

Albert Embankment Conservation Area			
Consultee	Consultee Response (summarised)	Council Response	Recommendation
AE1 (TFL)	The consolidation of the whole of the St Thomas's Hospital campus west of Lambeth Palace Road together with the entire length of the Albert Embankment into a single rather than the current two different conservation areas is a very rational strategy, as is the inclusion of more of the historic 1840s railway viaduct and adjoining historic industrial and commercial premises currently within the Vauxhall Gardens CA, and those along Newport Street and south of Tinworth Street.	Noted	No Change
AE3 NEXUS for LFEPR	Questioned why, when nothing has changed physically since the conservation area was designated in 2001 that the Council's position on some buildings at 8 Albert Embankment has changed.	Since 2001 the fire station site has been assessed for listing twice resulting in a more detailed understanding of its history and development. There has also been a major Public Inquiry on the site which has given the Council a much greater understanding of the significance of the buildings and spaces. The Council's change in position is therefore justified given the greater evidence.	No Change
AE6 Resident	The proposed extension to Albert Embankment Conservation Area is a very good idea and important to maintain some of the character of the local area as more high rise blocks go up in the surrounding area.	Noted	No Change
AE7 Montagu Evans for	The boundary should not be extended to include Camelford and Tintagel House because the area is of insufficient special interest to warrant designation. The quality and the interest of the area not of the individual	Not accepted. Officers do not agree.	No Change

Duchy of Cornwall	buildings that should be the prime consideration. The object should not be to protect individual buildings.		
	<p>Historic England advice states that there should be an explanation provided for conservation area boundaries.</p> <p>No additional evidence has emerged since 2001 to justify a change to the boundary. The position should be evidenced.</p> <p>The 2001 designation report specifically excludes the line of post-war offices along the embankment. The 2015 draft says something similar so why include Camelford and Tintagel? What evidence?</p>	<p>Not accepted. There is additional evidence:</p> <p>‘Lambeth Architecture – A Brave New World 1945 – 65’ was published in 2015.</p> <p>This has provided the first detailed over-view of post-war architecture in Lambeth. As such it is additional evidence which has informed the work.</p>	No Change
	The buildings are not special. Designed by TP Bennett with input from Louis de Soissons as consultant for the Duchy of Cornwall. There may have been a master plan by F Gibberd. We disagree that the architecture is of merit. They do not have a successful relationship with the River Thames.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The buildings comprise an attractive grouping on a prominent riverside site. Unlike many post-war London buildings and their more conventional neighbours on the opposite side of Albert Embankment these are significant free-standing which can be appreciated ‘in the round’. They present an attractive built form to the river frontage and share a common palette of high quality materials.</p> <p>De Soissons is a well-respected post-war figure and his other local work is also of high quality.</p>	No Change
	The conservation area statement does not align with Local Plan policy and Vauxhall SPD and would stifle the long term plans for the sites:	Not accepted. There are no site-specific policies in the Local Plan relating to these sites. Just because the wider area is identified for tall buildings / intensification / redevelopment does not mean that every site within the area will be appropriate for such development.	No Change

	The conservation area designation would stifle the long term plans for the sites:	Noted. No such plans have been shared with the Council or have been made public. It is therefore difficult to give them weight. The recent planning permission for Tintagel house included complete refurbishment and extension – illustrating that it has a viable future as an office.	No Change
	Diagram 2 on page 158 of Local Plan shows aspirations for a better river access. Similarly 3.1, 4.70, 4.91 and 4.92 of the Vauxhall SPD.	Noted. These illustrations are only indicative to show 'general aspiration' and should not be read literally to suggest that the demolition of Camelford House and Tintagel House is necessary to deliver that aspiration. For example we are delivering the open space enhancements suggested in 4.3 with the proposed new landscaping proposals at Tintagel House. This has not necessitated demolition.	No Change
	The buildings sit within the area identified in the SPD as suitable for a 'taller buildings cluster'. Failure to develop the sites would not optimise development which is a key mayoral objective.	A MAXIMUM height of 90m is identified for this area. There is no suggestion in the OAPF or the SPD that that EVERY site within the tall buildings area will be suitable. Nor is there any suggestion that all existing buildings here are earmarked for redevelopment. At 58 meters Camelford House already constitutes a substantial building.	No Change
	Camelford offers sub-standard office accommodation. The proposed refurbishment of Tintagel does not offer a long-term solution for the building.	Not accepted. The recent planning permission for Tintagel house illustrates that complete refurbishment and extension is a viable proposition for that building. Camelford House is similar in many respects.	No Change

	Client research suggests that a policy compliant development might be able to exceed 80m on the Camelford House Site.	Noted.	No Change
AE8 Edmund Bird	I am writing in support of Lambeth Council's proposal to extend the Albert Embankment Conservation Area to include Tintagel House and Camelford House which both feature in the book showcasing the best buildings in the borough from the post-war era - <i>Lambeth Architecture: A Brave New World 1945-65</i> , published in 2014.	Noted.	No Change
	These office blocks are both good examples of office architecture of the late 1950s by a noted firm of 20th century architects, TP Bennett. They are also some of the very last of the post-war office buildings on the Albert Embankment to survive the mass redevelopment of the last 15 years and are a building type once very common in the capital and elsewhere but diminishing rapidly in number. They are both well-detailed, built of an attractive brick and Portland stone facing materials and are distinctive contributors to the character of this stretch of London's riverscape.	Accepted.	No Change
	Tintagel House has an unusual double-height base of contrasting plum brick with shallow-arched windows to the first floor evoking the warehouses that once lined stretches of the Thames, an imposing slender and suave stone entrance porch and a Festival of Britain style ball, needle and crown copper finial above the projecting stone-clad bay. The dignified 17-storey rectangular tower of Camelford House is counterbalanced by a lower 11-storey curving tail wing forming an elegant composition. They have group value with each other and the refaced Peninsular heights (formerly Alembric House).	Accepted.	No Change

	Both buildings have made an important contribution to the social and economic history of Vauxhall and the Albert Embankment since their completion in the early 1960s, Camelford House accommodating the General Post Office's Telecommunications regional head office and Tintagel House serving as offices for the Metropolitan Police for many years after the building was opened by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth in 1960.	Accepted.	No Change
	They therefore form a fundamental part of the character and history of the Albert Embankment and most certainly merit inclusion within this conservation area. When the CA was first designated in 2001, the appreciation of post-war buildings of this era was far less than it is today, their inclusion now that their qualities are better understood and following the demolition of so many of this building genre, is welcomed.	Accepted.	No Change
AE9 Resident	I am delighted to see that 2 Lilac Place SE11 5QQ is now included in the Conservation Area since it dates back to the first quarter of the 18th.	Noted.	No Change
AE10 Twentieth Century Society	Register support for the inclusion of Camelford House and Tintagel House within the CA	Noted.	No Change
	TP Bennetts are an important post-war firm. A number of their other post-war buildings have been locally and statutory listed. Losses of post-war buildings across the city result in a greater importance being placed on the surviving examples.	Accepted.	No Change
	The buildings have an important relationship with each other – their spatial configuration on the riverbank and their common materials and details	Accepted.	No Change

	A number of other large modern buildings are already in the conservation area – 8 Albert Embankment and MI6 HQ therefore these further examples are justified as it is a characteristic of the conservation area	Accepted.	No Change
AE11 KOV	We don't have much quarrel with the proposals, and no area loses conservation area status.	Noted.	No Change
	We think that the two northern parks, Pedlars Park and Paradise Gardens, should now be included.	Part accepted. The boundary will be extended to include Pedlar's Park. Paradise Gardens is proposed for inclusion in the Lambeth Palace CA because of its historic connection to St Mary's Church. See later.	Part Change
AE12 VGERTA	We would welcome the expansion of the Conservation area to cover the Graphite Square business square, The Method mission Church and ex NEF site on Jonathan street to ensure that future developments are of low rise height and do not overshadow or adversely impact the buildings of Vauxhall Gardens Estate (most are already in the existing Vauxhall conservation area)	Not accepted. Conservation Area designation is not about stopping change. The Methodist Mission Church and NEF buildings are of no special interest and do not warrant inclusion in the CA. Graphite Square is already protected by conservation area designation. It is simply being moved from Vauxhall Gardens CA to the Albert Embankment CA.	No Change
	Other additions to the conservation area should include the Glasshouse Walk Playground, the Vauxhall Gardens Allotments Association's allotments on Glasshouse Walk.	Not accepted. These spaces are already within the Vauxhall Gardens Estate CA.	No Change
	The newly revamped Coverley & Hayman point sunken area	Not accepted. These spaces are not of special interest.	No Change
AE13	In principle no objections to the inclusion of Pedlar's Park .	Noted.	No Change

Internal – Council Parks			
AE14. Internal – Council Parks	No objections to the inclusion of Pedlars Park being included into extended conservation areas, in fact I fully endorse this possibility.	Noted.	No Change
Clapham Park Conservation Area			
CP1 Edmund Bird	The inclusion of the lovely Hollamby little set-piece on Magnolia Place is welcomed.	Noted	No Change
CP2 Local Resident	Why is St James, Park Hill (N Cachemaille-Day, 1958) omitted from inclusion? It is an important Listed building and represents a significant visual backstop in northward views.	Not accepted – St James’s Church, Park Hill is a grade II listed post-war church immediately adjoining the western boundary of the conservation area. This is a large brick building of austere character which sits in a context of 20 th Century housing and flats. The conservation area is largely characterised by 19 th Century villas. The church is not considered to contribute sufficiently to the character and appearance of the conservation area to warrant inclusion.	No Change
	I would support the proposed CA extension	Noted.	No Change
CP3 Clapham Park West Residents Association	Poynders Road (A205) the south along Kings Road, Rodenbhurst Road, and Elms Crescent. These properties deserve some consideration regarding preservation and enhancement lest they are lost to future development.	Not accepted. These areas are not considered to be of special interest.	No Change

	The area bordering Clarence Crescent has seen significant development recently, and it concerns Clapham West Residents Association that some consideration should be given to controls over the demolition of certain buildings and boundaries, limits the size of extensions, controls roof alterations, certain types of cladding, satellite dishes in some locations	Given there is no special interest addition controls are not considered justified.	No Change
CP4 Local Resident	I'm in favour of the small change to the boundaries, as you say, the brick built council houses are an unusually sympathetic development for the period.	Noted.	No Change
Lambeth Palace Conservation Area			
LP1 Local resident	The proposals to rationalise the boundaries between Conservation Areas makes absolute sense, as does the specific point of removing Parliament View.	Noted.	No Change
LP2 Local resident	We would like to have the Old Paradise Gardens (former Lambeth High Street recreational Ground) included in the Conservation Area.	Accepted. Now proposed for inclusion.	Change
LP3 Local Resident	I would like to support the inclusion of 'Old Paradise Street Gardens', formerly known as 'Lambeth High Street Recreation Grounds' in the conservation area as it would not exist were it not for it's historic links with Lambeth Palace.	Accepted. Now proposed for inclusion.	Change
LP4 Local Resident	I write to support the proposed extension to the Lambeth Palace Conservation Area but wish to advise you that one vital area of importance has been omitted, Old Paradise Gardens, Lambeth High Street SE11,	Accepted. Now proposed for inclusion.	Change

	<p>previously named Lambeth High Street Recreation Ground.</p> <p>The gardens were once a graveyard overflow from St Mary's Church and there is a strong possibility that people of note are buried there. It is currently included in the route of local historical walks. Situated in between St Mary's Gardens and the Royal Doulton building on Black Prince Road, it seems negligent to omit this piece of ground.</p>		
LP5 Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	<p>There is little sense in the campus being split between two conservation areas and it would be better for the whole of St Thomas' to be within a single conservation area. The character of the hospital and Lambeth Palace are distinct and separate and it would appear to make sense for them to be in separate CAs.</p>	Noted	No Change
	<p>However, the proposals to move St Thomas' onto the Albert Embankment CA may have implications for the Trust that are not currently evident and the Trust would ask that serious consideration is given to the preparation of a Character Appraisal for Albert Embankment as a priority before a decision to move the campus is confirmed.</p>	<p>This response was received in 2013. The Council has prioritised the preparation of a character appraisal to address this point.</p>	No change.
	<p>An alternative proposal is whether the hospital should form a conservation area in its own right. The hospital has a rich history and a diverse architectural character that reflects that history. The listed buildings dating from 1870's by Henry Currey were recognised in their time as being pioneering in their design and, similarly, the 1970's structures by YRM and the 21st century Evelina Childrens hospital by Michael Hopkins architects are recognised as examples of the most modern thinking in hospital design at the time they were built. By creating a separate conservation area the council could more</p>	<p>Not accepted. Given the hospital was erected at the same time as the Albert Embankment and is a landmark on the Embankment its inclusion within the Albert Embankment CA is considered most appropriate.</p>	No Change

	accurately reflect the diverse character of the campus area which is in a sense an anomaly in the area so the that development proposals can be considered within the context of the character of the campus.		
LP6 Local Resident	I am in full support of including 111 Lambeth Road in the conservation area	Noted.	No change
LP7 Friends of Old Paradise Gardens	<p>I write to support the proposed extension to the Lambeth Palace Conservation Area but wish to advise you that one vital area of importance has been omitted, Old Paradise Gardens, Lambeth High Street SE11, previously named Lambeth High Street Recreation Ground.</p> <p>The gardens were once a graveyard overflow from St Mary's Church and there is a strong possibility that people of note are buried there. The Friends of Old Paradise Gardens are keen to preserve its historical value and learn and educate others of the history of the area. It is currently included in the route of local historical walks.</p>	Agreed. Now proposed for inclusion	Change
LP8 Internal – Council Parks	In principle no objections to the inclusion of Old Paradise Gardens.	Noted.	No Change
LP 9 Internal – Council Parks	No objections to the inclusion of Old Paradise Gardens being included into extended conservation areas, in fact I fully endorse this possibility.	Noted.	No Change

LP 10 Garden Museum	The proposals to rationalise the boundaries between Conservation Areas makes absolute sense, as does the specific point of removing Parliament View.	Noted.	No change.
LP11 Local Resident	<p>I wish to object. Removing the traffic island at the south side of Lambeth bridge and adding it to the albert embankment conservation area risks a future development on that traffic island that could adversely impact the view of Lambeth Palace.</p> <p>As part of the Lambeth Palace conservation area that island is likely to be protected from development as it is integral to protecting the view and vista of the Listed buildings within the conservation area.</p> <p>As part of the Albert Embankment conservation area there is a risk of development. The other parts of the Albert Embankment which are set back from the actual river (like the roundabout) largely have development on them.</p>	Not accepted. Moving this land into the albert Embankment Conservation Area will not affect its status. It will not become a development opportunity	No change.
Lambeth Walk and China Walk Conservation Area			
LW1	The short row of Victorian Terrace houses on Lollard Street be included in the conservation area. The houses are the last remaining example of what would have been a network of streets.	<p>No accepted. Given their physical separation from the body of conservation area these buildings are not considered to contribute to the special interest of the conservation area.</p> <p>They are not considered of special interest.</p>	No change
Lancaster Avenue Conservation Area			

LA1 Local Resident	We feel that the Lancaster Avenue Conservation area should be extended to cover the existing one storey coach houses along 21-28 Dalton Street running along the back of 2, 2A, 4 Lancaster Avenue and along Chatsworth Way and separating itself from the busy Norwood Road developments and uses. These coach houses adds rare and considerable historic and design merit which needs to be included in any extension to the Lancaster Avenue Conservation Area as a block of character in need of preservation and protection. This would prevent further encroachment of new style modern excessive development on any infill or pockets of land which runs along the boundary of the existing conservation area.	Not accepted. This is a commercial building of little merit which is located at the edge of the conservation area. It is currently subject to development proposals. It is not considered worthy of inclusion because it contributes nothing to the special interest of the wider conservation area.	No Change
Leigham Court Road North Conservation Area			
	No responses received.		
Leigham Court Road South Conservation Area			
	No responses received.		
Minet Conservation Area			
M1 Brixton Society	We propose that the Conservation Area boundary should be extended to include 3 prominent buildings in the main section of Loughborough Road:	See below:	
	Iveagh House, including the former health centre within its curtilage (original design by E.Armstrong & F.McManus, 1953, for the Guinness Trust);	Not accepted. This building is of very different character to the conservation area. However, it is proposed to be locally listed.	No Change
	Hart House, 71 – 73 Loughborough Road	Accepted. This interwar pub is prominently located adjacent to the conservation area. It is an attractive	Change

	The former White Hart public house, rebuilt in the 1930s and more recently converted to flats;	brick building of good architectural quality in a prominent location. The building is considered to contribute sufficiently to the architectural and historic interest of the area to warrant inclusion.	
	Sussex Place of 1824, representing the first phase of residential development by Lord Holland. Is this 99 – 113 Loughborough Road?	Not accepted. These buildings are separated from the conservation area by modern development. They are too remote and already protected by statutory listing.	No Change
M7. Hart House Resident	We would welcome the inclusion of Hart House in the Minet Conservation Area	Accepted. This building is now proposed for inclusion.	Change
M8. Hart House Resident	We would be delighted for Hart House to be included in the conservation area	Accepted. This building is now proposed for inclusion.	Change
M9. Hart House Ltd.	<p>Concerned if Hart House was included in the Conservation Area, and the adjoining walled plot was not. This plot was historically always part of Hart House, and was only arbitrarily divided from it by a developer in the late 1990s.</p> <p>Currently the plot is poorly maintained and is a local eyesore, attracting fly-tipping and criminality (please see the photographs below). It is also the site of the one large and historic tree in the area.</p> <p>It would be odd if Hart House - which has been well maintained - was included in the Conservation Area, imposing new restrictions and regulations on the owner, while the adjoining plot - which has been allowed to deteriorate badly - was not.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The small vacant plot to the immediate rear of the pub, fronting Lilford Road and containing a TPO tree makes a significant contribution to the conservation area. It too is proposed for inclusion.</p>	Change

	Not in principle opposed to including the building in the Conservation Area, but would also wish to see a) the adjoining plot included as well, and b) an indication of the action that Lambeth might take to ensure it is properly maintained.		
M.10 Land owner	I would not like the small vacant plot to the rear of the pub to be included in the CA.	Not accepted. See above.	Change
Park Hall Road Conservation Area			
PH3. Local Resident	<p>Ask that consideration is given to including the Park Hall Business Park.</p> <p>The building is of particular historical and industrial architectural significance as one of the old Pye Electronics buildings. A key part of our industrial history, this company (established in 1896) and by association the building supported the development of equipment in support of teaching and research used during WW1, the subsequent development of the first wireless receiver and the first television receiver in the 1930s.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The building in question is locally listed and adjoins the West Norwood Conservation Area.</p> <p>However, it is quite distant from the existing Park Hall Road Conservation Area boundary and it does not have any relationship with that area.</p> <p>This matter is best considered when the West Norwood Conservation Area is appraised.</p>	No change.
PH5. Local Resident	<p>I'd ask that consideration is given to including the Park Hall Business Park.</p> <p>The building is of particular historical and industrial architectural significance as one of the old Pye Electronics buildings. A key part of our industrial history, this company (established in 1896) and by association the building supported the development of equipment in support of teaching and research used during WW1, the subsequent development of the first</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The building in question is locally listed and adjoins the West Norwood Conservation Area.</p> <p>However, it is quite distant from the existing Park Hall Road Conservation Area boundary and it does not have any relationship with that area.</p>	No change.

	wireless receiver and the first television receiver in the 1930s.	This matter is best considered when the West Norwood Conservation Area is appraised.	
PH7. Local Resident	<p>I'd like to you note my support for Park Hall conservation planning application and request that consideration is made to including the Park Hall Business Park in the conservation area as part of this consultation.</p> <p>The building is of particular historical and industrial architectural significance as one of the old Pye Electronics buildings. It's a prominent part of our local history, and would be worthwhile including to ensure this is preserved.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The building in question is locally listed and adjoins the West Norwood Conservation Area.</p> <p>However, it is quite distant from the existing Park Hall Road Conservation Area boundary and it does not have any relationship with that area.</p> <p>This matter is best considered when the West Norwood Conservation Area is appraised.</p>	No change.
PH6. Local Resident	<p>I'd like to register my support for the Park Hall conservation statement and I wondered if consideration had been given to include the Park Hall Business Park. It's a very interesting Art Deco period building and would sit nicely as part of the whole conservation proposal.</p> <p>I would recommend that this is designated as part of the conservation area</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The building in question is locally listed and adjoins the West Norwood Conservation Area.</p> <p>However, it is quite distant from the existing Park Hall Road Conservation Area boundary and it does not have any relationship with that area.</p> <p>This matter is best considered when the West Norwood Conservation Area is appraised.</p>	No change
Stockwell Green Conservation Area			
SG1 Local Resident	Strongly support extension of CA to include Hammerton hall and 102 Lingham Street.	Noted.	No Change

	However, Paras 5.1 and 5.5 not consistent.	Accepted. There was an error in the text in the consultation draft document. As a result of this consultation letters were not issued to no. 1 Stockwell Green (Grade II listed) and the former Plough Public House at the corner of Stockwell Green (north side) and Stockwell Road. As a result it is not proposed to proceed with their inclusion at this time.	Change
	The houses on Argyle Close should be added to the CA	Not accepted. These terraced Victorian properties adjoin back gardens within the conservation area, but otherwise are very much separate from it. They relate better to the existing streets outside the conservation area than they do to the historic development within it. For these reasons it is not considered appropriate to include them within the conservation area.	No Change
SG2 Local Resident	I am strongly in support of extending the boundary of the conservation area to include Hammerton Hall and 102 Lingham Street.	Noted.	No Change
SG3 Local Resident	I am strongly in support of extending the boundary of the conservation area to include Hammerton Hall and 102 Lingham Street.	Noted.	No Change
Streatham Common Conservation Area			
SC1 Friends of Streatham Common	FOSC supports the proposal to include the Thrale Alms Houses in the CA	Noted.	No Change

	It is hard to tell from the maps in the document whether the old lodge at the extreme eastern tip of the Common is included in the CA.	No change. The building in question is no. 57 Streatham North Side. It stands on the common and is included within the conservation area.	No change.
SC2 Cllr Wilcox	5.4 and 5.5 - very much supportive of these being included.	Noted.	No Change
	I am supportive of the rest of the draft and approve of the inclusion of the Thrale almshouses which I am pleased to see have been sensitively restored.	Noted.	No Change
Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area			
SP2 Edmund Bird	Following the 1999 boundary extensions I recall pressure from locals to further extend the boundary to include Woodbourne Ave - I felt this was on the cusp then but maybe worth another look at this nearly 20 years on.	No accepted. Officers do not consider that the situation has changed. Whilst Woodbourne Avenue contains pleasant inter war housing it exhibits no special interest. It does not warrant conservation area designation	No change
SP3 Local Resident	It is odd that No 72 is not included in the conservation area although it forms a pair with No 74.	Not accepted. This is not considered odd. Given that this part of the conservation area is focused around Tooting Bec Common it is sensible to terminate at the point.	No change
Sunnyhill Road Conservation Area			
	No responses received in respect of boundary changes		

Trinity Gardens Conservation Area			
T1 Brixton Society	We support the proposed changes to the boundary.	Noted.	No Change
T2 Local resident	I welcome the proposal to redraw the boundary of the Conservation Area (CA).	Noted.	No Change
T3 Local Resident	I have no problem with the proposed boundary changes.	Noted.	No Change
T6 Edmund Bird	Welcome 54 Acre Lane inclusion in the CA.	Noted.	No Change
Vassal Road Conservation Area			
	No response in respect of boundary changes		
Vauxhall Conservation Area			
V1 Local Resident	I wanted to share my strong support for this plan. I am a resident on Fentiman Road and with the extensive development now taking place in Nine Elms, I think it is very important that we protect local buildings which are of special architectural or historic interest.	Noted.	No Change

V2 Local Resident	I live in Meadow Road which is within the St. Mark's Conservation Area and therefore have no need of inclusion within the proposed extension to the Vauxhall Conservation Area.	Not accepted. The properties on Meadow Road and the western end of Fentiman Road are considered to be in Vauxhall. Inclusion within that conservation area is therefore considered the most appropriate course.	No Change
V4 Local Resident	I support your extension of CA32.	Noted.	No Change
V5 Local Resident	I live in Meadow Road and think the concept of including the St Marks area in the larger Vauxhall one a sensible idea.	Noted.	No Change
V8 Tfl	The extensions to the south to include part of the existing St Mark's Conservation Area and include the important industrial heritage of the former Beaufoy/Sarson's vinegar works (now Regent's Bridge Gardens) and the attractive historic enclave around the Wheatsheaf PH and Wyvil School seem eminently sensible and a welcome measure to protect these heritage assets, as is the extensions to include the Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens, the Royal Vauxhall Tavern and historic buildings on the Bondway such as the former Elephant & Castle public house and adjacent former bank.	Noted.	No Change
	We do however recommend that the proposed conservation area boundary be modified to exclude all of Vauxhall Bus Station (on the map prepared for the consultation, the proposed boundary slices through the eastward projecting section of the bus station opposite	Accepted. The boundary has been amended accordingly	Change

	the railway station) by realigning the boundary along the centre of Bondway/South Lambeth Place in front of the railway station;		
V10 Local Resident	We would like to register our approval of the extension of the Vauxhall Conservation Area (CA32).	Noted	No Change
V11 Local Resident	I wish to inform you of my support for the extension of the conservation boundaries to include Meadow Road, South Lambeth Place, South Lambeth Road and Wyvil Road. I believe including this street in the conservation area would be beneficial to the area.	Noted.	No Change
V12 Local Resident	111, 113 & 115 Tyers Street should not be included in any extension to the Vauxhall Conservation Area (CA32). All three are at the end of a small terrace. Number 115 was built in the 1990's and thus has no historical value. Number 113 has been much extended and altered over recent years and 111 is a new build with a very contemporary design. With this in mind, I am not clear why you are proposing to include them anyway and, being at the end of the terrace, they could be easily left out of your proposals.	Not accepted. Some of the properties are indeed modern but collectively they have an attractive, picturesque character. They are also prominently located and are important townscape contributors to the area.	No Change
V14 St Anne's Settlement	We were surprised to learn that the Council intends to extend the Vauxhall Conservation Area boundary to include our premises and to locally list structures within part of the site. We wish to formally record our objection to this proposed designation.	Noted. The building was locally listed in 2012. St Anne's Settlement have been aware of this because it came up in subsequent pre-application discussions.	No Change

	<p>Our site has been under discussion with the planning department for some time.</p> <p>You will recall that during those discussions, we reached the conclusion with you that subject to the detailed design of the proposals and clarification of the public benefits arising from the redevelopment that a housing-led mixed use regeneration of our premises was likely to be acceptable to officers.</p> <p>We are in the process of finalising an agreement with our preferred partner. Our intention is again to re-provide our facilities as part of a mixed use development with residential accommodation on the site to facilitate this.</p>	<p>Noted. These discussions were undertaken while the building was locally listed and it was clear at that time.</p> <p>The situation of the building and its positive relationship with the Vauxhall Conservation Area is a clear one.</p> <p>Whilst The aspirations of St Anne's Settlement are fully understood it would be remiss of the Council not to give serious consideration to inclusion of this site within the conservation area.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p>All of these buildings have come to the end of their useful life and comprise of disjointed spaces that are difficult to upgrade and alter to meet the current and future needs of the Settlement. The charity cannot continue to provide its community and charitable services unless it has a facility that meets our current and future needs and can generate income.</p> <p>It is essential that we are able to ensure that the site is unhindered by such a designation although we appreciate that redevelopment is by no means precluded by it.</p> <p>Any limitation of the redevelopment potential may well result in the charity having to vacate the site. In short, there are serious potential consequences that must be carefully thought through before a decision can be made that is in the best interests of the people that benefit from the charity.</p> <p>The main building does have some architectural merit but this is modest at best. Aside from its continued performance failures and maintenance challenges, its</p>	<p>Not accepted. This locally listed post-war block is enclosed on three sides by the conservation area boundary and the buildings on two sides are grade II listed.</p> <p>Officers consider that the building contributes sufficiently to the character and appearance of the Vauxhall Conservation Area to warrant inclusion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The three storey height of the building relates well to the street scene of Harleyford Road and thus to this conservation area context. - The prominent location at a junction means that the building is viewed in conjunction with the conservation area context and has townscape character. - The stock brick finish and restrained architectural character is in harmony with the established character and appearance of the conservation area. 	<p>No Change</p>

	architects, Walters and Kerr-Bate were competent but not highly regarded. None of their previous works are listed. We intended to open a discussion with you as to how elements of the existing boundary wall and decoration might be reused on the site.	Inclusion within a conservation area makes a strong presumption in favour of retaining the main building. However, national planning policy does not preclude demolition of buildings in conservation areas – it just sets a high bar of public benefits to be provided to justify the demolition.	
V17. Workspace Ltd	I think your boundary proposals (re the Vox Building site, Durham Street are sensible and we would be happy to support them.	Noted. NB For clarification this boundary change was not in the draft consultation document. It was identified following the initial consultation and the owners consulted at that time for their opinion.	No change
V18. Vauxhall City Farm	I can confirm that the Farm's formal view is that we would like our new building to be included within the revised conservation area, along with the wider area of the Farm that is already proposed for inclusion. We agree with your view of the quality of its design and its sympathy/contribution to the wider setting, surroundings, and overall amenity of the area.	Noted. NB For clarification this boundary change was not in the draft consultation document. It was identified following the initial consultation and the Farm consulted at that time for their opinion.	No change
Walcot Conservation Area			
W3 Local Resident	I support the extension of the CA to cover the whole west side of Sullivan Road and Monkton Street.	Noted.	No Change
	I suggest the CA should also include 1-7 Sullivan Road and 108-122 Brook Drive, as these are similar to the Victorian housing on the rest of Brook Drive.	Accepted. Officers subsequently looked at the area in question. There is merit in the inclusion of 108-122 Brook Drive buildings which have a similar character to the properties in Brook Drive which are already in the conservation area.	Change

		<p>Furthermore, the properties on the north side of the street are within the London Borough of Southwark's West Square and Elliots Row Conservation Area and the Brook Drive buildings in Lambeth terminate views out of that conservation area.</p> <p>Consultation letters were subsequently issued to the properties in question and any responses re included here.</p>	
W 7 Princes East Residents Association	I welcome the proposed change to the C.A. boundary by including the properties in Sullivan Road and Monkton Street. Whilst the buildings are not of historic significance, they do help to consolidate the boundary of the C.A.	Noted.	No Change
	<p>The building at 25a Wincott Street should be included in the C.A. It formed part of the Renfrew Site of the former Lambeth Workhouse complex built in 1870.</p> <p>The building itself is described as "Casual wards with labour yard" in an 1896 map of the area. As such the building is an integral part of Lambeth's social and public health history, and has a far greater historical significance than say the recently erected residential buildings, which it is proposed to include.</p> <p>It is also a handsome building itself, and in its detailing a fine example of late 19th century public architecture, which enhances the C.A. far more than say Kenneth Court. Given the above, I would strongly press for its inclusion to further enhance the C.A., and to be added to the list of buildings in appendix 2, which are considered to make a "positive contribution" to the CA.</p>	<p>Not accepted. This former workhouse building is separated from the main body of the conservation area by the Shelley School site. It contributes little to the character and appearance of the wider conservation area and for that reasons inclusion is not recommended.</p> <p>Local listing could be looked into in future.</p>	No Change

W9 Local Resident	As a resident of Sullivan Road, I am very pleased that you wish to absorb all of West Sullivan Road into the conservation area.	Noted.	No Change
W10 Residents of Walcot Square and Kennington Road	We are in agreement with the proposed inclusion of properties on Monkton Street and Sullivan Road and are therefore subject to the same rules that apply to the rest of the Conservation Area.	Noted.	No change
W11 Local Resident	<p>I do not support the proposed extension to conservation area to include the properties on Brook Drive's eastern end.</p> <p>The properties at Brook Drive which would be included in the conservation area are different in appearance to those currently within the area. For example, 112 Brook Drive and the adjoining properties do not have bay windows but are converted retail premises with flat facades.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand why these properties are considered contiguous with those across Sullivan Road and around Walcot Square/St Mary's Gardens.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The properties in question are of the same period and similar architectural style to the properties within the conservation area.</p> <p>It is true that there is not pure architectural unity. However, such architectural unity is not a requirement to justify inclusion within a conservation area.</p> <p>The properties contribute positively to the architectural and historic character of the locality as a whole and given that locality is already largely a conservation area these properties too should be subject to the same protection.</p>	No Change
END			