

**Our ref:** Q50490  
**Email:** rebecca.sanders@quod.com  
**Date:** 25 March 2021



Lambeth Council  
Planning Policy and Strategy  
PO Box 734  
Winchester  
SO23 5DG

**[Submitted by Email only]**

Dear Sir / Madam,

**DRAFT REVISED LAMBETH LOCAL PLAN 2020 – MAIN MODIFICATIONS  
CONSULTATION (FEBRUARY – MARCH 2021)**

**SOUTHBANK CENTRE, BELVEDERE ROAD, LONDON, SE1 8XX**

**REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF SOUTHBANK CENTRE**

Further to the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Examination Hearings in October and November 2020, this statement is submitted on behalf of Southbank Centre in response to the Main Modifications to the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan.

Southbank Centre is one of the largest landowners within the Waterloo and South Bank Opportunity Area and its site and performance spaces, which include the Royal Festival Hall, the Queen Elizabeth Hall, the Purcell Room and the Hayward Gallery, are among the UK's leading international cultural and tourist destinations.

It is within this context that Southbank Centre recognises the importance of the Lambeth Local Plan and welcomes the opportunity to continue to engage with the Local Plan process. As the Council and Inspector will be aware, Southbank Centre has engaged positively with the Council during the production of the draft Local Plan and has previously submitted representations during the Local Plan Review Issues Consultation (i.e. Regulation 18 Stage 1 - December 2017), the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Consultation (i.e. Regulation 18 Stage 2 - December 2018) and Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Proposed Submission Version Consultation (Regulation 19 - March 2020). Further representations were also made in October 2020 in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions Discussion Document (Doc INS03) during the Examination.

**Main Modifications**

As confirmed in the most recent representations, Southbank Centre supported the wording of Policy PN1 in the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan and, in particular, supported the responses made by the Council in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement (Doc PD06).

However, following the Hearing session for Main Matter 9: Places and Neighbourhoods [Policy PN1] and the oral representations made by the Council, Southbank Centre has concerns with regard to

**Quod** | 8-14 Meard Street London W1F 0EQ | 020 3597 1000 | quod.com

Quod Limited. Registered England at above No. 7170188





the changes been proposed to Policy PN1(h), which seek to secure additional funding for the Jubilee Gardens Trust.

Southbank Centre objects to the additional wording proposed for Policy PN1(h), as outlined under Main Modification 139 (MM139, Page 88). The Schedule of Proposed Modifications recommends that Policy PN1(h) is amended so that it now reads as follows [additional text shown in **red**, deleted text shown in ~~red and struck-through~~]:

***“Management, Maintenance and servicing requirements (including for sustainable watering) should be planned and designed from the outset. Supporting infrastructure and Servicing arrangements should not harm the openness of the MOL and should address Local Plan policy EN1(a)(iii). There should continue to be provision of public toilets in Jubilee Gardens. Where it is demonstrated that major developments in the vicinity of Jubilee Gardens and its extension will result in a significant increase in visitor numbers to the open space, planning obligations will be sought to mitigate the impact on management and maintenance of the Gardens.”***

The previous wording of Part (h) (without the Main Modifications) was positively prepared and did not limit the potential for delivery of development on the Hungerford Car Park, which is allocated in the draft Lambeth Local Plan by Policy PN1(h):

*“h) to supplement the public realm, green spaces will be protected and expanded, including Jubilee Gardens. Two thirds of Hungerford car park is protected as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Development at Hungerford car park can take place on the remaining one third if this promotes the expansion of the arts and cultural activities of Waterloo and allows for the extension of Jubilee Gardens on the protected two thirds. An element of enabling development on the one third may be acceptable, to support the delivery of the main arts and cultural uses.” (Policy PN1(h)) [our emphasis added]*

As a whole, Policy PN1 promotes the expansion of creative, arts and cultural activities and recognises the South Bank’s role as an international cultural and leisure centre and one of London’s most popular tourist destinations. This policy reference at Policy PN1(h) emphasises that the development at the Hungerford Car Park is an objective of the Plan and would be acceptable where it supports the delivery of arts and cultural activities. However, any additional funding requirement as a result of MM139 would restrict the viability and deliverability of this development.

Furthermore, the additional sentence at the end of Policy PN1(h) is not necessary. Other policies of the Local Plan, in particular Policy D4 - Planning Obligations, which states that “*section 106 planning obligations will be sought to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate the impact of the development and/or additional facilities and requirements made necessary by the development.*” The policy expressly states that these may include “local public realm improvements” and “maintenance and management arrangements”.



This element of the proposed Main Modification would therefore represent “unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area” and, accordingly, would not comply with paragraph 16 of the NPPF.

The current wording of the Main Modification is also ambiguous. For example, it is not clear from the policy what the Garden’s capacity is in terms of increasing visitor numbers without causing negative impacts on the management and maintenance of the Gardens. Moreover, the proposed wording does not give consideration as to what constitutes a ‘significant increase’ in visitor numbers given the volume of visitors that already pass through the Gardens. In short, it should not be assumed that an increase in visitor numbers will automatically cause adverse impacts on the Gardens that need to be mitigated. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis when specific development proposals come forward.

For these reasons, Southbank Centre considers that this proposed additional wording should be removed, leaving Policy PN1(h) as drafted in the Submission version of the Local Plan. Any application that comes forward for development in the vicinity of the Jubilee Gardens will be required to consider the potential impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding area in the usual way. It is the local planning authority’s responsibility to ensure these impacts are properly assessed on an application-by-application basis. The local planning authority can then use conditions and planning obligations specific to each application in order to mitigate any identified adverse impacts created. It is therefore considered that the additional wording proposed in MM139 is not necessary.

However, if the Inspector nevertheless considers it necessary to add confirmation that planning obligations will be sought in relation to the management and maintenance of Jubilee Gardens, we suggest that the wording is amended so that it removes the ‘significant increase in visitor numbers’ trigger and replaces this with a trigger which better aligns with the requirements of paragraph 56 of the NPPF.

Our suggested revised wording is outlined below:

*“**Management, Maintenance and servicing requirements (including for sustainable watering)** should be planned and designed from the outset. **Supporting infrastructure and Servicing** arrangements should not harm the openness of the MOL **and should address Local Plan policy EN1(a)(iii)**. There should continue to be provision of public toilets in Jubilee Gardens. **Where it is demonstrated that major developments in the vicinity of Jubilee Gardens and its extension will result in a significant adverse impacts on increase in visitor numbers the open space, planning obligations will be sought to mitigate the impact on management and maintenance of the Gardens.**”* [additional text from MM139 shown in **red**, deleted text from MM139 shown in ~~red and struck through~~, our proposed additional text shown in **blue**, our proposed deleted text shown in ~~blue and struck through~~]



The trigger should relate to the creation of any 'significant adverse impacts' rather than concentrating on an increase in visitor numbers, which does not necessarily directly correlate with adverse impacts.

Southbank Centre is satisfied that the proposed Minor Changes to Policy PN1 are acceptable and provide clarity to the Policy wording.

We would be very pleased to meet with officers to discuss this matter further and any amended wording should that be helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries or require any further information at this stage.

Yours sincerely

Rebecca Sanders  
Senior Planner

cc. Kim Schofield, Head of Project Management, Southbank Centre