

GLOSSARY

Summary of Representations:

Objection A

The glossary (p.172) is useful but there should be a glossary of initials - some initials have crept in unawares, such as "Lip" on the top of page 38. (Helen Fisher, Interim Chief Executive, Clapham Park Project- New Deal for Communities)

Response A

All remaining acronyms will be removed from the text.

Objection B

We would like to see a clear definition of key worker housing and recognition that this will mean family as well as single person and childless couple accommodation. (Leah Levane, Streatham Partnership Board)

Response B

Accepted – change made:

Key Worker Housing:

Workers for key public sector bodies experiencing problems of recruitment and/or retention. Includes health service workers, teachers, police, firemen, bus drivers and social workers. Includes housing for families not just single people. In order to also qualify as affordable housing must be for those on low incomes.

Proposals Map

Summary of Representations & Responses:

Objection A:

Proposals Map is unclear in parts of Borough (Government Office for London Informal Comment)

Response A:

Accepted. There were great technical problems with the printing of the Proposals Map that led to the quality and clarity of the map being less than desired. Improvements will be made to the revised map.

Objection B:

The following sites, identified in the London Ecology Unit handbook Nature Conservation in Lambeth, do not appear to be included on the Proposals Map as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance: Oasis Children's Nature Garden (LaB117), Vauxhall City Farm (LaL5), Sunny Hill Road Open Space (LaL6), Tulse Hill Nature Garden (LaL8), Kennington Park (LaL15), Hillmeads (LaL17). It is possible that some of the smaller Local sites are in fact shown, because the map code for Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance is almost impossible to detect for very small sites (Mayor of London).

Response B:

Accepted -The Oasis, Hillmeads, Kennington Park and Tulse Hill sites were omitted in error and are now to be included. The other two were not visible due to the weak strength of colour on the map that will now be changed.

Objection C:

Part of the pavement along Lambeth Palace Road to the north-west of the park 'belongs' to the park and should be included in the park boundaries. (It is the area marked by bollards and which contains seating. (Friends of Archbishops Park).

Response C:

Not accepted – this is highway verge not public open space, it is not covered by the parks maintenance contract.

Objection D:

The north-west of Archbishop's Park, the section owned by Lambeth rather than the Church Commissioners, is 'Stangate Triangle Replacement Land' and so should be shown as a 'protected London Square'. (Friends of Archbishops Park).

Response D:

The whole of the park is protected by the Act and is shown as protected London Square on the Proposals Map. This includes the land originally protected under the Act and the replacement land extension (which was actually land to compensate for land lost as part of the St Thomas's Hospital redevelopment after the war).

Objection E:

Boundary of Lambeth Walk Open Space is drawn incorrectly. It does not include the frontage site facing Kennington Road, from Lollard Street to Fitzalan Street- it is in fact a part of Lambeth Walk Open Space. (Friends of Archbishops Park).

Response E:

Accepted- although the land was previously to be developed for housing use, the Council now wishes to incorporate the site into Lambeth Walk Open Space and in the revised UDP the land will be incorporated within its boundaries.

Objection F:

Delete Lambeth Walk Open Space as a Parks Regeneration Area (Friends of Archbishops Park, Maryliyn Evers).

Response F:

Accepted - It is proposed to delete this designation (see responses and proposed changes for Policy 45). Lambeth Walk Open Space remains shown as a park (public open space) on the Proposals Map.

Objection G:

De-designate Kennington Park Extension, Vauxhall Park and Vauxhall Spring Gardens as parks regeneration areas (Friends of Archbishops Park, Marylyn Evers).

Response G:

Accepted - It is proposed to delete this designation (see responses and proposed changes for Policy 45). These open spaces were already and remain shown as being protected as parks (public open space).

Objection H:

Both Roots & Shoots and Vauxhall City Farm should be shown as sites of local nature conservation importance.

Response H:

Accepted - they are, and this will be made clearer in the revised Proposals Map (see also Policy 46).

Objection I:

The map is too small a scale for clarity, which is essential as the written statement contains no identifying text. e.g. Policy 57 refers to "core and edge of town centre areas" but the latter are not marked. In fact I cannot distinguish any "edge of centre" areas around any of the centres. The fact that the MDOs are also edged in purple is also confusing. Revert to three maps (Clapham South Neighbourhood Association).

Response I:

Accepted - The revised Proposals Map will be much clearer and will clearly show (which are currently weakly shown) the edge of centre areas.

Objection J:

The Proposals Map shows an area between County Hall and the North and South Blocks as Public Open Space. In fact this space is occupied by the extensions to the North and South Blocks it is not therefore available as public open space. (John Peer, Lambeth and Wandsworth Group - Council for the Protection of Rural England, Mr M Forwood, Peter Harris, Kate Hoey MP, Doris Newnham, J & C Finamore).

Response J:

Accepted – change made.

Objection K:

The Proposals Map shows a winding strip of land between the park boundary of Jubilee Gardens and the MDO boundary This corresponds to an existing footpath- which is actually part of the Gardens and should therefore be included as part of them (Lambeth and Wandsworth Council for the Protection of Rural England, Mr M Forwood, Kate Hoey MP, Doris Newnham, J & C Finamore, John Peer).

Response K:

Accepted - change made.

Objection L:

The map with MDOs should state the building or site name. There should be insets that give more details of proposals. (Sadie Campbell).

Response L:

Not accepted - this is not practical at almost whatever scale is chosen, hence the use of a clear numbering system. The revised Proposals Map will be much clearer.

Objection M:

Show Shell Podium as public open space and protect from development. (Anne and Mike Burke, Ms Esther Wang & Mdm Chwee Keng Wong, Peter Cariss).

Response M:

Accepted – the Shell Podium will be shown as public open space on the revised Proposals Map.

Objection N:

Incorporate the Kennington Road frontage sites in the area marked as park – Lambeth Walk Open Space (Friends of Lambeth Walk Open Space).

Response N:

Accepted - although the land was previously to be developed for housing use, the Council now wishes to incorporate the site into Lambeth Walk Open Space and in the revised UDP the land will be incorporated within its boundaries.

Objection O:

Redraw the boundary defining the Parks Regeneration Area to solely bound the Churchyard of St Leonard's Church (The Diocese of Southwark).

Response O:

Accepted - The Parks Regeneration Area designation has been deleted from the plan and the public open space boundary has been redrawn to exclude the church footprint as requested.

Objection P:

I felt that the map provided was too small. Whilst it complies with the statutory minimum requirement, the size does not facilitate effective examination. The map has errors with respect to some boundaries, e.g. County Hall site, the Waterloo Visitor Management Area - this cuts straight through housing. (Cllr Boodram, Julie Nunn, Tanwell Estate Tenants and Residents Association).

Response P:

Accepted - the revised Proposals Map will be much clearer and these errors will be corrected.

Objection Q:

Lavender Hill is entirely within London Borough of Wandsworth. It is suggested that Lambeth's interest is renamed to Queenstown Road. (Clapham and Stockwell Town Centre Board).

Response Q:

Not accepted - it is classified as the Lavender Hill District Centre in both the Wandsworth UDP and in GLA statistics and so it is considered better to use this term.

Objection R:

We consider parts of the draft Proposals Map to be unclear and overly complicated, and its scale makes it extremely difficult to follow the boundaries of the various policy allocations. For example, there are a number of policy allocations that may affect our client's site, but it is extremely difficult, in many instances, to clearly ascertain whether or not the allocation directly covers the site. In particular, it is not clear if the Waterloo District 'edge of centre' allocation extends over our client's site, as we feel it appropriately should. (Level Properties, Mark Brown).

Response R:

Accepted - the revised Proposals Map will be much clearer. The site in question is in the edge of centre area.

Objection S:

Both Woodfield Avenue and Drewstead Road should be withdrawn from network of local distributor roads. They are both established residential roads unsuitable for carrying through traffic and are part of an established environmental cell bounded by Streatham High Road, Garrads Road, Tooting Bec Gardens and the Railway Line (at Streatham Hill). (J Clyne).

Response S:

Accepted – change recorded under Policy 11.

Objection T:

Unable to confirm whether the Archaeological Priority Areas are accurately depicted. (Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (room Go1) English Heritage).

Response T:

Accepted – they will be much clearer in the revised Proposals Map. English Heritage have confirmed that they are shown correctly.

Objection U:

Presentational Quality of the Proposals Map and maps 1, 2 and 3 need to be improved (Clapham Park New Deal for Communities).

Response U:

Accepted – the revised Proposals Map will be much clearer.

Objection V:

The map shows the word "Norbury" prominently in blue overlapping the borough boundary with Croydon and into Streatham southward. I have never heard anyone call this part of the borough "Norbury" (Cllr David Malley).

Response V:

A small part of this town centre very close to Norbury Station is within the London Borough of Lambeth. It is known as Norbury in the Croydon UDP and the Mayor's London Plan.

Objection W:

There is an ambiguity in the Proposals Map enclosed with the deposit version of the UDP which shows both the whole of the Jubilee Gardens and Hungerford car park site as metropolitan open land and at the same time shows as a possible development the extension of buildings on part of the site as proposed in the South Bank Centre Master Plan. (South Bank Employers Group).

Response W:

Accepted - the boundary of the MDO for the South Bank Centre now excludes Jubilee Gardens/ Hungerford car park site.

Objection X:

The scale of the Map does not allow accurate examination of the Waterloo/South Bank Area (County Hall Owners and Residents Association, Eaton Square Garages Limited).

Response X:

Accepted- the revised Proposals Map will be much clearer.

Objection Y:

Have concerns about the intention to allow cycling along the Thames Path on safety grounds (Lambeth Friends of the Earth).

Response Y:

The Proposals Map does not show a cycle route along the riverside walk, the confusion arises from the similar coloration of Archaeological Priority Areas. The revised Proposals Map will be much clearer.

Objection Z:

The Proposals Maps should be amended to more clearly show the Mayor's Transport Development Areas (St George South London).

Response Z:

The revised Proposals Map will be much clearer in this regard.

Objection AA:

The key does not clearly identify the Waste Management and Manufacturing Areas (the line is too light). Does this include West Norwood KIBA? (Sally Keeble).

Response AA:

The revised Proposals Map will be much clearer. West Norwood KIBA is not a Waste Management & Manufacturing Area.

Objection BB:

Roots & Shoots (Supported by the Chair of Roots & Shoots, Philip Moore) should retain its present status and protection (Roots and Shoots).

Response BB:

Accepted – see under Policy 46.