

# Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form



Ref:

**R029**

(for official use only)

Name of the document (DPD) to which this representation relates:

Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Proposed Submission Version January 2020 (DRLLP PSV Jan 2020) and associated Proposed Changes to the Policies Map January 2020 (PCPM Jan 2020)

Please return to: [localplan@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@lambeth.gov.uk)

or by post: Planning Policy Team, London Borough of Lambeth, PO Box 734 Winchester SO23 5DG

by 11pm on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

**Please read the Guidance Note and Privacy Notice attached to this form before completing the representation form or submitting your comments**

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal details (please see applicable privacy notices in Section 5 of the guidance note)

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 you wish to make a representation about.

## Part A

### 1. Personal details\*

### 2. Agent's details (if applicable)

\* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

Title	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>
First name	<input type="text" value="A"/>	<input type="text" value="Ben"/>
Last name	<input type="text" value="Hunt"/>	<input type="text" value="Dakin"/>
Job title <sup>†</sup>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Planner"/>
Organisation <sup>†</sup>	<input type="text" value="UDN Redevelopments Ltd"/>	<input type="text" value="ROK Planning"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="16 Upper Woburn Place"/>
	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="London"/>
	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postcode	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="WC1H 0AF"/>
Telephone	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="07719959160"/>
Email <sup>†</sup>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="ben.dakin@rokplanning.co.uk"/>

<sup>†</sup> where relevant

# Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

## Part B – please use a separate sheet for each representation

**3. To which part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 does this representation relate?** *(identify specific reference if possible)*

Paragraph no.  Policy no.  Policies Map

**4. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is:**

*(please tick)*

<b>4.1 Legally compliant</b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.2 Sound<sup>^</sup></b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.3 Complies with the Duty to co-operate</b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>^</sup> *The considerations in relation to being ‘sound’ are explained in the notes at the back of this form. If*

*you have ticked ‘No’ to 4.2, please continue to Q5. Otherwise please go to Q6.*

**5. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is unsound because it is not:**

*(please tick)*

5.1 Positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2 Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3 Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.4 Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

*(Please tick only one option. A separate form should be used if you wish to raise more than one concern.)*

**6. Please give details of why you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible**

**If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 or their compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments and then go to Q9.**

*Please refer to the Cover Letter prepared by ROK Planning dated 12 March 2020 - reinstatement of missing parts of policy PN10 required.*

# Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in Q5 above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) You will need to say why this change will make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of this part of policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

*Please refer to Cover Letter prepared by ROK Planning dated 12 March 2020 - reinstatement of missing parts of PN10 required.*

*(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify your representation and your suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change to the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes I do wish to participate at the oral examination

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing sessions(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

If you have selected 'No', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

*(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)*

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination. You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

10. Please tick relevant boxes if you require notification of any of the following to your address stated in Part A:

That the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 and associated PCPM Jan 2020 have been submitted for independent examination

The publication of the inspector's recommendations following the independent examination

The adoption of the Revised Lambeth Local Plan and Policies Map.

Signature

*B.Dakin*

Date

*12/03/2020*

# Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

## Part B – please use a separate sheet for each representation

**3. To which part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 does this representation relate?** *(identify specific reference if possible)*

Paragraph no.  Policy no.  Policies Map

**4. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is:**

*(please tick)*

<b>4.1 Legally compliant</b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.2 Sound<sup>^</sup></b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.3 Complies with the Duty to co-operate</b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>^</sup> *The considerations in relation to being 'sound' are explained in the notes at the back of this form. If*

*you have ticked 'No' to 4.2, please continue to Q5. Otherwise please go to Q6.*

**5. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is unsound because it is not:**

*(please tick)*

5.1 Positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2 Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3 Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.4 Consistent with national policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*(Please tick only one option. A separate form should be used if you wish to raise more than one concern.)*

**6. Please give details of why you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible**

**If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 or their compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments and then go to Q9.**

*Please refer to the Cover Letter prepared by ROK Planning dated 12 March 2020 - reinstatement of missing parts of policy PN10 required.*

*(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)*

# Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in Q5 above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) You will need to say why this change will make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of this part of policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

*Please refer to Cover Letter prepared by ROK Planning dated 12 March 2020 - reinstatement of missing parts of PN10 required.*

*(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify your representation and your suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change to the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes I do wish to participate at the oral examination

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing sessions(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate. If you have selected 'No', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

*(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)*

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination. You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

10. Please tick relevant boxes if you require notification of any of the following to your address stated in Part A:

That the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 and associated PCPM Jan 2020 have been submitted for independent examination

The publication of the inspector's recommendations following the independent examination

The adoption of the Revised Lambeth Local Plan and Policies Map.

Signature

*B.Dakin*

Date

*12/03/2020*

**SENT VIA EMAIL:** ([localplan@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@lambeth.gov.uk))

**ROK REFERENCE:** WT/BD/R00097

12 March 2020

Planning Policy Team  
London Borough of Lambeth  
PO Box 734,  
Winchester,  
SO23 5DG

Dear Sir or Madam

**LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH  
DRAFT REVISED LAMBETH LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION JANUARY 2020  
(REGULATION 19 STAGE)  
REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF UDN REDEVELOPMENTS LTD**

**Background**

These representations are submitted on behalf of UDN Redevelopments Ltd, owners of the 'The Hero of Switzerland, 142 Loughborough Road, London, SW9 7LL'. For context, a planning application to redevelop the site obtained a resolution to grant planning permission from Lambeth Borough on 24 September 2019 (application ref no. 19/01481/FUL).

The description of development is:

*"Demolition of the existing public house and erection of a 13-storey building (plus basement and mezzanine floor levels and roof level access) including a replacement public house at basement, ground and mezzanine floor levels and 1 unit of ancillary staff accommodation (Use Class A4) with 35 residential units above (8 x Studio, 4 x 1 beds, 15 x 2 beds and 8 x 3 beds, Use Class C3), and cycle parking, waste storage, a substation, hard & soft landscaping including beer garden and private/communal amenity space, and associated engineering works".*

**Representations**

These representations are made in relation to Policy PN10: 'Loughborough Junction'. Specifically, a key element of this policy which has been removed between the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan (October 2018) and the Proposed Submission Version (January 2020) on which Regulation 19 consultation is

currently being undertaken by the LPA. As far as we can see, no explanation has been given for this removal.

As part of the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan (October 2018) the following was set out in relation to paragraph I) of Policy PN10:

*"I) Loughborough Road- improvements to the public space outside of the Hero of Switzerland will be encouraged".*

However, in the Proposed Submission Version (January 2020) this part of the policy is removed, with the policy going no further than paragraph g. In taking this omission into consideration, it should be noted that on the diagram in relation to policy PN10 (pg. 451 of the Submission Version) 'improvements to the Public Realm' are still shown as being proposed on this map in relation to the public space outside of the Hero of Switzerland. This removal of paragraph I of Policy PN10 is therefore out of sync with the accompanying map.

Regardless of whether it is intentional or not, it is our submission that this element of Policy PN10 should be reinstated to the emerging Local Plan for Lambeth. This is the case as this part of the policy assists in delivering positive public realm improvements within the Borough of Lambeth which is an important element of the Local Plan. This is also important as specified by the London Plan (both current and emerging). For example, Policy D8: Public Realm of the London Plan (Intend to Publish – December 2019) sets out that development plans should encourage and explore opportunities to create new public realm where appropriate as well as setting out general principles for public realm improvements. The public space outside of the Hero of Switzerland constitutes an appropriate location for such public realm improvements. In addition to this, the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) also cements the importance of public realm improvements, setting out in paragraph 92 that planning policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces. It is considered that this public space constitutes as such.

Furthermore, the Loughborough Junction Masterplan (2016) identifies 'Hero Square Public Realm' as a 'Gateway Project' for public realm enhancement. The Loughborough Junction Masterplan defines a Gateway Project as: "to identify a series of opportunities which are embedded in the heart of smaller neighbourhoods, to help build local pride and ownership"; and to "specifically target the creation, refurbishment and enhancement of community facilities and public realm". It is also pertinent that the Loughborough Estate Management Board (LEMB) have been party to discussions regarding the Hero of Switzerland development, including improvements to the public space outside of the Hero of Switzerland, and are supportive of the proposals.

It should be noted that the resolution to grant planning permission by Lambeth Council (application ref no. 19/01481/FUL) relied on a range of public benefits, included facilitating improvements to Hero Square, the name of the public space outside the Hero of Switzerland. Discussions regarding the S106 agreement are still ongoing between our client and Lambeth Council, however the works are to be executed by the developer up to a monetary cap. Therefore, the principle of a contribution being made to the Council to ensure the public realm improvements are delivered has been agreed. This is a key public benefit which will be delivered by the planning permission and was judged as such in the determination of the planning application by the LPA.

Further weight should be given to the fact that the funding and delivery of public realm improvements to Hero Square is listed as being a 'public benefit' in the Planning Officers' Report to the Planning Committee regarding application no. 19/01481/FUL. Such is the importance of the improvements to Hero Square as

part of this planning application that a section of the Planning Officers' Report is dedicated to Public Realm enhancements to the Square.

It is our submission that if this part of Policy PN10 is not reinstated then the Local Plan will not be sound on the basis that it will not be justified or consistent with national policy. This is because no justification has been given for the removal of this part of the policy and its removal weakens what would have been an appropriate strategy for Hero Square. Furthermore, the removal of policy support for a public benefit is contrary to national policy in terms of achieving well-designed places (in accordance with section 12 of the NPPF). As set out in paragraph 124 of the NPPF, the creation of high-quality places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

### **Summary**

The current draft Local Plan is not as sound as the previous draft version because of the removal of paragraph I of Policy PN10. It is our contention that this was in manifest error and the paragraph should be reinstated.

Please do not hesitate to contact either myself or my colleague Will Thompson ([will.thompson@rokplanning.co.uk](mailto:will.thompson@rokplanning.co.uk) or 07921 067 012) if you have any queries or require any further information.

Yours faithfully

Ben Dakin



**Planner**  
**ROK Planning**

**T: 07719 959 160**

**E: [ben.dakin@rokplanning.co.uk](mailto:ben.dakin@rokplanning.co.uk)**