

MDO 11

**Car Park ~~R/O~~ to rear of 337/365 Brixton Road
0.3ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

The proposal is ill defined. The proposed mews terrace would squash buildings into a narrow space abutting the proposed wall garden. There is a high density of living quarters in this part of West Central Brixton and the mews terrace. (Jon Spicer)

Response A:

There is sufficient space at the rear of Angell Terrace both for some additional housing and a small community garden.

Objection B:

Object to wholesale loss of site. Sufficient open space and parking should be retained to meet the needs of residents of Angell Terrace. (Alan Piper, the Brixton Society)

Response B:

Accepted in part – see proposed amendment.

Objection C:

Retain for community use. (Brixton Area Forum Board)

Response C:

This site is not and never has been in community use. It is a surplus car park of a building in civic (sui-generic) use. No realistic case has ever been made that this site should go for community use. It is unrealistic to propose that every potential development site in Brixton should go to community use given the other pressing needs in the area – including for housing.

Summary of Representations & Responses:**Objection A:**

Add: 'and seek to reduce current car parking provision and creating an active frontage on Acre Lane, which would enhance the streetscape" (Mayor of London)

Response A:

Accepted – change proposed, widened to refer to sustainable transport.

Objection B:

The need for sustainable development: Several proposals appear excessive in terms of their impact on the local environment. The viability of some proposals appears to be achieved only at the expense of neighbouring properties or the public realm. (Alan Piper, the Brixton Society)

Response B:

Not accepted – This is a sweeping statement that has been applied by the objector to several sites without specific justification and is not relevant to this site nor the MDO.

Objection C:

This proposal relates to an existing operational Tesco food-store on Kennington Lane. It does not state the reasons for redevelopment or the consequences for the existing retail provision. The policy is also silent on the procedure by which these development aspirations will be progressed (Tesco's)

Response C:

Not accepted – The reason is the pressing need for housing in London. Tesco's at board level, together with the Housing Corporation, has been examining the potential for development above and on the site of its stores. Lambeth has spoken to architects who have been examining the Acre Lane store which has proven to be one of the most promising sites. This is a site proposal for the private sector to implement which they are doing in this instance.

MDO 13

**Hambrook House, 17 Porden Road / 2-7 Town
Hall Parade**

0.5ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Hambrook House should be retained as it has considerable townscape value, anchoring the SW corner of the space around St. Matthew's Church. 17 Porden road is a temporary building past its service life; development would be welcome. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

Accepted in part - The Brixton Conservation Area was extended in 1998 to include Hambrook House. It is the former 'ACE' office, built in the 1950s with a number of jet age flourishes. It is considered to be of moderate townscape importance and to make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

MDO 14 — 228-234 Ferndale Road — 0.2ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

MDO 15

**St. Matthews Estate (West of St. Matthews Rd)
1.5ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Replacement should only be contemplated if new dwellings are better in quality and at least equal in number to the existing. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

Noted – no detailed proposals are made in the plan as to likely scale or design, and rightly so. This objection is difficult to act on – what is being asked for?

Objection B:

We object to this policy on the grounds that no reference is made for; a) the need to consult existing residents of St. Matthew's Estate, and b) the need for any redevelopment to provide at least as many units of social housing as are currently provided on St. Matthew's estate. (Brixton Area Forum Board c/o Brixton town Centre Manager)

Response B:

Amendment proposed on no loss of affordable housing units – although borough-wide Policy 15 states this anyway. There has already been extensive consultation with tenants; again it is not the place of the UDP to specify detailed consultation arrangements.

MDO 16

**Brixton Road/ Angell Town (West of Brixton Rd,
Near Junction with Loughborough Rd) 1.7ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

To amend the proposal to read "...and listed buildings at risk with particular emphasis on the St Johns Triangle site so as to enhance the conservation area by adopting a comprehensive and integrated architectural solution."(Diocese of Southwark)

Response A:

The St Johns Church Triangle site is outside this MDO area and it would elongate it unnaturally to extend it. It is accepted that this important listed building is at risk and in need of action, and that this can be facilitated by some limited appropriate enabling development between the church and the vicarage.

Objection B:

Agreeable to 'restoration' but opposed to 'regeneration'. This policy could be clearer where "regeneration" replaced by "restoration" (Louise Peachy – Stockwell Conservation Society)

Response B:

Accepted only in part – there need not be any conflict, as regeneration will in many cases mean conservation-led regeneration. Restoration may be appropriate on some frontages but not all.

Objection C:

Further loss of historic buildings should be resisted. New development "in keeping" is acceptable, but scale is more important than architectural style or materials. Replica buildings should be discouraged unless completing original paired or terraced buildings. Object to further loss of employment sites. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response C:

In this area some limited loss of employment sites is considered acceptable as a means of bringing difficult sites and semi-derelict buildings into use. The appropriate style and scale of buildings will vary on a site by site basis. Further loss is in any event restricted by the Boroughwide policies. The suggested wording on where replica infill is appropriate is considered too strict.

MDO 17 Remaining parts of Angell Town Estate 3.6ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received.

Summary of Representations & Responses:**Objection A:**

Clarify Site Proposals: Proposals for individual sites are generally in the form of very brief notes, which do not clearly distinguish between site history, current developments and new proposals. These should be identified separately; proposals appear excessive in terms of their impact on the local environment. Prefer to retain a remand facility within Inner London, rather than further afield, to enable visits by prisoners' families. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

Not accepted – each MDO refers to the full scope of proposals, which the plan could support. This might include current proposals, but these may fall by the wayside so it rather identifies the broad objectives, which should be met. Site history is only (and rarely) introduced where it is relevant to consideration of future proposals. Hence there is no need to identify these matters separately. Whether or not it remains a remand prison in whole or part is the responsibility of the prison service and not Lambeth Council.

Objection B:

We object to the proposal that Brixton Prison should become a "new community" if it becomes surplus. This is a meaningless concept. Brixton Prison represents a great opportunity to create a multi-purpose community facility whilst retaining its listed status. (Brixton Area Forum Board, c/o Brixton Centre Manager)

Response B:

Accepted in part – clarification proposed. A prison may not be a suitable location for a community facility.

MDO 19

**Waterworks Road/ Blenheim Gardens, off
Brixton Hill**

1.42ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Disappointed by the Council's lack of interest in restoring the Windmill and opening it to the public. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

The windmill is being restored with designs from Planet Earth architects with the aid of English Heritage and Channel 4.

~~MDO 20~~ ~~Morrish House, 1-31 Morrish Road, 61-69 New~~
~~Park Road~~ ~~0.3ha~~

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

Summary of Representations & Responses:**Objection A:**

Reference to the listed Tramshed should be changed to highlight the possible role in any medium term proposals for an extension of Cross River Transit to Streatham. TfL recommends that LB Lambeth consider carefully any short term use of this facility so as not to prejudice its possible use as a vehicle storage facility for Cross River Transit (Mayor of London)

Response A:

Accepted – although it is considered that the wording suggested could be improved slightly to make intentions clearer.

Objection B:

Whereas we support the retention and re-use of the Tramshed and Orchard Centre site, we object to future use being determined in advance from and in isolation to the Clapham Park Master plan. (Helen Fisher-Interim Chief Executive- Clapham Park Community Project)

Response B:

This site is outside the Clapham Park New Deal for Communities Area, the Orchard Centre is a listed building at risk requiring a new use. It would be unreasonable to delay this as this site is not covered by the Clapham Park project.

Objection C:

That designation refers to the "retention and re-use of the Tram-shed" which, in avoiding reference to possible redevelopment, undermines its potential. There is also no reference to the possibility of the site being prioritised for social housing. (Ujima Housing Association)

Response C:

Not accepted – the Tramshed is now being used by London Buses as a depot for its buses. This use is entirely in keeping with its original use and the Council's intention to keep the site available for the future development of the Cross River Transit route. The Tramshed makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Brixton Hill Conservation Area and so it is entirely reasonable to refer to its retention. The 'potential' for wholesale redevelopment referred to therefore does not exist. The Pinewoods part of the development has now been implemented so it is therefore been deleted from this MDO area. For the above reasons, it is not appropriate to refer to it as an affordable housing priority site as it is now very likely to be in employment use and protected for the Mayor's intended Cross River Transit Use.

Objection D:

Given that the quality and value of the listed building resides as much in their context and situation and that the whole site is needed for any educational use NO housing development to be allowed on the Orchard Centre. (Duncan Law – Holmewood Neighbourhood Assoc.)

Response D:

Not accepted – this would be contrary to national policy in PPG15 which requires a flexible approach to uses where these secure the future of listed buildings at risk. No firm reason is given for opposing residential development, which is supported by national and regional policy within a residential area such as this one. A feasibility study commissioned by the London Borough of Lambeth has shown that residential development on a small part of the site is the only feasible way of securing the future of the listed Orchard Centre buildings.

**MDO 22 — Pinewood Showroom, South Circular Road
0.2ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

This site is not in Brixton but in Clapham Park. The MDO number is not shown on the proposals map. (Margaret Ross-Bell – Clapham South Neighbourhood Assoc.)

Response A:

This has been deleted as a separate MDO and incorporated within an enlarged Clapham Park MDO.

Objection B:

We object to the future use of this site being determined in advance from and in isolation to the Clapham Park Master plan. The site should also be clearly labelled on the Proposals Plan. (Helen Fisher- Interim Chief Executive, Clapham Park Project – New Deal for Communities)

Response B:

This has been deleted as a separate MDO and incorporated within an enlarged Clapham Park MDO.

MDO 23 — **99 Elm Park (former Strand Centre)** — **0.6ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Deplorable lack of forward planning for educational needs. This is not a very satisfactory site for adult education because of its distance from public transport; we would prefer an adult education centre in or close to a Town Centre or local centre with good public transport. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

Noted – however, the site exists and is still needed for educational use.

Objection B:

No development of this site until decisions have been made on secondary school provision in the south of the Borough. (Simon Hooberman)

Response B:

Accepted – though site to be retained in educational use even after decisions on secondary school provision has been made. MDO designation therefore deleted.

Objection C:

Retain for community use. We would like to see the retention of some of the former Strand Centre as a play space/nursery. (Brixton Area Forum Board, c/o Brixton town Centre Manager)

Response C:

Not accepted – the site is still needed for educational purposes even after Clapham Secondary School and the proposed new Norwood Secondary School are built to ease the shortage of secondary school places in the borough.

Objection D:

Contradicts Policies 1, 25 and 26. Remove MDO23. Create a new definition 'permanent educational establishment' - 'The Strand Centre will be kept for permanent educational uses.' (NIT/NDM – Ricky Renalls)

Response D:

Accepted – MDO to be deleted for the reason given above.

MDO 24

Former Effra Primary School, between Effra Parade & Barnwell Rd 0.8ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Prefer conventional terrace housing arrangement of blocks along Effra Parade, ideally with similar setback distance to "Poets" roads nearby. Number of dwellings accessed from Barnwell Road should be modest, to avoid further traffic increase in Barnwell Road, which is already used by rat-running commuter traffic. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

This is an expanded version of what the policy says.

Objection B:

Keep for community use (Brixton Area Forum board c/o Brixton Town Centre Manager)

Response B:

Not accepted as it is surplus as a school and has not been used as such for some years and its development is needed to fund the new Tulse Hill School.

~~MDO 25~~ ~~41-75 Acre Lane~~ ~~1.7ha~~

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Object to further loss of employment premises, particularly at rear of site. Prefer reinstatement of original houses, which have been much altered, and their residential use would be acceptable in order to achieve this. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society)

Response A:

Partly accepted. MDO deleted. However reinstatement of original houses not accepted as presumption that existing employment use will remain.

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

We object to the proposal to develop the Dexter Adventure Playground, which is providing a service to the community children and young people foremost, is contrary to the Councils recreation and Leisure policy (UDP) RL4. This also conflicts with the draft proposals 26, which look to develop and impose community facilities, and 45, which look to protect and enhance open space and sports facilities.

(Andrew Moss, Anthony Horris, Denise Riy, Daniel Haydon, Damien Peters, R. Webb, Olivia Green, O. Campbell, Col Marriott, Jason Thompson, Pauline Anderson, Shane Collins, Collin Marriott, Cheryl Deane, Michelle-Anne Morrison, Camron Jemimoh, Errd Thompson, Maria Seychell, Darren Colly, Rita Marriott, Sarah Sango and Ralph Holpher – West Norwood Community Development, Mrs R. Spearing, Mark Hunter, C. Falconer.)

Response A:

Accepted. MDO has been deleted.

Objection B:

Object to loss of playing facilities. Existing floodlit ball games pitch is a local asset that should be retained. Small-scale building possible at NE end of site but preferred use would be for youth or training facilities complementary to the playground. (Alan Piper – the Brixton Society) (Stephen Cowley – Lambeth friends of the Earth)

Response B:

Accepted. MDO has been deleted.

Objection C:

Retain the site in remembrance of the developments that came out of the Brixton riots. The site used to promote equalities and diversity in employment. Part of the 'Youth Strategy' for increasing minority group participation in work based learning. (Nick Mac Rae – Friends of Hillside Gardens Park)

Response C:

Retaining cleared sites resulting from burnt out buildings is wholly inappropriate as a remembrance. See amendments proposed above.

Objection D:

We strongly object to any net loss of play space for children. Any lost space must be replaced with appropriate, local facilities. Any proposals to alter the current play space must be designed in close conjunction with the local community, taking into account the needs of those who currently use the facility. Any loss of a community facility will be strongly objected to. (Brixton Area Forum Board c/o Brixton Town Centre Manager)

Response D:

Accepted in part. MDO has been deleted.

Objection E:

We object to the reference in this policy to the demolition of shops and houses as being under "misguided Brixton Front Line crime prevention programme". Whether this programme was misguided or not, is not a matter for the UDP. This statement is also prejudicial to the proposal that this site should be redeveloped (Brixton Area Forum Board)

Response E:

Not accepted – putting right the misguided planning interventions of the past is a matter for the UDP.

MDO 27

33 Macaulay Road/LETS

0.7ha

Summary of Representations & Responses (MDO):

Objection A:

Planning brief for site is too restrictive and inflexible. (Peter Burke–Murphy)

Response A:

Concerns about the content of the planning brief will be dealt with in response to that separate consultation exercise. The policy gives considerable flexibility, on what is currently an employment site.

Objection B:

Objection is raised to MDO 27 for the following reasons:

- 50% employment floor space is an arbitrary proportion without rationale. No reason is provided for a different proportion in the brief for the Grafton Road site;
- The comprehensive development of both sites can be an objective but not a requirement;
- Extension or improvement of Clapham Library conflicts with Government advice on Planning Obligations contained in Circular 1/97 in that it fails to meet the tests of being directly related to the proposed development acceptance in land use terms. (Grainger Clapham Ltd)

Response B:

Reference to the requirement of 50% employment floorspace in a new development has been removed and replaced with 'a significant proportion of'. A higher proportion of employment floorspace is considered reasonable on this site as the 63 Old Town site, unlike this one, is not currently in employment use. It is considered important that the two parts of the site are developed in a complementary manner, and an amendment is proposed to clarify this. This need not mean comprehensive development, however without an improved access the LETS site is very difficult to develop, with the poor access, over basements, onto Old Town.

Policy 26 (D) (Deficiencies in Community Facilities) spells out the overall approach to seeking contributions to creating new or improving existing community facilities, including library provision. Increased population and corresponding impact on community facilities is directly related to new residential development in the Borough. Contributions for the improvements towards Clapham Library in terms of a Section 106 obligation, has a precedent in relation to the mixed retail residential scheme Tesco development at the Former South London Women's Hospital site, granted on appeal subject to a Section 106 Agreement, that included a significant financial contribution towards a public access ICT centre in Clapham Library.

MDO 28

**63 Old town / Grafton Square Police Site – Land
~~Next to 43~~ 0.7ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Over-restrictive – does not specify non-residential floor-space. Does not specify the design along Grafton Square (Groveville)

Response A:

As with all MDO's, it would be wrong to specify the exact uses acceptable, as a range are and the most important principle is to establish a mix. The proposed rewording has minimal design content and misses out the requirement for public space.

MDO 29

The Orangery, off Worsopp Drive

0.4ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Support, but should add reference to setting (English Heritage).

Response A:

Accepted – change made.

MDO 30

**Former Henry Thornton School, Clapham
Common Southside (Includes Henry Thornton
Centre, Elms Rd & Lambeth College, Clapham
Common Southside)**

3.2ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

MDO 31 — Former South London Women's Hospital, 1.1ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

This area is not within the area of Clapham High Street and Old Town - it is in Clapham Park. We also object to the proposed use as set out. The retention of the hospital (not 'original') building is incompatible with 'active frontage uses' as defined in Policy 19. (Margaret Ross-Bell – Clapham South Neighbourhood Assoc.)

Response A:

Accepted in part– will now be listed under Clapham Park and not Clapham. Any proposed use as a supermarket would need to comply with Policy 5. The retention of the original hospital is compatible with the creation of ground floor uses, just because this was a problem with the current Tesco's scheme does not mean that it is a problem with all potential schemes.

Objection B:

This is considered to be within the Clapham Park area and it is requested that a planning brief be developed, involving local people in its content should the current owner choose to revise current plans. (John How – Clapham & Stockwell Town Centre Board)

Response B:

Accepted in Part - will now be listed under Clapham Park and not Clapham. Decisions on priorities for development briefs are taken outside the plan process depending on staff time and work priorities.

<p><i>- MDO to be listed under Clapham Park and not Clapham High Street and Old Town -.</i></p>

MDO 32

**Park Hill / Northbourne Rd & various sites
fronting Clapham Park Rd 0.9ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

MDO 33 OCS site, 44 Clapham Common Southside, 1.5ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

MDO 34

Hasslerigge Primary School, Bowland Rd, 0.7ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Add a recommendation to see community facilities provided on this site or close by. There is concern to protect provision of community facilities through this development with support to develop or invest in premises that will be available for community use (John How – Clapham & Stockwell Town Centre Board).

Response A:

Not accepted – the site has been sold and replacement facilities have been provided nearby at the new Knights Hill School.

Objection B:

Retain for Community uses. (Brixton Area Forum Board – c/o Brixton Town Centre Manager)

Response B:

Not accepted – the site has been sold and replacement facilities have been provided nearby at the new Knights Hill School.

Objection C:

The proposal gets rid of school places we may need in the future for the expanding population. It is contrary to Policy 1 and 26 - Clapham has a shortage of community facilities. (NIT/NDM – Ricky Renalls)

Response C:

Not accepted – the site has been sold and replacement facilities have been provided nearby at the new King's Avenue School. The provision of school places is determined by Education, who in their last assessment have indicated a surplus of primary school places. The restructuring of primary schools is part of the Primary School Development Strategy (PSDS).

MDO 36

**Former Drive Thru, 33 Clapham High Street,
0.1ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

MDO 37

Mary Seacole House, 91 Clapham High Street & various neighbouring sites 0.5ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

MDO 38

Copyn Yard/Clapham Manor Depot, Clapham High Street / Clapham Manor Street

1.0ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None made.

Summary of Representations & Responses (Policy):**Objection A:**

The New Deal for Communities area is only part of Clapham Park. Issues such as the lack of community facilities, poor access to public transport and the fear of crime affect the whole area. Add a policy on the wider Clapham Park Area (John How – Clapham & Stockwell Town Centre Board)

Response A:

Accepted – change made. Although the proposed supporting text is slightly too long and has had to be edited.

Objection B:

We welcome the designation of the Clapham Park NDC area as an MDO. However, we object to a number of key aspects to the way this policy is currently presented. Propose that this policy is highlighted in blue, to afford it the status of other area-based policies. Propose that the policy is framed in ways that are more general. The area identified as MDO 39 on the Proposals Plan is incorrectly delineated. There should be a clear distinction between the wider Clapham Park area and the Clapham Park Project NDC area. (Helen Fisher – Interim Chief Executive – Clapham Park Project/New Deal for Communities)

Response B:

It is proposed to include the suggested supporting text and rewording of the policy (which requires slight editing to be the same style as the rest of the plan), as well as showing the wider area on the Proposals Map. It is also proposed to have a policy covering the whole of the Clapham Park Area. The MDO area is distinct from this however and so needs to be shown separately. It is important however to include a minimum of design guidance in the MDO, the NDC has requested some of these be in Boroughwide policies but as local issues it is much better that they are included here.

Objection C:

BT Group Plc is the owner of property interests (many located in strategic positions) within the Clapham Park Estate. It is their view that this policy should be specifying reference to 'Utilities Operator' as main partnership consultee's. BT buildings, whilst operational, are prohibitively expensive to relocate (tens of millions of pounds); therefore, development schemes need to work around them. (BT Group Plc)

Response C:

There will be, PPG12 however states that development plans should not list consultation mechanisms.

Objection D:

Provide more facilities for the current residents especially children. Contrary to policies 26, 1, 4, 5. Why did the council close the local library beside the estate? (NIT/NDM - Ricky Renalls)

Response D:

Accepted in part – proposed changes include a requirement for improved neighbourhood centres and community facilities. This would include facilities for all age groups, including the young. The Policy is not contrary to other plan policies.

Summary of Representations & Responses (paragraphs 5.5.1 – 5.5.3):**Objection A:**

Suggest change to 5.5.1 Clapham Park is a diverse, distinct area on the Lambeth/Wandsworth boundary. It encompasses parts which have benefited from the gentrification of Clapham alongside pockets of real deprivation that have not seen any significant regeneration activity

Paragraph 5.5.2 Despite these apparent differences, the whole area is united in not having significant community facilities. The local library was closed in 1999. There is also widespread poor or very poor public transport accessibility, adding to a sense of neglect among all sections of the population. Fear of crime is significant across the area.

Paragraph 5.5.3 Although this regeneration project covers only part of Clapham Park, its effects will benefit a much wider community, particularly on nearby estates. The Council will work to ensure that its programmes are integrated with a wider programme of renewal for the area's deprived parts and the conservation of its unique character.

(Helen Fisher, Interim Chief Executive. Clapham Park Project - New Deal for Communities)

Response A:

Accepted in part – although the suggested wording is slightly too long.

MDO 40

Herne Hill Station, Railton Rd & various properties between 128 and 140 Herne Hill, 0.4ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

The Mayor's Transport Strategy does not include extending the Victoria Line. Remove reference to Victoria Line extension to Herne Hill (Mayor of London)

Response A:

Although not included in the Mayor's transport strategy, London Underground has studied the possibility of a loop at Herne Hill and so it may be included in the future. Also at Canary Wharf station, Victoria line platforms have been safeguarded, and any future Kent based fourth London airport would require an extension to serve it – similar to the Piccadilly Line extension to Heathrow, as this has risen up the political agenda. It is therefore considered reasonable to include it as a longer term aspiration which would have considerable benefits to the Victoria Line, including allowing for much more frequent trains and increasing the capacity of Victoria Underground station itself.

Objection B:

Proposal is ambiguous about possible further public space on Railton Road frontage. This can only be achieved by displacing existing businesses or homes, which is not acceptable. (Alan Piper - The Brixton Society)

Response B:

This has now been created and so can be deleted from the MDO.

Objection C:

Any new development at Herne Hill Station should provide, in relation to private cars as well as for taxis and mini-cabs, for pick up and set down facilities for rail passengers, thus restoring the facilities recently ruined by the new bus lane markings in Railton Road. (Mr J. H. Ward)

Response C:

This is covered by the Boroughwide Policy 14(D) so there is no need to mention it specifically here.

Objection D:

Herne Hill is one of the few shopping areas in the borough that still has a range of small shops including a butcher, pork butcher, greengrocer and ironmonger. The suggestion that a small supermarket is needed is completely wrong. A supermarket would kill off the remaining shops. (Seamus Mac Bride)

Response D:

There is no such mention in the MDO, although a small supermarket has since been constructed within the district centre.

MDO 41

**AJ Bull at Railway Sidings Shakespeare Road
0.7ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

MDO 42

**2-24 Kennington Lane (including 2-6 Holyoak Rd
& 130-138 Newington Butts)**

0.6ha

Summary of Representations & Responses (MDO):

Objection A:

There is nothing at the junction of Kennington Lane with Newington Butts, which would justify a sudden emphasis on the vertical, or any sharp contrast with the medium to low level properties close by in Southwark. This stretch of Kennington Lane should preserve the pleasantly restrained air, which it now has. (ID Adams, Chair – Manor of Kennington Residents Assoc.)

Response A:

Accepted – change made. Vertical emphasis means narrow properties taller than they are wide, like a Georgian terrace, however this was easily misunderstood and this is proposed for deletion. There is scope for a modest increase in height on the site however.

Objection B:

The map supplied was too small to enable verification of this address. The wording of the policy suggests local conservation policy, can be used to evaluate any proposals. We do not believe this is so. (Paul Baker - Ambo Architects)

Response B:

Noted.

Objection C:

What is 'vertical emphasis'? (NIT/NDM – Ricky Renalls)

Response C:

Accepted – change made. Vertical emphasis means narrow properties taller than they are wide, like a Georgian terrace, however this was easily misunderstood and this is proposed for deletion. There is scope for a modest increase in height on the site however.

Summary of Representations & Responses (MDO):**Objection A:**

The deposit does not make clear what criteria are applied when for example Herne Hill District Centre is treated as a matter of policy (Policy 59) and not Loughborough Junction. Reword and reprioritise! (Magdi Abdehadi)

Response A:

Policies and MDO's are of equal weight and are only included as policies in Part B where they are not confined to a specific geographical area, which can be shown on the proposals map.

Objection B:

We object to this policy because it has insufficient detail, and does not go far enough towards promoting regeneration in this area. We do not agree with the idea that improvements to the station will necessarily have a positive regeneration impact in the area. The whole area needs to be improved to encourage people to make use of local facilities/businesses. Transport improvements cannot be the sole driver. There is a strong consensus (see BAF Loughborough Junction Master Plan) that the area should not be seen as an over-spill area for Brixton type activities, for example A3 use. We would like to see proposals for encouraging cultural, media and light industrial employment- generating uses. We would also like to see the reinstatement of community facilities in Wick Gardens. (Brixton Area Forum Board c/o Brixton Town Centre Manager)

Response B:

Accepted in part. The detail requested will need to be provided following a detailed master planning or development framework study. It is too soon to include it now. It is accepted that the station should not be the sole driver. A number of amendments are proposed reflecting the points raised. A3 uses will be judged against Policy 29 and Policy 53 restricting such uses to the core of the town centre.

Summary of Representations & Responses (Para 5.8):**Objection A**

Supported, however there is: no Ref. to a time scale, no Ref. to East London Line Extension to Clapham Junction (Orbirail) but referred to elsewhere in the Plan. Platforms to remaining lines - again alluded to elsewhere in plan - needs to be more specific, and many other improvements. (Tim Gaymer)

Response A

The timescale is in the hands of the Mayor of London. No timescale has been announced. Reference to East London Line extension now included.

Objection B

No reference except obliquely in the MDO sites to any expansion of Kings College -This should be mentioned here. (Barbara Pattinson, the Camberwell Society)

Response B

This is mentioned in Policy 26.

Summary of Representations & Responses (Para 5.8.1):**Objection A:**

Propose that the first sentence in 5.81. "The area round Loughborough Junction is one of the most neglected corners of Brixton." should be changed to read "The area round Loughborough Junction is one of the most neglected and deprived corners of Brixton." (Magdi Abdehadi)

Response A:

Accepted – change made.

Summary of Representations & Responses (Para 5.8.2):

Objection A

This paragraph should be reworded, as it is currently misleading; Thameslink already stops at Loughborough Junction. However, the Mayor supports plans to carry out major regeneration around the new station with the South London Line platforms linking to Thameslink platforms (Mayor of London)

Response A

Accepted – error corrected.

MDO 44

105 Minet Road / Wickwood Street

0.7ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

MDO 45

**Bengeworth Road Depot and Adjoining Land off
Bengeworth Rd 1.4ha**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

We do, however, object to what we consider a very limited interpretation of potential planning uses embodied in the description 'mixed-use employment area'. This objection is inextricably linked to the site's designation as a 'key industrial and business area' (see separate objection). The policy description within MDO 45 should be modified to read as follows: 'Predominantly residential although a mix of other uses may be appropriate, to include offices and/or a mix of retail uses to include retail warehousing.' (London Electric)

Response A:

Not accepted- limited justification is provided for the site not being designated as a Key Industrial and Business Area/ mixed use employment area other than the pressing need for housing in the Borough. However, it is acknowledged that this could apply to any site. Lambeth's plan has very carefully weighed and balanced the need for housing and the need for employment. It has assessed the best sites for employment through an independent consultant's report by GVA Grimley and as a result a number of marginal sites have been released for housing. This was found to be one of the best sites. The plan is also highly flexible concerning redevelopment of a number of low intensity sites (such as this) or run-down sites in need of investment. Hence a number of sites are designated as mixed-use employment areas. The Lambeth plan is able to meet ambitious housing targets whilst still protecting and enhancing the best employment sites. There is therefore no pressing need for allowing this site to go to wholly housing use.

The objector's argument is also contradictory. If there is a pressing housing case, then why should significant offices or retail be permitted reducing housing potential? The site is one of the few in the Loughborough Junction area capable of providing significant new employment premises without harming residential amenity. There are only residential properties on one side. The objectors suggested rewording would remove the priority given to the King's College Hospital. Were the site to become vacant the hospital must have first call, as it is ideally situated for hospital expansion. The site has poor public transport accessibility. This, together with its back street location, make it unsuitable for major offices, and this and its out of town location make it unsuitable for large scale retailing. The mixed-use employment area designation is considered to offer considerable flexibility in providing for both housing and employment use.

~~MDO 46~~ ~~145-147 Coldharbour Lane~~ ~~0.2ha~~

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

Officer Note: Site has been developed for 11 self-contained key worker flats and 9 dwellings.
(Planning reference: 03/02548/FUL)

MDO 47

118–120 Coldharbour Lane

0.5ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

MDO 48

Cowley / Myatts Field North Estates

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

The suggestion that replacement-sporting facilities have been provided in the park is not accurate, one example is, the pitch is half the size. A specific strategic plan should be developed as proposed in Lambeth's consultation document- Parks and Greenspaces, Strategic Plan -prior to imposing any further 'foreign' uses on this small but very much loved green space. (Leonard Sequeria, I Browne – Minet Conservation Association)

Response A:

Accepted in part – The Myatts Field Pitch has gone ahead anyway in advance of the Myatts Fields North proposal. They are not directly related, however it will act to some degree in compensation. The Myatts Field pitch is popular, and like all popular sporting facilities, this does cause a degree of disruption.

MDO 49

West Norwood Opportunity Site – Brooks Laundry 2-20 Lansdowne Hill, 260-36746 Norwood Rd, 1-12 York Hill **Area: 1.14 ha.**

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

I object to the idea of a medium size or large supermarket. There are a number of small-medium sizes ones that more than adequately meet the needs of local residents. (J. A. Williams, VWJ Pair)

Response A:

Not accepted – the Lambeth retail and leisure capacity study concluded that there was demand and need for a new medium sized supermarket in West Norwood. A ballot carried out by the town centre forum also indicated majority local support.

Objection B:

I have a number of reservations; for example, I do not agree with the ‘no increase in parking policy’. (Jane Pickard. Diane Miller)

Response B:

Accepted – an appropriate level of car parking in town centres is necessary to retain and where necessary develop the viability and vitality of the centre in line with the retail and other developments in a centre. A blanket clause could prove counter-productive and has been removed, however if parking was deemed excessive in the centre it could be excluded from further developments by condition.

Objection C:

Instead of including housing above a development, provide ‘local’ gym/fitness centre or some other commercial enterprise. (Diane Miller)

Response C:

The MDO already allows for this, but residential would also be acceptable.

Objection D:

The plan does not properly explain bus lay-by or cause and effects of buses on traffic in this area. No mention of ‘section 106’ money, which a development might attract! (Jane Pickhard)

Response D:

These are matters of detail, which can be addressed at application stage. By law and national policy, planning obligations would have to be spent in the area.

Objection E:

The need for more housing space is very great, but needs to be balanced against the need to make any redevelopment of West Norwood centre a success and the consequent need for adequate car parking. The right balance must recognise that not every piece of spare space should be earmarked for housing. (Mr J. H. Ward)

Response E:

Noted – the revisions accept that more parking is needed.

Objection F:

The site on the UDP covered by MDO 49 needs to include the Lansdowne Hill frontage, whilst the triangular site compounded on MDO 50 needs to become part of MDO 49. This continuation sheet accompanies objections to MDO 49. Moreover these ideas were presented to NAG during the winter, 1996-1997, after meetings with Town Planning and Highways Officers. The officers had agreed that it would be feasible, using highway criteria, to redevelop the large site bounded by Norwood Road, Lansdowne Hill, the York Hill Estate and York Hill as a one-way system, with retail development and car parking behind the shops fronting onto Norwood Road. It was agreed

by officers that a new road could be located alongside the eastern boundary of the York Hill Estate with adequate turning space into (or from) York Hill and from (or into) Lansdowne Hill. The triangular site flanked by Canterbury Grove and by Lansdowne Hill would probably be required to assist in the traffic circulation and create a better-looking space in front of the Lansdowne Church. The advantages of allowing back land development to the west of Norwood Road (between York Hill and Lansdowne Hill) include the attraction powers of a major retail development with parking. Hopefully, specialist shops would then locate alongside Norwood Road, which would be one-way with, however, traffic at a safe speed. West Norwood needs more visitors if it is to be regenerated. The disadvantages would be increased traffic generation, with a harmful impact on the residential roads of Knights Hill - in particular those feeding traffic into Royal Circus and then down York Hill and Lansdowne Hill from Leigham Court Road (and vice versa). Another already congested road is Knights Hill, especially from Thornlaw Road down into Norwood Road. The traffic effect of a major re-development of the back land to the West of Norwood Road would be reduced if there were one-way access/exit points into both York and Lansdowne Hills. (Cllr Robert Mc Connell)

Response F:

Accepted in part – it is accepted that the site area of the MDO should include the frontage onto Lansdowne Hill, to improve servicing and the appearance of this frontage and the wider site. It is not accepted that there should be provision for a one-way system. The objector is right to state that it is technically feasible, however it is not desirable. This would effectively create an additional small gyratory in West Norwood. The policy now of Transport for London, and of the Lambeth plan, is that gyratories create higher speeds, additional length of running for buses, isolate pedestrians in the centre and can create air pollution and traffic safety problems. The inclusion of the site of MDO 50 would only be necessary to facilitate this road system.

Objection G:

It is essential that any new Supermarket in West Norwood does not have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the West Norwood District Centre and is consistent with the scale and function of the centre. Add Additional paragraph 'Any proposals for new retail development on this site should be considered in accordance with Policy 5.' (Sommerfield)

Response G:

A need for new floorspace does not have to be demonstrated for sites in town centres allocated in a development plan. Similarly PPG6 does not require the impact of a town centre store on other town centre stores to be addressed. Nonetheless the other tests of Policy 5 need to be covered so a reference is necessary.

Objection H:

The triangle of space which is located by the junction of Canterbury Grove and Lansdowne Hill and lies between those roads, and which at present forms part of MDO50, should be included in the purview of MDO49. (Mr J H Ward)

Response H:

See response F.

Objection I:

Retain Victorian shop fronts. (Jane Pickhard)

Response I:

These are not listed or in a conservation area so it can only be expressed as an aspiration.

Summary of Representations & Responses:**Objection A:**

The triangular site bounded on one side by Canterbury Grove and on the other by Lansdowne Hill must definitely be part of the MDO49 West Norwood opportunity site. (Councillor Mc Connell)

Response A:

Upon further consideration, the Council has now decided to delete this MDO, therefore any future development of the site will be assessed against the general policies of the UDP.

Objection B:

The triangular site bounded on one side by Canterbury Grove and on the other by Lansdowne Hill must definitely be part of the MDO49 West Norwood opportunity site. Remove designation of housing site. (Roderick D. Brown)

Response B:

Upon further consideration, the Council has now decided to delete this MDO, therefore any future development of the site will be assessed against the general policies of the UDP.

Objection C:

Canterbury Grove, the triangle at the bottom may need to be used as part of a new traffic junction. Otherwise should be spruced up and used for a street market. A pedestrian route to Bloom Grove could be considered. (Jane Pickard)

Response C:

Upon further consideration, the Council has now decided to delete this MDO, therefore any future development of the site will be assessed against the general policies of the UDP.

Objection D:

I object to the proposal because the Council should concentrate on providing adequate community and business resources for the current residents of West Norwood before bringing more people into an already densely populated and under-served area. A disproportionate number of affordable housing projects are proposed for Norwood. (Diane Miller)

Response D:

Upon further consideration, the Council has now decided to delete this MDO, therefore any future development of the site will be assessed against the general policies of the UDP.

Objection E:

We submit that plans to develop more housing in MDO 50 should be held aside, until the right balance has been worked out between the housing needs of the area and demands of the more important redevelopment of MDO 49. (Mr JH Ward)

Response E:

Upon further consideration, the Council has now decided to delete this MDO, therefore any future development of the site will be assessed against the general policies of the UDP.

~~MDO 52 Knights Hill Cotswold Street 0.2ha~~

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

Officer Note:

The site has been redeveloped for affordable housing, with commercial (A1/ A2) on the ground floor, and therefore the MDO designation is being deleted.

MDO 53

**Knights Hill – Former Lambeth College
(Junction of Chapel Rd) **0.7ha****

Summary of Representations & Responses (Policy):

Objection A:

We have no quarrel with the idea of a mixed development here, but, in view of the size of the increase in the number of dwellings, the amount of new employment to be created here needs to be significant. (Mr J. H. Ward)

Response A:

This site now has planning permission, but it has only been partially implemented. A warehouse has been constructed on the northern part of the site. It is therefore proposed to reduce the size of the MDO to include the southern part of the site, which remains undeveloped. This part of the site has outline planning permission for a health club/ gymnasium (Use Class D2) and office/ light industrial (B1 units), but a developer has not been found. The site forms part of a KIBA and is located in the West Norwood Industrial Area, so any use would be expected to be predominantly employment generating.

Objection B:

This section should emphasize the need for excellent urban design. I agree that any development should have a street frontage. Furthermore, any development needs to be sensitive, i.e. short & long distance views, which are currently excellent from this location. (Sally Wadsworth)

Response B:

This site now has planning permission, but it has only been partially implemented. A warehouse has been constructed on the northern part of the site. It is therefore proposed to reduce the size of the MDO to include only the southern part of the site, which remains undeveloped. Any development would be expected to comply with Policy 31 and 32 of the deposit Unitary Development Plan, with respect to urban design. Any development should be sensitive to the character of the adjacent proposed extension to the Conservation Area.

MDO 54

Rothschild Street/Ernest Avenue (various commercial sites fronting Rothschild St, Ernest Avenue & Norwood High St) 0.9ha

Summary of Representations & Responses (MDO):

Objection A:

I object to the proposal because the council should concentrate on providing adequate community and business resources for the current residents of Norwood before bringing more people into an already densely populated and under- served area. (Diane Miller)

Response A:

Not accepted – the plan secures planning obligations from new development to improve this infrastructure. There have been successful housing developments on Norwood High Street which have been confined to the High Street frontage only which the plan proposes.

MDO 55

99-131 Norwood High Street

0.4ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

None received

MDO 56

44-52 Norwood Road

0.3ha

Summary of Representations & Responses (Policy):

Objection A:

I object to the proposal because the council should concentrate on providing adequate community and business resources for the current residents of Norwood before bringing more people into an already densely populated and under-served area. A disproportionate number of affordable housing projects are proposed for Norwood. (Diane Miller)

Response A:

It is not the case that a disproportionate number of affordable housing projects are proposed for Norwood. The objection fails to acknowledge London's severe housing crisis, or new policies in the plan to fund new facilities on the back of new housing and other development.

MDO 57

Avenue Park Rd (railway sidings on north side of the road)

Area: 0.5 Ha

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Should be used to improve Bus-Rail interchange at Tulse Hill Station and/or Park and Ride. This is not re-creation of street frontage, site was railway siding. (Roderick D. Brown)

Response A:

A large car park would be a poor use of the site, encouraging car use. This is not a good location for bus interchange being located on the wrong side of the railway and station. Public transport operators (Arriva, Network Rail and South Central Trains) operating from Tulse Hill have been informally consulted and have confirmed that they do not have any foreseeable plans involving the development of this site.

Objection B:

Any development on the east side of Tulse Hill Station should provide for picking up and setting-down facilities for cars and cabs. (Mr J H Ward)

Response B:

This is required by Borough wide Policy 14 D and so is not necessary.

