amend sub-paragraph (c) of MDO116 to: ‘...as an architectural group. Retaining the unity of overall form scale of the complex is essential to its function and aesthetic success...’	MOD-T/264
	C) Amend paragraph 5.16.49 to read: “The area has been the subject of a number of master-planning proposals over the years and there is now concern that matters need to come to a resolution – with an acceptable and deliverable plan that conforms with the Waterloo Development Framework. ” (FC120)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report It is considered that the Waterloo Development Framework, whilst not statutory, will make a valuable contribution to the Waterloo Area Action Plan and the future of the Waterloo area.	MOD-T/264a
	D) By ensuring that the MDO reference number is the same between the written statement and the Proposals Map.	Accepted	This numbering error was already amended at Revised Deposit stage	
MDO117	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO118	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
MDO119	I recommend that the final paragraph of MDO 119 of the RDUDP be modified to read as follows: "Development should create street frontage onto Lambeth Palace Road and improve the riverside walk and the open space to the riverside, whilst maintaining hospital security."	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/265
MDO121	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified as follows: A) Amend the first paragraph of MDO 121 to read: "Comprehensive development of whole site, retaining and fronting on to Royal Street. Proposals should seek to retain The Holy Trinity Centre and No.10 Royal Street since the Council's initial assessment is that the buildings make a positive contribution to the conservation area."	Not accepted	Reason: The Council considers that the proposed wording offers no substantive difference other than to indicate that a full assessment has not taken place. In any case the Council considers that the buildings referred to are worthy of retention and this is adequately covered in the original wording.	
	B) Amend the last sentence of the final paragraph of MDO 121 to read: "..if visible from it. Building height should be restricted in the southern part of the site due to its location within the conservation area and proximity to the park , with building heights progressively increasing on the northern boundary, where high rise development is likely to be more appropriate." (FC121, amended)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	MOD-T/266
MDO122	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
MDO123 (& Proposals Map)	<p>I recommend that MDO 123 of the RDUDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>A) “Part of the site is under consideration as an extension to the Lower Marsh conservation area. Development should seek to preserve those buildings that make a positive contribution to that area and those that frame/improve the road junction. Active frontages at ground level within the edge-of-centre boundary.</p> <p>B) With regard to the notation “Conservation Area: Proposed Addition” amend the Proposals Map by deleting the notation - see also objections to the Proposals Map below.</p>	Partly accepted	<p>Reason: The Council agrees with the Inspector's proposed first sentence. However, the proposed second sentence changes the emphasis of the text in the RDUDP from requiring 'development' to frame/improve the road junction, to requiring the preservation of buildings that frame/improve the road junction. It is the former aspiration that the Council wants conveyed within the text. The final sentence should also be modified to ensure it is phrased similarly to the previous sentence.</p> <p>Action: Amend sub-paragraph A) to – 'Part of the site is under consideration as an extension to the Lower Marsh conservation area. Development should seek to preserve those buildings that make a positive contribution to that area, including to the adjoining Lower Marsh Conservation Area, and those that to frame/improve the road junction. Active frontages are sought at ground level within the edge-of-centre boundary.'</p>	MOD-T/267
		Accepted	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p> <p>(See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Maps 14 and 15)</p>	MOD-PM/2
MDO124	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO125	I recommend the RDUDP be modified by deleting the	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the	MOD-T/268

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	last sentence from the text of MDO 125 so that it reads: "Development should include a new sports centre (including swimming pool) for community use serving the north of the borough. Active frontage uses to Upper Ground."		Inspector's report	
MDO127 (& Proposals Map)	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified: A) by deleting MDOs 127 & 128 and replace with the following: "MDO 127 Gabriel's Wharf and Prince's Wharf, Upper Ground - Area: 0.5 Ha. When redeveloped with mixed use but mainly affordable housing, should include a large public piazza with a rich mix of small active frontage uses with linkages to Princes Wharf site. It can include offices for South Bank cultural/TV uses. Retention of through pedestrian link from Upper Ground to Riverside Walk. Development should, together with Oxo Tower Wharf, provide consistent enclosure to Bernie Spain Gardens." (FC122-amended)	Partly accepted	Reason: The Council considers that the building at 58 Upper Ground is worthy of retention and will acknowledge the importance of this building in the South Bank Conservation Area Appraisal that is currently being undertaken. Re-insert sentence referring to 58 Upper Ground as follows – 'Retention of through pedestrian link from Upper Ground to Riverside Walk. <u>Retention of historic frontage building at 58 Upper Ground.</u> Development should, together with Oxo Tower Wharf, provide consistent enclosure to Bernie Spain Gardens.'	MOD-T/269
	B) Delete from MDO 128 the site of the Independent Television Site as shown on Map D, appended to LBL/127/2 (FC127).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity of MDO boundary on the Proposals Map. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 11)	MOD-PM/14
	C) Renumber the sites of Gabriel's and Prince's Wharves as MDO 127 on the Proposals Map using the corrected boundary shown on Map D attached to LBL/MDO127/2. (FC127)	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity of MDO boundary and numbering on the Proposals Map. (see Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 12)	MOD-PM/15
MDO128	See recommendations at MDO 127 above.	As for	As for MDO127	

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
		MDO127		
MDO129	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO130/131/1 31a	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
MDO132	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Glossary Note: Other changes to the glossary are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP in response to these objections BUT see also recommendations under Policies 4 and 32 and Map 1.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
PM Note: Other changes to the Proposals Map are proposed by the Council – see Proposed Modifications document	I recommend that the Proposals Map of the RDUDP be modified: A) as proposed in Further Changes FC123, FC124, FC125 and FC128 and	Partly accepted	Reason: Due to an error, Archbishop's Park was identified as a Protected London Square in FC128. This is not the case. As such only the "Park" designation of Archbishop's Park should be extended in accordance with FC128. Other Inspector's recommendations pertaining to FC123 (Hungerford Car Park), FC124 (Lambeth Walk) and FC125 (Riverlink Square) should be accepted in full for the reasons set out in the Inspector's report. (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Maps 1, 10, 2 and 13)	MOD-PM/4 MOD-PM/13 MOD-PM/5 MOD-PM/16

Policy/MDO/ Paragraph Number	Inspector's Recommendation	Lambeth Response	Reason for Response/Action	Modification Number
	B) by deleting from the Key, additions to, and deletions from, conservation areas together with their allocations on the map.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Maps 14 and 15)	MOD-PM/2
PM2	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by amending the Proposals Map as shown on Map C (LBL/45/2) (FC126).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report and for better clarity on the Proposals Map. (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 16)	MOD-PM/17
PM10	I recommend that the RDUDP be modified by deleting from the Proposals Map the "Other Public Open Space" allocation on the Shell Podium site (Proposals Map 10).	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report. (See Section 1 of Modifications Document 4, Map 21)	MOD-PM/25
PM11	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
PM41	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
PM42	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
PM45	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	
Misc	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDUDP.	Accepted	For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report	

**For further information contact:
Lambeth Council Planning Service**

Phoenix House
10 Wandsworth Road
London
SW8 2LL

Email : PlanningPolicy@lambeth.gov.uk
Web : www.lambeth.gov.uk/Planning