

GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY

Our reference: MGLA271124-5710

9 January 2025

Dear

Thank you for your recent correspondence in relation to your request for information.

In response to your queries:

1. I have a question though - are you able to confirm that this is all the information that I asked for? In particular I'm confused by the absence of anything here from Steve Reed MP.

Please accept our apologies for this omission. I can confirm that the representation from Steve Reed MP was received.

2. But can I ask you, can you confirm that this letter from Steve Reed was not among the representations considered for this planning application?

The matters raised in Steve Reed's letter (bulk, massing, proportion/out of character, overlooking, overshadowing, affordable housing and the quantum of single aspect units) are addressed in the GLA's Stage 2 report.

3. The same question applies, in fact, to Neil Garrett AM. I understand that he wrote to Deputy Mayor Jules Pipe about this application, but his name doesn't appear in the GLA planning report and his letter also doesn't appear in your response.

The representation from Neil Garratt AM was received on 21 October 2024 and could not have been considered as it was received after the decision meeting earlier that day. Please find attached for information.

Yours sincerely

Information Governance Officer

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

Information

Comment Name
a07Q50000d0Hze

Address
City Hall, Kamal Churchie Way, London, Essex, E16

Email
neil.garratt@london.gov.uk

Name
Public Comment

PlanApps comment?
☒

Planning Application

Consultation

Planning Application Old
[2022/0355](#)

Stance
Object

GLA Officer Review

Public
☐

Text
Dear *** Personal details have been removed ***,

I would urge you to reject the development of 100 Woodgate Drive in Lambeth (Ref 22/00300/FUL) by Hadley Property Group. This development is situated in a location that is visible from four London boroughs - Lambeth, Merton, Wandsworth and Croydon - with its construction having a detrimental effect on the local community in Streatham and the immediate vicinity in all boroughs, something the GLA has previously supported in their rejection of other applications.

Numerous local community groups including the Streatham Society and Friends of Streatham Common have expressed anger, frustration and disappointment that the proposal made it this far considering its inappropriateness.

I do not oppose the development of the site and bringing new homes to the area and would welcome a lower development more in-keeping with the local vernacular, but this proposal has significant flaws that not only make it wholly inappropriate for the community, but also means it is in breach of your own rules. It is a 14 storey tower in an area with 3 to 4 storey homes at most.

The frustration amongst residents is that the development is a lost opportunity to do something that would bring value and much needed services to the community. But this proposal has no architectural merit or warmth. The development would be a very bad precedent for the area and most likely lead to other very tall tower blocks in nearby areas.

The principle objections focus on the scale and density of the development which make it wholly unsuitable for the area and its clear breach of several legal requirements:

1. The development breaches the Lambeth Local Plan
2. The development contravenes the Immanuel church heritage site and protected Streatham Common view
3. The development has just 2 parking bays which will cause stress to surrounding streets
4. The impact from loss of light and privacy on local residents
5. The development is out of keeping and sets a precedent for the area, one that will permanently change its character
6. There is a chronic lack of capacity at Streatham Common station and other local transport links.
7. No provision for local community improvements including doctors, dentists, and schools

As the elected representative of people bordering this development, I call upon you to consider these submissions and exercise your power under Article 6 or 7 to refuse permission. This would also end the need to seek further legal recourse against the developers and local and regional planning authorities.
Yours sincerely

*** Personal details have been removed ***

Owner

 Planning Support

Comment status
Under review