

Southwark Borough Council Core Strategy Examination
Hearing Session 8 28th July 2010 @ 10.00 Tooley St Offices

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Examination of Matter 8 – Housing

Focus for Discussion:

Is the Core Strategy's approach to housing provision deliverable, sufficiently justified and consistent with the London Plan and national planning policy in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS 3)? Is the Core Strategy effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the Borough, including students?

- i. To what extent is the Core Strategy and its housing policies in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement? (including housing numbers and spatial distribution)? Is there flexibility within the Core Strategy to accommodate any change to the regional housing targets which may emerge in the short (or medium) term?
- ii. Is the evidence base to the housing policies robust and credible? How does this relate to the PPS3 and its associated guidance? To what extent is the content of PPS1 and 3, particularly satisfied by the Core Strategy?
- iii. To what extent, and in what ways, was the chosen spatial distribution of housing considered against alternatives?
- iv. What is the relationship between the Southwark SHLAA and the GLA Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Housing Capacity Study 2009. Why do discrepancies exist in their conclusions?
- v. Is there a demonstrable five year housing land supply within the first five years of the CS? To deliver housing targets? Is the housing trajectory robust?
Are there identified sites for years 6-10? (to deliver housing targets)
Are there identified sites for years 11-15?
What reliance on windfalls?

SP 5

- vi. Is Strategic Policy 5 too prescriptive? How would this policy lead to, or work alongside, a flexible DPD?
- vii. Does the evidence base support the density approach of SP 5?
Should there be a clearer relationship between density thresholds and PTAL? Is the policy in conformity with the existing and draft London Plans in this regard?
Should density be design led to increase flexibility? Could exemplary design justify higher densities outside Opportunity Areas and Action Areas?
Could SP Policy 5 increase density to increase housing supply? Would it create an undue constraint on delivery?
- viii. Should the policy incorporate housing targets for all opportunity and growth areas?

SP6

- ix. To what extent is Policy 6 in conformity with the existing and draft London Plans (and PPS3)?
- x. Is there any substantive evidence to indicate that the 35% threshold would not be economically viable and act as a constraint upon housing delivery? Is such a threshold the optimum, unless otherwise stated, across the Borough?
- xi. *What evidence indicates the deliverability of the policy aims, in terms of social rented, intermediate and private housing, over the plan period?*
- xii. Is Strategic Policy 6 too prescriptive? How would this policy contribute to a flexible DPD?
- xiii. How have migrant worker households been considered within the Housing Requirements Survey? Does this affect the robustness of the policy proposed?

Southwark Borough Council Core Strategy Examination
Hearing Session 8 28th July 2010 @ 10.00 Tooley St Offices

SP7

- xiv. Is Strategic Policy 7 too detailed and too prescriptive? How would this policy contribute to a flexible DPD? Could it be a constraint to housing delivery? What options were considered?
- xv. To what extent does the GLA SHLAA support such an approach? Is it compliant with the draft LP?
- xvi. How would the policy aims be secured? To what extent does the available evidence demonstrate that the policy would not be a constraint upon housing delivery?
- xvii. To what extent would the policy address the need for supported housing units?
- xviii. To what extent is the detail of SP7 consistent with the existing and draft London Design Guides? To what extent would the policy cross reference and/or repeat information to be produced in any subsequent supporting DPD/SPD? Do the sizes indicated exceed that of the Home and Community Agency 'Housing Quality Indicators'? Would this jeopardise delivery of schemes which receive grant aid?
- xix. Does SP Policy 7 adequately address supported housing units in light of the Housing Requirements Study?

SP 8 and SP9

- xx. Is the evidence of a need for student accommodation both robust and credible?
- xxi. Is policy 8 too prescriptive? How would this policy contribute to a flexible DPD?
- xxii. What evidence exists to indicate the extent that the requirement for affordable housing in Policy 8 would prejudice the supply of student housing?
- xxiii. Is SP Policy 8 consistent with draft London Plan para 3.53 and 3.39 – ie not require affordable as part of student? Should SP Policy 8 require affordable housing from all sites? (eg next to campus?) Conflict with London Plan para 3.42 and draft LP3.45? Inflexible and unsound?
- xxiv. Would the proposed change to SP 8 produce a sound policy (ie delete 'local')?
- xxv. Is the target for SP Policy 8 of 130 non self-contained units/year too low and based on sound evidence?
- xxvi. What is the second sentence of the final paragraph on page 87 referring to? What evidence supports this element of the document? Is it justified here?
- xxvii. Why does Policy 9 not contain a target for pitches linked to the evidence of need? Is this consistent with the approach of the Core Strategy in other areas?
- xxviii. Is the criteria approach consistent with Annex C of Circular 1/06?

3. Other Matters

4. Close