

London Borough of Southwark Examination of the New Southwark Plan

Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions – December 2020

Introduction

Following our initial examination of the submitted New Southwark Plan (the NSP) and the supporting material it was agreed with the Council that additional consultation would be undertaken at an early stage of the examination. This consultation (August-October 2020) allowed for initial comment on a number of proposed changes to the NSP including additional content on the quantum of development being planned for, the overall strategy and a housing trajectory. We have taken into account all representations made during this 2020 consultation together with duly made representations on the 2017 proposed submission version, the 2019 amended policies version in identifying below what we consider to be the main Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) regarding the soundness of the NSP. These MIQs should be read in conjunction with our separately published guidance note.

The hearing sessions will take place over a number of weeks in late February/March 2021. Our MIQs are structured to deal with matters of strategy and policies before considering site specific matters. The deadline for submitting statements in response to these MIQs is set out in the guidance note. Please note, you can only respond to questions below which are relevant to your representations on the NSP. These MIQs are not an opportunity to broaden the scope of your representations and comment on new matters. Representors should be aware of the Council's proposed modifications when the plan was submitted for examination in January 2020 (Document NSP01A) together with the further proposed changes presented for consultation in August 2020 (Document EIP27). An aggregate list of all the proposed changes are presented in examination Document EIP27D. The Council's response to our initial questions (document EIP16) also provides further useful context. Furthermore, additional evidence documents have been submitted into the examination by the Council since January 2020, with our agreement, and can be found on the Examination webpage. Agendas for the individual hearing sessions will be issued before the hearings commence.

Matter 1 – Procedural and legal requirements including the Duty to Co-operate

Issue 1

Whether the Council has complied with relevant procedural and legal requirements.

Questions

Plan preparation

- 1.1 Has the NSP been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant 'consultation plans' and met the minimum consultation requirements in the Regulations?
- 1.2 In accordance with NPPF paragraph 21, does the NSP identify 'Strategic Policies' – including for the purpose of those strategic policies against which any Neighbourhood Plan or Business Neighbourhood Plan would be required to be in general conformity with? Are any other the implementation policies to be regarded as 'strategic policies'?
- 1.3 The plan period is to 2033. Assuming plan adoption in the second half of 2021 there would not be a 15-year plan period on adoption as required by NPPF2019 paragraph 22. Is it necessary for soundness that the plan period is extended to 2036 and that 1 April 2020 forms the basis for year 1 for measuring the housing land supply in accordance with NPPF paragraph 67?

- 1.4 Is the plan sufficiently clear whether there are any policies from the existing development plan that would be superseded by its adoption?

Integrated Impact Assessment & Site Selection Methodology

- 1.5 Having regard to the updated Equalities Impact Assessment July 2020 [Document EIP76], in what way does the Plan seek to ensure that due regard is had to the three aims expressed in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in relation to those who have a relevant protected characteristic?
- 1.6 Is the approach to site selection in the New Southwark Plan justified, including the evidence in the Sites Methodology Paper [EIP82] and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.7 The updated April 2020 Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report (document EIP23) concludes that the policies of the NSP, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would not give rise to any likely significant effects on any Natura 2000 sites. Is that a valid conclusion in light of the response from Natural England (EIP21)?

General conformity with the London Plan

- 1.8 Does the Statement of Common Ground with the Greater London Authority (the Mayor) (Document SCG13, May 2020) confirm that the submitted New Southwark Plan would be in general conformity with the London Plan?
- 1.9 Are any modifications proposed, either on submission in January 2020, or subsequently, to address any issues of general conformity with the London Plan, in particular the strategy for the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area, the approach to Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) and the intensification of land currently in employment use?

Climate Change

- 1.10 Does the NSP accord with s19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) (as amended) by including policies that are designed to secure that the development and use of the land in the Borough contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?

Issue 2

Whether the Council has complied with the duty to co-operate in the preparation of the new Southwark Plan.

Questions

- 1.11 Overall, has the NSP been prepared in accordance with the duty to cooperate as required by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004?
- 1.12 Do the Statements of Common Ground with adjoining London Boroughs, Transport for London and statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency and Historic England etc. identify relevant strategic matters, actions in relation to cross border issues and the outcomes of the actions taken in relation to the duty?
- 1.14 In relation to the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area and wider growth along the Bakerloo Line Extension route has there been appropriate dialogue and agreed outcomes as part of the NSP process with the London Borough of Lewisham and GLA/TfL to ensure coordinated sustainable cross-boundary growth in this part of south-east London including potential cross-boundary options to support intensification of employment uses (for example in the Bermondsey area, including the "Dive-Under" project)?

Matter 2 – The Spatial Strategy and Area Visions

Issue 1

Whether the Plan's Spatial Strategy and Area Visions have been positively prepared and whether they are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – SP1a, SP1b, SP2 and AV.01 – AV.16

Questions

Strategic Vision

- 2.1 Is the plan's vision for the borough overall justified and sufficiently clear? How has the vision for the area been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal/ IIA?

Development Targets and Spatial Strategy (Southwark's Places)

- 2.2 Does the plan provide clear, positively prepared and justified development targets for the Borough?
- 2.3 Are the locations identified for development, including the focus on the opportunity areas, the most appropriate locations? What alternative options were considered? What role has the IIA had in influencing the distribution of development across the 16 policy areas identified?

General Area Vision Questions

- 2.4 For each of the 16 individual area vision (AV) policies in the Plan, is the basis for the strategy for that area clear, positively prepared, justified and in general conformity with the London Plan (including the opportunity areas)?
- 2.5 Are the individual area vision policies sufficiently clear as to the overall scale of development envisaged over the plan period and how this will be delivered, including what needs to be delivered through allocations in the NSP, through policies and allocations in Area Action Plans and where appropriate through Neighbourhood Plans?

Specific Area Vision Questions

Policy AV.01 – Aylesbury Area Vision

- 2.6 The vision refers to a figure of 4,200 homes to be delivered in the area through the 2010 Area Action Plan. What is the current situation in terms of the timeline for regeneration at Aylesbury; what has been delivered in the Aylesbury area out of the 4,200 homes and what remains to be delivered? Are the figures net given the existing housing stock to be replaced? Annex 2, Table 3 (detail to the housing trajectory) shows 1,063 dwellings in the pipeline in the Aylesbury AAP area including sites under construction. How does these sites relate to the AAP sites in the Vision Map and are they part of the 4,200?
- 2.7 To what extent is the NSP Area Vision, as the more up-to-date policy, consistent with the 2010 AAP in delivering sustainable development in this part of the Borough? Is the Aylesbury Vision Area in the NSP coterminous with the AAP boundary?

Policy AV.02 – Bankside and the Borough Area Vision

- 2.8 Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the role of the Southbank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan having regard to the fact that the Local Plan would, on adoption,

become the more up to date document? Are there any other impacts on the Neighbourhood Plan?

- 2.9 Does it accord with both the principles and requirements for the London Bridge and Bankside Opportunity Area as set out in the London Plan?

Policy AV.04 - Blackfriars Road Area Vision

- 2.10 Is the approach to tall buildings at the north end of Blackfriars Road consistent with NSP Policy P16 and the London View Management Framework?

Policy AV.08 – East Dulwich Area Vision

- 2.11 Does the vision adequately reflect the proposed allocation for Dulwich Hamlet Football Club?

Policy AV.09 – Elephant and Castle Area Vision

- 2.12 Does the Area Vision appropriately reflect the status and implications of Elephant & Castle being identified in the Intend to Publish London Plan 2019 as an opportunity area with an indicative capacity for 5,000 homes and 10,000 jobs? To what extent is existing regeneration likely to contribute to development targets having regard to the figures in Policy SP1b? Is the plan reliant on further phases of regeneration to sustain delivery in Elephant and Castle during the plan period?

AV.11 – London Bridge Area Vision

- 2.13 Is the vision consistent with NSP Policy P16 and the evidence base in relation to tall buildings, particularly in regards to the Shard?

Policy AV.13 – Old Kent Road Area Vision

- 2.14 Does the Area Vision, in combination with Policies SP1a and SP1b provide a justified and effective planning framework to coordinate investment and intervention to maximise the delivery of housing and the intensification of employment in the Old Kent Road opportunity area in a way which would be in general conformity with the London Plan?
- 2.15 Table 3 in Annex 2 of the NSP shows that a significant number of planning permissions have been granted on parts of allocated sites in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area and a number of those sites are now under construction. What are the respective roles of the NSP and Old Kent Road Area Action Plan in co-ordinating growth at this strategic location for London and this is suitably clear in the NSP? In terms of phasing linked to the proposed Bakerloo Line Extension and improvements to the wider transport network capacity, how much of the quantum in a 'phase 1' for Old Kent Road has already been approved? Is there flexibility for 'phase 2' sites/capacity were the proposed Bakerloo Line Extension delayed?

Issue 2

As part of the spatial strategy for the Borough, will the plan deliver sustainable regeneration that will be 'successful' for both existing and future residents, businesses and community services and spaces?

Policy SP2 – Regeneration for All

- 2.16 Are there local areas for regeneration in Southwark to which Policy SP2 is specifically aimed at? Is the focus for regeneration in Borough broadly aligned with the London Plan opportunity areas, the strategic areas for regeneration (based on indices of deprivation) identified in the Intend to Publish London Plan 2019 or is it broader?

- 2.17 Will the policy be effective in securing sustainable regeneration in Southwark (social, economic and environmental), in a way which ensures existing communities, including businesses and community infrastructure, retain access to affordable accommodation, especially in fast changing areas of the Borough, consistent with paragraph 93 of the NPPF and PPG para 53-006-20190722? What is the role of social regeneration charters and is this appropriately reflected in Policy SP2?
- 2.18 Does the Plan, including Policy SP2, provide sufficient safeguards to ensure that regeneration respects the character and heritage of the Borough?
- 2.19 Is there a role for Supplementary Planning Documents in supporting regeneration, including planning frameworks for opportunity areas or do existing and forthcoming Area Action Plans provide necessary detail for those areas of particular change in the Borough?

Matter 3 – Meeting Southwark’s Housing Needs

Issue 1

Whether the Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to meeting the Borough’s housing needs.

Relevant Policies – SP1, SP1a, SP1b, P1 – P11

Questions

Housing requirement/ target

- 3.1 What is the overall quantity of new homes that are to be planned for in the Borough up to 2033 and in light of Q1.3 above on plan period, should this be modified to cover the period up to 2036?
- 3.2 Having regard to the London Plan housing requirement of 2,355 homes per year for the 10 year period, how would the plan identify the housing requirement in years 11-15? What methodology would be used for calculating the housing requirement/target to the end of the plan period?
- 3.3 Is the housing requirement/target of in general conformity with the London Plan? Is it correctly identified on the proposed Housing Trajectory? Are there circumstances which justify an alternative approach to the calculation of the housing requirement and the use of a different method? If so, what are they and what would be the resulting housing requirement?
- 3.4 Is the policy clear as to the amount of housing that is to be delivered on small sites in accordance with NPPF paragraph 68? Is this in accordance with the London Plan?
- 3.5 What is the overall target for the number of affordable homes in the Borough over the plan period? How does the Council’s aim of delivering 11,000 Council Homes to 2043 relate to this target?
- 3.6 What is the target for housing for older people falling within Class C2 of the Use Classes Order (as amended) and how does this relate to the benchmark provision identified in the London Plan?

SP1b – Southwark’s Places

- 3.7 What is the basis for the approximate housing capacity figures shown? Are these intended to be minimum housing targets?

- 3.8 Do the approximate housing capacity figures include implemented planning permissions, and if so, how many dwellings are under construction? Should the extent of any implemented consents be shown more clearly?
- 3.9 What is the net minimum number of homes to be allocated in the plan, including in each vision area, once completions and implemented consents since the start of the plan period have been taken into account?

Issue 2

Whether the plan will be effective in delivering affordable housing to meet the needs of the borough?

SP1 – Quality affordable homes

- 3.10 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? How will the target of 50% of all new homes to be either social rented or intermediate tenures be achieved against a minimum 35% requirement on qualifying new development?
- 3.11 What is the evidence on affordable housing needs, and what does it say?
- 3.12 What is the past record in terms of the delivery of affordable housing and how will future delivery be achieved?
- 3.13 Is the plan consistent with the Framework in respect of all types and tenures of affordable housing? Is it consistent with the London Plan?
- 3.14 Is the minimum 35% requirement (on sites of 10+ units) justified in response to the evidence on the Borough's need for affordable housing? As with Aylesbury is it likely that forthcoming Area Action Plans for specific parts of the Borough could set alternative and specific affordable housing requirements?
- 3.15 Should the supporting text to policy be expanded to further explain the context / significance of affordable housing in the Borough including the role of the existing / forthcoming SPD on Affordable Housing?

P1 – Social rented and intermediate housing

- 3.16 Is the proposed fast track justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Are the exceptional circumstances for the use of the fast track route limited to the particulars set out in 4(1.), and 4(2.)?
- 3.17 What is the justification for the different percentage requirements in the Aylesbury Area Action Plan area? Is this supported by evidence, including viability?
- 3.18 What is the basis for the site size thresholds and the proportions of affordable dwellings sought? Is this justified and consistent with national policy?
- 3.19 Is the policy consistent with the Framework in respect of the definition of affordable housing? Is the exclusion of some forms of affordable housing products justified?
- 3.20 What effect would the policy have overall on the viability of development proposals and what evidence is there in this respect?
- 3.21 Is the requirement for proposals that would create 9 dwellings or fewer to provide social rented and intermediate housing or financial contributions justified and consistent with national policy, planning practice guidance and the London Plan?
- 3.22 What is the basis for the requirement for viability appraisals and reviews for all developments, even where these may be policy compliant, and is that consistent with NPPF paragraph 57?
- 3.23 What is the basis for the tenure split sought and is this justified?
- 3.24 What is the basis for the calculation of payments for developer contributions where affordable housing is not provided on site?
- 3.25 Are the expectations for shared ownership housing in respect of household income and the market value of such justified?

- 3.26 Is the policy overall sufficiently flexible including in relation to the viability of development?

Issue 3

Whether the plan will deliver an appropriate mix of housing to meet the various housing needs over the plan period? Are the policies for the design, mix and standards of housing justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

P2 – New Family Homes

- 3.27 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan?
- 3.28 Is the approach to a mix of tenures and the size of dwellings justified and supported by evidence? Is it sufficiently flexible?
- 3.29 Are any main modifications to Policy P2 necessary for soundness?

P3 – Protection of existing homes

- 3.30 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan?
- 3.31 Is the policy justified by the evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, including the 130sqm threshold as a definition of a 'family sized home'?

P4 – Private Rented Homes

- 3.32 Is the policy justified in distinguishing between private rented homes schemes of greater than 100 units and smaller schemes in respect of affordable provision and does this reflect the 2019 viability study evidence?
- 3.33 Is the proposed requirement for affordable provision on private rented schemes, including quantum and tenures, through either Policy P1 on schemes of 100 units or less, or Table 3 to Policy P4 on schemes over 100 units justified and consistent with national policy and the Intend to Publish London Plan 2019?
- 3.34 Is Policy P4 justified in requiring 20% affordable rent at London Living Rent equivalent and 15% social rent equivalent given the identified need for social housing in Southwark?
- 3.35 Will the policy, as amended, assist in meeting the housing needs of middle-income earners (i.e. those earning £60,000 to £90,000) who cannot afford to buy a home but may not be eligible for social rent? Is deleting the 5% affordable rent requirement, as set out in the proposed submission plan 2017, justified and consistent with the London Plan?
- 3.36 Is the policy justified introducing minimum tenancy periods and break clauses? Is this addressed by other legislation?
- 3.37 Is the minimum 30 year term for private rented and clawback mechanisms justified?
- 3.38 Would there be a 'fast track route' for build to rent schemes?

P5 – Student Homes

- 3.39 Is the requirement for wheelchair adaptable rooms justified and viable?
- 3.40 Is the requirement for affordable housing provision sought by the policy justified, consistent with the London Plan and is it viable? Is the level of affordable student accommodation set out in P5(2) justified and in accordance with the London Plan?

P6 – Housing for older people

- 3.41 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Is the affordable housing requirement viable?

- 3.42 How will the housing and accommodation needs of elderly persons be met in the Borough, both C3 housing (supported living etc) and C2 bedspaces? Is the plan justified in not seeking specific provision on allocated sites? (noting references to C2 provision on some sites has now been removed). Is there evidence that the market will provide this type of housing in the Borough on a 'windfall' basis?

P7 – Wheelchair accessible and adaptable housing

- 3.43 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
3.44 Taking each criterion in turn, are the requirements justified and supported by evidence?

P8 – Houses in multiple occupation

- 3.45 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
3.46 Is the requirement for HMOs to provide Affordable housing contributions justified and viable?
3.47 How will the assessment of the overconcentration of HMOs be made? Is the policy sufficiently clear when HMOs may be approved?
3.48 Are any main modifications to Policy P8 necessary for soundness?

Policy P9 – Supported housing and hostels

- 3.49 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
3.50 How will any assessment of overconcentration of supported housing be made? Is the policy clear enough in this regard?

P10 – Self and custom build

- 3.51 What is the overall scale of need for self and custom build homes in the Borough? How many self and custom build homes have been delivered, and how is the need for self and custom build proposed to be met?
3.52 Is the policy to support self and custom build justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Is the policy positively prepared?

Policy P11 – Gypsies and Travellers

- 3.53 Is the May 2020 GTAA (with a base date of January 2020) consistent with national policy in identifying accommodation needs for gypsies and travellers and is it justified in concluding that against the national planning definition in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (the PPTS) that no additional pitches are required in Southwark over the period 2020-2034?
3.54 Against a wider definition of those who aspire to culturally appropriate accommodation but have ceased permanently travelling, the need is identified as 42 pitches in the GTAA (plus 1 additional pitch for undetermined need). Additionally, the 2016 Housing and Planning Act at Section 124 requires that the needs of assessment of pitches on which caravans can be stationed and moorings for houseboats as part of a robust assessment of the housing needs of those who do not want 'bricks and mortar'. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 61 how would these housing needs be met in Southwark? Would the approach be justified in terms of the Equalities Duty?
3.55 Can the plan be found sound in the absence of a wider caravan/houseboat assessment, having regard to the update paper [EIP78] and the LPAs Local Development Scheme (LDS) which refers to 'annual amendments' (plan review) including specifically in relation to gypsy and travellers now that the latest LDS [document EIP66a (was OCRO0002)] has removed the proposed 'Gypsy and Traveller' DPD?

- 3.56 Is there any outcome to a review of the Springtide Close site, vacated in March 2020? Does this site provide supply for those seeking culturally appropriate accommodation who might not meet the planning definition of gypsy and traveller?
- 3.57 Will the proposals in the NSP to facilitate the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area have consequences for the existing gypsy and traveller accommodation in this part of the Borough?

P14 – Residential Design

- 3.58 What is the relationship between the policy and the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS)?
- 3.59 Is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan?
- 3.60 Taking each criterion in turn, are they justified and supported by evidence?
- 3.61 Would the policy be effective in ensuring that any open space secured in the OKRAAP is usable for all residents when compared against the London Plan calculator?
- 3.62 Should the policy provide guidance on the density ranges expected across particular site types in the Borough?
- 3.63 What is the status of the amenity space requirements shown in the fact box? What is the evidence to support the space requirements? Should these be included within the policy?

P15 – Designing out crime

- 3.64 Taking each criterion in turn, are they justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan?

P17 – Efficient use of land

- 3.65 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan?
- 3.66 Is the approach to 'meanwhile uses' sufficiently clear as to the uses that might be acceptable? Does the policy give sufficient regard to avoiding any potential for anti-social behaviour resulting from meanwhile uses?
- 3.67 What is the effect of the changes to the UCO on part 2 of the policy?
- 3.68 Are any main modifications required for soundness?

Matter 4 – Education and the best start in life
--

Issue 1

Whether the Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to education and the best start in life.

Relevant Policies – SP3, P26

Questions

SP3 – Best start in life

- 4.1 Taking each criterion in turn, are they justified and supported by evidence?
- 4.2 Is the policy necessary for soundness?

P26 - Education places (was P23)

- 4.3 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 4.4 Taking each criterion in turn, are they justified and supported by evidence?
- 4.5 How will any financial contributions towards additional school places be calculated? Is the policy sufficiently clear in this regard?
- 4.6 Is the policy sufficiently clear where land transfer may be required to support the delivery of new education places?

Matter 5 – Planning for the economic prosperity of the Borough including employment sites and town and local centres

Issue

Whether the Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to economy and employment.

Relevant Policies – SP1a, SP1b, SP4 – P43

Questions

Economy and Employment in general (SP1a, SP1, SP4)

- 5.1 What is the evidence in relation to jobs growth and the need for employment land/floorspace in the Borough over the plan period (i.e. to 2033)? What does it show? Is the employment land evidence base sufficiently up to date to provide a robust basis against which the policies in the plan have been prepared?
- 5.2 What is the overall scale of employment development envisaged by type, is this sufficiently clear and is it justified?
- 5.3 Are the floorspace figures in SP1b expected changes in floorspace? Or are they intended to be targets? Should the plan be clearer as to what the overall quantum of employment land and floorspace proposed to be allocated through specific sites should be?
- 5.4 Is the plan sufficiently clear as to the amount of office and general industrial floorspace that the plan intends to allocate or identify?
- 5.5 Have any alternative options for the distribution of new employment development been considered? If so, what are they?
- 5.6 Should the plan be clearer as to the requirements for floorspace within particular planning designations e.g. CAZ, AAP areas, town centres and elsewhere?
- 5.7 What effects, if any, do the changes to the Use Classes Order (September 2020) have on the employment policies?
- 5.8 Are main modifications necessary to any of the employment policies for soundness?

SP4 - Strong local economy

- 5.9 Does the plan provide for sufficient employment land of a range of types to meet identified needs?
- 5.10 Is the proposal to co-locate industrial premises with new homes justified and consistent with the London Plan?
- 5.11 Are the retail floorspace requirements justified and supported by evidence?

P27 - Access to employment and training

- 5.12 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Is it viable? Is it supported by evidence?
- 5.13 Is the policy sufficiently flexible to respond to local economic conditions and where viability may be challenging?

5.14 What mechanisms would be proposed to secure the requirement for local jobs? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to how this will be implemented?

P28 - Strategic protected industrial land

5.15 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Is it necessary for soundness that the NSP should only allow for co-location of residential on strategic protected industrial land (including LSIS) through the Plan's allocations?

5.16 Is the requirement to increase jobs sound and is it evidence-based?

5.17 Does the policy allow for business growth that may not result in a net increase in jobs (i.e. for automation)?

P29 - Office and business development

5.18 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

5.19 Taking

5.20 Is the policy sufficiently flexible to respond to changing economic circumstances?

5.21 Is the requirement for a two year marketing period justified? Is it supported by evidence?

5.22 Is the requirement for financial contribution towards training and jobs for local people justified? Is it viable?

P30 - Affordable workspace

5.22 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Is it viable? Is it sufficiently flexible?

5.23 Is the proposed Borough wide approach to affordable workspace rather than a geographically targeted approach justified? Is the requirement to provide 10% of proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace justified and evidence based?

5.24 Is the policy likely to be effective protecting small businesses based on the size of their premises alone?

5.25 How will any payments in lieu for offsite affordable workspace be calculated? Should this be included in the plan?

5.26 How will eligibility for affordable workspace be considered and secured?

5.27 How will existing affordable workspace be retained in the Borough?

5.28 Is the policy intended to require affordable workspace as part of employment refurbishment proposals or any net new employment floorspace including extensions to existing premises in single occupancy? Is this justified?

5.29 What would be considered exceptional circumstances to justify the provision of affordable retail or affordable cultural uses and is the policy sufficiently clear as to what these are?

P31 - Small shops

5.29 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are the thresholds in P31(2) justified and supported by evidence?

P32 - Business relocation

5.31 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Taking each criterion in turn, are the requirements justified and supported by evidence?

5.32 At what stage in the planning process is a business relocation strategy required to be provided and how would it be secured?

5.33 Should the policy require consideration of the market value of businesses as part of relocation strategies?

P33 - Railway arches

5.34 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Issue 2:

Ensuring the vitality of the Borough's Town and Local Centres

Relevant policies – SP1, SP1b, P34-P43

Town and Local Centres and retail development in general

- 5.36 Does the retail evidence base adequately reflect the level of additional population being planned for in the Borough? Is it up to date?
- 5.37 What is the scale of each type of main town centre uses proposed and are these justified?
- 5.38 Is the plan sufficiently clear as to the distribution of new retail floorspace being planned for at each tier of the retail hierarchy?
- 5.39 Should the network and hierarchy of town centres included in the reasoned justification of P34 be identified as a strategic policy? Does it accord with the Framework?
- 5.40 Are there sufficient allocations/ permissions to meet the identified needs of each type of main town centre uses identified in the retail study? If not, what is the net requirement of each type of retail development still to be identified?
- 5.41 Is policy SP1b sufficiently clear about the timing of the retail floorspace requirements? Should the plan be clearer as to the requirements by type (e.g. convenience and comparison goods)?
- 5.42 What effects do the changes to the Use Classes Order (September 2020) have on each of the town centre and shopping policies, particularly in regards to the newly created 'Class E'?
- 5.43 Are any main modifications required to the town centre and shopping policies, particularly in light of the changes to the Use Classes Order?

P34 - Town and local centres

- 5.44 Taking each criterion in turn, are the requirements justified? Is this supported by evidence? Is the evidence up to date?

P35 -Development outside town centres

- 5.45 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Have Primary Shopping Areas been defined? Are these shown on the Policies Map?
- 5.46 Is the local threshold of 1,000 sqm for impact assessments justified and supported by evidence?

P36 - Protected shopping frontages

- 5.47 Is the approach to protected shopping frontages justified, effective and consistent with the Framework?
- 5.48 Are the proportions of retail units in table 8 justified and supported by evidence? Are they identified on the Policies Map?

P37 - Shops outside protected frontages, town and local centres

- 5.49 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? Is the requirement for a 2 year marketing period and that there are alternative shops within 400 metres justified?

P38 - Shop fronts

- 5.50 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework?

P39 - betting shops, pawnbrokers and payday loan shops

- 5.51 Is the approach to protected shopping frontages justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? Is it supported by evidence?
- 5.52 Is the protected shopping frontage referred to in criterion 1 the same as a Primary/secondary Frontage?

P40 – Hotels and other visitor accommodation

- 5.53 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework?
- 5.54 Is the requirement for 10% of the total floorspace to be ancillary facilities justified? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to what ancillary facilities are?

P41 – Pubs

- 5.55 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? Is the requirement for a 2 year marketing period justified and supported by evidence?

P42 - Outdoor advertisements and signage

- 5.56 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework?

P43 - Broadband and digital infrastructure

- 5.57 Is the approach justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? Are the requirements set out for each criteria justified?

Matter 6 – Housing Land Supply

Issue 1

Is the level of housing required deliverable in years 1-5 (2020/21-2024/5) and developable in years 6-15 (2025/6-2035/6)?

Questions

Housing supply and delivery

- 6.1 Since the base date of the Plan at 1 April 2018, how many dwellings have been built in Southwark to 31 March 2020? Is that a net figure, allowing for demolitions and loss of stock?
- 6.2 What is the estimated total supply of new housing over the plan period?
- 6.3 What is the estimated supply from each source (allocations, permissions as of 1 April 2020, windfall) for the plan period? What is the evidence to support this and are the estimates justified?
- 6.4 What is the housing requirement for the first five years following adoption of the plan and what buffer should be applied?
- 6.5 Having regard to Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 68-007-20190722 what is the estimated total supply of specific deliverable sites for this period? What is the estimated supply from each source for this?
- 6.6 What is the estimated total supply of developable sites for years 6-10 and 11-15? What is the estimated supply from each source for this (including windfalls)?
- 6.7 What is the compelling evidence to support the windfall allowance? Is this consistent or comparable with the 'small sites' figure for Southwark identified in the Intend to Publish London Plan 2019?
- 6.8 Overall, would at least 10% of the housing requirement/target be met on sites no larger than one hectare?

Matter 7 – Policies on Health and the Environment

Issue

Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to health, the environment, heritage and tall buildings.

Relevant Policies – SP6, P44-P47, P55 – P69

Questions

Open Space – General

- 7.1 What requirements are there for new or improved open space and indoor sports facilities? Does the plan adequately identify the types of open space that are designated in the Borough? Are any new areas of open space proposed to be allocated?
- 7.2 How does the plan respond to any parts of the Borough that do not meet the open space standards? Are the provisions for new allocations/ designations in Area Visions translated into policy?
- 7.3 An Open Space Addendum (2019) is referred to in responses to representations. Has this document been completed? What does it say?
- 7.4 The reasoned justification for P56 indicates new Borough Open Land (BOL) and Other Open Space (OOS) has been designated in the NSP. Are these intended to be new 'allocations' or do they result from implemented planning permissions? If they are intended to be allocations, are these accompanied by new policies in the NSP to allocated them? Have any accompanying revisions to the Policies Map as a result of these been provided to the examination and were made available for public comment? Without prejudice, what mechanism(s) does the Council expect to use to designate such open space when the Local Plan is adopted?

SP6 - Cleaner, greener, safer

- 7.5 Is the overall approach in Policy SP6 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 7.6 Does the policy provide sufficient strategic guidance for other policies such as those which seek to providing new open space?

Policy P44 – Healthy Developments

- 7.7 What are the health issues in Southwark that part 1(1) of the Policy is seeking to address? What will be measure of 'easily accessible'? What are 'healthy activities' for the purposes of part 1(2) of the policy?
- 7.8 Should the NSP require Health Impact Assessments for major developments or is that a requirement already set out appropriately in the London Plan?

Policy P45 – Leisure, Arts and Culture & Policy P46 – Community Uses

- 7.9 Are there any implications for the policies arising from the recent changes to the Use Classes Order?
- 7.10 Do the policies provide sufficient protection to all sports facilities in the Borough in accordance with the NPPF at paragraphs 96 and 97? Is the two year marketing period justified and effective in demonstrating a sports / recreation site would be surplus to requirements? Alternatively, is the NSP informed by a robust and up-to-date

assessment of the need for sports and recreation facilities as required by NPPF paragraph 96 and does this show a likely surplus of facilities?

- 7.11 Would the effectiveness (implementation) of Policy P45 benefit from a 'fact box' similar to Policy P46 on what comprises 'leisure, arts and culture'?

Policy P47 – Hot Food Takeaways

- 7.12 Is policy justified and consistent with national policy (PPG para 53-004-20190722) and in conformity with the London Plan? Is there evidence to justify the thresholds in parts 1 and 2 of the policy?
- 7.13 Will it be effective in terms of health outcomes and amenity objectives? Does the NSP support a Borough Health Strategy that recognises the need to manage the number and location of hot food takeaways as a health issue and identifies a role for the NSP in this regard? Does the 2018 evidence review (document SP501) meet the evidential requirements to justify the policy?
- 7.14 Has the IIA appropriately considered the social and economic effects of the policy?
- 7.15 Are there any implications for the policy from the recent changes to Use Classes Order?

P55 - Protection of Amenity

- 7.16 What does the policy consider to be amenity? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the circumstances where development may be acceptable? Will it be effective?
- 7.17 Are any main modifications to Policy P55 necessary for soundness?

P56 - Open Space

- 7.18 Are the requirements for Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Borough Open Land (BOL) respectively justified and consistent with the Framework?
- 7.19 Is criterion 3 sufficiently clear in respect of what is meant by a building being no larger than the building it replaces? How will this be defined and/or calculated?
- 7.20 Are the proposed allocations/ designations of additional areas of MOL/ BOL or Other Open Space (OOS) set out within strategic policies? What are their boundaries?
- 7.21 How will the amount of new areas of open space to be provided from developments be calculated? Where is this information contained and what does it say?
- 7.22 Are any main modifications to Policy P56 necessary for soundness?

P57 - Open Water Space

- 7.23 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? What is the evidence in respect of houseboats? What does it indicate?

P58 - Green Infrastructure

- 7.24 Are the requirements for maintenance funding contributions sufficiently clear and are they justified and viable?
- 7.25 Over what period are Planning Obligations expected to provide for management and maintenance costs and is this justified?
- 7.26 Is the definition of large-scale major developments sufficiently clear and is it justified?

P59 – Biodiversity

- 7.27 Is the policy consistent with paragraph 174 of the Framework in respect of identifying ecological networks and the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity?
- 7.28 Is the requirement in P59(2) that any shortfall in biodiversity net gains must be secured through planning obligations or contributions justified? How will the amount be calculated? Would it be viable?

P60 – Trees

7.29 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

P61 - Reducing Waste

7.30 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

P62 - Land for waste management

7.31 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

7.32 Is the site for the IWF required? Is there a reasonable prospect of the use coming forward within the plan period?

P63 - Contaminated land and hazardous substances

7.33 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

P64 - Improving Air Quality (P66)

7.34 Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

7.35 Are the requirements justified and in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations (as amended)?

7.36 Is the requirement for developer contributions in P64(2) justified and how will it be calculated? Would it be viable?

7.37 Can the Council clarify whether the Air Quality Evidence Base Report referred to in response to representation NSPPSV238.6 is the AQ SAP (2017) or a different document?

P65 - Reducing noise pollution and enhancing soundscapes (P67)

7.38 Are the requirements of the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Is the policy sufficiently clear about the mechanisms that may be used to control noise pollution?

7.39 Will P65(3) be effective in mitigating the effects of noise arising from construction, including that from smaller sites? What mechanisms would be used to limit avoid the adverse impacts of construction? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to what these mechanisms might be?

7.40 Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

P66 - Reducing water use

7.41 What is the evidence base to support the specific requirements in the policy, particularly in relation to water efficiency standards in terms of the need for the standard and the effect on viability? Are the requirements justified?

P67 - Reducing flood risk

7.42 Is the Policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements justified?

7.43 Is the policy consistent with the Framework in respect of the sequential and exceptions tests?

7.44 Is the policy sufficiently clear and effective in relation to reducing flood risk from on and off-site sewer flooding?

P68 - Sustainability Standards

7.45 Is the policy overall justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

7.46 Taking each of the requirements in turn, are they justified, viable and supported by evidence?

P69 - Energy

- 7.47 What is the evidence to support the Council's approach to energy? What does it say?
- 7.48 Are the requirements in P69(2) for the proposed reductions in CO2 beyond the Building Regulations justified, consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Are they viable?

Matter 8 – Design, heritage and tall buildings

Issue 1

Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to design, heritage and tall buildings.

Relevant Policies – P12, P13, P18, P20, P22 – P25

Questions

Policy P18 – Listed Buildings and Structures

- 8.1 Is part 2 of the policy consistent with national policy at NPPF paragraphs 193-196 in relation to considering potential impacts of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset in respect of circumstances of substantial harm or loss and those of less than substantial harm?

Policy P20 – Conservation of the historic environment and natural heritage

- 8.2 Is part 3 of the policy consistent with national policy at NPPF paragraphs 193-196 in relation to considering potential impacts of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset in respect of circumstances of substantial harm or loss and those of less than substantial harm?

Policy P22 - Archaeology

- 8.3 Is the policy approach justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Is the amended approach of reducing 11 Archaeology Priority Areas to 6 and the tiered approach justified?

Policy P23 – World Heritage Sites

- 8.4 As one of the assets of highest significance, does the policy provide sufficient clarity on how development proposals likely to effect the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the three central London World Heritage Sites relevant to the Borough would be evaluated, in particular the relevant management plan concerned?
- 8.5 Are there identified views, vistas or buffer zones for the World Heritage Sites where a proposal is likely to impact on elements that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value?
- 8.6 Do Policies P23 and P16 in combination provide a justified and effective approach for managing proposals for tall buildings relative to World Heritage Sites?

Policy P24 River Thames

- 8.7 Does the policy appropriately reflect and align with the Thames Estuary Plan 2100 in its approach to managing flood risk?
- 7.15 Are any modifications required for plan soundness to reflect the interrelationship between the territorial planning jurisdiction of the London Borough of Southwark and the marine planning jurisdiction of the Marine Management Organisation?

Policy P25 – Local List

7.16 Does the policy offer appropriate protection for non-designated heritage assets in the Borough consistent with paragraph 197 of the NPPF? Has there been progress on preparing a Local List in Southwark and how does this relate to the Heritage SPD?

Issue 2: Whether the plan is justified and effective in its approach to managing tall buildings and protecting important views

Relevant Policies – P16, P21

Questions

Policy P16 – Tall Buildings

- 8.10 Do the proposed changes provide appropriate clarity on what is meant by tall building in a Southwark context?
- 8.11 Are the areas identified as being suitable for tall buildings consistent with the evidence, including the 2020 Tall Buildings Background Paper [EIP20], including the need to protect strategic and local views? Are they sufficiently clear?
- 8.12 Is there specific evidence to justify tall buildings on allocated sites outside of the identified areas for tall buildings in Figure 4 of the Plan? Are the area visions and relevant site specific allocations sufficiently clear on those locations not identified in Figure 4 where tall buildings may be considered appropriate in principle, subject to detailed matters of design and heritage impact?
- 8.13 Will the policy be effective in managing tall buildings in a way which is sympathetic to the character and urban grain of the Borough?
- 8.14 Are there any implications on the realisation of the growth targets for Old Kent Road arising from the Borough Views from Nunhead Cemetery and One Tree Hill, whose landmark viewing corridors to St Paul's Cathedral cut across part of the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area core?

Policy P21 – Borough Views

- 8.15 Are the identified Borough Views (set out in detail in Annex 1 of the NSP) justified? Has there been an assessment process that has considered and discounted other potential Borough Views?
- 8.16 Is Annex 1 'Borough Views' in the NSP justified, effective and in broad conformity with the methodology in the London View Management Framework in respect of the location of the assessment points, the view geometries and the parameters determining the heights of the threshold planes?
- 8.17 Is the Borough View to St Paul's from Nunhead Cemetery justified in terms of spatial significance and to what extent has the view been compromised by the 2016 Guy's Cancer Centre building?
- 8.18 Is the approach to Borough View 5 from the Millennium Bridge towards the Tate Modern justified, effective and consistent with the London View Management Framework? Are there consequences for the delivery of the plan's growth proposals for this part of the Borough (such as Bankside and Borough and Blackfriars Road)?
- 8.19 Are the details in Annex 1 on 'Borough Views' soundly based? As a consequence of the amended threshold planes is the strategy of the Plan deliverable in respect of potential consequences for building heights in parts of the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area?

Matter 9 – Infrastructure (including transport), viability and implementation including monitoring

Issue 1

Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to infrastructure and implementation.

Relevant Policies – IP1 – IP8

Questions

IP1 – Infrastructure

- 9.1 Does the policy adequately address the requirements for securing sufficient water support to support development?
- 9.2 Is the policy necessary for soundness?

IP2 – Transport Infrastructure (P51)

- 9.3 Taking each in turn, what is the evidence and justification for the strategic transport projects? Are the projects committed and where necessary does the NSP need to safeguard land to enable their implementation?
- 9.4 What is the latest situation regarding the timetable and funding for the Bakerloo Line Extension?
- 9.5 Does the NSP provide sufficient detail about the proposed Bakerloo Line Extension and the phasing of proposed development in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area to guide planning applications and the emerging Old Kent Road Area Action Plan?
- 9.6 Do the projects reflect the 2019 Movement Plan for the Borough and are initiatives such as the Southwark Cycling Spine or the Low Lines (including Peckham Coal Line) strategic transport projects for the Borough?

IP3 (IP2) – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 Planning Obligations.

- 9.7 Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the circumstances where contributions will be sought beyond monies collected from Community Infrastructure Levies (i.e. Borough and Mayoral CILs)?
- 9.8 Should the policy refer to 'mitigating' any impacts rather than 'offset'?
- 9.9 Is the policy required for soundness?

IP6 – Monitoring development (IP5)

- 9.10 Is the policy necessary for soundness? (see also questions in Issue 4 below)

IP7 – Statement of Community Involvement (IP6)

- 9.11 Is the policy required for soundness?

IP8 – Local development Scheme (IP7)

- 9.12 Is the policy required for soundness?

Issue 2: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan on promoting sustainable transport solutions in the Borough

Policy P49 – Highway Impacts

- 9.13 Are any proposed modifications to the policy and its reasoning required as a consequence of the recent 2019 Movement Plan?
- 9.14 Is criterion 5 justified and is the NSP clear on what are 'large development sites'?

Policy P51 – Low Lines

- 9.15 Are the low line routes justified and is the policy effective in securing their delivery? In combination with Policy P51 are there any other programmes or funds to deliver the low lines in Southwark? What is the role of the Low Lines SPD (identified in the Local

Development Scheme) and should this be referenced in the Policy and/or reasoning text?

Policy P52 – Cycling

- 9.16 Will the policy, and its focus on cycle parking provision, be effective in securing modal shift to cycling?
- 9.17 Is the focus in policy on the Southwark Cycle Spine route justified? Are there other planned improvements or gaps to address in developing a safe and convenient cycling network for Southwark? Is it clear to future users of the NSP whether their site would be on or adjacent to the cycle network in respect of part 1 of the policy? (is this the network routes shown on the Vision Maps?)
- 9.18 Are the requirements in the policy justified and viable, including criterion 7 re cycle hire fobs?
- 9.19 What are the implications of recent Use Classes Order changes for Table 9 accompanying Policy P52? Are the standards for Southwark justified?

Policy P53 – Car Parking

- 9.20 Is the policy justified, effective, viable and in general conformity with the London Plan, including the requirements (3 year minimum membership) and the 80 dwelling threshold for car club provision?
- 9.21 Is criterion 3 of the Policy clear on what quantum of provision of electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) would meet the requirement of the policy?

Issue 3: With regards to national policy on viability and the cumulative scale of obligations and policy requirements, is the Plan deliverable?

- 9.22 The May 2020 background paper on viability (document EIP20) sets out the viability evidence underpinning the NSP which is drawn from 6 principal pieces of work carried out over a 4 year period – the most recent of which is the 2019 BNP Paribas ‘Housing and Affordable Workspace Policies Further Viability Sensitivity Testing’. Cumulatively, do the viability studies provide the necessary high-level understanding of the viability of potential development sites in the Borough, particularly in relation to the requirements for 35% affordable housing and affordable workspace?
- 9.23 In relation to proposals in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area does viability appraisal appropriately factor in the likely contributions for transport infrastructure necessary to support the growth ambitions in this part of the Borough?
- 9.24 Is there an expectation that applicants will submit financial viability assessments and is that justified given that NPPF paragraph 57 states that up-to-date policy requirements in the plan should be deliverable reflecting the typology of sites represented in the Borough? Are site specific circumstances in Southwark so variable that some flexibility will be required around site viability to ensure deliverability of the plan strategy? Is that evidenced in the 2019 viability work with reference to certain site typologies and the CIL zones?
- 9.25 The 2019 Viability Study indicates a more nuanced approach to reflect the values in the CIL Zones in respect of in-lieu affordable housing contributions and affordable workspace. Should this be reflected in the NSP for soundness or is it a matter for the related SPDs including the Viability SPD?
- 9.26 Are the values/inputs used in residual method applied in the viability assessments informing the NSP appropriate, justified and reasonably aligned to the recommended approach in the PPG including ‘standardised inputs’? This includes key inputs of land values including existing use value and a required premium/uplift to incentivise release, construction costs, sales values (including prices paid by registered providers), developer profit, contingencies and risks, the nominal value of £2000 per dwelling/£30 per sqm for commercial for site specific S106 costs, the cost of the Mayoral CIL

(MCIL2) and Southwark CIL, and the cumulative cost of development plan policy (summarised at Table 1 of the May 2020 Viability Background Paper (EIP20))?

9.27 Overall, is the NSP consistent with national policy at NPPF paragraph 34?

Issue 4: Are the Plan's monitoring and review mechanisms effective and otherwise consistent with national policy?

9.28 The plan on submission does not contain a monitoring framework for the Plan. How will the effectiveness and performance of the policies in the plan be measured? Should a monitoring framework (possibly based on the indicators in Appendix 9 of the IIA) form an appendix to the NSP as a main modification to guide future Annual Monitoring Report processes?

Matter 10 – Site Allocations

Issue 1

Whether the overall approach to site allocations is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Questions

Site allocations - general

- 10.1 Is the 'must, should, may' approach sound? Is it clear as to the circumstances where planning permission would be granted, and will it be effective in securing the delivery of the site allocations?
- 10.2 Is the use of an indicative capacity sound? Is it sufficiently clear what the minimum dwelling contribution from each site would be? How have the indicative capacities been calculated and what is the evidence, including the Sites Methodology Paper [EIP82]?
- 10.3 For each of the site allocations, can the Council provide an up-to-date position on what relevant planning permissions have been granted as of 31 March 2020 and whether, as of 1 April 2020 which of those permissions are under construction? What effect would any extant or implemented planning permission have on the allocation in terms of the amount of development approved and its coverage of the allocation area? Is each site allocation policy sufficiently clear as to when the sites are expected to come forward for development? If a site allocation is under construction, is it right for these to remain 'allocations' in the NSP? Would the allocation be viable and is it deliverable? To what extent would land ownership or the need for any land assembly affect the deliverability of the site? Are the respective criteria to guide the proposed development justified?
- 10.4 Are the site allocation policies sufficiently clear as to whether tall and taller buildings will be acceptable?
- 10.5 Can the Council identify where in the evidence base the planned net increase in B class employment space has been quantified for all of the site allocations?
- 10.6 Is the plan is relying on the delivery of any sites that 'should' provide C3 Dwellings (rather than must)? If so, is this approach sound and what is the expected contribution?
- 10.7 For each of the allocations that seeks to provide employment, is the requirement to increase the proportion of B class uses on allocations justified? Does this provide sufficient flexibility if there is insufficient demand or viability?
- 10.8 For each of the site allocations, what effects, if any, do the changes to the Use Classes Order (September 2020) have on those respective allocations where use classes are referenced?
- 10.9 Are main modifications necessary to any of the site allocations for soundness?

Issue 2

Whether the site allocations in the Bankside and Borough are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Bankside and the Borough site allocations

Relevant Policies – NSP01 – NSP09

Questions

NSP01 – Site Bordering Great Suffolk Street and Ewer Street

10.10 Is the allocation soundly based having regard to the amount of floorspace to be allocated?

NSP02 – 62-67 Park Street

10.11 Is the policy sufficient clear as to what the quantum and land uses of new development are required to be developed on the site? Will the policy be effective in securing these?

10.12 Is the policy guidance and the requirements in relation to the impact on heritage assets and the LVMF sufficiently clear as to whether planning permission would be granted?

NSP03 – 185 Park Street

10.13 Does the capacity of the water network affect the Council's expected timeframe for the delivery of this site?

10.14 Is the policy guidance and requirements in relation to the impact on heritage assets and the LVMF sufficiently clear as to whether planning permission would be granted?

NSP04 – London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

10.15 Is there sufficient capacity in the water network to support the allocation? Is the proposed allocation deliverable within the timeframe expected having regard to the capacity of utilities?

10.16 Does the allocation provide sufficient guidance to ensure there is no harm to designated heritage assets or their setting?

10.17 Is the allocation sufficiently clear as to what is required of development in the Archaeological Priority Area?

NSP05 – 1 Southwark Bridge and Red Lion Court

10.18 Does the allocation provide sufficient guidance to ensure there is no harm to the designated heritage assets or their setting?

10.19 Is the requirement for open space justified?

NSP06 – Landmark Court

10.20 Is the boundary of the allocation justified? What is the effect of the allocation on the Crossbones Cemetery?

10.21 Does the allocation provide sufficient guidance to ensure there is no harm to designated heritage assets or their setting?

NSP07 – Land between Great Suffolk Street and Glasshill Street

10.22 Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the quantum of development of different uses that is allocated?

NSP08 – Swan Street Cluster

10.23 Is the allocation sound having regard to the capacity of utilities infrastructure on the anticipated timing of development?

- 10.24 Is the policy sufficiently clear as to what is proposed on each parcel of land?
10.25 Is the policy sound with regards to the effects on designated heritage assets?

NSP09 – 19,21 and 23 Harper Road, 325 Borough High Street, 1-5 and 7-11 Newington Causeway

- 10.26 Is there sufficient capacity in the water network to support the allocation? Does the capacity of utilities infrastructure affect the anticipated timing of development?

Issue 3

Whether the sites in Bermondsey Area Vision are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP10 – NSP12

Questions

NSP10 – Biscuit factory and Campus

- 10.27 Is there sufficient water infrastructure available to support the allocation? Is the allocation sound having regard to the capacity of utilities infrastructure to support the anticipated timing of development?
10.28 How has the proposed dwelling capacity been generated and is this supported by evidence?

NSP11 – Tower Workshops

- 10.29 Is the allocation sound having regard to the capacity of utilities infrastructure on the anticipated timing of development?

NSP12 – Chambers Wharf

- 10.30 Is there sufficient water infrastructure available to support the allocation?
10.31 Is the proposed phasing of the site justified having regard to the sites temporary use as a construction site for another project? What would be the effect if the temporary use as a construction site slipped?

Issue 4

Whether the sites in Blackfriars Road Area Vision are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP13 – NSP20

Questions

NSP13 - Conoco House, Quadrant House, Edward Edwards House and Suthring House (was NSP14)

- 10.32 Is there sufficient water infrastructure available to support the allocation?

NSP14 – Friars House, 157-168 Blackfriars Road (was NSP15)

- 10.33 Is the site deliverable/ developable at the point envisaged?
10.34 What is the Council's position in respect of the building of architectural and historic merit on the site?
10.35 Does the policy provide sufficient certainty to enable delivery of the allocation within the Council's expected timeframe?
10.36 Is there a reasonable prospect that the site will come forward for the intended uses? Should there be greater flexibility?

NSP15 – Land enclosed by Colombo Street, Meymott Street and Blackfriars Road (was NSP16)

10.37 What evidence is available to indicate that there remains the prospect of a wider redevelopment of the site for the uses the policy anticipates?

NSP16 – Ludgate House and Sampson House, 64 Hopton Street (was NSP17)

10.38 Is there sufficient water infrastructure available to support the allocation?

NSP18 – McLaren House, St. George’s Circus (was NSP19)

10.39 Is there sufficient water infrastructure available to support the allocation?

NSP19 – Land between Paris Gardens, Colombo Street, Blackfriars Road and Stamford Street (was NSP20)

10.40 Does the allocation provide sufficient guidance to ensure there is no harm to the designated heritage assets or their setting?

10.41 Is there sufficient capacity in the water supply and waste water network to support the allocation? What effect does this have on the anticipated timing of the development?

NSP20 – 1-5 Paris Garden and 16-19 Hatfields (was NSP21)

10.42 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

10.43 Does the allocation provide sufficient guidance to ensure there is no harm to the designated heritage assets or their setting?

Issue 5

Whether the sites in Camberwell are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP22, NSP25, NSP32

NSP22 - Burgess Business Park

10.44 Given the character and location of the site is it necessary for plan soundness that a comprehensive redevelopment of the site is secured through the vision and guidance in NSP22? Can the site viably retain the existing amount of employment floorspace on the site in addition to the indicative capacity for 671 homes as part of a mixed-use neighbourhood? Are there any material consequences from the recent appeal decision that may generate a need to modify the policy approach to NSP22?

10.45 Is it justified and effective that redevelopment of the site should provide industrial employment space in the form of B1c and B8 uses only? Is that consistent with evidence on need for employment premises?

10.46 Is it acceptable in principle that tall buildings are considered as part of an approach to maximising the development potential of the site?

NSP25 - Camberwell Bus Garage and NSP26 Abellio Walworth Depot

10.47 Noting the representations from TfL, how feasible is it to retain the existing bus garages and accommodate new residential development? Are these sites developable in the plan period?

NSP32 - Camberwell Green Magistrates Court

10.48 Can the site viably yield 150 residential units as well as providing employment (B1, D class), town centre and community uses (A1, A2, A3, A4, D1, D2) of at least the amount of employment generating floorspace currently on the site?

Issue 6

Whether the sites in Crystal Palace and Gipsy Hill are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policy – NSP34

Questions

NSP34 – Guys and St. Thomas Trust Rehabilitation Centre, Crystal Palace

10.49 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

10.50 Is the allocation justified having regard to the existing uses?

Issue 7

Whether the sites in Dulwich are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policy – NSP35

Questions

NSP35 - The Grove Tavern, 520 Lordship Lane

10.51 How has the indicative dwelling capacity been generated and is this supported by evidence?

10.52 Is the allocation sufficiently flexible if the building is retained in its existing use?

10.53 How will the extent of any demand to retain the use as a public house be assessed?

Issue 8

Whether the sites in East Dulwich are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies NSP36 – NSP40

Questions

NSP36 – Kwik Fit and Gibbs and Dandy, Grove Vale

10.54 Is the policy effective in respect of ensuring any main town centre uses are compatible with adjoining residential occupiers? How will it achieve this?

NSP37 – Dulwich Hamlet Champion Hill Stadium, Dog Kennel Hill

10.55 What are the landowners intentions for the site, and what are the implications of the allocation for the existing community facilities?

10.56 Is there a reasonable prospect of the redevelopment of the site and the inclusion of new homes as part of that redevelopment?

10.57 Is the boundary of the allocation justified, and will it be effective in supporting a comprehensive redevelopment of the stadium?

10.58 Does the allocation provide a sound basis for the redevelopment of the site having regard to the requirements of open space designations? Is the retention of site OS128 as MOL appropriate?

NSP38 – Railway Rise, East Dulwich

10.59 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

NSP39 – Dulwich Community Hospital, East Dulwich Grove

10.60 What evidence is available to indicate the proposed school and health centre are deliverable on the site? Are they viable?

NSP40 – Goose Green Trading Estate

10.61 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

10.62 Does the policy provide adequate guidance in respect of the adjacent heritage assets?

Issue 9:

Whether the sites in Elephant and Castle are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies - NSP44, NSP45

Questions

NSP41 - Newington Triangle

10.63 Is the indicative residential capacity of the site justified?

NSP44 – Salvation Army Headquarters, Newington Causeway

10.64 Is the site developable during the plan period as a comprehensive mixed-use site having regard to the site requirements and other NSP policy requirements? Is the indicative residential capacity of the site justified?

Issue 10:

Whether the sites in Herne Hill and North Dulwich are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policy NSP48

Questions

NSP48 – Bath Trading Estate

10.65 Does the policy provide sufficient guidance in respect of the designated heritage assets?

Issue 11:

Whether the London Bridge sites are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies NSP49-52

Questions

NSP49 – London Bridge Health Cluster

10.66 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

10.67 Is the boundary of the proposed allocation justified?

NSP50 – Land between Melior Street, St. Thomas Street, Weston Street and Fenning Street

10.68 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

NSP51 – Land between St. Thomas Street, Fenning Street, Melior Place and Snowsfields

10.69 Should there be a single, more comprehensive allocation covering NSP50-51 and what would be the effect of doing so?

10.70 Is there sufficient water infrastructure capacity to support the allocation?

10.71 Does the policy provide suitable guidance in respect of the impact on any heritage assets or their setting?

Issue 12:

Whether the Old Kent Road sites are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies - NSP53, NSP55, NSP56, NSP63-NSP67

Questions

NSP53 - Bricklayers Arms

10.72 Is the site developable or suitable as a broad location for development? Does the policy appropriately recognise the location as an area of potential for a Bakerloo Line Extension station?

NSP55 - Mandela Way

10.73 Is the plan justified in retaining the status of this allocated site as a "Locally Significant Industrial Site" (LSIS) and will it be effective in securing an intensification of employment uses, including displacement from other employment sites?

10.74 Is the designation and definition of the detailed boundaries of this site as a LSIS, including the types of uses that are acceptable in this location and the potential for intensification, co-location and substitution in conformity with the London Plan?

NSP56 - 107 Dunton Road (Tesco store and car park) and Southernwood Retail Park

10.75 Is the policy justified and effective in securing a comprehensive approach to the site, recognising land ownerships and the location as an area of potential for a Bakerloo Line Extension station?

NSP63 - Land bounded by Glengall Road, Latona Road and Old Kent Road

10.76 Is the proposed approach to employment land/premises at this location, including the extent of Strategic Industrial Land and balance of Locally Significant Industrial Sites, justified, effective, positively prepared and in general conformity with the London Plan?

NSP64 - Marlborough Grove and St James's Road

10.77 Are the policy requirements for the site justified and can the site effectively and viably deliver retained employment floorspace together with an indicative capacity for 1,000 – 1,200 homes?

NSP65 - Sandgate Street and Verney Road

10.78 Is the proposed approach to employment land/premises at this location, including the extent of Strategic Industrial Land, justified, effective, positively prepared and in conformity with the London Plan?

10.79 Does the presence of National Grid infrastructure affect the capacity and deliverability of the site?

10.80 Are the site requirements justified, including the ability of the site to effectively and viably deliver a mix of uses alongside 3,700 – 5,300 new homes?

10.81 Given the strategic nature and capacity of the site with the Opportunity Area, what is the profile for delivery of both the c.2,000 homes already consented, and the remaining balance of the allocation? How does comprehensive redevelopment of the site relate to a phased approach for growth in the opportunity area consistent with necessary transport infrastructure upgrades?

NSP66 - Devon Street and Sylvan Grove

10.82 To what extent does the Old Kent Road Gas Holder Site, with its Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC), affect delivery and/or timing of delivery of this site?

NSP67 - Hatcham Road, Penarth Street and Ilderton Road

10.83 Is the proposed approach to employment land/premises at this location, including the extent of Strategic Industrial Land, justified, effective, positively prepared and in conformity with the London Plan?

Issue 13:

Whether the Peckham sites are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP71, NSP72, NSP74

Questions

NSP71 - Aylesham Centre and Peckham Bus Station

10.83 Is the site developable during the plan period? Is the bus station facility on the site required to be accommodated as part of the redevelopment and is the policy justified in seeking 'small business space' in lieu of any surplus bus infrastructure?

10.84 Does the allocation make the most of the opportunity to reduce the quantum of car parking on the site given its PTAL rating?

10.85 What evidence and assumptions of density/building heights have informed the indicative capacity of the site to accommodate a mix of uses including some 850 new homes? Is the indicative capacity reflective of the site's location within the Borough View of St Paul's Cathedral from One Tree Hill?

10.86 Does heritage and townscape assessment of the site in the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP 26), which concluded that development of up to 20 storeys could be appropriate in this location remain valid in justifying the NSP approach to tall buildings on this site?

10.87 Is it necessary for plan soundness in respect of the NSP71 allocation that the view (undefined) from the Bussey Building is protected? Is the policy justified and effective in its guidance on the approach to tall buildings and the Bussey Building?

10.88 Is the policy justified in requiring intermediate affordable housing to be provided through a community land trust?

NSP72 - Blackpool Road Business Park

10.89 Is the Policy for NSP72 effective in enabling the site to come forward in a comprehensive and viable form?

NSP73 – Land Between the Railway Arches (East of Rye Lane)

10.90 Would the Policy for NSP73 facilitate effective and deliverable regeneration of this site? Is there a realistic potential for the site to accommodate residential development as part of a mix of uses?

NSP74 - Copeland Industrial Park and 1-27 Bournemouth Road

10.91 Is the site developable against the requirements and guidelines set out in the policy? Is the site alternatively allocated in the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP)? If so, would the PNAAP allocation be rescinded on the adoption of the NSP?

Issue 14:

Whether the Rotherhithe sites are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP76-NSP77

Questions

NSP76 - St Olav's Business Park, Lower Road

10.92 Are the requirements for the allocation justified and enabling effective delivery of the site, including retaining the existing quantum of employment floorspace?

NSP77 - Decathlon Site and Mulberry Business Park and NSP78 Harmsworth Quays, Surrey Quays Leisure Park, Surrey Quays Shopping Centre and Robert's Close

10.93 Is the significant estimated delivery of these two sites (in combination in excess of 4,000 homes) realistic and informed by evidence from the site developers/promoters?

Issue 15

Whether the Walworth sites are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

Relevant Policies – NSP80 and NSP81

Questions

NSP80 – Morrisons, Walworth

10.94 Is the policy justified and do the proposed amendments provide sufficient flexibility to secure an appropriate intensification of the site?

NSP81 – 330-344 Walworth Road

10.95 Is the policy justified and would it be effective in securing an appropriate redevelopment of site, including retaining any buildings of architectural merit or heritage value?