

Representation	Officer Response
<p>Misc. Comments Proposed Submission Version</p> <p>Organisation: GLA NSPPSV66.21</p> <p>A number of the sites in the Area Vision and Site Allocations document currently provide premises for industrial and distribution uses, including the Biscuit Factory, Burgess Business Park, Tower Workshops, Valmar Trading Estate, 49 Lomond Grove, Bath Trading Estate, and Copeland Road Industrial Park. The London Plan classifies Southwark as a limited transfer borough, with exceptional planned release related to the Old Kent Road opportunity area. The London Industrial Land Supply and Economy Study 2015 has established that there has been significant loss of industrial land across London, significantly outstripping the benchmark set in the Land for Industry and Transport SPG.</p> <p>Most site allocations for these existing industrial sites require small business space (use class B1) to be provided. This is not broken down into sub-classes, so this allocation could potentially allow the loss of all industrial activity on these sites, with mixed use redevelopment only providing office floorspace as a replacement. Whilst support for SME businesses is welcome, it is important that this is not to the detriment of the needs of London's industrial economy and logistics functions. Many existing SME businesses on these sites will be industrial in nature. It is recommended that clarification is provided for these allocations to ensure that industrial premises are provided as part of the mix of uses on these sites.</p> <p>The provision of a substantial quantity of additional office floorspace in some of these locations may also have potential impacts on the economic viability of town centres; the rationale behind requiring offices in these locations should be clarified as this should follow the sequential approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>As stated previously, it would be useful for the document to state the sum total of all industrial and employment land, including floorspace that is proposed for release and</p>	<p>Southwark Council, and the GLA, have, by exchange of letter have confirmed an agreed approach to the phased release of Strategic Industrial Land for mixed use development that would include a range of commercial uses including distribution and light industrial uses in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area. These letters, and associated plans are available to view on our website. This includes the introduction of 3 sites for Locally Significant Industrial Land (LSIS) and site allocations in the NSP now include reference to this designation and the requirement for replacement industrial uses on site. Other mixed use sites would need to conform to the design guidance in the Old Kent Road AAP which includes a variety of workspaces 'from laptops to forklifts'.</p> <p>Non-designated industrial sites are covered by Policy P26 regarding re-provision of employment (B class) uses where they are located in the opportunity areas, town centres or it is specified in a site allocation. Policy P26 requires a marketing strategy to be provided for the use and occupation of the employment floorspace to be delivered to demonstrate how it will meet market demand. Therefore planning applications must ensure the delivery of employment space is suitable to the local market and meeting demand. This means we would encourage a range of workspaces to suit demand in different parts of the borough. We are currently working on the types of affordable workspace that are in demand across different parts of Southwark to better inform developers.</p> <p>Emerging London Plan policy does not require no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity on non-designated sites. However the New Southwark Plan offers stronger protection to ensure no net loss of employment floorspace capacity which meets market</p>

any additional provision.

demand.

The emerging draft London Plan Policy E7 Part D states that mixed use or residential development proposals on Non-Designated Industrial Sites should be supported where either:

- 1) There is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for industrial purposes; or
- 2) **It has been allocated in an adopted development plan document for residential or mixed-use development;** or
- 3) Industrial, storage or distribution floorspace is provided as part of mixed-use intensification.

The council has taken measures to ensure the continuation of business uses on non-designated industrial sites. All currently adopted preferred industrial locations and proposed or adopted site allocations containing industrial land are protected by an Article 4 Direction which restricts the permitted development change of B1c (light industrial uses) to residential. Additionally all railway arches in B1a, B1c or B8 uses benefit from an Article 4 Direction restricting the change of use to residential.

Organisation: Bankside Residents Forum
NSPPSV19.34

As someone who was born in Bankside, grew-up and went to school there, and aims to continue to live in my neighbourhood, I feel that the views of my fellow Bankside Residents Forum (BRF) members and I should be taken into account when preparing such planning policies as those being submitted for examination.

BRF fully appreciates the pressures faced by planning officers in Southwark - dealing with swarms of developers and their supporting consultants vying to bring forward yet another multimillion pound development in Bankside. Yet, at the same it can't be said of planning officers, they do not understand the impacts, and pressures faced by local people and businesses of bad development decisions.

Representation acknowledged. The NSP aims to deliver a document of strategic policies that sets guidance on major development for new homes, social, green and transport infrastructure. Policies have been through rigorous amendments based on input from statutory and other consultees.

The plan is based on a robust evidence base to ensure it is justified and deliverable, including objective assessment of needs and viability testing of the plan. The evidence base will be made public alongside the final submission of the NSP.

Few residents say we don't want regeneration and revitalization, yet every resident would say no to schemes designed purely for commercial gain regardless of how it changes the neighbourhood.

Nowhere in the United Kingdom has faced such intense pressure from density, increase on the massing of the urban environment, or radical sectoral change in its local economy than Bankside.

Over 25 years under three local plans the damage has been done, and the stress on the community, infrastructure, the urban fabric has all been intense.

This New Southwark Plan should be a robust policy document that gives clarity to developers about the material consideration that could challenge or delay them during the planning process. There should be no more situations where policies are sidelined simply because the pay off in S106 and CIL is seen as mitigation. Evidence reports need to be factual rather than fictional, an example is the DCA 2011, the actual approved housing delivered is five times that of the capacity assessment.

Potential major development sites have been conveniently disregarded as likely to come forward in the next five to ten years, such sites amount to two new Shards scale sites within Cathedral ward.

Views of statutory and other consultees should be considered material considerations

As a spatial policy document the NSP as it currently is drafted has few merits. It lacks the unambiguous policies needed to deliver development schemes that make the most of site opportunities, the right balance of uses, and the social, environmental, economic and sustainable challenges our neighbourhood faces over the next decade to fifteen years. To put it simply this is a rehash of poor policies produced by the same officers making responsible for the last plan's lifetime. Nobody has been listened to, no lesson learned, no aspiration incorporated in the final submission. The examination stage is now the chance to demand a total revamp of the policies that show due diligence and thought by the local authority.

In earlier LDF guidance, the following statement captures what should have been done to ensure the NSP is sound:

The important things are for the implications of the uncertainty to be taken into account and the “what if” situation considered. Some authorities have addressed the situation by making reference to a range of possible outcomes. This is acceptable if it is not possible to be more precise. Spurious precision is not helpful and is potentially misleading. Where uncertainties exist that may affect the delivery of strategic development requirements, planned contingencies with appropriate monitoring and trigger mechanisms need to be included.

That as well as a robust evidence base is missing.

Organisation: Berkeley Homes (South East London)
NSPPSV21.1

These representations have been prepared on behalf of Berkeley Homes (South East London) Ltd (Berkeley) regarding the draft New Southwark Plan Proposed Submission Version (NSP) consultation.

These representations follow on from previous representations made by Rolfe Judd Planning on behalf of Berkeley in September 2016 in respect of the New Southwark Plan – Preferred Option June 2016 and September 2017 in respect of the New Southwark Plan Preferred Option - New and Amended Policies June 2017.

Overall we consider the policies in the NSP to support the objectives of the Council to deliver new homes and jobs in the Borough. However to assist the Council in these objectives we set out a series of amendments aimed at ensuring the NSP is both Legal and Sound in order to promote good growth throughout the Borough. Where suggestions are put forward these are designed to help guide the Council on the deliverability of the policies.

Supportive representation of the NSP acknowledged. Further comments have been responded to in relevant policy areas.

About Berkeley Group and its investment in Southwark

Berkeley has built 19,000 new homes in the last five years. In London, it has built 10% of all new homes, including 10% of new affordable housing, and its contributions to affordable housing and wider community infrastructure exceeded £0.5 billion. Over the five previous years to 30 April 2016, Berkeley has contributed a total of £2.3 billion to the Treasury through direct and wider taxation and it currently supports 13,000 jobs across the business.

Berkeley is also a significant investor in Southwark. It has delivered a range of innovative and exemplary urban regeneration projects across the Borough including developments at Tabard Square and One Tower Bridge. They are currently also delivering development at One Blackfriars. These developments deliver new infrastructure, high quality public realm and many new jobs in addition to a large number of affordable homes contributing to the success of the Borough.

Berkeley Group continues to invest in the Borough as demonstrated by its recent application to Southwark for a mixed-use development at Malt Street along the Old Kent Road. A planning application was submitted to the Council in July 2017 (Council Ref: 17/AP/2773). The scheme provides a mixed-used development of high quality design that incorporates up to 1,050 homes (including a proportion of affordable homes) and up to 5,500sqm of non-residential floorspace within an attractive and inclusive environment, optimising the use of this allocated site (Site Allocation OKR 10) in the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan (DOKR AAP (December 2017)) and Site Allocation NSP65 in the NSP.

The application is in direct response to the Council's vision for the area and the emerging DOKR AAP which seeks 20,000 new homes in the Opportunity Area by 2036. It will make a substantial and positive contribution towards the overall ambitious housing delivery targets of the Council's Local Plan of achieving 27,362 homes by 2025. The application scheme will also deliver a range of new job opportunities to substantially increase the provision of employment on the site helping the Council meet its target of 10,000 new jobs in the area.

Berkeley's investment in the Borough will continue so long as the delivery of viable development can be achieved. This relies upon development plan policies and guidance that encourages regeneration.

Representations on behalf of Berkeley

Please note where paragraph numbers are given, these have been counted down from the relevant section referenced.

...

Concluding Comments

Berkeley strongly supports the Council in its identification of the benefits of a combined Borough wide approach to deliver higher density developments within designated growth areas, town centres, opportunity areas and areas of high public transport accessibility. The focus on brownfield land and highly sustainable and accessible locations is important to delivery of 'Good Growth' as supported by the draft London Plan.

Whilst Berkeley supports the Council in the preparation of the plan and its aspirations for the Borough we would ask that it consider the suggested amendments contribute to the successful implementation and delivery of the NSP.

We would be happy to meet and discuss the contents of these representations should the Council determine it to be beneficial

Organisation: Better Bankside
NSPPSV22.1

Introduction

Better Bankside is the Business Improvement District (BID) for the Bankside neighbourhood. Prior to its submission to the Secretary of State, we are pleased to

Support noted. Further comments have been responded to in relevant policy areas

have this final opportunity to contribute to the strategic vision and local policy framework covering the next 15-year period up to 2033, as outlined within the emerging New Southwark Plan (NSP).

Since the previous 'Preferred Options' consultation stage, we welcome additions and amendments that include:

- Recognition of Bankside and the Borough as a "globally significant business district".
- Opportunity for active frontages now indicated onto the Site Allocations' indicative plans.
- A more robust framework when permitting loss of employment space in Central Activities Zone, town centres, opportunity areas and site allocations.
- Acknowledgement that Bankside and the Borough is an area of "great archaeological interest".
- Appreciation that the local economy is "notable for its diversity", detailing the range of businesses attracted into the area.

Better Bankside have facilitated extensive consultations with local businesses and residents within the Bankside neighbourhood, not least having helped to develop the Bankside Neighbourhood Plan to its Pre-Submission Consultation Draft, in partnership with the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum. We therefore have a strong understanding of the aspirations, opportunities and challenges of the Bankside and Borough community and the rapidly developing context in which it evolves.

We believe the following recommendations, in conjunction with the existing and emerging planning and economic policies, should be included within the Submission version of the New Southwark Plan, in order for it to be found effective, justified and ultimately sound.

Organisation: Copleston Church and Community centre
NSPPSV39.1

The following are comments I wish to make on the proposed version of the New

The preparation of the Citizens Charter is noted.

NSP75 sets out the vision for Aylsham Centre and Peckham Bus Station to provide, retail, homes, town centre uses and retain the

Southwark Plan on behalf of my organisation. I wish to appear at any public hearing/oral examination of these issues.

Firstly, I recognise the inclusion of Community Land Trust homes in the New Southwark Plan as a recognised 'Low cost home ownership product' (pg 24) and as part of the Site vision for site NSP75, saying 'Redevelopment of the site must:... Provide new intermediate affordable housing through a community land trust.' (pg 312). I would also like to commend Southwark Council's ambitious target to deliver 11,000 new council homes by 2043 with the first 1,600 complete or underway by the end of 2018. (pg 8).

This letter is largely in order to comment on one particular site – NSP75: Aylesham Centre and Peckham Bus Garage. After speaking to over 1,000 local people, attending all the public consultation workshop held by Tiger, running our own workshops on issues related to the site, canvassing local residents, shoppers and traders, Peckham Citizens has produced our Citizens Charter, a full copy of which is submitted along side this letter. Our headline proposal in the Charter is for the following to be delivered on the Aylesham site:

1. Affordable Homes

35% - 50% genuinely and permanently affordable, high quality homes for local people, priced according to local incomes, including social housing and a Community Land Trust.

2. Good Jobs

1 in 3 jobs for local people at all levels of seniority, a fully-resourced, targeted training strategy and all employees on site to be paid at least the London Living Wage.

3. Celebrating Peckham

An open, street-based design that includes a significant public space, protects key, local retailers and reinforces the existing culture, economy and built environment of Peckham, with no building on site at more than 9 stories tall.

bus station as required.

Policy P1 requires any proposed developments for new homes to provide a minimum of 35% affordable housing. Applicants and developers will be encouraged to exceed 35% affordable housing on sites where viable.

New jobs will be provided through the town centre uses in any redevelopment of Aylesham Centre and Peckham Bus Garage. Policy P39 sets out employment requirements during the construction of developments, in the final development and also requirements for procurement of goods and services generated by the development during and after construction. Within Policy P39 the requirements vary depending on the scale of the development. Policy P39 seeks to overcome barriers to employment as it promotes a targeted approach to improve employment participation within Southwark.

Any redevelopment of the site must include linkages as required by NSP75. The design of any redevelopment will need to comply with the design policies in the Plan e.g. P12 (design of places), Policy P13 (design quality) and Policy P16 (tall buildings).

A new Statement of Community Involvement is being prepared which sets out that the consultation required by the council through the planning application and plan-making process. A development consultation charter has also been introduced which sets out the minimum consultation requirements developments have to undertake. This also requires developers to submit an engagement summary setting out clearly engagement they have undertaken and setting out local concerns and how they have addressed them and how the feedback has shaped the development.

4. Community Engagement

A commitment to meaningful community engagement with residents, traders and community organisations throughout the design, construction and management of the project. This should include local stakeholders being part of determining how any Section 106, Community Infrastructure Levy or overage agreement funds might be allocated.

Individual
NSPPSV40.1

Is the Local Plan Legal?

The NSP is not legally compliant because the consultation information, documentation and material produced, whether online or hard copy, was not inclusive, accessible or comprehensible to the vast majority of Southwark residents and businesses affected by the plans.

The NSP is not legally compliant because the consideration for inclusivity and accessibility compliance is not effective, as it allowed consultation material to be published and consulted upon that was not inclusive or accessible, and which could not be successfully and comprehensively understood by local residents and businesses, some of whom are badly impacted by the plan.

Planning effects every aspect of our lives, so it is vitally important for local residents, businesses and communities to have full access to local plans and proposals that may affect their lives on any level. These local plans and proposals need to be fully understood by the communities they affect, so everyone can input into them and have their voices and views heard.

The NSP information and documentation was not prepared, presented or made available in a way that was accessible to all Southwark residents and businesses affected by them. So much so that much of the information and documentation remains unseen and unknown by the vast majority people most badly impacted by its proposals.

Throughout the process of developing the New Southwark Plan a range of events have been used to consult on the plan. A number of these included face to face questionnaires, community workshops and presentations at Community Councils and Tenants Association. We have sought to reach a wide audience. Where attendees require further assistance we are willing to assist on this. With each version of the plan we have also prepared an Equalities Impact Assessment (or an Integrated Impact Assessment which includes an Equalities Impact Assessment) to consider impacts on protected groups and to comply with our Public Sector Equalities Duty.

Our online services are currently in the process of being renewed and improved, including updating the Statement of Community Involvement.

For those residents and businesses who did want to know more and who were interested in further understanding the plans, they were often presented with information delivered in such a way as to be inaccessible and incomprehensible.

The NSP is not legally compliant because it goes against the Equalities Act because it is unbalanced, not equitable because it encourages development in Southwark which favours the wealthy.

The information contained in the NSP is biased because it is skewed towards development, so does not constitute a fair, equitable and balanced representation of the needs of existing residents, businesses and communities.

The NSP is not legally compliant because the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is out of date and not fit for purpose.

The NSP community consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). This document is out of date and not fit for purpose, so it is no longer relevant as a consideration for legal compliance for the NSP for future consultations.

Individual
NSPPSV42.1

In my opinion the NSP is not sound because of numerous reasons listed below.. I do not really understand the idea behind giving powers back to the local community if they are basically ignored in favour of corporate interests and property developers. There has been no effective engagement with the community and were it not for the actions of the OBF the vast majority would be none the wiser despite the huge implications it will have for all of them.

I therefore feel that the site allocation is not justified under the New Southwark Plan as it has not credibly engaged or included any of the local community and it has also completely ignore a plan that would take into account their wishes far more effectively and honestly.

Throughout the process of developing the New Southwark Plan a range of events have been used to consult on the plan. A number of these included face to face questionnaires, community workshops and presentations at Community Councils and Tenants Association. We have sought to reach a wide audience. Where attendees require further assistance we are willing to assist on this.

Our online services are currently in the process of being renewed and improved, including updating the Statement of Community Involvement.

I am happy to take part at the oral examinations and public hearings if the inspector so wishes. I do feel there has been a large lack of engagement and transparency through this whole process.

My reasons, consistent with the OBF, are listed below.

Thanks

Organisation: Environment Agency
NSPPSV58.1

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above. Having been involved in the previous consultations, we are satisfied that most of our comments have been incorporated in the New Southwark Plan Proposed Submission version.

Overall it appears the New Southwark Plan Proposed Submission version is founded on robust and credible evidence base. The Environment Agency notes that the findings of the sustainability appraisal have been reflected in the document and used to inform the policies.

It is our considered opinion that the proposed plan is consistent with the national planning policy and complies with the legal requirements and appears sound. It meets the legal requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and is positively prepared, justified and effective.

Whilst we support the draft plan we would wish to request the following minor additions and amendments:

Organisation: GLA
NSPPSV66.1

Thank you for consulting the Mayor of London on the Proposed Submission Version of the New Southwark Plan (NSP) and for extending the consultation deadline to allow for

Support noted. Comments are addressed under the relevant policies and site allocations.

Noted. Responses to specific policies can be found under the relevant sections.

additional meetings between Southwark, GLA and TfL officers. As you are aware, all development plan documents must be in general conformity with the London Plan under section 24 (1)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Mayor has delegated authority to me to respond and his representations are set out below. Representations from Transport for London (TfL), which I endorse, are set out in Annex 1.

The Mayor commented on the previous draft version of the New Southwark Plan Part One: Strategic Policies and Development Management Policies in a letter dated 12 February 2016 and on Part Two: Area Visions and Site Allocations in letters dated 2 May 2017 and September 2017. All letters highlighted elements of the draft document that could raise issues of non-conformity as well as providing more general comments.

GLA officers have had meetings and exchanged emails with Southwark officers over the past year to discuss conformity issues. However, there are still some outstanding matters which need addressing, specifically town centre classification and loss of SIL. It is hoped that these issues can be addressed prior to examination of the New Southwark Plan and my officers would be pleased to assist Southwark officers in finding ways to achieve conformity with the London Plan.

The London Plan

You will be aware that the Mayor published his draft London Plan for consultation on 1st December 2017. It is anticipated the Examination in Public of the London Plan will take place in Autumn 2018 with publication in Autumn 2019. Once published, the new London Plan will form part of Southwark's Development Plan and contain, where relevant, the most up-to-date policies. Southwark's Local Plan is required to be in general conformity with the current London Plan, however its policies will need to be considered alongside the draft London Plan. The draft London Plan and its evidence base is a material consideration in planning decisions, and gains more weight as it moves towards publication.

In this regard, the Mayor recognises that Southwark is at submission stage and has prepared its draft Plan and evidence base prior to the publication of the draft London

Plan. However, once the draft London Plan is published, Southwark will require a more comprehensive strategy for delivering housing. With regards to large sites in the Old Kent Road area, GLA and Southwark officers continue to work together to identify the full housing capacity of these sites.

General Comments

Southwark is set to deliver a significant amount of new development in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area. Southwark officers have worked and continue to work with GLA and TfL officers to help the Council realise its growth ambitions for the borough, including up to 20,000 new homes in the Old Kent Road area and an additional 10,000 new jobs. The Old Kent Road Area Action Plan Preferred Options is currently being consulted on and my officers welcome ongoing discussions on the detailed proposals and phasing that will guide development in the Old Kent Road area.

Organisation: Grosvenor
NSPPSV74.1

In October 2017 Grosvenor submitted a planning application for the comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of its 5.4 hectare strategic site comprising the Biscuit Factory and Bermondsey Campus sites located in Bermondsey within the London Borough of Southwark.

Grosvenor is proposing to deliver up to 1,343 new build to rent homes alongside a new school, employment space, new shops and amenities and a significant provision of new, public open space, play space and public realm .

In September 2017 we made written representations on Grosvenor's behalf to the previous consultation version of the New Southwark Plan in relation to the Site Allocation NSP082 Biscuit Factory and Campus and the draft private rented homes policy DM43.

Building upon the previous representations, this document focusses primarily on the Site Allocation NSP10, the boundary of The Blue Local Centre and New Southwark Plan

Noted. Responses to the site allocation and specific policies can be found under the relevant sections.

Policy P4 - private rented homes. It reiterates a number of points made previously which have not, in our view, been addressed in the latest version of the policy.

Grosvenor's strategic planning application ("Grosvenor's proposals") is scheduled to be determined in June 2018. We are keen to ensure that the site allocation and private rented homes policy adequately reflect the specific site conditions and the distinct economics of delivering build to rent housing. This will enable the timely delivery of new homes on these sites thereby making a positive contribution to the supply of new housing of all types in Southwark.

Organisation: Helix International Group
NSPPSV80.1

Troy Planning + Design (Troy Hayes Planning Limited) has been instructed as agents to prepare representations to the London Borough of Southwark on behalf of our clients Helix International Group Limited, the landowners of 328 St James's Road. This property is included in the proposed Allocation Policy NSP66 'Marlborough Grove and St James's Road'.

The landowners, Helix International Group Limited are in discussions with other surrounding landowners, seeking to work together to bring forward a comprehensive scheme.

Helix International Group Limited, their agents and other landowners would welcome the opportunity to meet and work with Officers from Southwark Council to support the delivery and aspirations of the New Southwark Plan, in particular Allocation Policy NSP66 'Marlborough Grove and St James's Road' and the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan.

References made within this document to 'the site' relate to 328 St James's Road and land surrounding this building. As identified in Site Allocation NSP 66 'Marlborough Grove and St James's Road' of the New Southwark – Proposed Submission Version (December 2017).

Noted. Responses to the site allocation and specific policies can be found under the relevant sections.

The contents of these representations does not prejudice any future representation or future negotiation with the London Borough of Southwark (Southwark Council) or any other interested party.

We wish to attend and appear at examination for all matters raised in this representation so that the Inspector in order to express through further written submissions and verbally the points key matters we set out in these representations.

Summary of Representations

Representations are made primarily in relation to the Old Kent Road Area Vision, Old Kent Road Allocation Policy NSP 66 'Marlborough Grove and St James's Road', P26 'Office and business development' and P54 'Protection of amenity'.

In summary, we support the Old Kent Road Area Vision and Allocation Policy SP66 'Marlborough Grove and St James's Road'. The allocation of the site for mixed-use development provides an important opportunity to provide new homes in a way that complements and intensifies existing commercial activity at the site and within the Old Kent Road area.

Representations are also made in relation to those policies which are likely to have the greatest significance to the future development of Allocation Policy NSP66, including 328 St James's Road, and neighbouring properties. Concern is expressed in relation to how Allocation Policy NSP 66 relates to other policies within the New Southwark Plan, principally P26 'Office and business development' and P56 'Protection of amenity'.

...

Old Kent Road Area Action Plan

The preparation of more detailed plans associated with the preparation of the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan are acknowledged. We will prepare representations to this as

part of the separate public consultation for the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan.

Organisation: Highways England
NSPPSV82.1

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.

In the case of the area covered by the New Southwark Plan, there is no SRN. After reviewing the New Southwark Plan, it is evident that there will be no material impacts on the SRN as a result of this document. Therefore, we have no specific comments to make at this time.

Organisation: Historic England
NSPPSV83.1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above consultation. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is taken fully into account at all stages and levels of the Local Plan process.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies the historic environment as part of the environmental dimension of sustainable development (para 7) and includes it as one of the twelve core planning principles (para 17). The NPPF requires an active, positive approach to the historic environment within Local Plans (paras 126 and 157) and recognises the value that this can bring to inspire high quality design in new development (paras 58 to 61). The following comments are therefore made in the context of the principles contained in the NPPF and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). We would also refer you to previous Historic England responses to

Noted.

Noted. A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed with Historic England.

Policy P19 (conservation areas) seeks to ensure that development conserves and enhances the significance of the conservation areas – it also references the Conservation Area Appraisals and Conservation Area Management Plans.

Where relevant in site allocations, reference is made to the site being within a Conservation Area, this is also identified on our Policies Map and therefore Policy P19 can be applied accordingly.

A local list policy has been included within the Amended Policies 2019 (Policy P25 – local list) which sets a requirement for development to take into account locally listed buildings and structures. This list is being prepared.

consultations relating to the New Southwark Plan, much of the contents of which continues to be relevant.

...

Notwithstanding these references to local character in the strategic policies, we consider that there are a number of important gaps in terms of the heritage requirements as set out in the NPPF. Our comments on these are set out below, as well as comments and suggestions in relation to individual development management policies and the Area Visions and Site Allocations. We consider that the Council should address these issues in order to ensure that the Plan is in conformity with the NPPF.

NPPF requirements

Historic England has produced a number of advice notes to help in the interpretation and application of national policy and guidance in this area which we would commend to you in the development of the draft Local Plan – in particular Good Practice Advice Note 1 – The Historic Environment in Local Plans (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/>). This identifies a number of key heritage requirements in the NPPF for Local Plans.

The NPPF specifies that an up to date and relevant evidence base should be used in the preparation of a Local Plan, and the document referred to above sets out a list of potential sources of evidence that can be used for this purpose. However, while we are aware that a number of suitable documents exist, such as conservation management plans and characterisation studies, we can see very little in the way of a link between these and the contents of the Plan. At this stage of the Local Plan process, we would expect to see a direct relationship between the underlying evidence base and how this has been used to guide and develop the objectives, policies and direction of the Plan. This point also relates to development proposed in a number of the site allocations included in the Plan – please see comments later in this response. We recommend that as a minimum, appropriate references to conservation area appraisals and

As set out in our Local Development Scheme, a Heritage SPD will be prepared which will provide further guidance on heritage relating to the New Southwark Plan Policies.

management plans as well as characterisation studies are included in relevant sections of the Plan – for example, in the area visions and individual site allocations policies.

As indicated above, the NPPF also requires a positive strategy for conserving and enhancing the historic environment. We note and welcome the range of development management policies relating to various elements of the historic environment within the Plan (please see comments in relation to a number of these below). However, we consider that this represents a reactive approach to the management of the historic environment and that more could be done on the part of the Council to establish a positive strategy. This could take a number of forms (in addition to making more explicit and strengthening the relationship between the evidence base and policy as indicated above): establishing a local list of heritage assets in the borough, a commitment to seek out solutions to Heritage at Risk and community engagement initiatives with heritage are just some of the ways in which a positive strategy can be expressed.

Vital OKR NSPPSV205.1

Individuals NSPPSV91.1 and NSPPSV128.1

During preparation of the NSP there has been a failure to achieve an overall understanding of, a failure to audit and to map, the economic life of the borough and its current accommodation extent and geography, and following that a failure to marry what there currently is (accommodation and the economic life that uses that accommodation) with predicted future requirements. There appears to have been no coherent attempt to match requirements with provision through careful policy and policy map designations. Nowhere in the evidence base have we found schedules and map assessments of accommodation quantums, with estimations of the effect of policies, plan designations and allocations, compared with estimates of future need. This is a fundamental failure, a disregard of the most basic obligation to plan.

Our alarm is greatest when we consider the cumulative effect, in a time of unprecedented pressure for residential growth in London, of the NSP as proposed for

Representation noted. As part of the preparation and development of policies within the New Southwark Plan, extensive evidence and research has been conducted. In regards to economy please refer to the Employment Land Review 2016, Retail Study 2015 & 2018, Town Centre Study 2014 (GLA), Industrial Land Supply and Economy Study 2015 (GLA) and London Town Centre Health Check Analysis Report 2013 (GLA), which aid in objectively assessing and defining the business and other development needs of Southwark.

Responses to the site allocation and specific policies can be found under the relevant sections.

submission. The economy and civic life of Southwark has the potential to expand substantially, yet the NSP as it stands would allow, and in part actively promote, shrinkage of the accommodation for that economy. The strip-out of capacity could be most dramatic from high street places and industrial areas.

The NSP has failed to demonstrate an understanding of, and an allowance for, the borough's full spatial needs for non-residential use, the latter due to a combination of inadequate protective policy and map designations, and active encouragement to develop counter to those needs.

It is not within our capability to do a comprehensive assessment of the type that Southwark should have (but have failed to) carry out, but our crude review suggests that the scope of non-residential accommodation required far exceeds what this proposed plan allows for, allocates and protects.

We ask that our first 6 objections below, and the NPPF and London Plan policies we highlight as indicators of unsoundness, be taken also as evidence to justify all the other objections we have made, each to components of the overall picture of accommodation supply for non-residential uses that the plan has failed to ensure will be adequate.

Vital OKR NSPPSV205

Individuals NSPPSV91.2 and NSPPSV128.2

We object to failure to objectively assess and define the business and other development needs of Southwark, and failure to ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.

We note, for example, that the Southwark High Street Survey 2015 concentrated on frontage retail, only considered 8 high streets within the confines of town centre boundaries, and the survey of people focused on shopping rather than the full range of activities, so the exercise was far from comprehensive. Likewise the only other broad review of high street settings was the Southwark Retail Study which concentrated on A class uses and commercial leisure, and only considered 14 designated town centres, thus ignoring around half of the borough's high streets. In a similar spirit the Southwark Industrial and Warehousing Land Study only took note of sites identified and recommended for protection as industrial land by the 2010 Employment Land Study, being the SPIL and LSIS, ignoring industrial and hybrid B class space, and indeed office / studio accommodation, in numerous non designated industrial sites, in high street settings and elsewhere scattered in predominantly residential areas. Most recently the Southwark Employment Land Review focused only on B class uses, disregarding a vast array of other employment generating uses, and it only considered the employment cluster areas highlighted in a 2009 study by URS, and relied on cursory reviews of areas, predominantly desk based, rather than systematic surveys. Thus the evidence base is woefully incomplete, sketchy and fractured.

NPPF para 14 requires Local Plans to meet objectively assessed needs.

NPPF para 17 requires that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. It requires that plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area,

Objection 1

We have a comprehensive evidence base that supports the New Southwark Plan which has been prepared by experienced economic consultants in collaboration with and on behalf of the council. This includes two comprehensive retail studies prepared by Lichfields. The selection of the eight high streets in the retail studies provided a representative and comprehensive sample of the diversity of population characteristics, retail style and retail offer. With regard to some of the smaller high streets, the council has surveyed all high streets in the borough and categorised them as primary or secondary shopping frontages. All of these parades are catalogued and mapped in the public domain. The industrial study and the employment land reviews (ELR) undertaken by GVA and CAG do not ignore non-designated industrial sites. The study includes a comprehensive analysis of 35 employment cluster areas across the borough. Furthermore the NSP site allocations for larger employment sites in the borough records the amount and use class of all uses present on the site and this is required to be reprovided on site where specified in policy, along with specified required use classes in site allocations. Our policies P26 and P38 (for reprovision or relocation of small businesses) require employment floorspace to be reprovided and specific businesses reprovided or relocated if a planning application is proposed for the site which requires a finer grain of analysis of the local economy prior to any changes being proposed to existing employment sites. The ELR does not ignore non-B class job growth it includes all sectors as identified through ONS and BRES data. The economy is constantly changing and it is important that planning policy and the evidence supporting it is kept up to date. Hence for our existing industrial areas including Old Kent Road and Parkhouse Street we have prepared more recent evidence through the OKR Workspace Demand Study which further updates the economical situation in Southwark and more specifically in the aforementioned areas and

<p>taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;</p> <p>NPPF para 158 regarding using a proportionate evidence base requires that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. The paragraph also requires local planning authorities to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>NPPF para 160, under the heading Business, requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>NPPF para 23 requires planning policies to meet needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses in full, un-compromised by limited site availability, and to ensure this local planning authorities should undertake an assessment of the need to expand town centres to ensure a sufficient supply of suitable sites.</p> <p>Objection 3.</p> <p>We object to failure to ensure that the assessment of, and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and failure to take full account of relevant market and economic signals. There has been a failure also to achieve a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</p> <p>NPPF para 70 makes clear that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies should ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.</p> <p>NPPF para 154 states that Local Plans should set out clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where.</p>	<p>supports the council's approach to making effective use of land and mixing industrial and residential uses in new and innovative ways. This is in line with both Part 11 of the NPPF and the emerging guidance in the New London Plan on co-location.</p> <p>Objection 3</p> <p>The evidence base takes into account market and economic signals in projections of employment sector and jobs growth. The NSP includes a wide range of policies and specified land uses in its site allocations that encourage a variety of use classes that will benefit the immediate local community and help to reduce journey lengths by providing local jobs, shops and community facilities alongside housing.</p> <p>Objection 5</p> <p>The details of all consultation undertaken in the NSP is set out in the published Consultation Plans and Consultation Reports that have accompanied the various stages of consultation. We have consulted extensively on the NSP and participated in a number of workshops focused on the economy including participation from local BIDS and business groups. We are committed to continuing engagement with businesses and our policies, such as P38 (business relocation) and P28 (affordable workspace) require the needs of businesses to be considered at an early stage of scheme design.</p> <p>Additionally, the council provides direct advice and guidance to employers considering creating an apprenticeship, including support in creating the vacancy, recruiting to the post and sourcing the right training provider. We also work specifically with the construction sector to promote the Southwark Apprenticeship</p>
--	--

London Plan para 6.7.6 explains that collaborative working between the Mayor, boroughs and other stakeholders on Development Plan reviews, planning frameworks and masterplans provide useful mechanisms to co-ordinate these processes. This should ensure that the need to maintain sufficient capacity for industry to service London's economy and residents is considered alongside other planning objectives including delivery of strategic infrastructure, housing, social infrastructure and other uses.

Objection 5.

We object to failure to carry out early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with (amongst others) businesses during NSP preparation so that, as far as possible, the plan reflects a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area. Engagement with enterprise has been minimal such that it is not possible to claim that the NSP reflects a collective vision.

NPPF para 160, under the heading Business, requires local planning authorities, in order to achieve a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area, to work closely with the business community to understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability.

NPPF para 155 requires early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. It suggests that a wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area.

London Plan para 6.7.6 explains that collaborative working between the Mayor, boroughs and other stakeholders on Development Plan reviews, planning frameworks and masterplans provide useful mechanisms to co-ordinate these processes. This

Standard.

The Southwark Business Forum helps to align the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities of some of the major corporate entities based in or operating in the borough with the council's own priorities. The agenda is shaped by the businesses and discussions have focused on skills provision and careers advice. The forum has been crucial in helping to shape policy, engaging in dialogue on key issues such as Brexit, apprenticeships and skills.

Support for Business Improvement Districts in Southwark is ongoing and is a key conduit for business support and engagement. We established a BIDs network bringing together the five Southwark BIDs of Bermondsey Blue BID, Better Bankside, South Bank BID, Team London Bridge and We are Waterloo. Key areas for discussion have included employment, apprenticeships, business rates revaluation and business rates devolution.

Affordable small business space is being built into planning policy and the council holds an approved workspace provider list to encourage quality in small business space development. In Camberwell and Peckham, the ongoing development of a Creative Enterprise Zone focuses on the protection and growth of affordable creative business space in the area.

should ensure that the need to maintain sufficient capacity for industry to service London's economy and residents is considered alongside other planning objectives including delivery of strategic infrastructure, housing, social infrastructure and other uses.

Vital OKR NSPPSV205.2
Individuals NSPPSV91.3 and NSPPSV128.3

We object to failure to effectively cooperate with neighbouring authorities to plan for

We are bound by a duty to cooperate as required by the NPPF and we regularly meet with our neighbouring boroughs in the wider South East London region. We have particularly collaborated with Lewisham on growth in the Old Kent Road and New Cross

issues with cross-boundary impacts, working together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within Southwark, for instance because of a lack of physical capacity. There is no clear evidence of cooperation with other authorities to consider how to meet the accommodation needs of economic and civic activity.

NPPF para 157 requires that Local Plans should be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations;

NPPF para 160, under the heading Business, requires local planning authorities, in order to achieve a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area, to work together with regional and neighbouring authorities to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base to understand both existing business needs and likely changes in the market.

NPPF para 178 makes clear that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries and that the Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities.

NPPF para 179 requires that local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. Joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas – for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity

NPPF para 181 requires that local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination.

opportunity areas and promote the Bakerloo Line extension. This includes collaborative working on economic issues such as work at South Bermondsey diveunder on industrial intensification and business relocation opportunities across both boroughs. We will be submitting SOCG's with our neighbouring boroughs as part of the NSP examination which will outline this collaboration on a range of wider London issues.

Individual
NSPPSV132.1

It has been brought to our attention that whilst completing representations via your

Representation noted. Sufficient time was provided for respondents to submit their comments on the New Southwark Plan.

online portal a number of our subscribers have not been issued with proper submission receipts. As a result we can only conclude proper formal consultation has not taken place and petition you forthwith to place notice of such on your website, correct the issue, and extend the consultation period to allow adequate time for those affected to properly respond.

Individual

NSPPSV133.3

2.6. Again, there is no reference to the Old Jamaica Road Business Estate allocation in this document. There has been a failure to consult on the allocation of this site throughout the whole Regulation 18 process.

Organisation: Southwark Law Centre

NSPPSV167.1

This representation concerns the consultation process for the New Southwark Plan (“the Plan”). The failings in the consultation process render the whole Plan both unsound and unlawful. The Plan is not sound because it is not justified – it has not allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties. The Plan is unlawful because Southwark Council has not followed its Statement of Community Involvement or Statement of Representations Procedure during the process of developing the Plan from the approval of the Options Version in October 2014 through to consultation on the Proposed Submission Version which ran until 27 February 2018.

I confirm that I wish to participate at the oral examination.

The Plan is unsound because it is not justified or consistent with national policy. In order to be justified a Local Plan must be supported by evidence, part of which includes the views of the local community on policies proposed by the local planning authority. A Local Plan will not be justified if it has not involved effective engagement with local individuals and groups. The National Planning Policy Framework also places great emphasis on the importance of consulting the local community in the process of developing and updating Local Plans. For example, it states:

- One of the principles that should underpin plan-making is “empowering local people

As requested, the Old Jamaica Road site allocation has been removed from the New Southwark Plan as set out in the Amended Policies 2019.

Significant consultation and notification of the consultation was undertaken. This is detailed within the consultation report.

Throughout the process of developing the New Southwark Plan a range of events have been used to consult on the plan. A number of these included face to face questionnaires, community workshops and presentations at Community Councils and Tenants Association. We have sought to reach a wide audience. Where attendees require further assistance we are willing to assist on this. With each version of the plan we have also prepared an Equalities Impact Assessment (or an Integrated Impact Assessment which includes an Equalities Impact Assessment) to consider impacts on protected groups and to comply with our Public Sector Equalities Duty.

Each version of the NSP has been strengthened through input from statutory and other consultees, including feedback received from consultation held with the residents of Southwark.

In addition, statement of common ground will be made public alongside the final submission of NSP that demonstrate the plan is

to shape their surroundings”.

- “Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning.”
- “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made.”

A number of failings in the consultation process have made it more difficult for interested individuals and community groups to engage effectively in shaping the New Southwark Plan. During consultation on the Proposed Submission Version (“PSV”), these included the consultation deadlines set by the Council and the inaccessibility of the PSV and its accompanying documents. Furthermore, throughout the process of developing the Plan, Southwark Council has failed to provide any evidence that it is monitoring the consultation responses it receives or actively seeking to engage individuals and groups from communities that are typically underrepresented or less engaged in public life.

The PSV consultation: deadlines and accessibility of documents

Southwark Council’s attitude towards the PSV consultation, which in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement included both an informal and formal period of consultation, appeared to be that since the Plan would no longer be amended by the Council before being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, there was no need for the community to respond at this stage. Initially, only the briefest (12-week) consultation period was offered, even though this consultation period spanned the Christmas and New Year holiday season. The Council’s attitude towards this stage of the consultation was evident in an email to Community Southwark in which a council officer suggested that it would be more worthwhile to comment on the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan, rather than the New Southwark Plan, since no further changes would be made to the latter. By adopting this attitude, the Council effectively ignored the legal right of any person to make written representations on the submission version of

based on effective cooperation and agreements in other authorities.

During preparation of the Plan, consideration has been given to the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan and our policies have been prepared accordingly. Our policies have been informed by our evidence base documents.

a Local Plan and so have the opportunity of speaking at the public hearings on the Plan. Despite the arguments made by Community Southwark in correspondence with Southwark Council, to the effect that consulting over the holiday period would not allow the community enough time to engage with the PSV, it was not until a letter was sent by Southwark Law Centre challenging the legality of this consultation period that Southwark Council agreed to extend the consultation deadline by a further four weeks. The failure to make certain important documents available or readily accessible also contributed to the difficulties faced by members of the local community in engaging with the Plan. The evidence base documents were not published online until 16 January 2018, well after the end of the informal consultation period and four days after the original deadline set by the Council for submitting written representations. The Council did then extend the deadline for submitting written representations until 27 February 2018. However, extending deadlines at short notice to compensate for the failure to publish documents also hampers community engagement. Most individuals and groups will respond to planning policy consultations in their free time, and may have set aside a particular day or time to respond based on previously advertised deadlines. In this way the delayed publication of important documents and changing of deadlines at short notice makes it harder for the local community to plan how and when to respond to a planning policy consultation. Changing deadlines in this way also indirectly resulted in a lack of clarity around the consultation end time, with the Consultation Plan stating that formal consultation would end at 5pm, while Southwark Council's website now states that the deadline for written representations is 11.59pm on the specified date. Another issue during the consultation period for the PSV was the accessibility of documents at local libraries, in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Statement of Representations Procedure. The provision of Local Plan documents in hard copy is very important for enabling those without access to a computer or who find it difficult to view large (350-page) documents on screen to engage with the consultation process. None of the Appendices to the PSV (such as the Integrated Impact Assessment and Consultation Report) nor the evidence base documents for the Plan were made available in local libraries, despite these being important documents for assessing the soundness of the Plan. While a hard copy of the Proposed Policies Map was provided in libraries in A3 format, the many layers of information and level of detail on a small map made it impossible to make sense of the

map. When a request was made to council officers have some copies of the map printed in an A0 format, this was refused on the basis that the map can be viewed online. Offering the only comprehensible version of the Proposed Policies Map in online form effectively excludes those who have difficulty viewing images on screen from part of the consultation process. By contrast, the current Adopted Policies Map for the borough is available, for a small charge, in a very large format, with three separate oversized sheets for the north, middle and south of the borough.

The consultation process and monitoring underrepresented groups

The Consultation Plans and Reports drafted by Southwark Council by way of auditing the consultation process for the Plan demonstrate a failure to monitor consultation responses or attempt to engage underrepresented groups. Southwark Council repeatedly states in its Consultation Plans and Reports that “we monitor our consultation at every stage so that we can see where we need to engage more with certain groups at the next stage of consultation”. However, no such monitoring is evident in any of the Consultation Reports. There is no evidence provided as to what equality and diversity monitoring forms indicate about who has responded to different stages of the Plan consultation. There is also no mention in any of the Consultation Reports of particular efforts undertaken by Southwark Council to engage any groups which it had identified as being underrepresented among consultation responses to date. None of the stakeholder groups which Southwark Council gave presentations to or ran workshops for during the development of the Plan represent individuals who are typically less engaged in public life or find it difficult to engage. Southwark Council has been further hampered by its use of a Statement of Community Involvement that was last updated in 2008: the lists of groups and organisations representing individuals with different protected characteristics and interests in Appendix E are seriously out of date, with certain listed organisations no longer in existence and newer, currently active organisations and groups not appearing on those lists.

These are just some examples of how the approach to consultation adopted by Southwark Council during the development of the Plan did not effectively engage with local people and groups, leading to a Plan which is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy because it is not based on a collective vision for the area.

Organisation: Southwark Law Centre
NSPPSV167.2

The Plan is unlawful because it does not comply with the Statement of Community Involvement or the Statement of Representations Procedure

The Plan also fails the test of legal compliance, since it has not been developed in line with Southwark Council's Statement of Community Involvement or made available in accordance with the Statement of Representations Procedure. The Plan has also been developed on the basis of a number of documents which are out of date.

Failure to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement

Southwark Council is under a legal duty to comply with its Statement of Community Involvement when developing a new Local Plan. There are a number of ways in which Southwark has failed to comply with this duty. First, as mentioned above, there have been no efforts to engage the particular groups identified in Appendix D to the Statement of Community Involvement. In Appendix D Southwark Council identifies a number of methods which it undertakes to use to engage groups which may otherwise face barriers to taking part in planning consultations. The Council states that it will, among other things:

- seek to provide information and training on planning tailored to the needs of the groups identified in Appendix D,
- use translators and interpreters where appropriate,
- source local knowledge on how to engage the identified groups, ensure that all written information is available in different languages, and
- train council officers in understanding equality, diversity, faith and belief issues.

However, none of the Consultation Reports for any stage of the development of the New Southwark Plan provide any evidence that these methods have been used. There is no reference to Appendix D or the methods listed in the Appendix in the Consultation Reports. In response to a Freedom of Information Request (Reference 884411) made on 30 January 2018 and answered on 23 February 2018 Southwark Council confirmed that it has done nothing in relation to overcoming barriers to consultation faced by particular groups beyond what is mentioned in the Consultation Reports.

The Statement of Community Involvement also provides: "We will promote equality for

Significant consultation and notification of the consultation was undertaken. This is detailed within the consultation report.

Throughout the process of developing the New Southwark Plan a range of events have been used to consult on the plan. A number of these included face to face questionnaires, community workshops and presentations at Community Councils and Tenants Association. We have sought to reach a wide audience. Where attendees require further assistance we are willing to assist on this. With each version of the plan we have also prepared an Equalities Impact Assessment (or an Integrated Impact Assessment which includes an Equalities Impact Assessment) to consider impacts on protected groups and to comply with our Public Sector Equalities Duty.

The plan is supported by a robust evidence base that can be found on the examination webpage.

The Statement of Community Involvement has been reviewed to strengthen and make the engagement process more inclusive and transparent. It includes the creation of a Development Consultation Charter, which requires developers to submit an engagement plan at the pre-application stage for major and strategic applications. Developers will also be required to submit an engagement report, detailing the stages of consultation undertaken.

Documents should have been accessible at Tooley Street or at any local libraries and service point computers within Southwark. Where they were not accessible, help could have been sought from our trained staff if there were difficulties. Advice could also be requested via email and telephone.

all and respond to the needs of our many diverse communities. We must consult groups that do not usually get involved. We will monitor consultation exercises for the Equalities Target Groups: age, gender, ethnicity, religion/belief, sexual orientation and disability. We will report this in the consultation statement to the decision maker". This approach is reflected in the Consultation Plans drafted by the Council. However, when it comes to the Consultation Reports, there is no evidence of any monitoring of consultation exercises for the Equalities Target Groups, apart from some brief analysis in the first Consultation Report which relates only to responses to the "Let's talk about your high street" consultation conducted in 2013/14 at the very beginning of the development process for the New Southwark Plan.

By failing to engage in any of the specific methods listed in Appendix D or in monitoring and reporting on the engagement of different Equalities Targets Groups in the Consultation Reports, Southwark Council has failed to comply with certain aspects of its Statement of Community Involvement, thus rendering the Plan in breach of section 19(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Failure to comply with the Statement of Representations Procedure

Both the Statement of Community Involvement and the Statement of Representations Procedure provide that Local Plan documents will be made available for public inspection in local libraries during informal and formal consultation periods. Some failings in this regard have already been noted above. During an audit of the locations for viewing PSV documents listed in the Statement of Representations Procedure undertaken by Southwark Law Centre on 12 and 15 January 2018, it was evident that many of these documents were effectively inaccessible to local people. In four locations the documents were not available at all when requested – namely Dulwich Library, Newington Temporary Library, Peckham MySouthwark Service Point and Walworth MySouthwark Service Point. In others the library staff did not know what the PSV documents were or where to find them. It was only after describing the appearance of the documents to the library staff that they could be located. A further problem for accessibility was the practice in John Harvard Library of giving Local Plan documents to the Local History Library. The opening hours of the Local History Library are different to and much more limited than those of the John Harvard Library advertised in the Statement of Representations Procedure.

While Southwark Council extended the deadline for the formal consultation period on 16 January and promised to ensure that hard copies of the PSV documents were available in all locations listed in the Statement of Representations Procedure on that date, officers only later acknowledged the need for further information and training for library staff to ensure that the PSV documents were truly accessible.

Failure to keep important planning policy documents up to date

The Plan is also not legally compliant to the extent that it is based on other documents which are out of date. Contrary to the requirements in section 15(2)(f) and (9A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Local Development Scheme for the London Borough of Southwark is not up to date. It was last updated in July 2017 and has not been updated to reflect the extended consultation period for the PSV or the delays in the consultation process for the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan.

The Plan has also been developed on the basis of a Statement of Community Involvement which is seriously out of date. For example, the wrong address is provided for the Council's offices, and reference is made to the Willowbrook Centre as a source of help and advice which ceased to exist in 2011. Similarly, as already mentioned, the lists of organisations and groups in Appendix E do not reflect current reality. For example, Peckham Vision, VitalOKR (and many of the businesses who are members of VitalOKR), Latin Elephant, Friends of Burgess Park and Neighbourhood Forums such as those in Bermondsey and Bankside, all of which are very active community organisations, are not listed.

For these reasons, as well as being unsound the Plan also fails to comply with the legal requirements on consultation.

Organisation: Southwark Law Centre
NSPPSV167.3

Representation

This representation relates to the legal compliance of the New Southwark Plan ("the Plan"). The Plan should not be approved because in preparing it Southwark Council has failed to comply with legal duties under the Equality Act 2010 ("the 2010 Act"). A more

A robust Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out for the submission version of the New Southwark Plan. With each version of the plan we have prepared an Equalities Impact Assessment (or an Integrated Impact Assessment which includes an Equalities Impact Assessment) to consider impacts on protected groups and to comply with our Public Sector Equalities Duty.

detailed understanding of the potential impact of the Plan on groups with particular protected characteristics is necessary in order for council officers, councillors and the Planning Inspector conducting the examination of the Plan to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty (“PSED”) set out in section 149 of the 2010 Act. Case law has established that Planning Inspectors are also bound by the PSED and a failure to have due regard to the matters listed in section 149 could render an Inspector’s decision liable to being struck down by a court.

I confirm that I wish to participate at the oral examination.

Legal duties

Section 149 of the 2010 Act provides, in relevant part:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—
(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The courts have clarified what “having due regard” means for public authorities or those exercising public functions. During the decision-making process, the person or authority in question must be clear precisely what the equality implications are when balancing them against other considerations and must recognise the desirability of achieving equality objectives. The PSED must be exercised in substance, with rigour and with an open mind in such a way that it influences the final decision. It is a continuing duty which applies throughout the decision-making process and cannot be delegated. Those bound by the PSED must assess the risk and extent of any adverse impact and the ways in which such risk may be eliminated before the adoption of a proposed policy.

The Equalities and Human Rights Commission has produced technical guidance on the PSED. Showing that the guidance has been followed is relevant to the question of

A gypsies and travellers policy has been included in the Amended Policies New Southwark Plan. The council has commissioned a needs assessment that will establish the requirements for traveller and gypsy accommodation.

whether a public body has complied with the PSED or not, and a public body should justify any departure from this guidance. This guidance provides more detail on the nature of the duty on public bodies to gather evidence of the impact that policies are likely to have on people with different protected characteristics (“equality evidence”). A body subject to the PSED needs to be able to show that it had adequate and accurate equality evidence to enable it to have due regard. Evidence must be sufficient to give the public authority sufficient understanding of the particular disadvantages, different needs and/or disproportionately low participation experienced by people who share particular protected characteristics. Furthermore, a public authority has a positive duty to obtain equality evidence if it would not otherwise have sufficient evidence to have due regard to the considerations listed in section 149(1) of the 2010 Act.

The failure to comply with the PSED

Southwark Council seeks to demonstrate that it has complied with the Public Sector Equality Duty in its Plan preparation through the Integrated Impact Assessment (“IIA”) which accompanies the Plan and has been updated with each new draft of the Plan.

The IIA aims to fulfil the Council’s legal and policy requirements to produce a Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Equalities Analysis and Health Impact Assessment. It is accepted that there are overlaps between the methods and outputs of these different assessments and Southwark Council are entitled to decide to fuse these different analyses into a single integrated impact assessment. However, the Council is still required to comply with the full duty in relation to each assessed aspect, and such an approach should not lead to a superficial or cursory assessment of equalities impacts.

The IIA fails to comply fully with Southwark Council’s duties under the PSED for three main reasons. First, insufficient baseline information on equalities has been collected to enable the Council to take a properly informed decision on whether the policies in the Plan advance equality of opportunity between those with and without protected characteristics or foster good relations. Second, while the IIA’s framework objectives and sub-criteria for assessment rightly seek to test the Plan policies for impacts on different specified groups, the actual analysis of site visions, strategic policies and development management policies is thin, uses boilerplate clauses and does not delve deeply enough into the consideration of the potential impact of policy on groups with

different protected characteristics. Southwark Council has failed to follow its own stated aim of assessing whether its policies are effective for all target groups. To some extent, this is a direct consequence of the fact that insufficient baseline evidence has been gathered, as this evidence is necessary to properly consider the potential impact of Plan policies. The analysis in the IIA also makes no attempt to model how the long term benefits of policy compliant development will be far-reaching and will significantly narrow the inequality gap. Rather it simply assumes that the benefits of regeneration will be accessible to all.

Third, there has been a wholesale failure to consider the impact of the policies in the New Southwark Plan on one group protected by the Equality Act 2010, namely Gypsies and Travellers. This is surprising given that certain sites allocated for development in the New Southwark Plan are adjacent to current Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Organisation: Southwark Space

NSPPS169.01

Regarding the whole of the New Southwark Plan we object to:

Failure to objectively assess and define the business and other development needs of Southwark;

Failure to carry out a review of land available for economic development, undertaken at the same time as, or combined with, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;

Failure to ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area;

Failure to meet the business development needs of Southwark;

Failure to ensure that the assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that full account has been taken of relevant market and economic signals;

Failure to be aspirational but realistic, and to pay careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking, and define a plan that is deliverable.

Failure to carry out early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with

The plan is based on robust evidence base to ensure it is justified and deliverable, including objective assessment of needs and viability test of the plan. A number of evidence base documents are on our website and additional evidence base will be made public alongside the final submission of the NSP.

It should be acknowledged that each version of the NSP has been strengthened through input from statutory and other consultees, including feedback received from consultation held with the residents and stakeholders of Southwark.

In addition, statements of common ground will be made public alongside the final submission of NSP that demonstrate the plan is based on effective cooperation and agreements in other authorities.

<p>businesses during NSP preparation;</p> <p>Failure to effectively cooperate with neighbouring authorities to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts</p>	
<p>Organisation: Studio Makecreate NSPPSV175.1</p> <p>Regarding the whole of the New Southwark Plan we object to:</p> <p>Failure to objectively assess and define the business and other development needs of Southwark;</p> <p>Failure to carry out a review of land available for economic development, undertaken at the same time as, or combined with, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;</p> <p>Failure to ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area;</p> <p>Failure to meet the business development needs of Southwark;</p> <p>Failure to ensure that the assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that full account has been taken of relevant market and economic signals;</p> <p>Failure to be aspirational but realistic, and to pay careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking, and define a plan that is deliverable.</p> <p>Failure to carry out early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with businesses during NSP preparation;</p> <p>Failure to effectively cooperate with neighbouring authorities to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts.</p>	<p>The plan is based on robust evidence base to ensure it is justified and deliverable, including objective assessment of needs and viability test of the plan. A number of evidence base documents are on our website and additional evidence base will be made public alongside the final submission of the NSP.</p> <p>It should be acknowledged that each version of the NSP has been strengthened through input from statutory and other consultees, including feedback received from consultation held with the residents and stakeholders of Southwark.</p> <p>In addition, statements of common ground will be made public alongside the final submission of NSP that demonstrate the plan is based on effective cooperation and agreements in other authorities.</p>
<p>Organisation: V & B Romitelli NSPPSV200.1</p> <p>Just to follow up on the latest plan and consultation - it seems if we've read it right the map shows in areas such as Ilderton Road that existing good estates (Tustin) and</p>	<p>Representation noted.</p>

housing (Manor Grove) are likely to remain and not be demolished. If done without hammering leaseholders (another contributory factor in damaging communities and lives) or adding too many tall buildings which could create problems along the quite narrow road (though some are probably unavoidable), this is potentially a good thing, and shows maybe people were listened to?

We are then more in favour of this latest plan. Saving existing communities, homes and lives is very important.

Organisation: The Wardens and Commonalty of the Fishmongers of the City of London
NSPPSV208.4

In light of the information set out above, on behalf of our client, we consider that the general approach to the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan should be commended. However, there are some concerns over the approach and flexibility afforded to the delivery of economic development and efficient use of the site (NSP83). As currently worded the Draft Local Plan is considered unsound on the basis that it is inconsistent with national policy and not effective in certain areas. WYG reserve the right to submit further information in respect of the issues raised should the LPA submit the Draft Local Plan examination without the amendments suggested.

Individual
NSPPSV218.7

To the Southwark Planning Department responsible for the New Southwark Plan

I am very concerned that vague wording in the NSP will not prove robust enough over the years to force compatibility with the London Plan as it develops.

I am concerned that the NSP is not linked up to form a cohesive interconnected Southwark landscape of safe streets, industry, affordable rent for business and housing, views throughout the borough through low building, dense green tree space, new approaches to cemeteries as protected green space through lawn, tree, ash and plaque

Representation noted. The NSP aims to deliver a document of strategic policies that sets guidance on major development for new homes, social, green and transport infrastructure. The plan is based on robust evidence base to ensure it is justified and deliverable, including objective assessment of needs and viability test of the plan.

During preparation of the Plan, consideration has been given to the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan and our policies have been prepared accordingly. Our policies have been informed by our evidence base documents.

The Plan needs to be read as a whole, the development management policies set out our requirements for industry (Policy P28 – strategic protected industrial land), affordable rent for housing (Policy P1 – social and intermediate housing) and businesses (Policy P30 – affordable workspace), green spaces (Policy P56 – open space), air quality (Policy P64 – improving air quality) and transport requirements (Policy P48 – public transport,

remembrances.

I am concerned that lack of robust statistical surveys leaves opportunity to fudge resident opinion and concern.

The New Southwark Plan is not legally sound as:

- It fails to comply with the 2014 national planning practice guidance on transport or policy in the 2018 New London Plan
- It is not justified by evidence: it relies on a totally out-of-date 2009 transport strategy and while it refers to the 2015 Southwark Cycling Strategy, it has cut out most of the routes in it without giving any reasons
- It is not positively prepared to tackle air pollution, lack of opportunities for daily physical activity, road safety or congestion in Southwark

And:

1. Southwark makes no provision for a linked up dense mature tree green grid, improving connectivity for wildlife and clean air for physical activity by greening corridors between our parks and green spaces with trees and other planting.
2. A high quality, high density network of cycling & walking routes, that meet if not exceed the London Cycling Design Standards and provide for significant growth
3. Reduce motor traffic, with clear targets and measures to tackle Satnav fuelled rat-running through our residential streets
4. No new private car parking in new developments other than disabled and car club bays

P50 – walking and Policy P52 –cycling).

A Movement Plan has also been prepared which sets out our approach to improve peoples' experience of travel to, within and around the borough. The plan places people and their wellbeing at the heart of the policy and our vision for the next twenty year. It includes missions and actions to ensure we meet our vision. This can be accessed on our website.

5. Tough policies on developers to ensure construction does not endanger people cycling and walking, such as by requiring the use of the highest safety rated lorries."

Individual
NSPPSV239.38

We would like to draw the Inspectors attention to the fact the the Statement of Community Inveolvement was drafted in 2008 and is still considered robust enough to submitted by the local authority as evidence. We however, would highlight that a range of consultees are not listed in Appendix E. Consultees not directly listed include to name just a few:

Bankside Residents Forum
Better Bankside
Team London Bridge
BARD
Borough Market Trustees
BROAD
Falcon Point TMO
Benbow House
Clink Street Residents
Neo Bankside Residents
Peabody Southwark Street
Redwood Housing Coop

NB

Due to circumstances beyond our control as it was envisaged that the deadline for submission would obviously be the last day of the month the 28th February 2018, rather than the actual date of the 27th February. There are a number of responses that will not therefore be submitted until after the closing date. We hope that the local authority will however appreciate and support us by ensuring these additional

Southwark Council's SCI is currently in the process of being updated and any form of feedback received has been acknowledged and responded to, with all responses being uploaded online. Each version of the NSP has been strengthened through feedback received from consultation held with the residents of Southwark.

comments are submitted as evidence for the examination and Inspector's consideration.

Individual

NSPPSV239.43

As someone who was born in Bankside, grew-up and went to school there, and aims to continue to live in my neighbourhood, I feel that the views of my fellow Bankside Residents Forum (BRF) members and I should be taken into account when preparing such planning policies as those being submitted for examination.

BRF fully appreciates the pressures faced by planning officers in Southwark - dealing with swarms of developers and their supporting consultants vying to bring forward yet another multimillion pound development in Bankside. Yet, at the same it can't be said of planning officers, they do not understand the impacts, and pressures faced by local people and businesses of bad development decisions.

Few residents say we don't want regeneration and revitalization, yet every resident would say no to schemes designed purely for commercial gain regardless of how it changes the neighbourhood.

Nowhere in the United Kingdom has faced such intense pressure from density, increase on the massing of the urban environment, or radical sectoral change in its local economy than Bankside.

Over 25 years under three local plans the damage has been done, and the stress on the community, infrastructure, the urban fabric has all been intense.

This New Southwark Plan should be a robust policy document that gives clarity to developers about the material consideration that could challenge or delay them during the planning process. There should be no more situations were policies are sidelined simply because the pay off in S106 and CIL is seen as mitigation. Evidence reports need to be factual rather than fictional, an example is the DCA 2011, the actual approved

Representation acknowledged. The NSP aims to deliver a document of strategic policies that sets guidance on major development for new homes, social, green and transport infrastructure. Policies have been through rigorous amendments based on input from statutory and other consultees.

The plan is based on robust evidence base to ensure it is justified and deliverable, including objective assessment of needs and viability test of the plan. All evidence base will be made public alongside the final submission of the NSP.

housing delivered is five times that of the capacity assessment.

Potential major development sites have been conveniently disregarded as likely to come forward in the next five to ten years, such sites amount to two new Shards scale sites within Cathedral ward.

Views of statutory and other consultees should be considered material considerations

As a spatial policy document the NSP as it currently is drafted has few merits. It lacks the unambiguous policies needed to deliver development schemes that make the most of site opportunities, the right balance of uses, and the social, environmental, economic and sustainable challenges OUR neighbourhood faces over the next decade to fifteen years. To put is simply his a rehash of poor policies produced by the same officers making responsible fir the last plan's lifetime. Nobody has been listened, no lesson learned, no aspiration incorporated in the final submission. The examination stage is now the chance to demand a total revamp of the policies that show due diligence and thought by the local authority.

In earlier LDF guidance, the following statement captures what should have been done to ensure the NSP is sound:

The important things are for the implications of the uncertainty to be taken into account and the “what if” situation considered. Some authorities have addressed the situation by making reference to a range of possible outcomes. This is acceptable if it is not possible to be more precise. Spurious precision is not helpful and is potentially misleading. Where uncertainties exist that may affect the delivery of strategic development requirements, planned contingencies with appropriate monitoring and trigger mechanisms need to be included.

That as well as a robust evidence base is missing.

Individual

Noted. Major developments are defined in the glossary of the Plan.

NSPPSV267.4

There needs to provision in the plan stated the criteria to define major construction developments and large scale major developments.

Individual

NSPPSV290.6

Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not: - Please give details of why you consider the New Southwark Plan to be not legally compliant or unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the New Southwark Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The sub title of this "Southwark Plan" speaks of "keeping promises" and that is not the documented experience which I have regarding the application of the Southwark Plan to Canada Water - Rotherhithe.

Keeping promises must be guaranteed by the Plan itself when it refers to resident involvement.

I have seen community involvement which has been easily altered behind closed doors, ignored or managed during secondary consultations.

If these integrity problems are not addressed in the plan, it is not clear what the plan seeks to achieve as it would appear to be going in two different directions, at least two different results.

Without clarity and integrity it not necessarily will mean that both solutions were the most appropriate strategy.

It is no clear what will happen when other interests take precedence, if both differing solutions will be consistent with National Policy.

My experience is that without efforts to protect the integrity of this process it can result in near fraud situations (example agreements concerning Seven Islands Leisure Centre which seem to be partially withdrawn after the agreement had been reached).

There are no procedural guarantees for previously consulted matters. Agreed results can be changed behind closed doors or by managing and forcing a change using

Policy IP6 sets out that we will consult on draft planning policy and guidance, in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. We are in the process of updating our statement of involvement (SCI) which will give our residents further clarity on how we implement our planning decisions, in addition to giving guidance on how residents can be more involved.

<p>secondary consultations as a tool to give precedence to other interests. (example: concerning agreements reached over the building heights).</p>	
<p>Organisation: Old Bermondsey Forum NSPPSV297.1</p>	<p>Representation noted.</p>
<p>Do you consider the document to be legally compliant in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012?</p> <p>Legally compliant</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is sound? - Soundness</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Justified</p>	
<p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Effective</p>	
<p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Consistent with national policy and the London Plan</p>	
<p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Positively Prepared</p>	
<p>Organisation: Peckham Coal Line NSPPSV304.7</p> <p>Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not: - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the New Southwark Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the New Southwark</p>	<p>Policy P51 (low line routes) seeks to protect Low Line routes, including the Peckham Coal Line, where proposed development obstructs the implementation of Low Line routes it will not be permitted. Policy P51 also requires any development coming forward to support the implementation of Low Line routes.</p>

Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Ideally a specific policy should be introduced that defines PCL with reference to a boundary plan with an explanation of the project and its aims. More detail can be found in the PCL feasibility study. The proposal is an elevated park, pedestrian and cycle route to connect Peckham Rye (Rye Lane) and Queen's Road Peckham (Queen's Road opposite Asylum Road), and to connect to the wider green and cycle route networks. This will promote better connections between these areas, improve public health and encourage sustainable modes of transport. Development should not compromise the delivery of this route, and should contribute directly to it where directly affecting it. The PCL team would welcome the opportunity to discuss appropriate wording further. The additional policy could be located before or after policy P49. This will make the NSP sound by clarifying what the PCL is in order that this stated aim can actually be delivered.

Individual
NSPPSV306.5

Do you consider that the New Southwark Plan is unsound because it is not: - Please give details of why you consider the New Southwark Plan to be not legally compliant or unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the New Southwark Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

JUSTIFIED:

- The plan is not founded on robust and credible evidence bases
- Evidence of participation of the local community is poor or entirely lacking
- The consultation that has taken place has not allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties
- The sources of evidence are not convincing
- The evidence base is not up to date [1]
- There is not a clear cut audit trail showing how and why the preferred approach was

The NSP is a strategic plan for the Borough that sets out how we aim to fulfil our promises and achieve social regeneration.

Extensive consultation has been undertaken through the preparation of the New Southwark Plan, this is detailed further in the Consultation Report.

We are in the process of updating our statement of community involvement (SCI) which will give our residents more clarity on how we implement our planning decisions, in addition to giving guidance on how residents can be more involved.

Robust evidence base documents have been prepared or updated as required to inform the New Southwark Plan.

The Plan does not go into detail about the delivery partners on site allocations. Where relevant, this will be set out in Area Action Plan.

arrived at. The main alternative options should be discussed in the Sustainability Appraisal (in terms of social, environmental, economic and resource use objectives)

[1] Not more than 3 years old for documents relating to retail, employment and housing and not more than 1 year old for key documents such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Economic Needs Assessment

EFFECTIVE:

Deliverability:

- Delivery partners are not signed up
- The strategy is not coherent with that of neighbouring authorities
- The timescales for delivery are not realistic
- The plan does not explain how when and by whom its key policy objectives and proposals will be achieved

Flexibility:

- The plan does not include (sufficient) remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need minor adjustment or significant change.
 - Minor adjustments could be the outcome of monitoring processes
 - Major changes could be responses to funding problems for example

Monitoring:

- The plan does not include targets or milestones which relate to the deliverability of policies (including housing trajectories).
- It is not clear how targets are to be measured (by when, how and by whom) and these do not line up with the annual monitoring report

CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY:

- The plan departs from national policy without clear or convincing reason
- The plan does not but should depart from national policy due to an identified and justifiable local need
- The plan does not comply with the London Plan (see new draft Nov 2017)

A Statement of Common Ground will be prepared setting out how work with neighbouring authorities has been undertaken.

Through monitoring of the Plan once it is adopted we will be able to identify where amendments are required. Monitoring of the plan will be undertaken and set out in an annual monitoring report which will be published on our website. A number of indicators have been set out within the Integrated Impact Assessment; this will be updated prior to the submission of the Plan.

During preparation of the Plan, consideration has been given to the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan and our policies have been prepared accordingly. Our policies have been informed by our evidence base documents and background papers have been prepared which provide more justification of the policies.

POSITIVELY PREPARED:

- Is it not clear what the Plan is seeking to achieve
- There is not a direct relationship between the identified issues, visions and objectives
- It is not clear how policies will meet the objectives
- There are obvious gaps in the policies
- The policies are not internally consistent

Individual
NSPPSV218.11

The existing manner of Representation through Consultations is impossible to track, trace and quantify. This is a problem for the entire NSP and the history of planning decisions across the board, throughout the nation over time. Consultations are wordy questions or just requests for input from concerned citizens and interest groups. Consultations are left in public places (often they are not where they are meant to be but there is no tracking of that omission; like the NSP itself was said to be at my local library from the 18th of January but never arrived nor was it known to librarians). Representation should be a statistical questionnaire. The questions, the construction, sampling, graphs, statistical responses can be analyzed independently with clarity of documented user group response. It is perfectly clear why a statistically accountable collection of opinion is not the preferred route of council planners and politicians who would prefer to err on content delivery rather than be hindered by time spent getting it right.

It should be acknowledged that each version of the NSP has been strengthened through input from statutory and other consultees, including feedback received from consultation held with the residents of Southwark, ensuring compliance with the NPPF & London Plan.

The documents should also have been accessible online at the libraries and services points. Help could be sought from our trained staff regarding the consultation if there were difficulties. Advice could also be requested via email and telephone.

Southwark Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is currently in the process of being updated which will give our residents more clarity on how we implement our planning decisions, in addition to giving guidance on how residents can be more involved.