

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

23 December 2021

Dear Lambeth Planning,

Re: PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 21/04356/FUL - Redevelopment of the former Woodlands and Masters House site

I am writing to log my opposition to the proposed development of the former Woodlands and Masters House site at 1 Dugard Way, SE11 4TH.

On 8th January 2021, following extensive local representation on the matter, a Public Inquiry led by the Planning Inspector rejected the original proposed put forward by Lifestory Group. Since then, new proposals have been put forward by the developer.

It is my view that the fundamental issues that were raised by the Planning Inspector in January have not been adequately addressed in the new proposals. It remains the case that, on balance, the proposed redevelopment of this site will cause unacceptable harms that are not outweighed by the overall benefits of the proposals.

In January, the Planning Inspector determined that the site in Kennington is an “urban” rather than a “central” site. As a result he found that this form of incongruous dense development was inappropriate for the site and had a substantial adverse impact on the character of the area. The new proposals from Lifestory continue to promote the sort of site development that is suited to a “central” rather than “urban” site.

Indeed, while the current proposals set out plans for 155 flats on the site, Section 6 of Lambeth’s own site allocation paper (Draft Lambeth SADPD - due to move to consultation in the new year 2022) suggests that 90 units would be an appropriate density for the site. Ultimately, the proposed density of the site is the direct cause of the harms set out by the Inspector that again have not been adequately addressed in the revised proposals.

Lifestory continues to allude to the nearby Elephant & Castle Economic Opportunity Zone as justification for over-development of the Woodlands site. While it is the case that Elephant & Castle has been identified as a regeneration area, with grounds for further densification, the

Woodlands site in question clearly falls outside this zone. This was further reinforced by the Planning Inspector earlier this year.

If our planning system is to have any meaning, then it would be only right to reject the current Lifestory application on these grounds: that this site sits squarely within an “urban” setting and that the density proposed for this site is therefore unsuited to it.

I hope that Lifestory will be put forward a more suitable proposal for a low-scale residential development suited to the area’s urban characterisation, where the benefits clearly outweigh the harmful effects.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Caroline Pidgeon', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

Liberal Democrat London Assembly Member