



NEW SOUTHWARK PLAN
AMENDED POLICIES CONSULTATION RESPONSES

SUMMARIES

JANUARY 2020

Miscellaneous Comments – General Comments (Amended Policies)

- Climate change has not been represented in the policies.
- Most of concerns from Mayor of London have been met, except some along the Old Kent Road.
- The Mayor raises the importance of phasing to deliver council objectives and set out a clear strategy for retention of industrial capacity.
- Critical of the Design Review Panel because it is not independent.
- The NSP does not address the changes introduced in the Mayors' Transport Strategy (MTS) and Draft New London Plan, especially with regard to transport and the public realm.
- Objections raised regarding the loss of industrial land.
- Objections raised regarding evidence from the GLA not being taken into account for industrial land.

Legality concerns:

- Plan is not sound or legal because it does not comply with the NPPF, London Plan or Mayor's Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration.
- The NSP is not legal as it has failed in any way to comply with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking, which was published in 2014 before the first consultation draft of the NSP.
- Plan does not comply with NPPF or London Plan.
- Objections raised regarding inconsistency with NPPF and London Plan generally, but especially regarding OKR sites and Industrial land.

Consultation

- Critical of the fact that we only allowed representations to be made online.
- Objection to the definition of brownfield land.
- Southwark can be proactive in proving its dedication to mitigating any impact on these protected groups.
- The survey is poorly designed.
- By only allowing online responses it discriminates against those without internet access, and the most vulnerable to policy changes.
- Consultation does not appear to be full or fair.
- Objections raised because individuals were not consulted.
- Objections to Southwark changing their consultation procedure mid-way through Regulation 17 unlawfully.
- Consultation should occur with households directly.
- The online form is inaccessible and difficult to fill in for many.

Legality concerns:

- Criticisms associated with the use of legality as a judgement of the plan, it is too restrictive to judge the plan by.
- Plan is unlawful because it does not comply with the Statement of Community Involvement or the Statement of Representations Procedure.
- The Consultation Report for the amended policies version does not show any evidence that all the methods have been used.
- Southwark Law Centre - gave advice to residents that "The New Southwark Plan is not legally compliant because Southwark changed their consultation procedure mid-way through Regulation 17 unlawfully. There is a legitimate expectation that this round of consultation should be procedurally identical to previous rounds of consultation at this stage".
- 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 unsound because it is not justified or consistent with national policy.

Protocol

- Southwark needs to consider the impacts on mental illness of the destruction of community and ignoring local opinion.
- The NSP has been prepared with reference to only a rudimentary, incomplete and outdated evidence base.

P1 Social rented and intermediate homes

- Inconsistent with the Draft London Plan fast track approach at 40% affordable housing. Fast track should be for 35% affordable housing provision and 50% affordable housing provision for development on public sector land and industrial sites.
- No evidence to support the 40% fast track approach.
- Southwark should use an affordable housing threshold of 10 or more dwellings.
- Clarity is requested on the point relating to habitable rooms. It is not clear how Southwark Council will determine “equivalence”.
- The policy and supporting text should make clear that development can provide a mix of different affordable housing tenures and the Mayor’s preferred affordable housing tenures.
- The policy undermines the ability to take a ‘portfolio approach’ agreed with the Mayor as set out in the Draft London Plan, which states ‘where there is an agreement with the Mayor to deliver at least 50 per cent across the portfolio of sites, then the 35 per cent threshold should apply to individual sites’.
- All schemes should be subject to viability reviews, fast track route should be removed.
- The threshold for the ‘fast-track’ should be raised to 50% affordable housing in line with the Mayor’s strategic target and need.
- The fact box should be re-inserted, no reasons given for its removal.
- Vacant building credit should be allowed in some instances.
- The new NB statement is unclear and should be deleted.
- ‘Subject to viability’ should be removed.
- The requirement for provision of social rented housing should be increased.
- Policy P1 is not sound. Under point 2 of the Viability section of Policy P1 the proposed threshold of 40% should be reduced to 35%.
- To be in conformity with the draft new London Plan, Southwark needs to ensure that its threshold and overall approach is justified.
- The policy should reflect the threshold approach to viability as set out in the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG 2017.
- With the proposed release of significant amounts of industrial land within the borough, Southwark should make reference to the latter threshold for public land and schemes where industrial capacity is lost, as set out in Policy H6 Threshold approach to applications in the draft London Plan.
- The supporting text should note that affordable housing should only be provided off-site in exceptional circumstances, except for small housing schemes.
- For clarity and to ensure that the policy is effective, the supporting text to Policy P1 should acknowledge Policy P5 (Housing for Older People) and it’s linked approach that specialist affordable accommodation for older people can come forward.
- The policy is unclear about how the viability review process will work in practice.
- The policy doesn’t take account of what makes up a neighbourhood.
- A large amount of text has been deleted from the reasons sections. Concerns are raised that this will make it harder to scrutinise the detail and justification for planning applications. The deleted text should be restored or replaced with something that serves a similar purpose.
- Support for Policy P1 which seeks to provide for both ‘social rented’ and ‘intermediate’ housing.
- The proposed amendments to Policy P1 are not consistent with the definitions of affordable housing as set out in the revised NPPF (2019).
- The reference to social rent should be included in the fact box.
- To be consistent with the new policy title, the term affordable housing should be deleted throughout the policy.

- The term affordable is vague and subjective.
- Intermediate housing is not supported because it does not provide secure life-time tenancies to tenants who may otherwise be eligible for council housing.
- The Council should clear its waiting list by building more council homes before more market housing is permitted to be built.
- The Council should build more socially rented housing so rents are invested back into the borough.
- The policy requirement should be a minimum of 50% of all new housing as social rented.
- To be consistent with the new policy title, the term affordable housing should be deleted throughout and replaced with social rented to meet the needs of those on the housing waiting list.
- ‘subject to viability’ should be removed from the policy.

Legality of the plan

- It is recommended that the mix of affordable includes a proportion of homes for rent between London Living Rent and rents affordable to households on incomes of £60,000, to be in conformity with the London Plan.
- Policy P1 is not legal or sound as it does not comply with the London Plan on Estate Regeneration.
- Policy P1 is welcomed although this needs to be amended to refer to the correct policy-compliant threshold of 35% for the draft policy to be made sound.

P4 Private rented homes

- Should be a requirement to secure the PRS for 15 years, not 30 years. Not consistent with the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG 2017.
- Inclusion of Affordable Rent for household incomes of £60,000 - £90,000 per year as an appropriate affordable housing product should be re-inserted into the policy.
- The policy is inconsistent with the Draft London Plan which allows solely discount market rent on build to rent schemes.
- The affordable housing requirement should be the same as P1.
- This sentence should be deleted: ‘where the provision of private rented homes generates a higher development value than if the homes were built for sale, the minimum affordable housing requirement will increase to the point where there is no financial benefit to providing private rented homes over built for sale homes’.
- It should not be necessary for affordable housing reviews to be required where 35% affordable housing has been provided and implementation targets have been met.
- Do not support that the build to rent affordable homes should be allocated on the social housing waiting list and the intermediate housing waiting list.
- Policy P4 should be removed. Self-contained, private rented home developments should be subject to the requirements of P1, as they were in earlier versions of the draft NSP.
- The following additional wording should be added to Paragraph 1.3 of the policy: “meeting the same standards of design as build for sale, whilst reflecting the specifics of Build to Rent Housing and the demands of those renting”.
- Private renters should not be obliged to take a three year tenancy if they would prefer a shorter term.
- The provision of affordable housing in accordance with Table 3, subject to viability is unachievable and will prove obstructive to the Build-to-Rent sector in Southwark.
- Point 2 of Paragraph 1.7 and Paragraph 2 should be deleted from the policy.
- Policy P4 is inconsistent with P1, and it is unclear why the policy on social rent homes should be applied differently in the case of large, private-rental schemes.

- Private rented homes should be comprehensively monitored for compliance to the standards and quality of living they provide.
- The proportions for build to rent should be the same as for Policy P1: i.e. 25% of total should be social rent.
- Reference to ‘social rent equivalent’ should be changed to social rent, ‘equivalent’ should also be removed from ‘London Living Rent’.

Legality of the plan

- The policy requirement is not sound as it is not consistent with regional guidance set out in the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG 2017.
- For the policy to be sound and consistent Paragraph 1.7 should be changed to: “Provide affordable homes in accordance with P1 or Table 3, subject to viability”.
- The policy is not sound due to the increase of the social rented housing threshold from 12% to 15%.

P9 Optimising delivery of new homes (Amended policy P9 and P13)

- Exemplary standards of residential design requirements are overly prescriptive, inflexible and inappropriate.
- Objection to the requirement of 2.5m ceiling height. This should be amended to be in line with the draft London Plan i.e to be 2.5m for at least 75% of the gross internal area.
- Objection to the requirement of providing green communal amenity space and additional communal plan areas for children.
- Objection to the requirement to provide partially or fully inset balconies.
- The requirement for entrances to be shared between affordable and market homes is not practical and it should be deleted. Policy wording should be amended to require developments to be tenure blind with no material differences between the entrances for the affordable and market units.
- Wording on single and dual aspect requirement should be amended to provide more clarity.
- The Mayor welcomes the deletion of the density ranges.
- Policy should be amended to highlight that development must optimise the delivery of new homes and make the most efficient use of land.
- The policy should seek to optimise the delivery of housing on individual sites through a design led approach that assesses the capacity for growth and the context of the site.
- Objection to the policy requirement for communal child playspace to be provided for specialist/older people accommodation schemes.
- Habitable separate kitchen is required by a Registered provider for an affordable unit. Where the design may preclude a window, if the kitchen is over 11sqm, then it should count as a habitable room.
- Amend wording to allow single aspect units where they are well-designed and will provide a high level of amenity for future occupants.
- Policy should be amended to development proposals to make the most efficient use of land and be designed at the optimum density, taking into account site context and connectivity / accessibility by public transport and other sustainable modes. The policy should then set out the suggested design-led approach.
- As the density table has been deleted from the policy, the ‘fact box’ setting out how residential density would be calculated should also be deleted.
- Concerns over the density ranges being removed from policy and that the exemplary standards of design won’t provide sufficient control and mitigation of over-dense developments.
- The requirement of shared entrances for affordable and market homes to be made

mandatory. Otherwise it will be overcome by resistance from developers and registered providers for whom it is a cost and administrative inconvenience.

- Suggested exemplary criteria to be included in the policy:
 - Thin walls should be avoided to mitigate against noise nuisance within developments;
 - Environmental impact (demonstrable carbon neutrality, with no ability to offset through payment in lieu);
 - Green space (both provision of and access to) should have greater importance in these criteria;
 - Air quality issues should be mentioned.
- Supports the requirement for entrances to be shared between affordable and market homes, and additional wording should be added to allow everyone to get to every floor.
- Should be clarified that when referring to affordable homes it means both social rent and intermediate.
- Concerns over the child play space requirement for market/intermediate housing being lower than for social rent.
- Policy should be amended to allow a degree of flexibility when appropriately justified.
- The policy should be amended to require provision of fully or partially inset balconies, unless appropriate justification is provided for alternative private amenity provision.
- With regards to ventilation systems, the policy should be amended to provide a level of flexibility, with additional wording: “Where possible, development should utilize non-mechanical ventilation systems such as...”.
- With regards to single aspect dwellings, the policy should be amended to provide some flexibility to recognise that on major redevelopment schemes in urban locations it will prove very challenging to avoid any two-bedroom single aspect units while also addressing site constraints, policy requirements and other design considerations. Additional wording should be provided: “Where possible, single aspect should be avoided on dwellings with two or more bedrooms...”.
- The emerging New London Plan (paragraph 3.4.5) refers to avoiding single-aspect dwellings that contain three or more bedrooms, and this should be reflected in proposed Policy P9 in order to be consistent.
- Policy should be amended to only require private and communal amenity space to meet the identified space standards.
- Support for the high design standards set out for new homes and support for the principle of optimising density on any given site.

Legality of the plan

- With regard to private and communal space requirements, in order to be more effective, the policy should be amended to require provision of private and communal space requirements, and to exceed these where possible.
- The proposed wording of policy P9 is not justified, as it is not based on robust and credible evidence, nor is it consistent with national policy.

P71 Homes for Travellers and Gypsies (New policy)

The consultation summaries below were received during the consultation period for the Amended Policies on Policy P71.

- A needs assessment should be carried out in line with the definition set out in the draft new London Plan; and for any additional need, sufficient capacity should be identified within site allocations or on a sub-regional basis.
- No reference is made in the policy that a needs assessment is planned to be carried out or what methodology is planned to be used for this. This should be included in the policy.

- Southwark Council has failed to take into account the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites when preparing the New Southwark Plan.
- Concerns over the lack of Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment in the Council's evidence base.
- Concerns over the Strategic Housing Market Assessment not considering the housing needs of those living in caravans and mobile homes on Traveller sites in Southwark.
- No evidence has been gathered on the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers within Southwark.
- No indication within the methodology for the 2009 Southwark Housing Requirements Study that the research conducted included interviews with those living on Gypsy and Traveller Sites.
- The New Southwark Plan is inconsistent with the adopted and emerging London Plan, NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers Sites which set out the requirement of carrying out a needs assessment, set pitch targets and identify a 5-year supply of land to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- Southwark Council's approach is unfair as it prioritises the accommodation for settled communities, without considering if there is a need for further site capacity for the Gypsy and Traveller community.
- Policy P71 successfully protects the four named Gypsy and Travellers sites and if there is a need for more, however the methodology on how need is identified is not set out.
- The failure to include a methodology to calculate future Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs in the Local Plan is a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- The wording of point 2 should be changed from "additional facilities" to "additional accommodation".
- The policy should include that Southwark Council will identify and update and annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites and a supply of specific developable sites for years 6 to 10 and 11 to 15.
- The inclusion of Policy P71 in the NSP is welcomed.
- Concerns about the vague wording of the policy. The meaning of 'facilities' is unclear, and the policy should refer to new sites for additional accommodation instead.
- The key problems with a separate Gypsy and Traveller Plan approach is that all or most of the sites that would be available, suitable and deliverable are already allocated for other uses through the Local Plan and AAPs.
- The Draft London Plan requires local authorities that have not conducted an accommodation needs assessment to do so within 2 years of its adoption, or use the figure of need from the 2008 GTANA. For Southwark, this is 15 pitches. The inclusion of this figure in P71 would be supported.
- Draft London Plan Table 4.4A figure should be used as a definition for pitches to be delivered in the first five years of the NSP. This should be reviewed subject to the new Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessment to be undertaken by the Council.
- It should be indicated how the Council will implement the Draft London Plan Policy H16 E regarding site audits.
- Concerns over accommodating additional Gypsy and Travellers sites.
- Pitch targets should be set and should be monitored annually.
- The wording of the second part of the policy is vague as it only commits to identifying sites for additional facilities and it does not identify future deliverable accommodation locations in accordance with need.
- There should be a clear definition of the term 'accommodation'.

Legality of the plan

- The policy is not positively prepared or justified because the Council has not produced an assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, either as part of the SHMA or as a separate study.
- The policy is not effective because the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers should be assessed and planned for alongside all other communities, not as part of a separate exercise.
- The policy is unsound as it provides no definition of Gypsies and Travellers; identifies no needs (and even makes the protection of existing sites subject to need) and identifies no new sites. The policy should include the draft London Plan's Policy H16 B definition of Gypsy and Travellers.

SP2 Amended Policies

SP2 Regeneration that works for all Amended Policies

SP2

- Representation offers support for part (2) investing in communities and existing residents and Part (6) in driving good design that installs pride of place in all communities.
- Concern raised for 'heritage-led regeneration' and 'place plans for the different areas in the borough' as these effect new policy P70 and are open to broad interpretation.
- The Policy is considered to be unsound and unjustified due to a lack of evidence, lack of community consultation, and fundamental undeliverability, both in itself and in relation to other parts of the NSP. For points 5 and 6 to be sound they need to be developed through genuine community consultation. Direct links should be made to P14 and P70.
- There is a risk that too many tall buildings will be built and have a detrimental affect on mental wellbeing and recreational conditions. Tall buildings should be no more than tall buildings.
- Regeneration doesn't work for residents on the Housing waiting list, for example the Aylesbury Estate is predicted to lose many social rent and affordable homes. There are other examples of social rent homes also being lost.
- The wording around the requirement to provide publically accessible space in buildings higher than 30m is considered to be ambiguous and impractical.
- The amendment is welcomed to acknowledge that all residents should benefit from regeneration but the soundness of the amendment is questionable as most of the policies in the Submission Version of the plan should also have been re-written to take full account of the implications of the amendment.
- There is no evidence to show how this amended policy will be achieved.
- The policy seems to only apply to areas with Social Regeneration Charters and so it is not regeneration that works for all. When communities are not consulted appropriately it cannot work. There needs to be a change from a market led development model.
- The policy is going in the right direction but does not meet any of the tests of soundness. Changing the heading of the policy does not make it effective – SP2 is still attached to the same group of policies and so it is unclear how they relate to the strategic policy.
- The policy should include a commitment to work with the community sector.
- The policy needs to define what is meant by terms such as "wellbeing," "equity of esteem" and "better lives in stronger communities".
- There needs to be more detail on how this policy can be delivered by providing details on the preparation of Social Regeneration Charters and place plans. The Development Consultation Charter should be referenced.
- The policy needs to give clearer indication of how those who face greater disadvantage will be identified, how investments will be made and how Southwark defines the "causes of inequality".
- SP2 should include the requirement for a fine grained, comprehensive and systematic 'place audit' to be conducted in regeneration areas at the earliest stage possible. This audit should include a needs assessment focused on identifying the needs of people with protected characteristics so that investment is targeted to benefit the most disadvantaged.
- Southwark should provide evidence that it has considered the impact of large developments on infrastructure in neighbouring Lambeth.
- Recent planning permissions are contrary to the policy.
- Support for inclusion of reference to tenure integration but it is noted that there will always be specific instances in which Registered Provider's requirements have implications for the way in which different tenures can be located or accessed in order to support the delivery and management of these housing products at the levels of affordability that are required.
- Question over why Alvey and Kingslake Estates have only just been included as brownfield land in the Aylesbury Map without consultation from the community.

SP2 Amended Policies

- The policy is welcomed but the monitoring table in Annex 6 should be amended to include specific indicators which will measure progress against this policy.
- Support for the policy but the addition of “social regeneration frameworks” and “social regeneration charters and place plans” to SP2 does not effectively demonstrate how communities will be meaningfully consulted, nor how these plans will tackle inequality. These frameworks and charters should be provided in the policy and not reasons. A SPD is also needed to provide guidance.
- Policy SP2 should outline how local employment opportunities linked to regeneration can be structured to meet the needs of the local community.
- SP2 should reference affordable workspace.
- The policy should make greater reference to the climate emergency and how this will be dealt with.
- The Policy should find a different way of linking this policy to all relevant development management policies and not just P11 to P22.
- It should include a commitment to work with the community sector to develop robust community processes managed by communities themselves.

Legality of the plan

- The plan is not sound because a large part of the Plan is the section of proposals for what the council wishes to see on the various site allocations it has listed and many of proposal sites have already been given full planning permission.
- The policy does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan or the Mayor’s Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration (2018).
- The Plan is not justified without evidence which includes the views of local community.

P14 Tall buildings

- The inclusion of a map highlighting the locations of tall buildings is welcomed.
- The map could be further refined to take into account viewing corridors, conservation areas and historic assets and with a more fine grained assessment of specific locations / areas.
- Publically accessible space to be provided on or near to the top of all buildings over 30m is considered to be unreasonable.
- Height and massing of proposals for tall buildings should have to include detailed supporting information that includes how negative impacts will be mitigated against.
- As per the London Plan tall buildings require statements to indicate clearly to developers the maximum acceptable heights and massing on sites that would conform to the policy.
- The maps highlighting the locations of tall buildings are considered to be too vague and non-specific and many are in historic neighbourhoods which would have a detrimental impact on the areas unique character and feel.
- The area shown on Map 1 will lead to a detrimental impact on the skyline as it encourages a scattered approach to tall buildings.
- The definition of tall buildings lacks clarity. There is no definition of what makes a tall building a ‘landmark’ building. The policy should define what is meant by ‘context’, ‘emerging context and ‘exemplary architectural design’.
- Tall buildings also encourage a contradiction with Southwark’s affordable housing policies as recent viability reports from the GLA show how it is more difficult to achieve policy compliant levels of affordable housing in tall buildings. Viability should be calculated with reference to site, not simply building, as the latter may allow developers to ‘design-out’ affordable housing.
- Tall buildings are less environmentally sustainable. P14 would allow a tall building on the boundary of Burgess Park which would have a detrimental effect on biodiversity and undermine the conservation value of the SINC. The policy contradicts the council’s aim to be

SP2 Amended Policies

carbon neutral by 2030.

- The inclusion of Burgess Business Park as a potential location for tall buildings is not planned.
- P14 should be justified in relation to P18 and P54.
- The policy should explain how 'appropriate, sensitive and inappropriate locations' will be assessed and indicate what relevant standards will be applied to make this assessment where the tall buildings might have a negative impact on the setting of and vista surrounding public and protected open spaces.
- No building, tall or otherwise, should have a harmful impact on strategic views, as set out in the London View Management Framework, or to our Borough Views and, any building which has an appreciable impact on the skyline should make a positive contribution to that skyline.
- Support for the identification that tall buildings are typically appropriate within major town centres, opportunity area cores, action area cores and the Central Activity Zones.
- It is proposed that the following wording is included: The design of tall buildings will be required to minimise the risk of suicide/promote suicide prevention through its design and appropriate use of lighting, physical barriers and signage.
- Historic England does not consider language of 'avoid unacceptable harm to the significance of designated heritage assets or their settings' to be strong enough.

Legality of plan

- The policy is not justified or positively prepared because it introduces a fundamental policy change about tall buildings with no evidence to support or justify the change.
- Policy is not compliant with London Plan which requires a plan-led approach to tall buildings.

P70 Local List

- The policy should set out how consultation, criteria and committed timeline for the development of the local list.
- It should set out what will happen when a proposed development impacts on a locally-list asset.
- It is unclear when consultation took place on this policy.
- The policy is not considered to be effective because it does not comply with good practice as set out in Historic England's Advice Note 7.
- The list is considered to be incomplete as it does not include buildings or structure from outside areas covered by AAPs or SPDs.
- The policy does not indicate the level of protection that would be given to structures included on the list. The policy should set out what will happen when a proposed development impacts on a Locally-listed asset.
- To make this policy sound meaningful engagement should be carried out with the public.
- NSP64 is a site which contains cultural heritage and would benefit from being included on the List.
- The policy should include criteria for the inclusion of assets on the list and explain how these assets will be dealt with.
- This policy should include methodology on how the local list is prepared, how regularly it is reviewed and what developers will be required to "take into account" when buildings, spaces and structures that appear on it.
- It is not clear how P70 or P18 are consistent with the NPPF or Historic England's Conservation Principles.
- The Camberwell Area Vision is inconsistent with SP2.
- Policy only mentions buildings and structures and does not mention places e.g. public parks.
- Policy does not link to P16, P17 and P18.

SP2 Amended Policies

Suggestions for inclusion on the List

- The Shared
- Thomas Becket, Old Kent Road
- Wessex House, Old Kent Road and other Southwark Housing designed by Peter Moro and Partners
- Avondale Square by Sir Lancelot Keay, Basil Duckett and Partners North Peckham Civic Centre and mural
- Cobbled yard and the Old Southern Railway Stables, St. James's Road and Catlin Street
- Group: St George's Church (GRADE II) and surrounding mature trees, the Passmore Edwards old library, bath and washhouse (Grade II), the mature trees opposite the church in Burgess Park.
- Views of St Giles Church, Camberwell from Burgess Park Views of the chimney on Burgess Business Park from Burgess Park
- Views of the skyline across the lake past Cobourg School and the listed New Peckham Mosque (formerly Church of St Mark) from Burgess Park
- Views of the Georgian houses on Cobourg Road and skyline from Burgess Park
- Views of the skyline across Burgess Park towards St George's Church
- Views of the Shard from Burgess Park
- Old Mill Building, Blackpool Road
- 42-43 Peckham High Street

Legality of the plan

- Policy is considered to be unsound. It is unclear how the policy will deliver heritage-led regeneration.

Annex 4: Borough Views

- The view of St Paul's Cathedral from the top of One Tree Hill is significant.
- Support the proposed protection of the Borough Views and control of tall buildings within planning guidance.
- Support for the proposed changes to View 3: Camberwell Road Linear View towards St. Paul's Cathedral.
- The Mayor welcomes the amended view geometries that aim to address some of the concerns raised previously. However, the area the draft NSP covers falls within the background of a number of Protected Vistas. The maps shown in Annex 4 do not show the parts of Southwark that are affected by the viewing corridors, only the parts in the City of London.
- Development proposals should carefully assess any impacts the development may have on Protected Vistas to ensure no harm would result to their composition.
- Robust defence of the Borough views in planning decisions and stronger protection of both the borough views are required to ensure they are protected.
- It is requested that the threshold height at which the proposed Landmark Viewing Corridor be restored to 52.1m AOD, to protect the Lantern, Dome, Upper Drum, Upper Balustrade, Peristyle and Drum of the Cathedral as per the Strategic Viewing Corridors.
- Request that the lowering of the threshold height of the proposed borough view of St Paul's Cathedral from Nunhead Cemetery from 52.1m AOD to 45.0m AOD is not amended, 52.1m AOD should be restored.
- The identification of View 5 is not based on any demonstrable evidence base interrogated according to consistent criteria. Borough View 5 should be regulated by means of a process called 'Qualitative Visual Assessment' (QVA) as introduced into practice by the LVMF in 2002

SP2 Amended Policies

as the process for making qualitative judgments to ensure the appropriate management of change in those strategic views identified as River Prospects or Townscape Views.

- Support for the cross reference of the LVMF.

P28 Affordable Workspace (Amended Policies)

- Questions over viability of the 500sqm employment floorspace threshold.
- Concerns over lack of viability evidence.
- The feasibility of a scheme to deliver affordable workspace should be subject to viability.
- Criticisms have been raised that it is not appropriate to try and deliver on the same site, small and new businesses workspace and larger established users workspace. There is no market failure that this policy needs to address.
- Concerns raised over when to judge a business has been 'too successful.'
- Objections raised to ideas that businesses have the same social needs.
- Objections raised over the policy providing an unfair advantage to certain businesses because subsidised employment space distorts the market.
- Objections raised on perceived insufficient demand for this 10% affordable workspace.
- Objections raised over failure to define small shop floorspace.
- The policy should be amended to require affordable workspace where there is an identified need as opposed to a blanket requirement.
- P28 goes far beyond what the London Plan requires in terms of provision of affordable workspace without robust or credible evidence.
- There is no evidence underpinning the threshold for provision of affordable workspace.
- The policy cannot respond properly to market signals.
- There needs to be some flexibility because some sites deliver more benefits in other areas like residential and industrial on the same site.
- The policy does not account for businesses that choose to move or are not 'displaced'.
- The 10% affordable workspace should be subject to viability and not expected of all developments because it is not viable to do so. It could cause detriment to the scheme.
- The policy does not prevent useable and affordable workspace from being destroyed by unnecessary development.
- There is a lack of definition of: affordable workspace, discount or market rent or the criteria for eligibility of affordable workspace.
- There is no distinction made between non-profit/charities and commercial providers.
- The policy does not protect small businesses from loss of income due to gaps in operation.
- There is a risk of displacement of small businesses because it doesn't define what feasible means.
- It fails to guarantee premises for such small and independent businesses to continue to operate in like-for-like premises during the process of development.
- Objections raised to the focus on the provision of new affordable workspace.
- Objections raised to the policy not meeting the council's obligation to observe its public sector equality duty as many employees and small business owners are people with protected characteristics.
- The policy encourages displacement of small and independent businesses and allows developers to argue affordable workspace is not feasible. There are concerns this would be exploited by developers.
- The policy does not address A use class floorspace.
- Proposing 10% affordable is too much of a change from the previous small and independent businesses policy and changes the intent of the policy.
- Application of policy P28 across borough shows that demand is equal across the borough for type, concerns over whether this is actually the case.
- The policy is criticised for not being viable, and there is a lack of evidence.

- Elephant and Castle is already affordable.
- Concerns raised over potential conflict with other plan policies.
- Concerns raised about affordable provisions in mixed use schemes, concerned these will not be viable.
- Viability of full range of B class uses should be tested in mixed-use schemes, for the provision of affordable workspace to be viable and suitable as a policy.
- Need more rigorous policy for replacement and re-provision of existing low cost space.
- Objections raised based on the impact of the policy on reducing light industry floorspace, especially the impact on the OKR.
- Need to be more consistent with what the policy is protecting and promoting.
- Concerns over when the developer will determine whether an affordable versus a commercial workspace provider is used.
- Policy emphasis is on new provision and not re-provision of affordable workspace.
- Policy is ambiguous and appears to only address B class uses when it refers to small independent businesses making up 97% of businesses in Southwark Council.
- There is no reference to what happens to existing small businesses when development is being carried out – therefore conflicts with SP2 as these businesses are not protected.
- Objections have been raised to the loss of small business space during development.
- Objections raised to the omission of reference to the night time economy from the policy.
- This version of the policy is much weaker in protection of small and independent businesses.
- There should be no difference from the perspective of the developer between an in lieu payment and the provision of affordable workspace from a financial perspective.
- No methodology is proposed which would enable developers to factor this requirement into their feasibility or financial appraisals at the earliest stage of the development process.
- Supportive of policy, but needs to make more reference to ‘flexibility’ within the policy.
- Policy would cause harm to overall supply of floor space.
- The policy discriminates against some businesses because of their size.
- These in lieu payments must take into account additional social benefits.
- Focus has shifted from protecting small and independent businesses to provision of affordable workspace
- Objections raised to lack of information about how developers would factor in this requirement to their feasibility or financial appraisals at the earliest stage of the development process.
- Policy does not prevent useable and affordable workspace from being destroyed.
- ‘In lieu’ payments encourage redevelopment which removes existing satisfactory and appropriate affordable workspace and jobs.
- Affordable workspace used by the night time economy needs to have provisions made for sound and security.

Legality concerns:

- Plan is not sound because it does not explicitly guarantee like for like workspace for SMEs affected by the proposals and the language is not very explicit, it is also unclear how affordable is defined.
- P28 fails the test of soundness as it is not justified through robust and credible evidence.
- Despite amendments, the policy is not considered to be sound because it does not protect against the loss of useable affordable workspace.

- Policy is unsound because the policy emphasis is on new provision and not re-provision of affordable workspace.

P36 Hotels and Visitor Accommodation (Amended Policies)

- Critical of the policy requiring 10% of the total floorspace of hotel as ancillary facilities due to a lack of justification and why mitigation is required, concerns also raised about the feasibility of this.
- Concerns over the infringement of hotels on the local setting, especially of tall buildings.
- Concerns raised over the rise of Airbnb and lack of planning policy protection against its dominance.
- Concerns raised over increasing and large volume of hotels in Southwark.
- Concerns raised that hotels should not be at the expense of housing.
- Criticism that a 10% requirement for ancillary may reduce employment opportunities as there would be fewer guestrooms.
- Concerns raised over inconsistency with London Plan and NPPF, because it does not meet demand for hotels and does not address the balance of local land uses.
- The current wording is criticised for being too prescriptive.

Legality concerns:

- Plan is unsound because other forms of visitor accommodation are not defined and the serious deficiency of community meeting space should be identified and protections provided.
- Support noted and plan noted as sound.
- Policy is unjustified due to a lack of evidence base.



NEW SOUTHWARK PLAN
AMENDED POLICIES CONSULTATION RESPONSES

JANUARY 2020

Camberwell Town Centre Boundary - Amended Policies Version

- The extended town centre boundaries include two bus garages, which are not town centre uses and are required to be retained unless suitable alternative sites can be found (Mayor of London).
- Objection to the proposed extension of the Camberwell town centre boundary to include NSP22, NSP25, NSP26, NSP27 and NSP28 because this would bring them within the scope of policy P30 Town and local centres which permits the inclusion of town centre uses therefore increasing the likelihood of loss of industrial accommodation. To improve soundness in relation to the NPPF and London Plan requirements the plan should achieve no net loss of industrial accommodation across Southwark.
- Objection to failure of designating site allocations NSP22, NSP25, NSP26, NSP27 and NSP28 as LSIS and failure to require no net loss of industrial accommodation on these sites (Vital OKR).
- Objection to the 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.
- Objection to the failure to recognise and inclusively designate a significant proportion of the borough's existing high street settings as town centres, and thus to protect them from development that could reduce non-residential capacity.

Elephant and Castle – Amended Site allocation
--

NSP46 Skipton House (deleted site)

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Note that part of the site allocation could still come forward and could form a smaller site allocation at Keyworth Hostel and Perry Library.• Theatre’s Trust concerned about the loss of cultural space originally allocated in this site allocation. |
|--|

Rotherhithe Site Allocations Amended Policies

NSP86 Croft Street (new site allocation)

- GLA note that any proposal is to consider potential road alterations on Lower Road that may narrow the Croft Street junction and introduce a two-way segregated cycle track across the mouth of Croft Street
- Objection to the failure to define requirements for industrial accommodation within mixed-development on this site

NSP80: St Olav's Business Park, Lower Road

- Southern Grove Real Estate consider changes made to the site vision to be unacceptable. Reference to the provision of active frontages should be put under development 'should'
- No further comments from other representations

Old Kent Road Site Allocations Amended Policies (Jan 2019) Consultation Response Summaries

NSP57 Mandela Way

- The Mayor of London welcomes the requirement for the re-provision of industrial uses capacity.
- Possfund Custodian Trustee Ltd objects to the LSIS designation and sufficient detail is provided in the draft Old Kent Road AAP.
- Trustees of the Tate Gallery does not object to the inclusion of industrial uses however operational requirements of them and sensitive residential uses located alongside must be accommodated without prejudice to industrial operations. The draft AAP guidance and the NSP site vision and site requirements should be aligned.
- Vital OKR support the LSIS designation but consider there should be a policy, more guidance should be given regarding the quantum and type of industrial accommodation, and object to map notations of improved connectivity on the site vision map. Also suggest part of the site boundary should be reduced to emit the area adjoining OKR.

NSP65 Land bounded by Glengall Road, Latona Road and Old Kent Road

- The Mayor of London supports the requirement for reprovision of industrial uses but considers the area between the retained SIL and Ossory Road should remain as SIL.
- The site allocation should acknowledge and contribute positively to Burgess Park MOL/SINC and the Glengall Road conservation area (Friends of Burgess Park).
- Support from Berkeley Homes.
- Vital OKR support the LSIS designation but consider there should be a policy, more guidance should be given regarding the quantum and type of industrial accommodation, and object to map notations of improved connectivity on the site vision map. Suggest further locations for LSIS and SPIL within the site allocation.

NSP69 and NSP70 Hatcham and Ilderton Road

- The Mayor of London objects to the loss of SIL in this location and that industrial uses should be retained and intensified. It would be difficult to accommodate mixed use development on some parts of the site.
- Support from Twenty Twenty Glengall Ltd with note that site-specific considerations should be taken into account as the site allocations are very large.
- Vital OKR support the LSIS designation but consider there should be a policy, more guidance should be given regarding the quantum and type of industrial accommodation, and object to map notations of improved connectivity on the site vision map. Suggest further locations for LSIS and SPIL within the site allocation.

SPIL Gasworks site boundary change

- Objections relate to the reduction of SPIL designation in this location.