

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE A

Wednesday, 15th April, 2009 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Andrew Gibson, Councillor Diana Morris (Vice-Chair), Councillor Brian Palmer, Councillor Neil Sabharwal and Councillor Toren Smith (Chair)

APOLOGIES: Councillor John Whelan

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor June Fewtrell and Councillor Ashley Lumsden

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

2. **MINUTES (25.03.09)**

RESOLVED: That agreement of the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th March 2009 be deferred to allow officers to clarify queries from Members.

3. **WOODFIELD RECREATION GROUND, ABBOTSWOOD ROAD (ST LEONARDS WARD)**

In introducing the report, officers drew attention to the late representations outlined in the tabled addendum sheet. The site in question was in Lambeth but was owned by Wandsworth. The last temporary permission in respect of the site expired on 16th April 2008. The site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land. If the Committee decided to approve the application, it would have to be referred to the Secretary of State who would have the option of calling in the application on the grounds that it was in contravention of the Council's existing UDP policies.

The applicants addressed the meeting urging the Committee to approve the application in order to allow the Waldorf Steiner school to continue to operate pending a suitable alternative site being secured. The school had been looking for an alternative site for some time but to date nothing suitable had been found and this was very frustrating. The school was self financing and

a 25 year permission was being sought to amortise building costs over the longest possible period of time. The school was making good use of Metropolitan Open Land and the Council's UDP permitted development of green space where this use was beneficial.

Councillors June Fewtrell and Clive Bennett also addressed the meeting in their capacity as Ward Members. Councillor Fewtrell sought clarification on what support the Council had offered the school in trying to relocate. Wandsworth Council had abandoned plans to build football pitches on the site and in view of this, the school needed a further temporary permission to allow them more time to relocate. Councillor Bennett requested the Committee to grant a further temporary condition to prevent disruption of education provision and to allow better planning for the school's relocation. If the school was closed at short notice, it would not be possible to find places at local schools

A parent of pupils at the school also addressed the meeting and praised the school for providing a high standard inclusive alternative to state education. It was accepted that the school's current location was no longer sustainable and the school was working hard to raise funding to support the relocation costs. However it had taken much longer than anticipated to find a new site which was able to meet the school's future vision.

In response to questions and comments, officers advised that they had met with the applicant to discuss relocation options and although officers could not provide assistance in identifying sites, they could advise on a site's potential for development. If the Committee was minded to grant another temporary condition, this could include an informative to make it explicit that there was no permanent right to use metropolitan open land. Officers acknowledged the shortage of primary school places in the area but this had to be balanced against the need for metropolitan open land.

The Committee was appreciative of the needs of the school but felt that the provisions of the UDP could not be disregarded. Some Members had been present when the previous application for a temporary decision was granted and it was felt that the school's existing location on metropolitan open land was totally unsuitable and that the use of the site for a community school would not have been approved. There were serious safety concerns about public rights of access to the school site which was not the case for any other school in Lambeth. The Committee was also concerned that following the expiry of a previous planning permission which was granted for a temporary period, the school was currently operating without planning permission. In addition, a further 25 year temporary permission was now being sought.

The Committee highlighted the need to report to the Secretary of State whenever planning applications were approved which did not accord with the UDP. The school's current location detracted from the openness of metropolitan open land and the school had always known that the planning permission was temporary. It was not however in the best interests of the pupils nor the school to stop the operation of the school suddenly and there was a case for a further temporary permission to allow the school to explore all options for relocation.

MOVED by Councillor Smith and SECONDED by Councillor Morris

That planning permission be granted for a temporary period expiring on 31 August 2010, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the previous applications

Voting

For – 4

Against - 1

Abstentions - 0

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted for a temporary period expiring on 31 August 2010, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the previous applications.

4. LAND BOUNDED BY BARRHILL ROAD, BLAIRDERRY ROAD AND ARDWELL ROAD (STREATHAM HILL WARD)

In introducing the report, officers drew attention to comments in the tabled addendum sheet.

Local residents addressed the meeting objecting to the development on the grounds that the bulk, height and massing in the revised application was still unacceptable. Residents felt that as the alterations to the previous application were so minor, officers should be recommending that the application is refused. Furthermore, the impact on the future development of the vacant Streatham Megabowl site should be taken into account. The proposed scheme was an overdevelopment of the site and would increase parking stress which was particularly bad when the local bingo hall was in use and when children were being dropped off or picked up from a nearby nursery.

Objectors felt that the height of buildings on Barrhill Road should not be used as a precedent for the height of the proposed scheme and properties in Streatham Hill would be overlooked. Notification of the meeting had been sent during the Easter break and the parking provision of 18 spaces for 71 units was inadequate. The proposed location of the access points was unsatisfactory and there was no designated parking for commercial units.

The scheme would put added pressure on the local infrastructure including schools, public transport etc and the Section 106 Agreement would not result in additional train services from Streatham Hill Station. Furthermore, refurbishment works at the Station were already in progress. Residents were not in favour of controlled parking.

Councillors Ashley Lumsden and June Fewtrell addressed the meeting in their capacity as Ward Members. The opportunity to attend a briefing was welcomed but suggestions from residents were not reflected in the proposed scheme. The site visit was helpful and it was felt that the site should be retained for employment use. Under the proposed development, the outlook

for properties in Blairderry Road would be altered to the detriment of residents and would also impact on residents in Streatham Hill. The adjacent former garage site on Ardwell Road had not been included in the development and would prejudice the development of the rest of the site. It was also suggested that the development should be considered in the context of the development of the Megabowl site.

The proposed scheme was not in keeping with surrounding buildings, the proposed amenity space provision was poor and there was no play provision for older children. Although the Section 106 contribution was welcomed, the parks and open spaces that would benefit were some distance away. Parking stress was particularly bad during the evening and at weekends so retaining the existing entry point would avoid the need to access Blairderry Road. In addition, the proposed loading bay would reduce parking provision

The applicant addressed the meeting and stated that the site being developed was not protected for employment use within the UDP and the employment space on the site had been under used. The re-provision of employment space was higher quality and would create 50 new jobs. 40% of the housing units would be affordable and the proposed scheme would act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the town centre.

Members of the committee were concerned that the report did not provide justification for the loss of the employment and no marketing evidence had been provided to support this. The scheme was overbearing, was an overdevelopment of the site and would neither enhance nor preserve the conservation area. The transport report was inconsistent and there would be increased parking stress.

In response, officers stated that although the concerns regarding parking stress were recognised, in the event of an appeal, emphasis would be placed on the proximity of public transport links. A Section 106 Agreement would assist in alleviating future parking stress together with the proposed car club and travel plan. The proposed Section 106 Agreement was in accordance with the UDP and the scheme met requirements in terms of housing mix, amenity space and the proposed employment space was a vast improvement on existing provision. The site was not a KIBA and had not been designated as an MDO.

Members of the Committee reiterated their previous concerns regarding

- The reduction in employment space
- Affordable housing provision
- Parking provision
- Unacceptable massing
- Inadequate dwelling mix

MOVED by Councillor Smith, SECONDED by Councillor Palmer and

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: That the application be refused on the following grounds:

- overdevelopment
- parking stress
- employment provision
- housing mix

5. 202-230 WANDSWORTH ROAD, SW8 (STOCKWELL WARD)

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

6. 202-230 WANDSWORTH ROAD, SW8 (STOCKWELL WARD)

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: That approval of details be granted subject to condition 1 as set out in a previously approved application (08/03976/FUL).

7. PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01.02.09 - 28.02.09

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: That the planning appeal decisions received from 01.02.09 – 28.02.09 be noted.

8. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01.02.09 - 28.02.09

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: That the planning enforcement decisions received from 01.02.09 – 28.02.09 be noted.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

CHAIR
PLANNING APPLICATIONS
COMMITTEE A

Date of Despatch: Thursday, 23 April 2009

Contact for Enquiries: Antoinette Duhaney

Tel: 020 7926 3133

Fax: 020 7926 2361

E-mail: aduhaney@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk