

APPENDIX 1

Myatts Field North Development Planning Guidelines CHANGES TO CONSULTATION DRAFT

<i>Page number</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Proposed text amendment</i>	<i>Reason for change</i>
(v)	Preface	Remove preface	This text is about a past consultation event and therefore not appropriate.
lv (was p VI)	Executive Summary	<p>Amend the end of the first paragraph “and emerging Revised Deposit UDP (2004) incorporating the proposed modifications (2006).”</p> <p>At the end of the text add “Consultation These DPG’s have been consulted on both prior to a draft being produced and subsequently. This process has involved a wide range of current residents, stakeholders and those living and working in the surrounding areas. The outcome of this consultation has been primarily positive and there is a good level of support for the guidelines.</p> <p>The consultation comprised the following stages:</p> <p>A stakeholder workshop was held in November 2005 to guide the preparation of draft development planning guidelines.</p> <p>Following formal Council approval of the draft guidelines, the public consultation process began. A summary of the guidelines was produced as a four page newsletter and</p>	<p>To ensure the DPG’s are consistent with current policy</p> <p>To ensure the DPG’s describe the consultation strategy</p>

		<p>distributed to all homes and businesses in the area. Included in this mailing was a survey to be completed and returned in a reply paid envelope provided.</p> <p>The newsletter invited people to an exhibition held on Saturday 18th March 2006 and further workshops held on 30th March 2006. It also gave details of where the full draft guidelines could be viewed and contact details for further assistance. 28 people came to the exhibition and 25 people attended the workshops.</p> <p>A total of 2355 newsletters and surveys were delivered. 243 surveys were completed and returned.”</p>	
4	1.2	<p>Change from the third paragraph onwards: “The Development Planning Guidelines for Myatts Fields North will frame the renewal of the neighbourhood. The consultation on the preparation of the DPGs has therefore aimed to engage, inform and respond to the local community and stakeholders with clear communication and consultation. The consultation has sought to maximise responses from local residents and including hard to reach sections of the community.</p> <p>The methodology for the consultation in the drafting of the DGPs is contained in Appendix A of this document. The feedback obtained from the two stages of consultation carried out is summarised in Chapter 2 of this document.</p> <p>Together with this community consultation, project meetings between LB Lambeth officers, members of the TMO, the masterplanning team and consultants have ensured that the</p>	As above.

		<p>views of the local community were represented during the production of this document.</p> <p>The proposed timing for the review and adoption of the DPGs has been as follows:"</p> <p>Also change "proposed timing" to " timing" on timing summary table.</p>	
11 (was p 10)	2.5	<p>Add section 2.6 as follows:</p> <p>"2.6 Results of Stage 2 Consultation</p> <p>The second stage of Consultation was carried out after the draft document had been approved by The Executive and comprised the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the DPG's and survey delivered to all residents on the site and the surrounding area; • An exhibition; • A workshop; and • Canvassing of those that had received the summary and survey. <p>Full detail of the consultation carried out and the feedback received is set out in Appendix A of this document.</p> <p>In general a good level of support was received for the DPG's and on the majority of issues and the majority of the feedback was supportive. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearly 90% of the survey respondents agree or tend to agree with principle of creating a network of more traditional streets that connect local destinations and public transport routes; • Nearly 80% supported the principle of on street car parking; 	To ensure that the outcomes of the consultation process are clearly set out and reflected in the Development Planning Guidelines.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 85% supported the principle of no net loss of open space; • 90% supported improved and relocated community facilities; • 80% supported the provision of new homes with a greater diversity of tenures and types of housing; • Over 90% supported the principle of all homes having appropriate amenity space or good access to local green space; • 60% supported the principle of new buildings generally being 3-5 storeys in height; • Over 55% supported an increase in density to create additional new homes to support the redevelopment of the estate; • Over 80% supported the need for the future development to have a strong and distinctive character and relate well to the rest of the neighbourhood, including the neighbouring conservation areas; • Over 90% supported the creation of a range of types of housing in high quality buildings that form pleasant and attractive streets; and • Over 90% supported the principle that new development should comply with the objectives of sustainable construction and best practice to reduce energy demand, incorporate energy efficiency and renewable energy generation. <p>The workshop event also allowed a number of more detailed issues to be raised, including the traffic impact on the surrounding area, concerns about the impact on Patmos Road.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Although most of those consulted agreed with the Draft Development Guidelines there were a number of exceptions that have where possible and appropriate been taken on board in this final version for Adoption by the Council. See appendix A for full further detail.”	
16 (was p14)	3.1.4	Change second paragraph “..... Lambeth’s Revised Deposit UDP is at an advanced stage. The public inquiry took place in 2005 and Inspectors report on objections was published in March 2006. The Inspectors Report gives strong support to the UDP policies with over 90% of recommendations supporting the Councils Posiiton. The next step of the adoption process will be the deposit of proposed modifications with adoption anticipated to take place in early 2007. The revised UDP and Inspectors Report will therefore be material consideration and carry substantial weight in the Development Control process.	To reflect the current position and programme for the adoption of the UDP.
16/17 (was p14/15)	Table 3.2	Amend the policy objectives as follows: “Policy 1 The Vision for Lambeth: To make Lambeth a great place to live, work and visit by promoting high quality, sustainable development.” In Policy 31 Streets Character and Layout, remove “In particular, developers should show how they have taken ‘Secured by Design’ into account.” In Policy 45 Open space and sports facilities, amend the last bullet point “Development which protects the nature conservation value and biodiversity of the land.”	To reflect the proposed modifications to the Revised Deposit UDP

39 (was p37)	4.1.3	Amend paragraph to read: “Design quality is a fundamental objective of the redevelopment of the Myatts Field North Estate and will be an important factor to the Council in their consideration of any future planning applications. In addition to the design of the new and retained buildings themselves this will also specifically apply to the long term management and maintenance of the homes and the quality of the public realm and landscape.”	To ensure that the importance of Design Quality is clearly reflected in the document.
40	4.2.1	Add another bullet point into the box of overall development objectives: “• Minimise, wherever possible, increases in traffic impact within the site and on the surrounding adjacent residential areas.”	To ensure that the need to carefully minimise traffic impact on the surrounding area is taken into account in the preparation of any proposals.
43 (was p41)	4.3.6	New fifth bullet point “Mix of tenure – The estate redevelopment proposals should give careful consideration to ensuring that the tenures are well mixed throughout the estate and all are represented around all of the open spaces and primary streets.”	To ensure that the rehoused existing residents are not located into the worst parts of the redevelopment and that all tenures are well spread throughout the site.
44 (was p42)	4.4.2	First para “The redevelopment of the Myatts Field North Estate must minimise any loss of public open space in accordance with the site specific Planning Policy. This is of particular importance as the current area of public open space, even when relocated and improved, will have to be shared between a larger number of residents in the future. The current area of open space, when significantly upgraded and reorganised, is considered appropriate for an overall increase of up to 250 residential units. If more units than this number is to be provided or open space is to be lost then additional contributions towards the upgrading of off-site open spaces may be required.”	To clarify the situation in relation to the area of existing open space and current planning policy and to set out the maximum additional site capacity that the improved open spaces could serve.

		Second para “In reorganising the current area of open space a range of types, sizes and locations of open space will need to be provided. These will need to serve all of the existing and new residents and those within the immediate context. An Open Space and Public Realm Strategy, developed in conjunction with local residents, will be required as part of any Planning Applications for this site.”	
46 (was p44)	4.5.2	Change the first paragraph to read “.....and it should generally be no taller than 4 storeys.” Change the second bullet to read: “Up to 6 storey development may be appropriate in key locations along Ackerman Road and Mostyn Road and at key landmark locations within the site, if necessary, to deliver the required level of additional development on the site (note: this should exclude new development for existing residents of the estate).”	To make clear that there is a desire to keep the majority of the development no taller than 4 storeys where possible and in particular along Patmos Road
46 (was p44)	Figure 4.8	Take the 3-6 storey ‘blob’ off Patmos Road on the diagram. Change the key to make clear that landmark elements don’t necessarily need to be taller, just a special element of the design.	As above
47 (was p45)	4.5.3	Change to read “The existing net density of the Myatts Field North Estate is in the region of 340 habitable rooms per hectare. There is considerable potential for this to be increased and still deliver the high quality, low to mid-rise development required. Proposed densities should be in accordance with current UDP standards (350-450 HRH), which are considered appropriate for the site’s location, accessibility and in relation to the current site density.	To clarify the situation in relation to the density and that this need not mean high rise development.

		Within this broad range the following is appropriate:”	
50 (was p48)	4.7.1	Delete Achieve zero energy development on at least part of the site	The Housing Department, via the Environmental Development Team commissioned Faber Maunsell to undertake an in depth assessment of the most sustainable energy efficiency approach for future development proposals for the estate. The conclusion of this work is that the MDO target in the UDP included in the DPG, of achieving zero energy development on at least part of the site is not the most effective approach to reducing energy consumption, and greater benefits would be achieved if higher energy efficiency standards are applied across the whole of the site. Therefore it is proposed to delete this reference in the DPG, and focus on achieving eco – homes very good across the site.
64 (was p62)	New 6.8	New section required: “6.8 Pre Application Public Consultation As part of any Planning Applications for all or part of this site the applicant is required to carry out pre-application consultation and to submit a report. This should demonstrate that effective consultation has given all sections of the community a chance to comment on the detailed proposals, and should set out how those comments are reflected or have influenced the final scheme, where appropriate. The community includes but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents of Myatts Field North; • Residents within the wider area used for the 	To ensure that sufficient consultation is carried out as part of the subsequent stages of the development and to ensure that all residents are fully consulted on the scope and content of any future planning applications.

		<p>Consultation Strategy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives from all local community groups and stakeholders; • Health and local services; • Education and local schools; and • Transport. <p>The developer should particularly demonstrate efforts to engage those often excluded groups like those for whom English is not a first language, people with mobility problems etc.”</p> <p>[Note: the numbering of section 6 has been changed to reflect the hierarchy set out in the rest of the document].</p>	
70 (was p69)	Appendix A	<p>Change the stage 2 part of the Methodology section to set out what has happened and the relevant dates and to refer to the separate Consultation Report.</p> <p>Add a new section after Feedback on the Stakeholder Workshop summarising the main sections of the Consultation Report including the addition of the tables of survey feedback and other comments.</p>	To ensure that the consultation is reflected in the guidance.
75 (was p74)	Appendix B	<p>Add a paragraph at the beginning as follows: “Note: this section has not yet been amended to take on board any further changes to the UDP following publication of the Inspectors Report, as these changes are still in the process of being finalised.”</p>	To ensure that the policy background is clear and as up to date as possible.