

Waterloo Community Development Group

A Company Limited by Guarantee, registered in England & Wales
Registration No. 4269850
Registered Charity No. 1114299
Registered Office: 14a Baylis Rd, London SE1 7AA
Tel: 020 7633 9291 Fax: 020 7401 2469
Website: www.wcdg.org.uk
Email: admin@wcdg.org.uk



Sri Hall
London Borough of Lambeth
Phoenix House
10 Wandsworth Rd
London SW8 2LL

3 September 2007

Dear Sri

RE: Elizabeth House, 39 York Road, SE1 Pl. Appl. No, 07/02628/FUL

WCDG is funded by Lambeth Council to consult the local Waterloo community on redevelopment proposals and make representations as appropriate.

WCDG has received four presentations on the proposals over the past year at various well attended public meetings:

- 28/06/06 – presentation at general meeting by P&O of applicant's aspirations for the site and the results of the public design competition, including details of the winning design
- 17/01/07 – presentation at general meeting by Allies & Morrison and P&O on the re-design of the competition scheme
- 26/04/07 – special meeting convened for full presentation of proposals prior to submission of planning application; presentation by Allies & Morrison, P&O, and planning consultants
- 11/07/07 – presentation at general meeting by P&O and planning consultants, focusing specifically on questions raised at the earlier meeting in April.

The minutes of these meetings are appended at the end of this letter.

In addition I have had three meetings with Allies & Morrison and P&O to go through details in the application and to discuss the elements of the proposed s106 agreement.

The outcome of those consultation meetings has been mixed although tending toward the positive. ***In summary, while there are aspects which are less attractive and we would wish were different, the proposals bring significant benefits in various ways which on balance outweigh our concerns. Nevertheless there remain aspects which we believe require further attention from the local planning authority before permission is granted. Generally we are more positive about the lower parts of the proposals, but more negative the higher it gets.***

The response to this application has been very much coloured by the fact that, unhappily, planning permission already exists for a scheme which we believe to be seriously flawed. We objected strongly to this proposal in the years prior to the outline permission being granted in 1996, and it was extremely unsatisfactory that the authority managed to keep that permission 'alive' by agreeing to suspend determination of the details submitted in 1999. Unfortunately

Lambeth finally granted permission for the details in 2005. As a result the applicant has made clear at consultation that it may consider implementing this permission if the current proposals prove unacceptable. Therefore a prime consideration for us has been not whether the application is an improvement on the current situation (of which there are mixed views), but whether it is an improvement on the approved scheme. Furthermore the approved scheme has effectively established the principle of the large scale of any redevelopment and the acceptability of major intensification of use on the site, as well as the use primarily for office development.

In consideration of this application we have also been very mindful of the aspirations in the London Plan for Waterloo as an Opportunity Area, and the general thrust of the Waterloo Development Framework. In particular we accept the need for increased densities and intensification of use of key sites in Waterloo, and we accept the principle of a cluster of tall buildings around Waterloo Station, which clearly includes the application site. Moreover, we strongly support the concept that intensification through major increases in height should also bring clear community benefits which contribute to ensuring Waterloo is a place capable of sustaining residents, workers, commuters and visitors.

Clearly once these two aspects are taken into account – namely, the existing permission and the planning aspirations – then some of the key principles are effectively determined, and consideration instead focuses on ensuring that the details of the design adequately meet these aspirations and the claims made on their behalf. This is borne out by the conclusion of the minutes of our most recent meeting in July:

“There were mixed views about the proposals. Some thought the design ugly, undistinguished, lumpy, and indicative of overdevelopment, but others felt the current buildings were much uglier and in poor condition, and P&O already had permission for something rather worse. There were concerns over the safety of trees on the roof, and evidence that it would be windy at ground level in the public spaces; nevertheless the back of the building was a clear improvement on the current car park, and tube access was much improved. Generally the meeting was more positive about the lower parts of the proposals, but got more negative the higher it got.”

1) Consultation

As demonstrated by the various meetings referred to above, the applicant has proved exemplary at consulting with the local community through WCDG, and has always been responsive to our questions and concerns – they have produced upon request a number of visual representations from specific local viewing points, for example. Their approach throughout the development of the proposals from the 2006 public competition has been very helpful in ensuring that there is a very clear understanding of this application within the local community.

2) Overdevelopment and the absence of an area masterplan

Many of the aspects of concern highlighted below are potentially indicative of overdevelopment of the site. This issue is clearly related to the lack of a masterplan of some form for this and adjacent sites. All four sites stretching from the station to the river are proposed for redevelopment – the application site, the Shell Centre, Waterloo station, and the Hungerford Car Park. As a group these form an extremely significant part of central London, yet there is no clear plan for how the redevelopment of each site will contribute to the regeneration of the adjacent sites and the area as a whole. The site of any new buildings on the Shell

site will be circumscribed by this application were it approved; this would itself impact upon the potential redevelopment of the vile Hungerford Car Park. The arrangements of tall buildings, basement development, traffic and servicing, public spaces and pedestrian movement are inter-related between these 4 sites. While the applicant has clearly (and successfully) considered the relationship to the potential redevelopment of the station, they have not been able to be so mindful of the potential redevelopment of the Shell Centre and Hungerford car park due to the lack of a masterplan or more detailed development framework for the area.

3) Land Use

In order for Waterloo to significantly intensify land uses whilst achieving a sustainable community it is necessary that all large sites are developed with a mix of uses. Waterloo generates over a third of the employment in Lambeth, and this function needs to increase, so using the main part of the site for large offices is entirely appropriate, and we acknowledge to some extent the fact that the large floorplates necessary to ensure the successful lease of the offices means that the building do need to be bulky. The additional employees that the development will bring will help improve the viability of the nearby shopping centre at Lower Marsh. For this reason we would not want to see more A1 or A3 uses on the site than those proposed, which replace the miserable shops currently stretching along York road. We welcome the residential element of the proposals – Waterloo needs more residents – and the affordable element, although we would wish that this element was increased to 50%. We also have concerns about the lack of appropriate levels of amenity space in the residential. The only way that we can envisage this being mitigated would be through a very generous contribution towards the £4m shortfall on the Jubilee Gardens project, and would expect at least £1m, commensurate with other s106 agreements on adjacent sites.

4) Impact of design and height of proposals

The initial 2006 proposals were considerably higher than the current application, and met with much concern. Following concerns about the impact upon the World Heritage Site the height of the three towers have been reduced to roughly that of the adjacent Shell Centre. As stated above, there is an acceptance that in order to achieve the aspirations for intensification of land use in Waterloo tall buildings may be appropriate in the sites on and around the station. However, in the absence of a more detailed planning framework for a cluster of tall buildings than that provided in the Waterloo Development Framework, it is quite difficult to assess the impact of tall buildings on the application site alone. It is our view that the station itself is the best site for tall buildings – both in terms of minimising the negative impact and marking the transport node and the most significant part of Waterloo – but we realise that this view is not necessarily shared, and the absence of any specific proposals for the station makes consideration of applications on sites adjacent to the station all the more difficult. In visual townscape terms the heights of the proposed towers appear to be commensurate with the concept of a cluster of tall buildings around the station, and are not so tall as to preclude something taller on the station itself.

In general terms, therefore, the heights of the three proposed buildings are tolerable. However, tall buildings should be assessed on their specific impact locally. The hostility of Waterloo residents to tall buildings is widespread and is based upon the daily unpleasantness experienced around the existing tall buildings in Waterloo, all of which are shorter than that proposed (e.g. Shell Centre, 3i's/ Union Jack Club, Century House). The following concerns were raised in consultation:

- Impact of shadowing, particularly upon St John's Church and the Roupell Street Conservation Area, and Jubilee Gardens. However, the shadow analysis suggests that this shadowing will be transitional at the worst times of year, and negligible at other

times of year. We are concerned about 15% of the new public spaces which will suffer from permanent shadowing, and suggest more thought needs to go into this – see below

- Impact upon microclimate: the additional winds and turbulence caused by other local tall buildings demonstrates that most tall buildings create very serious microclimate problems (the Gherkin is the only tall building in central London we are aware of which does not do so) including very unpleasant downdrafts. The South Bank area already suffers from being windswept as a result of its monumental buildings and proximity to the river: however, the application is unlikely to exacerbate this problem given its proximity to the Shell Centre and Waterloo Station. Furthermore, the current slab building which stretches along York Road contributes to the high winds and poor environment along York Road; the Environmental Statement seems to bear out the expectation that the proposed breaks in development along York Road will improve this poor environment, and this is welcomed. However, we are concerned about the new public spaces between the buildings, which will suffer in some parts from unacceptable levels of wind and turbulence, and only moderately tolerable conditions elsewhere in these spaces, according to the Environmental Statement. The applicant appears to unintentionally acknowledge this problem since they are proposing some glassed-in booths on the public spaces which could be managed by the cafés in the ground floors of the buildings. We don't consider the proposals sufficiently thought through on this aspect, and suggest more work needs to go into designing baffles or other additions (the Environmental Statement makes some proposals) to improve the environmental conditions and to ensure that the 15% in permanent shadow is somehow useable.
- Impact upon local views: views of the London Eye from the hinterland to the east will be blocked, in particular the view from Millennium Green and Waterloo Road. These views are very important for the local residential community, most of whom live east/south of the station: this view marks clearly the direction of the river. The skyline to the east/south will be completely dominated by the proposals: it is therefore a shame that there has been insufficient thought gone into the view of the buildings from this side: we would like to see greater articulation, and perhaps even a more radical twisting of the two office buildings, to provide a more interesting view. The pictures provided by the applicant of the proposals viewed from Kennington Road/ Imperial War Museum suggest an even more uninteresting view over the station. The view from Roupell Street Conservation Area is also significantly harmed, although it is already compromised by the existing tower and the Shell tower.
- Impact upon amenity of adjacent residents in County Hall and Roupell Street area of loss of daylight/sunlight and views of the sky – we accept the Environmental Statement's assessment that this impact would be relatively minor.

In addition there is a more general concern regarding the impact of the proposals upon the general amenity of local residents and others in the area in terms of oppressiveness of the tall buildings. Not only are the proposed buildings tall, the office buildings in particular are very bulky – significantly more bulky than anything currently on the site, or the adjacent Shell Centre.

The only direct mitigation to the massive bulk proposed would be the new open spaces created around them (including the pedestrian improvements to York Road). These spaces are a critical component making the bulky buildings potentially acceptable. It is therefore absolutely essential that these spaces are as attractive and useable as possible, and that they are perceived as 3 inviting and genuinely inclusive new piazzas for London. They will need to perform many different functions, as destinations in themselves, as places to pass through hurriedly or languidly, as places to shop or eat/ drink, as meeting places, and as places for just idling. We are not convinced that the plans as yet meet these requirements. Concerns about

the microclimate and shadowing of these spaces is evidenced in the Environmental Statement, and we have further concerns about the arrangement of glass boxes within the spaces, and the public use of the spaces. **We strongly suggest that the details of the design of these open spaces, including any mitigating structures as suggested in the Environmental Statement, are dealt with as reserved matters.**

The overall design of the 3 towers has met a mixed reception at public meetings, with some considering them ugly, lumpy, over-bulky, and over-bearing, particularly in relation to the overhanging of public space created by the twisting of the buildings. Others considered them undistinguished and not radical enough in terms of the twisting or other elements of the design. There was greater support for the view that the east side of the application site will be a considerable improvement upon the current mess of roads, ramps, rubbish tips and car parks.

5) Residential

We welcome the residential element of the proposals, and the element of affordable housing, although we would wish it were 50% of the hrh of the development. This proposal would go some way to addressing Lambeth's very poor performance in meeting its affordable completion targets (Lambeth is achieving only 62% of its target, and is currently 889 homes short to hit the 2016 target). We particularly welcome the fact that the affordable housing is within the same building as the private housing – a first for South London, where all previous major developments have separated private and affordable housing into different buildings. We also accept the argument for the mix of sizes of flats.

However, as stated above we have concerns about the amount of amenity space for residents. Lambeth's draft Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions' (June 2007), which relates to PPS3 (para 16 and 17), London Plan (Further Alterations) Policy 3D.11, and LBL UDP Policies 32 and 45, states

"Sufficient outdoor amenity space must be provided in new residential developments. It can be provided in the form of private garden space or as communal amenity space. The expectation is for provision to be made on site though, if not feasible, appropriate contributions would be required for off-site provision... For new flats, communal gardens are required at a minimum of 50m² per development with an additional 10m² per flat... Communal gardens should comply with the following standards: ... receive sunlight, even in the winter" (para 2.6-2.9)

We believe that these concerns could at best be partially mitigated by a significant contribution to nearby open space and playgrounds at Jubilee Gardens.

We have not looked in detail at the residential space standards and whether the application meets Lambeth's draft SPD 'Guidance and Standards for Housing Development and House Conversions' (June 2007), which details residential space standards required by PPS3 (para 10) and RUDP Policy 32. The draft SPD proposes minimum overall floor area for new build. The GLA commissioned report 'Housing Space Standards' August 2006 recommends larger minimum internal dwelling areas (MIDA) based upon the number of potential occupants: it notes, for example, that 4 people (2 children and 2 adults) may well end up live in a 2-bed flat.

We support the GLA's widespread concerns about the absence of clear space standards and the long-term decline in standards, and note the following comments from the GLA (in the brief commissioning HATC Ltd in 2006 to investigate these concerns):

"There has been growing concern that the internal space of new dwellings may be getting smaller. There is evidence that less family size housing is being provided. There is however concern that internal space within both family and non-family homes may also be reducing. This has implications for both accessibility and for sustainability and for quality

of life including health. In addition there is a relationship between size of units and affordability. In recent years, Government targets have focused on unit output rather than the quality of provision. The London Plan, while establishing general design principles (including Lifetime Homes and wheelchair provision), does not give specific guidance on standards. It is imperative that good quality housing is provided to create a suitable and sustainable living environment for now and future generations.” (GLA/ HATC ‘Housing Space Standards’ August 2006)

6) Parking

We greatly welcome the fact that this would be a ‘zero car’ development, removing the current 150 parking spaces. This will be a benefit both in terms of more efficient and attractive land use with the removal of the appalling current surface car parking; it will also be a benefit towards the health of Waterloo residents, who currently suffer from the worst air quality in Lambeth (particularly at the nearby County Hall island site). Clearly this will also contribute towards sustainability.

7) Servicing

Although we can see the benefits of the approach to servicing on Leake Street, with 6 lorries an hour using 2 truck lifts, and a taxi drop-off point, we are concerned about the potential impediment or disincentive to pedestrian use of Leake Street. Leake Street is a key route through to Lower Marsh from the South Bank, particularly from the application site. Lower Marsh is the most important amenity for Waterloo residents, and any threat to its vitality or viability must be averted. The proposed development could bring several thousand new shoppers to Lower Marsh, which will be extremely beneficial, but their main means of access is Leake Street. The design of the residential tower and the location of the servicing area turns its back on Leake Street, and the vehicle movements would be likely to confuse pedestrians. The 2005 feasibility for improvements to Leake Street illustrated that appropriate improvements could be undertaken, although they would be costly at £900,000. There is already contributions from nearby developments at County Hall island site and from Shell (via s106 agreements attached to their permissions); we would therefore expect the applicants to provide a handsome contribution towards improvements to Leake Street and its entrance to Lower Marsh, including signage.

8) Other issues

- **Safety:** We have raised safety concerns with the applicant regarding the proposed trees on the roof of the lower office building. This seems an attractive touch, but there are concerns about pieces of tree breaking off in high winds and falling 400ft to pedestrians below. We are not aware of the response of the applicant to this issue and are not clear as to a design solution (a glass wall around the trees?). We therefore suggest that this is dealt with as a reserved matter
- **S106 agreement:** as stated above, if the application were to be approved we would expect to see a significant contribution of at least £1m towards open space and playgrounds at Jubilee Gardens, and £400,000 or more towards the £900,000 cost of improving the Leake Street/ Lower Marsh connection. The residential element of the application will also generate educational needs. If Waterloo is to become a place capable of supporting the expected major intensification of land use it needs a major upgrade of its key community facilities, in particular a public library. Waterloo has suffered a temporary library since 1966, and the recent Lambeth Libraries review recommended that a new facility be pursued urgently. Lambeth is required to provide library facilities for all residents, students and workers in Lambeth, and Waterloo has a very high

number of workers and students in addition to its residents. This application will increase the number of workers and residents considerably, and we would expect to see a very generous contribution towards the development of a new permanent library in Waterloo.

We look forward to you taking the above points into consideration when making recommendations for the determination of this application.

Yours sincerely

Michael Ball
Director, WCDG

APPENDIX 1

Waterloo Community Development Group

Minutes of General Meeting 7 July 2007

PRESENT:	Doris Newnham	David Clarson	Jenny Hines	Sgt Kevin Hyder
	Pauline Anderson	Barry Rawlings	Jenny Styles	Jo Smith
	Enid Kakaire	Jean Chandler	Collette West	Jenny Williamson
	Reg Grossman	Charles Chan	Michael Wolfers	Ken Hamilton
	Melanie Tighe	Von Sleightman	Rosa Wright	Robin Dahlberg
	Helen Lyons	Margaret Mellor	Michael Ball	Eileen Hamilton
	David Mills	David Fisher	Elizabeth Broadbridge	Rebecca Baster
	Roger Sweet	Clare Ballard-Yawson		
APOLOGIES:	Jean Bates	Mary Dove	Wendy Mathews	Patricia Moberly
	CLlr Peter Truesdale	CLlr Diana Braithwaite	Rev. Richard Truss	Robin Pembroke
	Karen Phillip			

2) Minutes from previous meeting: Agreed **3) Matters arising:** none. The Chair noted that Waterloo Community Regeneration Trust (WCRT) had finally been wound up, having run since 2001, and thanked Clare Ballard-Yawson for all of her efforts. WCRT had forced organisations to work together positively, and WaCoCo would continue these partnerships. Clare received a picture and reminded everybody that elections to WaCoCo continue to September.

4) The Future for Living Space/ Play Space – Jo Smith, Business Manager, Living Space; Jenny Hinds, Blackfriar’s Settlement at Play Space

Ten years ago WCDG began a regeneration project to create Millennium Green, a new adventure playground, and a community building which became Living Space. The building was opened in 2002 by Lambeth Council as a community learning centre and social enterprise. In addition to providing a broad range of youth and community services for local residents it also operates commercial services including an internet café. Jenny explained that she had been working on the site with children since 1988, and Play Space, run by Blackfriars Settlement, provides internal space for children and young people, and the necessary supervision of the adventure playground. Jo explained that Lambeth was now considering turning over the whole site to a ‘Community Interest Company’. This would be run as a commercial business with the assets of the building and site ‘locked in’ to the company; it would be completely independent of the Council, with local people on the Board making decisions,. Michael reminded the meeting that WCDG had recently undertaken a survey of community assets as the first step to better community use of the numerous sites owned by the council but under-used by the community. A workshop followed – see separate sheet.

5) Redevelopment of Elizabeth House, York Road – David Hudson (P&O), (architect)

P&O had presented plans in January and April, and were now providing answers to previous questions. They were proposing replacing the 1960’s tower and slab building currently along York Road with 3 unusual twisting blocks up to 27 storeys, for offices, housing and shops. There would be publicly accessible space at ground floor – the equivalent of nearly twice Parliament Square – and new links into Waterloo Station. The heights of all 3 buildings would be similar to the Shell tower, highest 115m. The impact of shadowing would be minimal, with no shadowing on residents, apart from some very minimal transient (i.e. lasting up to 2 hours) shadowing on the Roupell Street area at a few times of the year. Of the new public spaces created around the buildings, only 15% would be in permanent shadow. Local views: residents facing the site from County Hall would have some views opened up, but some sky blocked. From Millennium Green the buildings would appear large over the station roof, and that views of the Eye would be almost completely obscured. The buildings would be less defined in the view from Kennington Rd/ Imperial War Museum, and would appear as a general wall of development. The most northerly building would also be very visible from Roupell Street. Microclimate and winds: the original schemes had had significant problems, but with revisions the wind along York Rd would be less or equal to current conditions. There would be mainly ‘comfortable’ walking conditions in the 3 new open spaces, and comfortable for sitting in some parts of these spaces. David pointed out that the appalling conditions at the 3i tower on Waterloo Rd pre-dated the requirement to wind-test all major proposals, and these mistakes would not be repeated. Parking: this would be a ‘zero car’ development, removing the current 150 parking spaces. Servicing would be on Leake Street, with 6 lorries an hour using 2 truck lifts, and a taxi drop-off point; there would also be one on York Road. From November taxis would no longer go through Leake Street with the closure of the Waterloo International Terminal. Public transport improvements would include new lifts and escalators directly into the Underground ticketing area, and better bus stop waiting areas on York Rd, although Transport for London would be responsible for maintenance of lifts/ escalators. P&O were expecting to spend £15m -17m on the public realm including the 3 new open spaces; £9m of this would be outside their site on adjacent roads and spaces. There would be 4,800 employees in the offices (an additional 3,000 on current levels), and 500 new residents, with 40% of the new flats affordable. Michael pointed out that he had already suggested to P&O that they should be making a large contribution towards the capital cost of a new library, £1m towards transformation of Jubilee Gardens to match that offered by Shell, as well funding improvements to Leake Street and Lower Marsh.

There were mixed views about the proposals. Some thought the design ugly, undistinguished, lumpy, and indicative of overdevelopment, but others felt the current buildings were much uglier and in poor condition, and P&O already had permission for something rather worse. There were concerns over the safety of trees on the roof, and evidence that it would be windy at ground level in

the public spaces; nevertheless the back of the building was a clear improvement on the current car park, and tube access was much improved. Generally the meeting was more positive about the lower parts of the proposals, but got more negative the higher it got.

6) **Any other business:** a complaint about late night license for the Young Vic: the new architecture reverberates the sound extremely badly, which was bouncing out of the building into surrounding streets. The new licensing process decides individual licenses on their merits, not by general policies, but Sgt Kevin Hyder explained that licences which had been issued could be challenged and the license removed, and that this had happened successfully at Isabella Street. It was agreed WCDG needs to scrutinize more closely acoustic issues arising from planning applications.

Waterloo Community Development Group

Minutes of General Meeting 17 January 2007

PRESENT:	David Clarson	Eileen Hamilton	Doris Newnham	Wendy Matthews
Jim McElvogue	Robin Pembroke	Maureen Robinson	Margaret Mellor	Robin Dahlberg
Austin Winkley	Nicola Brooker	Jean Bates	Cllr Peter Truesdale	Vivienne Legg
Pauline Anderson	Donald Weighton	Charles Chan	Marina Thaine	Michael Ball
David Appin	Charlotte Parry	Helen Lees	Juergen Uren	J Joyce
Rosa Wright	M. Payton	R. Thom	Linda Barret	Rev. Richard Truss
Andrew Barret	David Fisher	Harold Simmons	Ron Lynn	H Joyce
Ken Hamilton	J Smith	Richard Woollard	Les Elliot	James Hatts
Sarah-Jane Lucus	Sheila Needham	Patricia Moberly	David Goh	Von Seightman
Steven Black	Sunjay Makwana			

APOLOGIES: Phylis Caine	May Cummins	Pat Scott	Andrea Dahlberg
Christopher Brooker	Dorethee Boukacem	Cllr Diana Braithwaite	Cllr Stephen Morgan

1) **Minutes from previous meeting:** Agreed

2) **Matters arising:** none

The Chair spoke of the death of Ian Gwalter over the holiday period. Ian had been a spirited campaigner and had long championed the rights of the disabled; he had been a great supporter of WCDG and would be sadly missed.

3) **Redevelopment of Elizabeth House, York Road – Graham Morrison (architect), David Hudson (P&O)**

In 1996 P&O received planning permission for 900,000 sq ft of offices and shops at ground floor in 3 blocks along York Road, which would replace the currently dilapidated Elizabeth House and tower along York Road. But in 2006 architects Allies & Morrison were appointed to create a new design. Graham outlined the constraints: 3 tube lines run under the site creating engineering problems of where to pile foundations; thousands of commuters and tourists passing through (including 1 million annually to St Thomas' Hospital); an unwanted taxi run and car parking separating the site from the station; and English Heritage concerns about views from Parliament Square and St James' Park. A priority for redevelopment would be connecting Sutton Walk, Jubilee Gardens, the Eye and the hospital to the station at ground level, and creating attractive public spaces on the site. Pulling back from York Rd and widening the pavements would reduce the dominance of York Rd. Removing the taxi run was a preference but this was up to the Department of Transport. Three unusual twisting blocks up to 27 storeys were proposed for 1.4 million sq ft of offices, housing (including 40% affordable) and shops, with publicly accessible space and new lifts into the underground. The buildings were informally arranged to avoid a monolithic wall of development, and to suggest pedestrian routes through. The tallest building in the development will be around the same height as Shell tower (109m) and the hub of the London Eye. They were working with Network Rail to fit the options being developed for the redevelopment of Waterloo Station.

There were concerns about the lack of a masterplan – with the Shell centre and Hungerford car park also being considered for redevelopment. How useful would the public spaces be if they are overshadowed by buildings leaning inwards? Wouldn't they be very windy as a result of the tall buildings? Was the twisting of the buildings just part of the fad for creating "iconic" buildings? What was the impact upon views, daylight and shadowing of going from current 16 storeys to 27 storeys? Apart from the new entrances to the underground, how will the currently overloaded services cope with several thousand more workers and residents? What would be the impact upon Leake Street and access to the south of the station? And what of the impact upon Lower Marsh shops? There was support for the redevelopment of the current ugly buildings, car parks and ramps. The developers were going in the right direction by reducing heights by 40% from original proposals. Thousands of additional people in Waterloo could also help Lower Marsh shops. Nevertheless, the concerns and questions raised needed to be addressed. A planning application is expected in February.

4) **Redevelopment of Partnership House, 157 Waterloo Road** – the developers had received negative comments from Lambeth and didn't wish to attend until they had 'clarified' their proposals.

5) **Transforming Jubilee Gardens – Don Weighton (Friend of Jubilee Gardens), Michael Ball (WCDG)**

Michael explained that planning permission granted in spring 2006 for completely new Gardens – with hills, cliffs, and a bridge. The scheme was worked up by a steering group involving local community groups, the South Bank Centre and other business interests. The steering group will become an independent Trust to manage the Gardens, but the project is currently held up by lack of funds (in September the Lottery rejected a £3m bid, but there is £2m already committed). Don explained that the 'cliff' walls would cost

£600,000 and paths a further £340,000; both could be done more cheaply in brick or removed altogether from the scheme, although this would undermine the design. £1m of savings had already been found from the £7m design, but further savings could also be made by developing parts of the Gardens incrementally as funding became available. The unanimous view of the meeting was that the funding shortfall was not enormous and Waterloo needed and deserved the highest quality Gardens; the scheme already had strong community support, so the steering group should stick to its guns and keep the pressure up to find funding. There was also unanimous support for an independent Trust owning and managing the site, properly autonomous of the South Bank Centre and any other interest, with community representation on the Board.

7) Any Other Business – none

Waterloo Community Development Group

Minutes of General Meeting 28 June 2006

PRESENT:	Charles Chan	Ken Hamilton	Eileen Hamilton	Jenni Williamson	
	Robin Dahlberg	David Fisher	Pauline Anderson	Rosa Wright	
	Von Sleightman	Michael Wolfers	Ian Adams	Chris Watkins	
	M Payton	David Goh	Michael Ball	R Newton	
	Patricia Moberly	Chris Smith	James Hatts	David Mills	M
Payten	Ron Lynn	Wendy Mathews	David Alpin		
	Tim Pollard	Sarah-Jane Lucas	Sunjay Makwana	Lesley Price	
	Stephen Bull	D Crossman	Helen Lees	Ken Ward	
	CLlr Gavin Dodsworth				
APOLOGIES:	David Clarson	Phyllis Caine	Chris Brooker	Nicola Brooker	
	Hilda Joyce	John Joyce	Cllr Peter Truesdale	Cllr Diana Braithwaite	

1) Minutes from previous meeting – agreed

2) Matters arising – none

3) Elizabeth house and Waterloo Tower, York Road – William Ederly (Managing Director P&O estates)

William explained that P&O acquired the site in the 1960's, and in 1991 proposed redevelopment to double the office space to around 100,000m² (opposed by WCDG at the time). Details of this proposal were finally approved in 2005, by which time P&O felt that they were outdated and put in an application for a large tower with glass canopy across York Road. This application was withdrawn following adverse comments from Ken Livingstone, although height or size was not a concern to London's Mayor – and the site is identified for tall buildings in the Waterloo Development Framework. In 2005 P&O held an international competition to find an architect and new design for the site. William showed models of the four finalists and of the winning design by Allies & Morrison for 3 towers of mixed-use.

The key aims of the redevelopment are (i) create major new office space, plus flats and shops; (ii) create uses and tall buildings which will form part of a cluster of tall buildings around the station, and which will relate to and complement Waterloo International Terminal, due to be de-commissioned in 2007 and whose future use is not clear; (iii) improving pedestrian and disabled access to the station, the underground, and York Road and the South Bank, replacing the current canyon on York Road and unsightly car parks behind.

Shops, cafés and restaurants were proposed for most ground floor uses, punctuated with escalators and lifts into the station and underground, including a direct connection to the Waterloo & City line. The taxi road would be removed, the York Road pavement widened its central reservation removed; the high-level may be retained, but P&O were flexible on this. There would be only 20 parking places (currently 186). The mix of large and small flats would include affordable housing. There would also be a major s106 contribution towards local services. P&O hope to submit an application in October and to have redeveloped the site within 5 years.

There were strong concerns about the impact of such a large development upon many aspects of life in Waterloo, including (i) overdevelopment and general congestion – was Waterloo capable of absorbing large quantities of additional people? (ii) the height (appx 180m – nearly twice the height of Shell tower) would dominate the area being viewed, blocking views of the Eye, the river and the South Bank, casting long shadows across Waterloo; (iii) although it was 3 towers at ground floor it would feel like a wall of development and could replicate the current canyon; (iv) impact upon transport system. Although the meeting welcomed reduced parking and removal of the taxi run, and that the proposals may enhance the experience of visitors and commuters, there was no benefit whatsoever for the Waterloo community.

4) Current Planning Applications

a) Waterloo Health Centre: An application to temporarily extend the thriving but cramped doctor's surgery into an adjacent shop unit in Lower Marsh district shopping centre. A similar application was submitted in 2005 but withdrawn following objections regarding loss of shops. The surgery has 6,500 patients and 6 doctors (plus 2 nurses). The current 269m² provides only 50% of the recommended area required for a health centre. The application could provide an additional 130m² which will allow for a further 5 years of use. There had been support previously for the aspirations to improve the facilities of this valuable service, but there were concerns about the loss of yet another shop unit on Lower Marsh. WCDG had met with the health authority on a number of occasions to investigate alternative sites, but none had been identified as available. Therefore the meeting agreed to support the proposals as a temporary measure.

b) County Hall Island Site Westminster Bridge Road: built in 1968, vacant since 1986, various permissions for redevelopment since

1999 for offices and/or hotel. Permission granted 2004 for 743-bed hotel, in 2005 for 913-bed hotel: now an application for 953-bed hotel plus 3 additional floors in basement for a conference centre, private swimming pool and gym. This application brought no benefit to the local community other than through the s106 agreement to improve some pedestrian areas, and the amounts proposed were inadequate. WCDG to object to the level of s106 proposed.

5) Any Other Business – none