

London Borough of Wandsworth - Planning Applications Committee - 14 January 2025 at 7:30pm

PRESENT

Councillors: Belton (Chair); Councillor Ayres (Deputy Chair); Councillors Apps, S. Boswell, Colclough, Govindia, Humphries, Justin, Owens and White.

Officers: Mark Hunter (Head of Strategic Development), Janet Ferguson (Planning Officer), Nick Calder (Head of Development Management), Sharon Molloy (Principal Urban Design Officer) and David Tidley (Head of Transport Strategy)

Others: Laura Campbell (LBW Democratic Services), Duncan Moors (external legal advisor).

INTRODUCTION

Chair: Okay. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen and although I'm told I'm too late, I better for form's sake say Happy New Year to everyone. I hope they had good festivities etc etc. And welcome to the first Planning Applications Committee meeting of 25.

A small but important agenda.

First of all, can I sign as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting? Councillor Humphries?

[inaudible]

Fine.

I've seen them agree, that's agreed. Secondly, is there anyone here who wishes to declare an interest and perhaps Councillor.

That's interesting. I thought Councillor Apps was going to declare an interesting.

Yes, just if you could please.

Councillor Apps:

All right, so I'm Councillor Apps, I'm Shaftesbury in Queenstown Ward. I'm not participating in the first item because I've previously raised an objection. So I could be said to be predetermined.

Chair:

That's the peculiarity of changing the boundaries during the course of this process. So that's why that's happened. And so we move on to the first item indeed, which is Planning applications.

Nick Calder:

Chair.

Chair:

Sorry. And indeed Mr. Calder wants to make an introductory remark. I forgot. Sorry, Mr. Calder.

Nick Calder:

Yes, thank you Chair. Nick Calder, Head of Development Management at Wandsworth Council. Just so for reference, to my left is. Do you want to introduce.

Duncan Moors:

Good evening, I'm Duncan Moors, I'm the external legal advisor.

Laura Campbell:

I'm Laura Campbell, Democratic Services.

Nick Calder:

So what I just wanted to highlight was in the late items, you'll see in advance of any late items, there's a reference to the local plan update and I thought I'd just take a few minutes. Just to highlight that as of yesterday the local plan was published for a six week consultation period. This is called a Regulation 19 Draft Update to Policies.

There's six policies that are proposed to be updated as part of this local plan update. I won't go through all of them but the highlight includes the affordable housing policy, the policy on proposed bill for student accommodation ones for housing for sheds facilities which are things like the co living schemes that we've had at committee before and also for build to rent schemes. There's six in total.

There's more information online. I just wanted to highlight that as per the late. The note, in the late items we refer to paragraph 49 of the NPPF which talks about the weight that you can give these policies. Obviously it's very early stage. This is the first time these policies have been published so that anybody can actually see them and they've got six weeks in which to make comments.

So at this stage any application that's already in is very, very limited weight for applications that come forward in the next couple of months again it will be limited, wait and then after that six week period we'll review the comments.

If there's a lot of objections to a policy again it won't have that much weight until an inspector has reviewed it at the public inquiry. That will come forward afterwards.

So at this stage these policies have come forward, they're out of consultation. We'll review or my colleagues in the local plans team will review those.

The comments for tonight and for the next couple of months though, it's just to highlight that though you can give these policies weight, it's limited at this stage and we wouldn't advise refusing on these grounds.

So end of my speech.

Chair:

Thank you Mr. Calder.

I think for members note really rather than other people, very technical but I'm sure members understand I should have said that myself at the beginning about introducing people. Other members of the committee will no doubt introduce themselves when they make contributions.

Agenda Item 1 - Booker Cash & Carry and BMW Car Service Garage 41-49 and 49-59 Battersea Park Road London SW8 5AL

Chair:

But now to get on with the first application which is the booker application Booker cash and carry application 2022/1835 and I'm going to ask Janet Ferguson to introduce.

Janet Ferguson:

Good evening, my name is Janet Ferguson, I'm the planning manager of the street strategic development team. I'm just going to do a brief presentation.

So this first slide shows the site at 41 to 59 Battersea Park Road as existing.

There's a vacant retail warehouse on the site which is shaded red on the top image. Previously there was a BMW service centre that was demolished in the spring of 2022. To the east of the site is southeast of the site is New Covent Garden Market. To the north is Battersea Power Station. To the west are immediately to the west is Viridian Apartments and there's New Mansion Square which is a new affordable block to the rear of the site.

The application is a full application and it's for three buildings.

Plot one would provide 55 affordable residential units.

Plots two and three would deliver 762 student bedrooms. Within that there's 237 studio rooms and 525 classrooms and kitchen area. Of that total, 198 of them are affordable student rooms.

In addition there's 495 square metres of flexible floor space in plots one and two, disabled car parking in Sleaford street and servicing areas, a new play park, a play area and park and

a pedestrian link through to the south west corner to New Mansion Square and onto Thessaly Road is proposed.

The next slide Shows the front elevation fronting onto Battersea. Plot one is the 12 storeys high and that's where the affordable housing units are proposed. The student accommodation is in the green and red blocks.

The green block is plot two is 17 storeys and there's a variation in height of plot three between 15 and 22 storeys.

The buildings are to be constructed in precast concrete which is to be manufactured off site and makes the construction fast and efficient.

During the processing of the application, revisions have been received to plot one to reduce its height and amend its footprint, which has been reconfigured to attain the trees on the frontage of Battersea Park Road.

The bottom image shows the view from the park to the rear of the buildings which includes 4,442 square metres of public realm, a total of 506 square metres of informal and formal play.

This final slide shows in the top image the impression of the commercial units that are provided in block two and that's taken from within the park.

The benefits of the scheme are listed within the slide and you can see that a number of jobs are created with the construction related to the student accommodation and commercial unit.

And there's a community and cultural use of one of the units that's to be provided at a peppercorn rent.

The roof plan in the bottom corner of the slide shows the extent of the new park and the amenity areas serving the student accommodation in blocks 2 and 3.

The green credentials of the development are also listed and include solar panels at roof level.

The urban greening factor score of 0.4.

The proposal exceeds the 35% reduction in CO2 emissions.

12 swift boxes and at least 6 bat boxes are to be integrated into the buildings.

Also, green roofs and ray gardens are provided and the development would achieve BREEAM outstanding rating for the student and retail elements of the scheme.

The residential would achieve home quality mark four star rating.

I wanted to briefly it's been mentioned already that whilst the committee report at page 23 refers to representations from the Shaftesbury and Queenstown ward and councillors, this was correct at the time when the application was first considered consulted upon in 2022, the site is now within the Nine Elms ward which is reflected on the front page of the committee report.

I also wanted to highlight that whilst the application was made valid and consulted upon in May 22, design changes were sought and reported to a DRP meeting in 2023 and revised plans were later submitted to the LPA in May last year, some 15 months later with no advance notice or discussion with officers at that time.

During the last six months, further consultations and negotiations have taken place to address outstanding issues around highways services, disabled access standards, sustainability and the advancing of the section 106 agreement.

The applicant has lodged an appeal against non determination. So the committee must consider whether they would have been minded to grant or refuse planning permission if they had been given the opportunity to resolve the application.

This completes my brief presentation. Thank you, Chairman.

Chair: Thank you. Mr. Hunter, do you want to elaborate at all on that last point about what we're doing?

Mark Hunter: I'm Mark Hunter, Head of Strategic Development so the applicant have the right to appeal against non determination if the council haven't considered the application and they've chosen to do that.

So members need to consider what they would have done if an appeal hadn't been lodged and what they would have been minded to do, because then we take that forward in the appeal process to consider the council statement of common ground.

So we have to agree with the applicant, if we can, on which parts of the application we're in agreement with and which we aren't.

And again, this would reduce any exposure to costs if we can agree common ground and

again, if you should be reminded to you would have approved this application, then we'll take that forward and the applicant will then consider that and the inspector will and will probably hold a hearing still but it will be low key in terms of just agreeing the 106.

And there may be other considerations you want to take forward but yeah, it depends what we are going to fight the appeal on.

Mr. Moors might want to say anything extra on that.

Duncan Moors:

Chairman, I can answer that, yes.

So with a non determination appeal, particularly in these circumstances, you have the opportunity to give a view as to what your take on the application would have been in the absence of that appeal being made.

So the recommendation before you is to grant the officers would have granted consent.

However, if members take a different view, then it would be very helpful to officers if you could put forward these putative reasons for refusal to enable officers to frame the counsel's response to the appeal.

Just an additional point to what Mr. Hunter said about the low key nature of subsequent appeal. Irrespective of the counsel's take or approach to the appeal scheme, the inspector, he or she will have her own or his own considerations that will need to be looked at. And also there may be interested parties, members of the public, who may wish to make representations.

So there will be some planning issues that will be canvassed before the inspector, irrespective of what approach the Council takes.

But I would say that if the council doesn't take a view, wishes to remain silent, then it puts officers in a very difficult position. And also, as Mr. Hunter mentioned, there is a risk of costs being awarded against the council because the appellant will not know what case it needs to meet.

Just briefly if I may, Chairman, for costs in planning appeals, they're not the same as in civil proceedings, so the victor isn't entitled to the costs just by virtue of the fact that they were successful in the appeal.

Costs are awarded either on application by a party or by the inspector if a party's behaved unreasonably and that unreasonable behaviour has put the other party to unnecessary or

wasted cost, both of those limbs have to be satisfied.

Now, there can be full or partial orders of costs, and also unreasonable behaviour can be in relation to procedural steps, missing deadlines, not being particularly responsive.

And also there can be substantive reasons for why costs are awarded against the party. For example, if a local authority fails to substantiate any grounds for refusal when it actually comes to an appeal, that is a substantive ground upon which an inspector can make an award of costs.

So, Chairman, unless I can assist further, I'm happy to answer some questions,

Chair: if members have any right on this specific point, about exactly what we're doing tonight as opposed to the application itself. Any questions on that? I think it seems perfectly clear to me, but we got Councillor Humphries followed by Councillor Colclough.

Councillor Humphries:

Thank you, Chair. Councillor Guy Humphries, Councillor for Southfields in Putney and opposition speaker on this committee. Thank you everybody for that explanation of where we're at and what the procedure.

Obviously, it's a very unusual situation that we're in tonight and we're not often having to deal with things in this kind of situation.

In fact, I'd quite like to know if we know of any other examples when the council has been in this position.

And I hear what everybody said about why we've ended up where we are, but we all received, I think, today, a letter from the applicant putting out their point of view. And I'm just slightly disconcerted by the fact that we've ended up in this situation, rather than being able to judge it normally with less stress from the implications of costs and penalties to the council.

It puts the councillors in a very sensitive situation. So I just wonder if we could have a little bit more of an explanation as to how come we've ended up in this situation.

Because, yeah, the applicant seems to think one thing and that's not Necessarily exactly what we're hearing from officers. So perhaps we could get a little bit more detail as to why we've ended up where we're at.

Mr. Calder. Have you got any comments?

Nick Calder:

I can probably answer the first point about how many other ones. I think there's been about

three in the last 10 years where there's been a minded to recommendation. Most of them have been minded to refuse, but there was one other reminder to approve But for the substantial answer, I'll hand over to the head of Strategic Developments.

Mark Hunter: Do you want me to go back to 2022, Councillor, or....

So originally, when the application came in just for student accommodation, I discussed with members at that time and it's fair to say that student accommodation isn't the most popular, given the borough's C3 housing need.

And student accommodation has to provide student affordable. And in this case GLA agreed a fast track blended amount because of the different uses on the site of 39.8%, I think affordable.

And I went back, having discussed with councillors, to the applicant and said you might have some trouble getting through. Members aren't particularly receptive towards student housing. A really good idea, because what's in need in the borough is C3 affordable housing. And if you could see a way to providing a block of C3, they weren't particularly pleased about it, but after some months did come up with a block of C3, which you've seen there, and that came in and then there were concerns from Viridian apartments, amongst others, on the sunlight and daylight impact.

So I again went back to the applicants and asked them to reduce the height of that block closest and rotate it so that the impacts were lessened and they did that and then we had to look at sustainability again and we had three design review panels and the third design review panel to get the design absolutely spot on.

So, you know, we've been very thorough on this one and really pushed the applicant. And then they got to a position a year and a half ago where they weren't sure the scheme was viable anymore. So they held it in abeyance for a year and they came back in the early summer and started up the scheme again. And we went out to consultation and we asked for some more changes and then wheelchair housing wasn't quite right.

So we went back and we got that and, you know, know, maybe the applicants think that the officers have been a bit too thorough in getting a great scheme. However, we think we've done our job thoroughly.

We may have taken a certain amount of time over that, but I think it's better to get it right than get it quick. I don't know whether you'd agree with that. And so therefore, you know, things may have been delayed a little bit just to finesse it, to get it, to comply with all the policies and, and standards. And maybe the applicants thought that we took a bit too long in doing that.

So, you know, I feel as though I've done a thorough job here. Maybe they think I was a bit

too thorough. I don't think that is the case and can be the case.

Chair:

I think you've done that very well, Mr. Hunter. And the improvements are certainly very notable. I'm sure we're going to be asked that.

I don't know whether they keep Councillor Humphries happy if I said, can you put all that in writing for me? So it's a letter that I have explaining the reasons and it may be useful at appeal stage as well, but there's quite a few bits and pieces there.

Councillor Colclough?

Councillor Colclough: Thank you, Chair. Councillor Colclough, for St. Mary's Ward, I have a couple questions.

First one, going off of Mr. Hunter's last answer, were the applicants given indications that they were going to lodge this appeal for non determination or was it sort of. Did it come out of nowhere?

And then secondly, as well, I also noted that we have a lot of planning obligations and conditions in this application and if the appeal was successful, will those obligations and conditions still be upheld on our side or do we lose them, Essentially?

Mark Hunter:

On the first point, they did say that they were considering appeal. It didn't come out the blue and I was aware of that and I still thought it was right to be very thorough and that was my choice.

And, you know, apologies to you councillors, that sits with me, but hopefully we've now got a report in front of us that does show that scheme does tick every box. It meets every standard, meets every policy.

And therefore, second point, on the obligations, we will put forward our obligations and conditions to the inspector, but he could change those if he was so minded. He, she, they can have got the power to do what they want with that.

But substantively, because we're in agreement largely with the applicant, we think that they would pretty much be unchanged.

Chair: There is an assumption there that he or she will approve it. We don't know, but if he or she does, we hope they accept the conditions we put forward the best we could manage. Okay. Councillor White.

Councillor White: Yeah, I just wanted to make sure that I understand that planning permission was given for this site. So what we're Commenting on this evening is the

changes from that planning permission.

Mark Hunter: There was a planning application in 2016. There's an extant permission on the site for a residential scheme which they've in effect technically commenced and so that's live. Is that the question, Councillor?

Councillor White: 2019.

Chair: There was a planning permission given for the site. So that's on, I think, Councillor White, if that's the point that I think 2019. Yeah, I think I picked that up as well and I think I've had a correction from. Perhaps Ms. Ferguson can correct us.

Janet Ferguson: Yes, I think in the late Items on the second page, there's reference to the Planning Application 2015/6813. It was reported to the meeting of the Planning Committee on 19 October 2016, not March 9, 2019. So that permission has been implemented, as Mr. Hunter said, it's extant.

Some of the conditions have been discharged and the BMW garage building has been demolished.

Chair: There's an error in the paper, which is in the late papers. The 2019 dates that you picked on. I did it too as well when I read it through. It's actually 2016 and that's the confusion and that's the application. That is, as they say, extant.

Mark Hunter: Apologies, Councillor. Yes, that's correct.

Chair: Okay, Any other questions? Councillor Govindia, thank you.

Councillor Govindia: Mr Hunter mentioned time taken to negotiate with Viridian about impact of increased height or on the light to that block. But I note that the paper also has comments from Peabody about the blocks at the rear of, I suppose, block three leading onto Mansion Square and so on.

Could you expand on how you have been able to satisfy Peabody and the residents of that block about loss of light?

Mark Hunter: I'll pass that on to Mrs. Ferguson, who's the expert.

Janet Ferguson: I'd like to point you to page 93 of the Committee agenda, where I think it gives a useful summary in paragraph 11.29 in the table, which gives you a summary of all of the buildings that have been assessed in terms of their daylighting and compared with the consented scheme. And I think there is some reduction in amenity to some of the rooms. You can see it's really confirmed in paragraph 11.30. There would only be seven rooms in total that would have a greater impact when compared with consented scheme. But there

would be 18 more rooms affected within Phase 4A and one room in the various buildings, A1.1 and A1 5.

But if you look at the table, you can see that there's a change of Seven rooms in total that would be have a greater impact than the consented scheme.

So that summarises the position, I suppose in respect to Viridian and phase 4a.

Councillor Govindia:

So roughly twice as many of benefit as have worsened, if that's the opposite of benefit as a result of the change. If I'm correct about reading of that table, the Phase 4A Building A 1.1 has a greater number of flats which will lose out. Am I not right?

Janet Ferguson:

That's correct. But there's a reduction in Viridian. That's the Peabody owned block.

Councillor Govindia: And that was my question, wasn't about Viridian, it was about Peabody. And the Peabody is a net loser as a result of the heights increased at block 3. Am I not right?

Janet Ferguson: Yeah, that's correct. But I think it's also worth also having a look elsewhere in the report. If I can just find the correct paragraph.

When the scheme for Peabody was granted it was always on the basis that it shouldn't prejudice the development of the adjoining site.

So I'll just find the correct paragraph.

Councillor Govindia:

I think it's planning approval is on the basis that you don't prejudice the adjoining site. I mean that's a pretty clear principle of planning.

Janet Ferguson:

But I think if you look at paragraph 11.11 it talks about the potential for overlooking and residential outlook and privacy. Talking about the windows that were repositioned and the angle of the windows were specifically designed, designed to reduce the residential amenity impacts on those future residents.

Mark Hunter: And just to add to that, Councillor Govindia, the sunlight daylight guidance does specifically say that in regeneration areas, inner city areas, you're invariably going to get some.

Councillor Govindia: So tough luck?

Mark Hunter: Sorry, no, not tough luck but to get the kind of housing we need and to balance all the different ambitions of maximising site potential and increasing housing as we need, then there is going to be some impacts but it's not so severe as to be refusable in officers opinions.

And we got an independent Sunlight and Daylight assessor to consider that on our behalf and he's advised us that Councillor Justin, it's your ward.

Councillor Justin: Yes, I mean I'm minded not to have an opinion in case because I, I do want to vote on this. So I've....

Chair:

You can, you can certainly speak and vote as well.

Councillor Justin:

Oh good. All right. I mean, I mean I spend a lot of time up at the new development and probably three times a week because that's part of my constitutional run stroke walk to try and keep my weight down.

So I'm there A lot. And I meet a lot of the residents. What the residents are saying here is that they need a student apartment block here like a hole in the head.

What's happening, what's needed is to make some kind of family friendly residential, because this is going to be an enormous development as more and more people move in.

And I don't see. I mean, when the report repeatedly uses the word student, there's a word missing in front of that and the word is foreign, because it's only foreign students who are ever going to take up these spaces.

Chair: Does foreign include Yorkshire people and Lancashire people?

Councillor Justin: It's not of interest.

Chair: Foreign from another country, really?

Councillor Justin: Yeah, yeah. I mean, I don't. I just don't see that, you know, there's no university or higher education in the immediate area. I mean, I'm always told that, you know, the Nine Elms development is empty.

I'll tell you what is empty. Two blocks that have been created. And they mentioned in the report, you know, we've got just to the west of Battersea Park Road, where the railway bridge is, you've got a student accommodation there.

You've got a massive block of student accommodation on the Vauxhall side. And I tell you, they're the ones that are empty.

You know, there's no lights on it. Why on earth we would need a third block of student accommodation in an area?

Look, the scheme really isn't in keeping with the area. We need to build a residential area in Nine Elms where people put down roots and where more amenities can be.

We need doctors and dentist surgeries, we need supermarkets. But what we're going to get is a load of transient living. What we really need, in a nutshell, we need prams, not bikes. And once you start to see more prams than bikes, you'll know that the Nine Elms development has been a success and, you know, the want of going on too long ago, it really is a development that we need in Nine Elms like a hole in the head. And that's all I really need to say, because that sums up what the residents who are there now. Think about it.

Chair: Now, that's a very clear statement of your opinion. Would you care to speculate in planning terms? Sorry to be boring, but we are a planning committee. So would you care to speculate the planning.

Councillor Justin: The officers need things to be able.... I mean, this has come back into us with four more stories than the first application, which we just agreed had been given permission. So if it's now four storeys higher, than it was before are all of the calculations on the way overlooks the other Viridian now invalidated and have to be done again? It's now four stories higher.

Chair: Right. Do you want to develop this, I mean, if you're developing this into a case to move against the application. I know it's primitive. I know it's primitive and I'm sure I'm openly.

People who speak against the application. And there may be more than.

I'm just reminding Councillor Justin as though he needed it, but I'm just doing it, that we need planning grounds as well.

So think about it. At least I'm more than happy to move on to other people first. But I was just pressing him to think about what the grounds are.

Councillor Justin: I take your point, but the explanation from our legal people here seem to be based more on the worry of the cost of an appeal. Yeah, that's not fair either.

Chair: I understand that.

Councillor Justin: Yeah.

Chair: Councillor Humphries, I think, had his hand coming up just for my benefit and maybe others as well.

Councillor Humphries: On a more general point, because of this, again, slightly strange nature of what we're deciding or proposing tonight. And it goes back to what Councillor Colclough was saying earlier.

So in the course of this discussion that we're having now, if we come up with any ideas, as we would in a normal planning application, where we might want to put an extra condition on or an amendment on or something like that, is that still part of the process that we can do now?

Because it's an important point, because there might be things in a normal discussion, we might come to a point where we want to modify something slightly. Is that still. Are we just judging it on what it is?

Chair: Can I say, as chair, and get advised if I've got it wrong, that from this point on having decided, we're deciding what we would have decided otherwise. So, yes, we can put any condition we like on. This is what we would have done. Yes, yes.

Mark Hunter: Just to add a little bit to that is we can't defer and go back for discussions quite clearly. We need to consider what's in front of us, but it will be in front of the inspector as well. So we need to kind of look clearly at what is in the report and consider.

Consider the facts of the case based on that.

Councillor Humphries: If I could just come back on that Chair. Thank you, Mr. Hunter.

And as you said in your earlier remarks, I think I was right in hearing that the parts that we like and the parts that we don't like in this application will be something that is put into the mix to weigh up where we go as far as the appeal goes.

So that might include things that we suggest now that haven't been put in the report so far.

I might suggest things that haven't been put in the report.

Mark Hunter:

Well, we need to suggest what those are because I can't imagine there's anything that hasn't been put in the report, Councillor.

But you need to consider the facts of the case that are in front of us. We can't go back and just like bits of it. Would you agree with the recommendation or not? And if not, you need to clearly justify on planning grounds.

Chair: Well, with respect, Mr. Hunter and Councillor, let's not argue about an abstract condition. If someone comes up with a condition to be added, we can decide then whether it's okay or not.

Mark Hunter: Okay, go on.

Chair: Right, okay. Any Councillor Ayres?

Councillor Ayres: Fiona Ayres. I represent East Putney. I have nothing for or against students, but I do have a lot against the number here. I could happily live with three blocks with one of them having 300 students in and the two others having housing.

I know this is not the application before us, but the scale of this I think is almost unimaginable. And I'll tell you where it shows. It shows in the size of the bicycle parking areas in these dark basements. They are huge empty areas, probably ill lit, probably ill ventilated, that are hostile. They are not suitable for young people, some of whom may be foreign but may be just confused and vulnerable.

Those bicycle spaces are dreadful.

My other quirk, my objection to it is that it claims to be a sustainable development. Well, I'm glad you've got bat boxes, I'm glad you've got the other things. But you've got over 800 internal bathrooms on this site, the student accommodation, every Single1, all 762 of them have extract fans. Because the bathrooms are internal and this is not necessary. Half of them could easily have natural light and natural ventilation if the bathrooms were put in line rather than side to side. I'm very keen on this, as the rest of you will know, that the whole business of bathrooms being unnaturally lit, it's unnaturally light lighted. It's the recipe for all this mould that we're dealing with in other aspects of council work. Dealing with mould all the time, because they're internal bathrooms mostly.

My major point though about this scheme is that I would have voted against it had it come up in the normal process. But I feel very strongly that a lot of work has been done that it's come this far and for me, I'm sorry, the reasons for the delays are suspect. I don't mean necessarily unprofessional or evil, but something to do with a lack of will.

And this concerns me and I don't think it's honest and just to have brought an application this far and then to turn it down.

So I'm very conflicted about this at the moment. I'm thinking I might abstain. I still haven't decided whether I'm for or against it. So I await further enlightenment for the rest of my course. Colleagues, thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor Ayers. Ah, Councillor Govindia. Sorry.

Councillor Govindia: Thank you. I think Councillor Ayres has probably helped crystallise some of the thinking, in a way. And one of the issues is about the quantum of student accommodation that she raises on this side and perhaps for the committee's benefit.

And there's a question that, that I had raised with Mr. Calder in correspondence is, what is the quantum of student accommodation in Nine Elms?

Not just in Wandsworth, but Wandsworth and Lambeth, within a kind of a mile, mile and a half. Because I know that in the recent newspapers, sorry, the Lambeth Council's given permission for 800 units on Albert Embankment, just about a mile away.

There are Kings Court College blocks in Vauxhall, bit of Lambeth, and there is obviously Palmerston House in this borough. So it'd be useful to have some idea about the quantum of student accommodation in the area.

And I've got some specific questions arising from Ms. Ferguson's introduction.

So perhaps deal with the quantum and then I can raise questions arising from Ms. Ferguson's introduction.

Chair: Can I ask, Councillor Govindam, in genuine inquiry, when one gets as far as the Albert Embankment, how much is one dealing with the central London conurbation, in which case we've got hundreds of students, thousands of students and almost hundreds of colleges.

I mean, we often talk about how meaningless borough and more particularly ward boundaries are in all kinds of things, like housing, for instance. But really, when you're getting on the Albert Embankment, that's in range of all sorts of academic institutions in a way.

What is it reasonable to ask? Can you refine the question a bit? That's very broad.

You went from Nine Elms, which is a single ward, to being Lambeth, which is quite a lot more. I think someone, if we've got the policy people here, can say what the student demand in Wandsworth is likely to be, but.

Councillor Govindia: Can I help you chair? Sorry, Answering that question, because my Question is about the Nine Elms Opportunity area. And the Albert and Bank site that I

mentioned is within the opportunity area.

Chair: Oh, it's that particular bit.

Councillor Govindia: And also the other sites that I mentioned around Vauxhall are also in the opportunity area.

Mark Hunter: If I could answer Councillor Govindia's question. But I think I need to go back a bit and say about student accommodation that the policies that we have in our local plan are led by the Greater London Authority on this and what they do is specifically on student accommodation. Look at the need across London and the great role that the higher education institutes in London play in the economy of this country.

Not just directly in keeping the institutions going with the foreign students, which are, you know, hugely important their income, but also the spin offs and education and jobs that spin off from those.

So it's set centrally and it clearly identifies that there is a significant demand and under supply of such accommodation in London, and particularly within half an hour's commute of the main institutions, Imperial King's College, London School of Economics, so on, so forth and, and London School of Economics have expressed interest, particularly in this site.

And what we're also required to do in planning is to maximise development on sites. And so obviously this kind of scale of development has been imagined in the past because it was in our local plan and in the designation for this site, a height of 75 metres is the maximum permissible height.

The height of these buildings are below that. So it is something that is in accordance with the design height guidelines for this particular site.

It did get higher throughout the course of the application because they wanted.

[inaudible from Councillor Govindia]

Mark Hunter: Yeah, no, no, but there's a context here, Councillor.

Councillor Govindia: Was it that 'we've got to maximise numbers'. I'm sorry, Mr. Hunter, my job is to ask questions.

Mr Hunter: Okay.

Councillor Govindia: And my job is to get an answer. And my question is about numbers, not a lesson on the policy about the GLA and us while we're maximising.

Mark Hunter: I've digested it, thank you. And so what we need to look at for the policy is an 800 metre zone from the site we can't look at in policy terms, the Nine Elms area as a whole. We need to look in the policy terms it specifically refers to within the neighbourhood area. And the neighbourhood is specified as 800 metres from the site.

So 800 metres from the site, that walking distance. There are three institutions.

If we get this one, what we've got is the Lambeth College, Belmore street, just over the Borough boundary which is 250 student beds. We've got the Palmerston Court which is 867, I think, and we've got this one which is 765.

So what we need to do for the GLA figures and government figures for housing returns is we use, because these rooms are particularly small, is we use a divider of 2.5 to give the equivalent of equivalent of C3 homes and that is what we get for our new homes bonus.

So you divide that by the 2.5 and when we look at that and it's paragraph 1.7 of the committee report puts it all in detail, what it does when it aggregates those together, it gives the student accommodation, if this was approved, would total 4.3 of the Wandsworth housing delivery that we've got either built or in the pipeline, which is, you know, pretty small percentage. It's not over concentration in any way.

Lambeth have got other ones. My understanding is that the Vauxhall, the Elburton Bankman one hasn't actually been approved. There is one at Miles street street and there's a further one on the below the sports centre opposite Vauxhall park, but they're more than 800 metres. So for policy terms we can't include those and we would also need to, when we consider that 4.3, is it any kind of saturation and what impact does that have? Is there any clear substantive harm from that use?

You know, we need to consider things like the amount of spend, as Mr. Diamond points out in his email.

Councillor Govindia: I think I've got the numbers.

Chair: I mean, I think to be fair to Councillor Govindia, we're talking about 1850, something like that is in the 800 metre area. That that's fine and I think there is something nearing that on the wider Nine Elms area.

Councillor Govindia: Just turning to Ms. Ferguson's introduction, three specific questions.

One is about the 198 affordable student rooms. What is the definition of affordable? Because in housing terms there is a very specific definition of what is an affordable housing and in this case what is.

Is it 30% less than the going rate or 40% and is it for perpetuity or what? So it's all very well

to throw the line that it's going to be affordable student accommodation, but how affordable and for how long?

The other is that in most construction projects in the borough, we debate given some attention to construction jobs, but given that there is the construction methodology here is off site precast concrete units, is there a risk that the number of construction related jobs is not going to be enough and whether that there's a way in which that figure has been quantified or not.

And my third point is about car free nature of the development, particularly for people with disabilities who might be housed there or the students with disabilities who might need a car.

And the second group of course is the 55 units of affordable housing. Is it the intention that none of them would have access to a car parking space?

Chair: Right, you get that, Ms. Ferguson? I've got in effect four questions actually.

One is affordable students, one number of real jobs given that half of them will be off site in terms of concrete as a construction and the nature of car free space, both as far as students are concerned and as far as affordable council tenants are concerned.

Janet Ferguson: So the GLA SPG sets out a definition.

I can read it out to you if you like. Affordable student rent is defined as a rental cost for the academic year equivalent to below 55% of the maximum income that a new full time student studying in London and living away from home could receive from the government's maintenance loan for living costs that academic year.

[Unknown] Is this in perpetuity?

Janet Ferguson: Yes it is.

Chair: That's in perpetuity.

Janet Ferguson: And then there's the number of construction jobs we think. I've no reason to believe that the 280 jobs haven't been that they've been based on the predicted construction of the development.

And Steve Diamond who's been consulted on the application hasn't flagged that as being unrealistic for this type of development.

It's been set out in the application. So I've no reason to doubt that those jobs have been

calculated on the basis of the materials that are used as part of the development.

Chair: And it's car free as far as students are concerned.

Janet Ferguson It's car free. There's five disabled spaces that are provided in the sleaford studio and 55 tenants.

Chair: Okay. Councillor White.

Councillor White: Yeah, I mean there are some positives with this one.

I'm going against the grain of the arguments that people have been making tonight and saying that we do need student accommodation in London. Anyone expecting to come to London and rent in the private rental sector is going to get a nasty surprise.

There is also the affordability element here as well and it's nice to see London Living Rent being used as well because I think that's an underutilised model for affordability in London.

And the other thing is actually going on to what Councillor Govindia said, actually the off site part of this in construction is actually meaning that we can actually build a lot more than we currently can because we've got a lack of skilled workers.

But also you can bring in more people into construction as well because a lot of the jobs are actually desk based and they're not site based. So there are a lot more people, people who might be attracted in that way.

So those are all quite positive things.

But I'm rather with Councillor Ayres on this. The amount of students that we have here and the overbearing.

I mean, there's one picture in here and I can't have it. And it's like these three blocks are menacing the local affordable blocks. I mean, New Mansion Square has got a lot of issues at the moment anyway, despite having this as well, being menaced by three blocks at the end of the road.

Also, I was rather perturbed by the argument the LSE put up that, you know, we're going to, you know, overbear our local affordable residents so that they can afford to run the their courses.

I think we're more interested, obviously in our local residents rather than whether the LSE can run their courses, really.

And this doesn't hit our, as has been said, this doesn't hit our emergency emerging affordable rent policy.

And there's a lack of outdoor amenity space has been outlined.

And another question I have here is about Mansions [sic] being 10.1 metres away. Am I wrong in thinking that there should be a minimum of 18 metres? I'll stop there because I've got other points to make. But is it supposed to be 18?

Janet Ferguson: I think in terms of policy, there isn't a distinction set in the local plan. Sometimes 80 metres is used as a rule of thumb for developments outside of densely built urban areas.

I mean, I think the committee report refers to a closer distance of 6 metres between the extant scheme and the proposed and New Mansion Square. So it's actually further away in the proposed scheme.

Councillor White: Scheme than what was consented?

Janet Ferguson: Yes, we consented.

Councillor White: God, really, really close.

Chair: 18 metres, by the way, that wasn't face to face though, was it?

I mean, I read the bit in the report, of course, and it does say other words and it was like edge to corner or something, I can't remember. It wasn't face to face.

Janet Ferguson: It's not direct. There's an angle, it's an oblique angle and windows are facing away and that's at the closest point. If I refer you to pages 88 to 89, that sets out all the distances in relation to the Mansion Square buildings.

I think, for example, paragraph 11.8 shows that there's a distance that stretches between 16 metres and 21 metres.

And I think it is the paragraph 11.10 where it talks about the 10.1, the closest distance, which, again, as I just mentioned, it's six metres on the extant permission, but those two pages really cover off the separation distances.

Chair: So 18 metres. People have a lot of problems with distance and what's it mean? 22 yards. Cricket pitch, bit more about 19 metres. Me to the people in the public gallery, perhaps. Not face to face. So, you know, have your view.

Councillor White: Yeah. And the last point I wanted to make was that there was another positive as well.

Obviously reducing the burden on the private rental sector. But if this was an affordable block, that would be reducing the impact on the private rented sector as well, and that would be much more in line with what we have there and might overcome some of the issues we've had with Nine Elms, which is overwhelmingly private and overwhelmingly being bought to be rent out. Rented out as well. A lot of those properties.

So, yeah, on balance, I don't think this is going to be good for the area.

Chair: Any other? Oh, yes. Now we've got a Councillor Humphreys, Councillor Ayres.

Councillor Humphries: Thank you, Chair. A couple of different things just to bottom out.

There's a lot of mentions at various points in the report and also in the late items about the LSE and also other institutions, but is it correct that, you know, it's fine and dandy for these institutions to say they support the idea, but has anybody actually signed on the dotted line yet as far as saying they're actually going to take this or expressed a serious interest in taking it?

Because it's one thing to say they welcome more housing. It's another thing to say they're going to take it themselves.

Perennial problem we have. It's not just in this market, is it? It's in housing as well, where housing associations are interested, it said, but which one? And so on?

Chair: Yes.

Councillor Humphries: Perennial problem, Chair.

Mark Hunter: No one has signed on the dotted line yet, but the institutions don't with student accommodation because they might not get planning permission.

Councillor Humphries: It's a nice way of putting pressure back on the committee, isn't it, to say that if you don't get permission, then you're going to get in anyway. That's not terribly helpful, Mr. Hunter.

Well, yeah, okay. And so that's one aspect, another aspect. So, you know, let's be pessimistic and not often pessimistic Let's be pessimistic and assume that they failed to fill this building in a couple of years time. There's an empty building sitting there like the one in Vauxhall.

Is it possible with this modular construction to adapt the building into regular residential

accommodation? Because this is something we've seen once in the co living schemes as well, where there's a potential to adapt the building in the future if the need that is expressed there doesn't turn out to be there. Is it adaptable?

Mark Hunter: Yes, it is.

We, I mean as with Palmerston Court, you may remember we did the same there and this came from some time ago when Councillor Govindia sent me an article on oversupply in Cardiff, I think it was particularly and got us on Palmerston to consider this and we've got plans in that one and in here in the design and access statement it shows how it could be converted to C3 residential if there's no demand for such student accommodation.

Chair:

Does it say that in the paper?

Mark Hunter:

It may well not.

Chair:

I think for future reference. It's very useful thing to have said in the paper but yeah, if you go on, carry on.

Councillor Humphries:

Yeah. There's more I'm afraid again, dragging us back. Sorry, we're getting a bit all over the place.

But back to the jobs offer and the employment offer again. It does specifically talk about the construction jobs, the quantum of which seems to be fairly settled. But what about jobs longer term in the rest of the building? It doesn't specify that exactly.

It's a bit vague in the report about what their offer is for local people in the jobs as far as I either in the servicing the student accommodation or in the retail units and all the rest of it.

Mark Hunter: I think that's fair. You know, there aren't a huge number of jobs. There is some commercial space at ground floor and there will be some jobs associated with the student accommodation.

But Mr. Diamond, our E.D.O., is content with the proposal and as he points out, the student accommodation in the Battersea constituency is generating something in a region of £112 million. Is it? He has a figure from London Economics on that.

Councillor Humphries: I thought that was quite interesting that I think it was even a higher figure than that. But that's the spend of the students, isn't it? These famed international students that have deep pockets to buy these places, rent these places in the

first place, but that spends London wide. It's not in the borough, is it?

Mark Hunter: Some of it will be to the borough but it's secondary employment from local shops and businesses and you know,

Councillor Humphries: So the students the students that are not in colleges in Wandsworth, they'll be elsewhere in London. And we're doing out more of our sterling work to support the rest of the London economy rather than the local economy.

Chair: As you know, this is speculative, isn't it? I mean, I'm sure the Duchess and the Masons. I'm sure the Duchess and the Mason's Arms are looking forward to it with glee. So, I mean, it depends what kind of expenditure you mean, where and when.

Councillor Humphries: If I've been a hard working student all day at LSE, I'll probably go to a bar around the corner from there and then get the last tube home at night. I would have thought it's more likely scenario.

Mr Hunter: Yeah. I mean, just to add that Mr. Diamond's also secured in the 106, £130,000 for local employment agreement that he'll put towards his job match programme.

Chair: So there are benefits. Councillor Ayres?

Councillor Ayres: It's a very simple question. Something I just don't understand.

On the drawings of the student accommodations, the corridors have great long spines for most of their length. Why are the corridors divided up like that? So that blocks of student accommodation can't be reached by the one on the other side of the wall.

Sharon Molloy: Hi. Sharon Molloy, Principal Urban Design Officer. Yeah, the reason is for that.

Councillor Ayres: I can't hear you.

Sharon Milloy: No, sorry. Can you hear me? Good. The reason for that is fire regulations. The scheme had to be redesigned. It's got the two cores now and it's for eternal means of fire escape.

And the reason the corridors have the separate door is to allow students from one side to come through to the other in the event of a fire. And it's fire regulations also it.

It's an aside, but for management it just keeps noise down, helps manage it. Because you only have see it on plot C on the upper levels you have seven units, seven bedrooms on one side and I think you have eight on the other.

So it keeps it to traditionally like eight round decor. But primarily it's for fire.

Chair: Does that mean to say the long, long corridors on states like the Arndale will be illegal in future because of change of fire regulations?

Mark Hunter: It probably wouldn't pass today's regulations if built now, Councillor, but.

Chair: Right, okay.

Mark Hunter: I don't know what the retrospective position is.

Chair: Okay. Any other? Oh, Colclough hasn't had a go yet.

Councillor Colclough: Thank you, Chair. We were saying earlier about hypothetical conditions if the committee wanted to include them.

And I do find it slightly concerning the LSE comments about how it's going to be that there's going to be potentially a large amount of overseas students there.

And if there was a way to potentially do an informative saying that, you know, we want to make sure that, you know, all possible ways of making sure that especially the affordable student accommodation gets a decent amount of UK based students there because it is really difficult being able to afford living in London, especially as a student. So especially that affordable student element. It would be good if that was a priority for UK students.

Mark Hunter: If members want to express that view, we can pass that on to the inspectorate. It's up to the inspector as to what weight he might give to that. But it sounds unusual but willing to give it a try.

Councillor Govindia: Accommodation should be targeted to local demand of local students. In a sense, you cannot be creating overseas international students affordable quota.

Chair: You've surely got to. I mean that may be okay, but you surely got to include all the British Isles. I'm not sure about Ireland, but you can't. I mean, I know the Scottish have a different educate, but we surely can't exclude.

Councillor Govindia: No, no.

Chair: Okay. So we're talking about either Great Britain or the British Isles. One of. One of the two. Yeah.

Mark Hunter: The GLA sets the guidance for student affordable. So we need to check on that. But we could add something on. I mean depending on review members take. We could.

Councillor Humphries: With respect, Chairman, I think it's important. Important that. You know we've been talking a lot tonight and Mr. Hunter and the team rightly have talked a lot about what this scheme can do for London.

I think it's equally as important particularly for the committee to really concern that we're doing as much as we can for domestic students as well. It's absolutely fair. I don't think there's anything contentious about that at all.

Chair: Councillor Owens is absolutely jumping up and down. I could use. I could use vulgar language to express. First time this evening.

Councillor Owens: Sorry, Councillor Owens Northcott at ward. Surely the business of.

And I completely agree with Councillor Colclough and the other councillors on this about reserving these.

I think it's 198 affordable student rooms. Surely that would be covered under the fact that the criteria is below 55% of the maximum income for studying in London through the maintenance loan. Because if you're an international student, you wouldn't necessarily be getting a maintenance loan. So if it was based on the maintenance loan criteria, that would apply solely to UK students and possibly not the Republic of Ireland.

Chair: Thank you. And people can argue with me if you like. I would be very, very strange to me to exclude all those hundreds and thousands of students I've known from Yorkshire, Lancashire, who could come and now live in London. I would hate that as a thought.

So I would hope it was sticking to the UK at least. But on that basis. Were you happy with the UK there, Councillor Colclough, or do you want to stick to London?

Councillor Colclough: I think in general, UK is fine.

Chair: Sorry, you think generally?

Councillor Colclough: Yeah, yeah, fine.

Chair: Okay. Any other? I've got a couple of questions I want to ask myself. Clearly, in the officer's view, this is absolutely compliant with both council policies and London plan policies and therefore, clearly we don't have to ask you speculatively to take a view what would happen on appeal.

By definition, you would say that on appeal it would be passed because otherwise it's got to

be compliant.

Therefore, if we're going to find grounds to refuse it, we have to find ways in which it's not compliant or in which it's substantially changed from a previously extant application.

And so far only one person, and maybe, maybe the committee is going to agree to pass it anyway, in which case I needn't pursue this.

But if it's going to move to refuse, then we have to find reasons in planning terms that will stand a chance of winning in appeal and have to be appealing to an inspector.

And at the moment I've only had. I think I've had 'I don't likes', which is fine, but it's not a planning reason. The only one I've had is an increase in height.

So although Councillor Govindia was bullying me for raising this an hour ago, I haven't had anything else.

And at some point or other, this is very difficult. I don't think I would have been in favour of this scheme first time round. I can't actually remember what I thought at the time, but then the plans were done by, with respects, a different party and I may not have approved it, but now I'm in reverse position.

So I'm asking everyone to be very responsible and considered about the view they take.

Maybe people are going to support it, but if they're going to oppose, then there's got to be good reasons and reasons that we'd all be comfortable about in defending in an appeal. So that's what I'm looking for.

Councillor White, Councillor Humphries?

Councillor White: Can we object on the basis of the daylight impacts? And that's why my question earlier on, I was a bit confused because there are slight improvements, not for all Blocks, simple block is overly impacted in both schemes. But can we object on that basis?

Chair: Well, we can. Whether people think it's credible. I mean, I'm sorry, that wasn't. I mean, that may be a case. That may be one point. I'm noting it.

Councillor Humphries: To follow on from Councillor White's point. I think there is some credibility and where he's going with that, because the. The impact of the height on the new extra over and above what we've already got approved, and the impact, particularly on where that's going on, as we were talking about earlier on the Peabody side.

So the impact of the overlooking and overlooks on the gardens as well, and the amenity space on Peabody.

So the overbearing impact on the neighbouring site, particularly the Peabody one, I think has got some credibility as far as something that is definitely a detriment to this application.

Chair: Remind me of the increase in number of students between the two applications. Oh, it was residential. Right, of course. Ah, so there's the sheer quantum of....Councillor Humphries, sorry Councillor Govindia?

Councillor Govindia: So I looked at, in a sense, the extent, permission and this, and in. In a way, the differences between the two.

One is the height and therefore all the things that flow from that, and then the other is the nature of the use of those buildings.

The previous application was wholly residential with ground floor commercial and community use and things like that.

And this is obviously two blocks of student accommodation.

The ground floor uses remain more or less in square meterage, roughly the same, and then there is 55 residential units.

So there's a reduction in housing, there's an increase obviously in student accommodation, there's increase in height, and the consequence of the increase in height is on the loss of amenity and outlook for the adjoining blocks in particular Peabody, as Councillor White says.

So I think that I'm sure that officers with planning speak more at their fingertips than I have, would be able to craft words around the increase in height creating and overbearing as overbearing structures, with their impact on reduction in amenity and outlook, and in light in particular, in case of the Peabody buildings, and in terms of change of use effectively from wholly residential bar ground floor uses to residential and student, is the need for housing remains greater, high and in fact greater.

And whereas the student accommodation, this site is not wholly dependent on it, whereas the borough's housing needs are greater.

So I think it's the balance between two types of needs or demands and I would say the housing need and demand is greater and therefore that's a good enough reason to say that this is not acceptable.

Chair: Personally I don't. Personally, I'm not terribly convinced those will get very far. I'm going to ask you to one of you. Ah, is Councillor Humphries going to volunteer?

I'm going to ask one of you to frame because I'm just about to move that the officer's recommendation be accepted and there are certainly some people here who incline to think that that's what we need to do in the circumstances.

But once if that's past, end of story of course. But if it's not, then we'll need someone to have an amendment that's acceptable in planning terms. So that's all I'm saying.

Does that help you, Councillor Humphries?

Councillor Humphries: Thank you. I was just also thinking about another credible line of attack on this one is the intensification of the use of the site because it's a very different aspect from 300 residential units on the permission that's already extant to the hundreds of units we're going to get here.

So the intensification site, and we haven't even got onto Mr. Tidley and the impact on deliveries and servicing and all the rest of it because it's going to be much more intensive use of vehicles, access, servicing, all those which will impact on the benefit of the site with all the lovely walkways and such like, will be completely filled up with delivery mopeds, delivering stuff to all those students in those 700 units.

So the intensification of use of the site will be much greater in this application than it would be in the currently approved one.

Mr. Tidley, you're being offered the hot seat by, by your suit, by your boss here. Mr Tidley might have something to say about the, about the NPPF as well.

David Tidley: Okay, yeah, thanks. David Tidley, I'm the Head of Transport Strategy.

Just having listened to the discussion so far, I pick up on a few points, if, if I may, to pick up on Councillor White's point.

First to think about the extant permission as the starting point. I think it's fair, it's right to say that that development would actually result in a larger increase in trips than the proposal that's before you tonight.

Particularly in the peak hours because effectively the student trip numbers in terms of road traffic are less than residential and so the numbers of journeys will actually be reduced during the peak periods.

There will be more walking trips because students walk more in terms of their sort of day to day activities.

Then we come to servicing and I think the challenge is the application has been

accompanied by a very detailed transport assessment that sets out on an hourly basis how the servicing would predictions of servicing arrangements and using approved methodology and including what occurs at other student accommodation sites to estimate the numbers of journeys that would be carried out servicing during the day.

And that assessment generally demonstrates that the servicing needs of the development could be accommodated by the proposed servicing arrangements. The three delivery bays that are being proposed.

We did pick up at the beginning of the meeting Councillor Cogley's comment about conditions. And within the paper there are two pretty key conditions.

One is condition 52 which, sorry, condition 54, which is the condition that the access to the servicing bays on the third party land, effectively a Grampian condition, so very little development could occur before that condition was discharged.

And then the condition 55 is a delivery and servicing plan which despite the application being accompanied by a plan that we think is broadly acceptable, there's nevertheless still a condition that before each phase is occupied, details need to be provided of the numbers of servicing per block, the times at which these vehicles would service, the types of vehicles and how it would be managed as well.

So I think going back to the comment we sort of started from really about where we are with an appeal may certainly be my view that the right course of action would be to say that the development is acceptable in traffic and servicing.

In terms subject to the delivery of these robust conditions, rather than to suggest that development is unacceptable despite having these conditions.

I think I'll probably just leave it there, but that's where I would probably come from.

Chair: Thank you, Mr. Tidley. Councillor Humphries again.

Councillor Humphries: Sorry Chair, but if I could come back on that. I mean it all sounds very plausible but the, the reality is, if you look at page 107 where we got some of those numbers down at 49, it says student accommodation. The findings indicate 46% of users of the site are expected to make trips on foot.

But when we've been told that they're not going to be going to college in the vicinity of the site, you know to me that they're not going to jump on the underground directly opposite this site to go to their college or use a bike or whatever, the impacts are surely much greater than are estimated here, which I presume this report comes from the applicant rather than being done by ourselves. So I'm sure that's one reason why they make it sound favourable?

I mean it says the same thing here. So we're talking about on the residential side, we're talking about a car free site for 55 residential units and so they can't take anything on a car.

It says only, you know, only. What is it? 23% are going to use the underground. So if you haven't got a car, how are you going to get to work? If you only in 23% of people living in 55 units are going to be getting about.

It may stack up with the numbers and deliveries. I'm assuming we're talking about ocado lorries and supermarket deliveries and stuff like that, but I was thinking more about the impact of things like the Deliveroo bikes where people get their breakfast delivered and all those lovely walkways around the site which are being highlighted as a benefit to the scheme.

We know how that works in reality. In reality, on a day to day level, they'll be full of mopeds going backwards and forwards, mowing down pedestrians left, right and centre as they're trying to deliver their next package from Deliveroo. Or just eat.

Surely it's just the gap between where.

Chair: It's not really like that much in Nine Elms at the moment, is it? Well, they'll have to get their stuff from somewhere just around Battersea, around the power station itself, surprisingly. I mean, there's more deliveries in my road than there are usually there.

Councillor Humphries: But I just, you know, there's a difference between students, accommodation and people who are actually living there. That's exactly my point.

Chair: Okay. I mean, I think that we've got all.

I suspect that there's hardly a committee member here who is 100% sure of whatever it is they're going to vote, but I think we can, because I know from conversations most of you beforehand, you're all a bit divided on it one way or another, so unless someone's got anything brand new, I might as well move to the vote, might I not?

No one's going to say anything. Okay.

So in front of us, we've got a recommendation from the officers that this application be approved. Can I have a show of hands please, for those who in favour of approving it?

3...4. 4. Beg your pardon?

And those against as opposed to abstain. And then I'm immediately going to turn to you and say, okay, come up with the words.

And five against.

Now please come up with the words. And by the way, when you feel like it, which ones of you are going to volunteer to appear at the inquiry on behalf of the council?

I'm prepared to, actually. But which one of you lot is going to support me?

Councillor [x]: Got form on that one.

Chair: Sorry, Councillor, you and I have form on that one?

Councillor [x] We do indeed, yes.

Chair: Oh, sorry if people watching didn't understand that. Those voting in favour of the recommendations was four votes and those against five.

So that falls. At least at the moment it does if we've got an acceptable rejection.

I think perhaps Ms. Campbell would remind us of the vote effectively means that what is proposed cannot happen.

And if there is no further vote, then that is the only vote that this committee has taken.

Councillor Govindia: So I appreciate you're wanting to get reasons for refusal.

Chair: Well, I can't accept a vote of refusal without any reasons. I mean, that just doesn't work, does it?

Councillor Govindia: I think that the recommendation we were told at the beginning of the committee that this was about, had they not appealed and had we had the chance to make it, we would have made such and such a decision.

What the vote suggests is that we would not have made that decision.

And given reasons, as you know, we always have to. Well, so I did start. And you felt that they were not good enough because you thought the vote might go the other way in the first instance.

So I start again that the changes between the extant permission and this proposal is in two areas.

One is the quantum height and then the nature of the use of this building and the height of increased height and the impact of that on adjoining properties, and particularly the Peabody block, has been discussed and debated here.

Suggests that that is a good enough area for committee to rely on as a reason for refusal and that the change of use in effect from wholly residential bar the ground floor uses to residential and predominantly student, or overwhelmingly student with some residential, is the wrong balance for land use on that site, given the demand and need for affordable housing and affordable housing in particular.

Chair: Well, this is really between five of you. Five of you prepared to accept that as a reasonable.

Chair:

Okay, so can I. We have a seconder. Well, seconded, yes.

Chair: So the decision we're actually taking is to turn down the officer's recommendation on the basis of the words that Councillor Govindia gave, which my clerk here has written down. Would you care to read them out just to make sure we've got them right?

Laura Campbell: In terms of the quantitative height and use of buildings, the increase in height and the impact on the adjoining properties, in particular the Peabody, the change of use in effective from the ground floor from residential to predominantly student accommodation, no longer is the balance of land use and housing need, and the housing need in particular.

Councillor Govindia: Sure the wording will improve on second reading.

Chair: So those members in favour of refusing on those grounds Five.

Chair: Those against. That's logically me. One. Okay. An abstaining three.

Chair: Okay, Move on to the second application