

ANNEX

Examination into the Aylesbury Area Action Plan DPD

SCHEDULE OF SUGGESTED CHANGES

ISSUE 1 – October 2009

The changes below are expressed with strikethrough for deletions and underlining for additions of text

The first column distinguishes the three types of change. 'CS' relates to changes intended to achieve consistency with the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, 'C1 to C10' are those specifically set out in the Report and 'E' denotes alterations for editing and clarification purposes, largely as suggested by the Council.

The page and paragraph numbering refer to the submission DPD, and do not take account of the addition or deletion of text.

Type of Change	Page	Paragraph/ policy/ figure	Proposed change	LBS Comments
CS	Through-out document		Rename "masterplan area" as "core action area", throughout the document	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".
E	12	1.2.1	The Aylesbury Estate was constructed between 1966 and 1977 (<u>the location of the Aylesbury AAP area is shown in Figure 2</u>).	✓
CS	27	BH2	The masterplan area is designated as a Public Transport Accessibility Zone (PTAZ) as shown on the Proposals Map (see Figure 7). <u>The footprint of the Aylesbury estate is designated as a core</u>	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".

			<u>action area on the Proposals Map (see Figure 7).</u>	
CS	28	3.2.4	As regards public transport accessibility, the proposed average density will be in compliance with the London Plan density matrix (GLA 2008, Table 3A.2) for an urban setting with existing and future improved Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) ranging from 2-6. Increasing the number of homes and investing in schools, employment space, shops and community facilities will help to support future improvements in bus services (see policy TP2). The Walworth Road Public Transport Accessibility Zone (PTAZ), which is designated in the Southwark Plan, has therefore been extended to cover the AAP area. <u>In view of this context, higher densities are appropriate in the core action area.</u> Such an approach is supported by the London Plan (GLA, 2008, para 3.21).	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".
CS	28	3.2.5	Developments in the PTAZ <u>core action area</u> which exceed 700 habitable rooms per hectare will be expected to provide an exemplary standard of design with an excellent standard of living accommodation, in line with policy 4.1 of the Southwark Plan <u>the Core Strategy Preferred Options.</u>	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".
CS	29	Figure 7	Proposed masterplan <u>core action area</u>	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".
CS	29	Figure 7	Existing PTAZ – delete from Figure	✓
CS	29	Figure 7	Proposed PTAZ extension - delete from Figure	✓
CS	29	Figure 7	Amend the boundary of the AAP area as set out in the attached plan (Table of Changes Appendix A).	✓
C1	31	Policy BH3	BH3 Tenure mix <u>50% of new homes in the core action area will be affordable and 50% will be private.</u> We will require the following mix of tenures on <u>each proposals site</u> all proposals sites within the <u>core action masterplan area</u> :	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".

			<p><u>Proposals site AAAP1 (Phase 1)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>41% Private</u> • <u>59% Affordable</u> <p><u>Proposals sites AAAP2 and AAAP3 (Phases 2 and 3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>50% Private</u> • <u>50% Affordable</u> <p><u>Proposals site AAAP4 (Phase 4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>58% Private</u> • <u>42% Affordable</u> <p><u>Of the affordable housing provided, 75% should be social rented and 25% should be intermediate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% private • 50% affordable, of which 75% should be social rented and 25% should be intermediate 	
C2	32	3.3.8	<p>The testing we carried out on the masterplan demonstrated that a 50/50 <u>the splits between affordable and private housing set out in policy BH3 will be physically possible in all development blocks. Therefore, all</u> developments blocks should seek to provide the tenure mix <u>which is appropriate for the proposals site in which the block is located, as set out in policy BH3, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not possible through an openbook financial appraisal. A greater proportion of affordable units will be provided in the first phase in order to improve the deliverability of the scheme. This will be balanced by the provision of fewer affordable units in phase 4 to deliver the aim of achieving 50/50 split between affordable and private homes across the core action area. However, in</u> order to provide some flexibility, the policy seeks to ensure that the correct mix is provided across each phase as a whole,</p>	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".

			rather than per development block. We will monitor developments to ensure that the correct proportions are provided within each phase (see section 8).	
E	43	4.3.1	Add title "Reasons" above paragraph 4.3.1	✓
E	43	4.3.1	Policies PL2 and PL3 are designed to create an easy to understand, lively and interesting neighbourhood with safer, well overlooked streets and open spaces and a variety of buildings and blocks types to give more interest and character.	✓
C8	52	Policy PL8	We will transform Burgess Park so that it becomes a more attractive and better-used open space serving local people and south-east London. Improvements will encourage and celebrate sporting activities, healthy living, education, biodiversity and cultural diversity and will be designed to <u>facilitate open space activities which will</u> support and enhance the regeneration of the Aylesbury area. We will seek the provision of flexible outdoor spaces, particularly in Burgess Park, so that stage events and festivals can be held.	✓
E	52	4.5.6	We will also make it easier to move around the park by reducing the barriers to movement caused by Albany Road, Wells Way, Trafalgar Avenue, St. George's Way and other roads. These will become calmed routes, with high <u>quality and wide pedestrian and cycling crossings.</u>	✓
C4	53	5.3.3	Existing public transport accessibility levels (PTALs) are higher in the AAP areas closer to Walworth Road and Old Kent Road and are lower in the centre of the area. Simply redesigning the block layout in the masterplan area <u>Core Action Area</u> will raise PTALs as the masterplan layout brings homes closer to bus stops (existing and estimated masterplan <u>Core Action Area</u> PTALs are set out in Appendix 8). <u>However, it will be necessary to raise PTALs further and improvements to the frequency of the existing bus services which run through the Core Action Area as well as new routes to Peckham and</u>	Change is on Page 58, not page 53. Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".

			<u>Elephant and Castle will be sought in Phase 4 in co-operation with TfL and with developer funding.</u>	
E	57 and 111	Figures 15 and A6.2	Delete new Church Road as an access street.	✓
E	70	7.2.1	The first phase of development, Phase 1a, <u>started on site in April 2009.</u> starts on site shortly.	✓
C5	73	7.4.2	Fourth sentence: Delete £1.8 billion and £299m ; Insert <u>£1.2 billion and £169m.</u>	✓
E	73	7.4.3	We are in discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) (formerly Housing Corporation and English Partnerships) about the funding <u>for</u> the delivery of new replacement affordable rented and intermediate accommodation in phase 1.	✓
E	73	7.4.3	In addition, we have submitted a bid to the <u>secured £2m from the GLA under the Priority Parks scheme for £2m</u> to support improvements to Burgess Park. We have a commitment of £4m NDC match funding.	✓
E	74	Table 1 – Aylesbury Resource Centre	Add “Southwark Council” in column 3 and “Capital programme” in column 4.	✓
C9	78	Table 3 – PL2	Development should conform with the design guidance in Appendix 6.	✓
E	78	Table 4 – TP3	Parking provision should not exceed 0.4 spaces per home <u>averaged over the core action area as a whole.</u>	Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as “Action Area Core”.
E	86	A2.1.1	PPS1: Delivering Sustainable d Development	✓
E	86	A2.1.6	On issues in areas in which the AAP has no policies, for example on the use of metropolitan open land and the need to incorporate green roofs and sustainable urban drainage	✓

			systems, policies which are in the London Plan and Southwark Plan on these issues will apply.																									
E	88	Appendix 2	See revised appendix 2 (Table of Changes Appendix B).	✓																								
E	92	A3.1.2	All of the background work described in Part 1 of this document has been taken into account in preparing the AAP. Together with the extensive consultation a series of objectives have been developed. These are outlined in the following section <u>appendix 4</u> as place-making, delivery and sustainable development objectives.	✓																								
E	97	A4.1.4	The appraisal checks the preferred options for developing the AAP area against the set of sustainable development objectives set out above <u>below</u> .	✓																								
E	99	Appendix 5	See amended appendix 5 (Table of Changes appendix C).	✓																								
E	110	A6.5.2	Design streets so that pedestrians and cyclists feel safe.	✓																								
E	134	A6.6.11	Section A6.5.1	✓																								
E	142	A6.6.30	The location of balconies must however be balanced with the need to provide daylight to lower levels flats and to the street.	✓																								
C3	159	Table A7.1	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Phase</th> <th>Phase 1</th> <th>Phase 2</th> <th>Phase 3</th> <th>Phase 4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Site reference</td> <td>1a, 1b, 1ci, 1cii, 7, 10</td> <td>4a, 4b, 5</td> <td>6, 8, 9</td> <td>2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 11, 12, 13, 14</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. private units</td> <td>722 582</td> <td>322</td> <td>224</td> <td>846 986</td> <td>2,114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. social for rent units</td> <td>522 592</td> <td>241</td> <td>169</td> <td>635 565</td> <td>1,568</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Phase	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Total	Site reference	1a, 1b, 1ci, 1cii, 7, 10	4a, 4b, 5	6, 8, 9	2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 11, 12, 13, 14		No. private units	722 582	322	224	846 986	2,114	No. social for rent units	522 592	241	169	635 565	1,568	✓
Phase	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Total																							
Site reference	1a, 1b, 1ci, 1cii, 7, 10	4a, 4b, 5	6, 8, 9	2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 11, 12, 13, 14																								
No. private units	722 582	322	224	846 986	2,114																							
No. social for rent units	522 592	241	169	635 565	1,568																							

			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No. of intermediate units</td> <td>175 <u>245</u></td> <td>81</td> <td>57</td> <td>214 <u>144</u></td> <td>527</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total units</td> <td>1,419</td> <td>645</td> <td>450</td> <td>1,695</td> <td>4,209</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>34%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Redevelopment Phase</td> <td>2011 - 2016</td> <td>2013 - 2018</td> <td>2017-2020</td> <td>2020 - 2027</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	No. of intermediate units	175 <u>245</u>	81	57	214 <u>144</u>	527	Total units	1,419	645	450	1,695	4,209		34%	15%	11%	40%	100%	Redevelopment Phase	2011 - 2016	2013 - 2018	2017-2020	2020 - 2027		
No. of intermediate units	175 <u>245</u>	81	57	214 <u>144</u>	527																							
Total units	1,419	645	450	1,695	4,209																							
	34%	15%	11%	40%	100%																							
Redevelopment Phase	2011 - 2016	2013 - 2018	2017-2020	2020 - 2027																								
C6	161	A7.1.24	The model calculates the full lifetime cost of the capital programme at around £1.8 <u>£1.2</u> billion and has identified a total funding shortfall of around £299m <u>£169m</u> (see table 7A.2 for details). This does not take into account any social housing grant which might be available.		✓																							
C7	162	Table A7.2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Public sector funding requirement</th> <th>Total funding shortfall £m</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land value deficit</td> <td>76.185 <u>62.98</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Infrastructure costs (shortfall after developer contributions)</td> <td>20.737 <u>3.44</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leasehold acquisitions</td> <td>130.422 <u>65.73</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CPO enquiry costs</td> <td>1.500 <u>1.50</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Re-housing tenants, estate management and community safety</td> <td>21.853 <u>15.39</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demolition</td> <td>39.075 <u>11.28</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land disposal and programme management</td> <td>9.893 <u>9.00</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>299.665 <u>169.3</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Funding Income</td> <td><u>86.69</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Public sector funding requirement	Total funding shortfall £m	Land value deficit	76.185 <u>62.98</u>	Infrastructure costs (shortfall after developer contributions)	20.737 <u>3.44</u>	Leasehold acquisitions	130.422 <u>65.73</u>	CPO enquiry costs	1.500 <u>1.50</u>	Re-housing tenants, estate management and community safety	21.853 <u>15.39</u>	Demolition	39.075 <u>11.28</u>	Land disposal and programme management	9.893 <u>9.00</u>	Total	299.665 <u>169.3</u>	Funding Income	<u>86.69</u>		✓			
Public sector funding requirement	Total funding shortfall £m																											
Land value deficit	76.185 <u>62.98</u>																											
Infrastructure costs (shortfall after developer contributions)	20.737 <u>3.44</u>																											
Leasehold acquisitions	130.422 <u>65.73</u>																											
CPO enquiry costs	1.500 <u>1.50</u>																											
Re-housing tenants, estate management and community safety	21.853 <u>15.39</u>																											
Demolition	39.075 <u>11.28</u>																											
Land disposal and programme management	9.893 <u>9.00</u>																											
Total	299.665 <u>169.3</u>																											
Funding Income	<u>86.69</u>																											

			Funding Gap	82.63	
			Table A7.2: Total funding shortfall Public Sector Funding Requirement		
E	162	7.1.31	The council has submitted a bid to <u>secured £2m from</u> the GLA under the Priority Parks scheme for £2m to support improvements to Burgess Park. We have a commitment of £4m NDC match funding.		✓
E	166	A.8.1.1	The following plans show <u>indicative public transport accessibility levels across the Aylesbury AAP area both as they are now (Figure A8.1) and as they might be following the redevelopment of the estate (Figure A.1a). The increases in PTALs shown in Figure A8.1a are due to the fact that following redevelopment, blocks in the core action area will be smaller and routes to bus stops will be more direct.</u>		✓
E	166	A.8.1.2	It should be noted, however, that the plan showing the proposed PTAL is indicative only. Improvements to bus services will bring further improvements to PTALs. PTALs in the core action area taking into account both the masterplan layout and bus service improvements are shown in Figure A8.2. (Nb. The plan is based on the improvement of service frequencies for existing transport routes through the area and does not consider the introduction of new routes or the modification of existing routes.) This plan demonstrates that improvements to bus services will result in higher levels of public transport accessibility. This accessibility will be further increased with the introduction of new routes as proposed within the AAP.		Core Strategy publication draft/submission document refers to this as "Action Area Core".
E	167	New figure (The new	Insert new figure as follows: <u>A8.1a Indicative proposed public transport accessibility, taking into account the masterplan</u>		✓

		figure can be seen in the Transport and Movement Strategy Figure 3).	<u>layout</u>	
E	167	Figure A8.2	Figure A8.2: Indicative proposed public transport accessibility, <u>taking into account the masterplan layout and bus service improvements</u>	✓
E	170	Glossary	<u>Annual Monitoring Report</u> <u>This is produced every year as part of the local development framework. It sets out how well our planning policies are performing based on a range of different indicators.</u>	✓
E	171	Glossary	<u>Community Infrastructure Levy</u> <u>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a government proposal which will enable local authorities to make a charge for most types of new development in their area. CIL charges will be calculated using a formula and will be based on the size of a development. Funds raised by the CIL can be spent on infrastructure, such as public transport improvements, schools, parks etc. needed to support the development of the area</u>	✓
E	174	Glossary	<u>Public Transport Accessibility Zone (PTAZ) Areas within urban or suburban zones, which have better public transport, significant potential for new development and investment, and a mixed use character including significant retail development (Southwark Plan 2007, Appendix 18)</u>	✓
E	174	Glossary	<u>Planning brief</u>	✓

			<p><u>Planning briefs are prepared by a local authority as a guide for developers interested in buying and developing a site. They may contain more detailed information about the number of homes which can fit on a site, the design of homes, levels of car parking etc. They are not used to help assess planning applications, unless they are adopted as supplementary planning documents.</u></p>	
E	175	Glossary	<p><u>S106 Planning Obligation</u> <u>These are also called planning gain or section 106 contributions. Applicants for major developments are usually required to provide payments to offset the impact of their scheme and make it acceptable. This may include improved transport, environment, employment, housing or recreation facilities. They could also be built as part of a development rather than provided as a payment.</u></p>	✓