

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 506 344">SP4 Strong Local Economy</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 367 421">Derek Kinrade NSPPSV47.9</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 1420 564">SP4: Here we again we have various time scales: '2014/2036' and 'to 2031' . Elsewhere 2033 and 2043. This is a plan for the future. Cannot the plan be consistent in its projections? Reasons, para.1: what is meant by 'paying attention'?</p>	<p data-bbox="1478 466 2065 922">Projections for economic and retail floorspace have been recommended in our evidence base documents to inform the plan. These are based on current cyclical or economic market trends. Approvals and delivery of floorspace is monitored annually. The reasons para 1 states we pay particular attention to proposed growth in betting, payday loan shops and takeaways and the potential loss of pubs, leisure and cultural uses. This means we have particular policies in the plan on all of these uses, and we monitor them carefully in line with the policy requirements.</p>
<p data-bbox="188 1008 353 1072">SE5 Forum NSPPSV465.2</p> <p data-bbox="188 1114 1451 1251">"We do not find evidence in the plan that Southwark has concrete, effective and timely plans to support Camberwell Town centre's distinct and diverse shops, services, arts and cultural activities (strategic vision 3). which would have a positive impact on employment in Camberwell -which is one of the Boroughs most employment deprived areas (SP4.6.)</p> <p data-bbox="188 1260 1406 1359">Historically Southwark has given far less support to local businesses in Camberwell than in other areas such as Dulwich. For example, Dulwich was funded by the Council to develop and erect High Street banners. The community in Camberwell has had to crowdfund to design and install our own.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1369 1447 1433">Many local businesses have suffered during COVID, so the local community is producing window stickers, a web site and coasters to promote local businesses in line with the 15-minute city initiative (SP5.1).</p>	<p data-bbox="1478 1078 2065 1251">The plan provides a vision for Camberwell and policies relating to town centres. We are monitoring town centres as part of the Council's Action Plan for retail and town centres. This is addressing the issues raised.</p>

Southwark has not supported our local businesses by promoting them.
 Nor has it acted on long term empty high street sites such as the former library on Camberwell Church St
 Southwark has failed to incorporate the Camberwell identity into its consideration of planning applications in the Town Centre
 So
 Southwark should produce concrete and timely plans to revitalise and promote Camberwell businesses
 Adopt and promote the identity assets agreed by businesses and a wide range of residents and groups after extensive consultation by SE5 Forum
 Fund the promotion of Camberwell's High street
 Take action to find uses for long term empty spaces
 And regeneration should be inclusive of a range of business owners and staff. Businesses do not have a vote and are frequently excluded from the process of developing policy.
 Doubling / tripling the economy could offer skilled manual jobs to a diverse array of people.
 "

The Camberwell Identity Group

NSPPSV 472.6

"SP4 and other references to new retail space.
 Not positively prepared or effective.
 'Increasing retail floorspace'. There is no mention of a specific Camberwell Action Plan unlike other areas in the borough. The Plan has many references to new retail uses. Given dramatic changes as a result of the pandemic, including the increase in working from home, the reduction in commuting, the reduction in specific types of retail (there are already a number of empty retail units), there should be a specific study made of this issue to see how it affects the Plan and what long term and short term measures should be adopted. For example how the Council can actively prevent more loss of retail by lobbying central government on business rates, helping tenants negotiate with landlords, promoting the reuse of empty retail as meanwhile spaces.

Examples of existing empty retail space include the Old Library and new retail spaces below modern developments e.g. Camberwell Station Rd, also below Peabody and Camberwell Lanes. Can the council exert pressure on property developers at the planning application stage that if the retail units were not

The Camberwell Plan is not a planning document. It is a useful document which sets out information about the area and development. It is a background paper rather than a planning document.

We are monitoring town centres as part of the Council's Action Plan for retail and town centres. This is addressing the issues raised.

The use classes with the new use class E does allow for more switching of uses. We will be addressing that in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspector.

<p>rented within a time period, they automatically become potential ‘meanwhile’ spaces that can be used for community uses at costs well below market value.</p> <p>Policy objection I do not consider this policy sound because it is not positively prepared or effective "</p>	
<p>Savills on behalf of Safestore NSPPSV157.2</p> <p>"SP4 – Strong Local Economy: We will work to make sure that Southwark has a strong economy where all of our existing and new residents, businesses and workers benefit. This will be achieved through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivering at least 460,000sqm of new office space from 2014 to 2036; and 2. Providing at least 84,000 new jobs; and 3. Bringing more opportunities for people to find work, get into training and achieve their aspirations; and 4. Making Southwark a place where the town centres and high streets thrive and are a place to do business in the London and global economy, where business owners know this is the borough where their enterprises will grow and prosper; and 5. Ensuring the distinctive town and local centres will be places where shops, leisure, office and community uses are competitive and popular, providing customer choice for local communities; and 6. Increasing retail floorspace by up to 26,672sqm by 2031 over and above commitments; and 7. Working with our residents to assist them to be and stay financially independent; and 8. Ensuring we retain intensify industrial land and co-locate industrial premises with new homes London needs; and 9. Working with local business and other partners to make sure our residents are equipped with the skills and knowledge to access the many exciting opportunities that being in Southwark brings; and 10. Ensuring the delivery of 500 new affordable small business units. <p>Safestore supports the aspiration of LBS to target 84,000 new jobs, intensifying industrial land and co-locating industrial land with new homes where appropriate. Use Class B8 storage units have a low impact on residential amenity and are considered appropriate for co-location development, which can comprise</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>various design solutions to ensure that self storage operations can be undertaken without detriment to neighbouring future occupants.</p> <p>The co-location of light industrial with residential space is in line with the intend to publish draft New London Plan, and a welcome addition. Moreover, intensifying industrial land will provide additional floorspace capacity to accommodate more jobs, supporting the local and regional economy. Safestore therefore supports this position."</p>	
<p>Sarah Vaughn NSPPSV 502.2</p> <p>"Document: NSP EIP 27A Policy: SP4 Strong Local Economy Not positively prepared 2. Equally important as investing in green infrastructure is the investment needed in people to care for it. A flexible green workforce with a spirit of nurture is required and the provision of green apprenticeships, the creation of new jobs and the reskilling, training and redeployment of existing employees must be a priority for the council and its contractors. A skilled and knowledgeable green work-force can also train volunteers to work alongside them. "</p>	<p>Southwark's Economic Renewal Plan 2020 commits to A Green New Deal for Southwark. This states: <i>We will focus renewal as an opportunity to root our climate change commitments in the local economy and business growth, by supporting a green new deal that creates jobs, cuts emissions and generates a new wave of profitable environmental innovation.</i></p> <p>Policy SP4 will be implemented by increasing employment spaces and jobs and the council commitments in relation to tackling climate change and a new green deal for jobs will interlink with the ambitions of Policy SP4 and SP6. We will consider an amendment to the plan to better reflect this ambition in SP4 to propose to the Inspectors examining the plan.</p>
<p>Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum NSPPSV132.2</p> <p>"Document: NSP EIP 27A Policy SP4: Strong Local Economy Not positively prepared or effective. We support the new additional wording of ‘..existing and new residents, businesses..’ however for the plan to be positively prepared or effective, the focus on office space (targets) needs to be fundamentally reframed given the new pandemic situation and more emphasis and audit based evidence be provided to support local businesses being able to remain and evolve in highstreet settings The policy says that</p>	<p>The NSP plans for development over the next 15 years, and the evidence base demonstrates a high demand for office floorspace. It is important the plan is sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances however the longer term effects of the pandemic would need to be justified by evidence and there is no current evidence which justified a change in approach in</p>

highstreets should thrive and this is also reflected in some Area Visions (e.g. AV 11 “Support the development of vibrant new high streets on St Thomas Street, Crucifix Lane and Tooley Street, complementing the distinct character of nearby Bermondsey Street”) however 40% of highstreet settings have no protection and some like those in AV11 are threatened by the weakness of Tall Buildings and Site Allocations policies which will render them without daylight and subject to high levels of wind making them unsustainable. The resulting shortage/squeeze is leading to economic gentrification of industrial areas which undermines policy SP2 (regeneration working for all) and Local Economy Policies 28-33. For the plan to be positively prepared or effective there needs to be a thorough audit of existing highstreet settings to assess how these can be supported and allowed to grow (in depth and diversity as well as in ‘length’) and not least how their social cultural and educative value can be understood from within their localities - the Forum could expand on this using local examples and are interested in how the new stated intention to “..encourage the creation of jobs in the environmental sector to help to respond to the climate emergency” could be developed in more detail for example with regards to the circular economy and SP6 policies.

"

the NSP policies. The respondent notes evidence should support local businesses to remain and evolve in high street settings. The policy is flexible to encourage growth in offices, particularly in high street settings (policy point 5). Supported by the development management policies in the plan which require the reprovion and growth of employment floorspace in the CAZ and in town centres.

The plan identifies protected shopping frontages on its proposals map and policy schedules. AV11 references the development of vibrant new high streets, which have the potential to become high streets with new development. Once established, these could also be allocated protected shopping frontage status if applicable in a later plan review. The council undertakes an audit of protected shopping frontages annually.

Tall buildings in site allocations would be subject to a microclimate and wind assessment in detailed planning applications as required by our validation checklist.

Southwark’s Economic Renewal Plan 2020 commits to **A Green New Deal for Southwark**.

This states:

We will focus renewal as an opportunity to root our climate change commitments in the local economy and business growth, by supporting a green new deal that creates jobs, cuts emissions and generates a new wave of profitable

	<p><i>environmental innovation.</i></p> <p>The New London Plan and the Climate Change Act as legislated by the UK government set out a target to meet net carbon zero by 2050. As demonstrated in the Energy Background Paper (2020), the policies in the NSP are designed to meet this target to align with national and regional planning policy and planning policy guidance, and law. As a council, we have declared a Climate Emergency and set a target to meet net carbon zero as a borough by 2030. This policy will be reviewed in the context of this target which is only based on a council declaration. This is set out in the Environmental Committee Scrutiny Report November 2020.</p> <p>Policy SP4 will be implemented by increasing employment spaces and jobs and the council commitments in relation to tackling climate change and a new green deal for jobs will interlink with the ambitions of Policy SP4 and SP6. We will consider an amendment to the plan to better reflect this ambition in SP4 to propose to the Inspectors examining the plan.</p>
<p>Union 4 on behalf of Caddick Developments NSPPSV497.4</p> <p>"Economic Policies Policy SP4 is entitled 'Strong Local Economy' and includes a proposed change which refers to intensification and co-location on industrial land: "Ensuring we intensify industrial land and co-locate industrial premises with new homes London needs."</p>	<p>The sites proposed as SPIL on the NSP proposals map will remain as industrial sites only suitable for industrial retention or intensification. However some sites currently in industrial use are proposed for industrial co-location with new homes under site allocation policies in the NSP,</p>

<p>Policy SP4 is entitled 'Strong Local Economy' and includes a proposed change which refers to intensification and co-location on industrial land: "Ensuring we intensify industrial land and co-locate industrial premises with new homes London needs." 3 We support this proposed change to Policy SP4 and consider that it is sound, in being both 'positively prepared' and 'justified'. However, we would question whether Policy SP4 is entirely consistent with Policy P28 which refers to strategic protected industrial land (SPIL). Policy SP28 states that "only industrial uses (B1b, B1c, B2, B8, sui generis industrial use classes) and uses ancillary to the industrial uses, will be permitted" on SPIL land. We note that Paragraph 3 under Policy SP28 is a proposed change and that it states as follows: "Much of the industrial land in the borough is located in the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area. These sites will be intensified for mixed use development and industrial co-location. Development will include an innovative new approach to create new town centres which include community facilities, retail, office, education and health uses. Industrial development will be included alongside or underneath new homes with specific design criteria to ensure businesses can operate successfully without harming residential amenity."</p>	<p>LSIS designation on the proposals map or policies and the masterplan for the Old Kent Road AAP.</p>
<p>CBRE Ltd on behalf of Royal London NSPPSV344.4</p> <p>This policy sets out significant targets, including for 460,000 sqm of new office space (2014-2036); and providing at least 84,000 new jobs; increasing retail floorspace up to 26,672 sqm by 2031 over and above existing commitments. These are ambitious but challenging targets and the implications of Class E will also need to be considered. We note the policy requirement across LB Southwark to intensify industrial land and co-locate industrial premises with new homes. The Six Bridges site has the potential to achieve this innovative concept; but given the need to introduce residential, it will be challenging to intensify industrial use further on this particular site, although this has the potential to be achieved across the Borough.</p>	<p>Noted. Detail of how this site is expected to be developed utilising industrial colocation policies is set out in the Old Kent Road AAP and its sub area typologies, alongside the NSP site allocation. The AAP contains a policy target to achieve no net loss of industrial floorspace across the opportunity area. Sites where industrial capacity could be intensified are also identified.</p>
<p>GLA NSPPSV66.2</p> <p>"Amendments to Clause 8 of Policy SP4 support co-location of industrial premises with new homes in the borough. The ItP London Plan as amended by the Secretary of State directions does not support co-location of industrial uses with housing within Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL). Direction DR4 proposes</p>	<p>We agree with the points made in terms of intention however do feel the policy is sufficiently robust to not give rise to speculative</p>

several amendments to the ItP London Plan including the deletion of Part D of Policy E5 which requires the refusal of residential development proposals in SIL, however it is considered that this direction does not alter the policy position of Policy E7(B) that co-location with SIL is not supported. The current wording of Policy SP4 could give rise to speculative approaches that result in the co-location of residential and industrial uses on SIL designated sites in the borough. To bring Policy SP4 into alignment with Policy E7 of the ItP London Plan the policy wording and its supporting text should be amended to make clear co-location of industrial uses with residential use is only supported on LSIS sites identified for co-location with residential use in the plan's site allocations. Similar amendments to policy wording and supporting text should be made to Policy P28 to clarify that co-location of industrial uses with residential is only supported on LSIS sites identified for co-location in the plan's site allocations. In the absence of a clearer policy on LSIS sites, the current wording in the supporting text to Policy P28 could result in the introduction of residential uses into SIL via mixed-use development and co-location which would be contrary to Policy E7 of the ItP London Plan."

approaches that would allow for co-location of residential and industrial uses on SPIL designated sites. The wording of SP4 commits to both intensifying industrial land as well as co-locating industrial premises with new homes, in line with the ItP London Plan. Policy P28 is clear that on sites designated as SPIL, no other uses than industrial would be acceptable. The reasons are intended to make reference to the proposals for existing industrial land to be released from SPIL designation in this plan, and intensified for mixed use development and industrial co-location particularly in the Old Kent Road OA. LSIS would be developed in accordance with ItP London Plan policy E6. We will consider a proposal to the Inspectors to make the reasons for Policy P28 clearer in this regard.

Extinction Rebellion
NSPPSV525.5, .6

"Policy SP4 policy states: "We will work to make sure that Southwark has a strong economy where all of our existing and new residents, businesses and workers benefit. This will be achieved through..."

Southwark Council declared a Climate Emergency in May 2019. The council have consulted on the strategy, have a stakeholder group and have held a conference to help inform the strategy development. <http://modern.gov.southwarksites.com/documents/s89801/Report%20Climate%20Strategy%20report.pdf> There is no mention within this policy of a just transition, or the importance of green jobs and a greener economy as included in the Draft Climate Strategy. I therefore do not consider this justified in the light of the Council's own commitment to the principles of a just transition and the Green New Deal in the Draft

Southwark's Economic Renewal Plan 2020 commits to **A Green New Deal for Southwark**. This states:
We will focus renewal as an opportunity to root our climate change commitments in the local economy and business growth, by supporting a green new deal that creates jobs, cuts emissions and generates a new wave of profitable environmental innovation.

Climate Emergency Strategy:

“There is now a clear emphasis from business leaders, economic experts, politicians and others that the government must ensure that our economy and jobs are central to tackling the climate emergency. A significant part of this is the implementation of a Green New Deal.

The fundamental pillar of the Green New Deal is that economic, social and climate justice are indissoluble. It argues that for decarbonisation through actions like greener transport and more environmentally friendly building to be successful, our economy needs to be prepared to support it and flourish from it. This means large scale investment in renewables, a ‘just transition’ into well paid, unionised green jobs and supporting developing countries' climate transitions. In Southwark, this means greater and broader funding for green initiatives, having the latest green technology available and an influx of available and well paid jobs in green businesses. The council’s priority, particularly in the context of COVID-19, is that a green recovery is able to support business and provide significant economic opportunities for our residents.”

I do not consider this policy effective or sound. This policy does not show leadership in addressing the Climate Emergency. The Council should ensure that this transformation is fair and equitable from a social perspective. The Council should actively integrate the just transition concept into all relevant policies and decisions, applying lessons from research, best practice, and case studies from other city contexts."

"I would support the Council in developing and bringing forward amendments designed to align the NSP with the draft Climate Emergency Strategy, specifically on:

- The importance of a Just Transition, which aims to secure workers' rights and livelihoods as economies are shifting to sustainable production, combating climate change and protecting biodiversity.
- The creation of a green jobs programme for the Borough, including skills and training, to support tackling the climate and ecological emergency. Where jobs might be impacted by a transition to a more sustainable Borough, the Council should ensure alternative green jobs are just as attractive, well paid and skilled. It is vital that the workers in many of the impacted sectors have the skills they need in a green economy, so the council should invest in skills development and training to support the green transition, rather than a return to ‘normal’
- Promotional Living Wage campaigns to empower individual employees to make greener choices day to

The New London Plan and the Climate Change Act as legislated by the UK government set out a target to meet net carbon zero by 2050. As demonstrated in the Energy Background Paper (2020), the policies in the NSP are designed to meet this target to align with national and regional planning policy and planning policy guidance, and law. As a council, we have declared a Climate Emergency and set a target to meet net carbon zero as a borough by 2030. This policy will be reviewed in the context of this target which is only based on a council declaration. This is set out in the Environmental Committee Scrutiny Report November 2020.

Policy SP4 will be implemented by increasing employment spaces and jobs and the council commitments in relation to tackling climate change and a new green deal for jobs will interlink with the ambitions of Policy SP4 and SP6. We will consider an amendment to the plan to better reflect this ambition in SP4 to propose to the Inspectors examining the plan.

day

- Working directly, and through bodies like the Southwark Business Forum, with small businesses to support them taking measures to reduce waste and carbon emissions. This could include waste management, improvements to energy efficiency or changes to the public realm to encourage walking and cycling."

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 651 344">P28 Strategic protected industrial land</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 544 421">Savills on behalf of Safestore NSPPSV157.5</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 667 494">"P28 Strategic protected industrial land</p> <p data-bbox="188 501 752 529">1. On strategic protected industrial land (SPIL):</p> <p data-bbox="188 536 1070 600">1. Only industrial uses (B1b, B1c, B2, B8, sui generis industrial use classes) and uses ancillary to the industrial uses, will be permitted; and</p> <p data-bbox="188 606 1055 670">2. Development must retain, grow and intensify industrial uses including increasing the number of jobs.</p> <p data-bbox="188 676 1008 705">2.1 Make use of railway arches for employment uses (B use classes).</p> <p data-bbox="188 711 674 740">2.2 Seek to increase the number of jobs.</p> <p data-bbox="188 746 1111 1104">2. The area of SPIL which is host to the Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) will be retained as SPIL unless the criteria of policy P64/P62 are fulfilled Safestore supports the principle of SPILs being used as a designated zone to protect industrial land and intensify industrial uses that in turn will support local economies and which may not be appropriate elsewhere within the borough. Safestore also consider the deletion of point 2.1 and consolidation of point 2.2 to be appropriate. The policy should however be amended in light of the new use class order (UCO), which as previously stated splits the previous Use Class B1 into the newly created Use Class E .</p> <p data-bbox="188 1110 1088 1283">Within the New Southwark Plan: Southwark Council’s Proposed Changes to the Submitted New Southwark Plan 2018-2033 August 2020 Consultation Plan document (hereby known as ‘NSP consultation guidelines’), there are two criteria referenced when judging the merits of an emerging policy document as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="188 1289 649 1318">1) Whether the Local Plan is legal; and</p> <p data-bbox="188 1324 647 1353">2) Whether the Local Plan is effective.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1359 1043 1423">Ascertaining whether the NSP is legal is of particular relevance when considering whether the NSP can be assessed as being ‘sound’ or not as</p>	<p data-bbox="1137 392 2040 456">We will be addressing the changes to the use classes order and their effect on the policies in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspectors.</p> <p data-bbox="1137 501 2063 778">The representation is noted regarding the requirement to increase the number of jobs when it comes to self storage businesses specifically. It is acknowledged these businesses could generate employment opportunities in the wider economic context. However the policy as currently worded is flexible enough to acknowledge wider job creation in an economic context, encouraging a wide range of industrial uses, and the council is keen to ensure the policy encourages an increase in jobs particularly where industrial uses are intensified.</p>

required by paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Regarding point 1.1 of Draft Policy P28, this policy refers to the previous UCO and is therefore considered to be contrary to current legislation (specifically the Use Classes Order). Draft Policy P28 as it is currently worded is therefore no longer aligned with the current legal system in conflict with Criteria 1 above. It should also be noted at this stage that we are aware that a number of other draft policies within the NSP are also subject to this contradiction to current legislation, however, we will not be commenting on those draft policies as part of this representation.

Given that former Use Classes B1a, B1b and B1c are now included within the separate new Use Class E, Use Class E should also be permitted within the SPIL so as to not restrict any proposed development in a SPIL that would increase employment floorspace.

Regarding Point 1.2 this policy requirement is considered to be partly ineffective at achieving its overarching aim, which is to protect and encourage the development of industrial spaces within SPILs. This is because the policy as currently drafted requires any commercial development to 'increase the number of jobs'.

Whilst this requirement may appear to be a positive aspect to the draft Policy, as outlined previously, self-storage businesses (which fall under Use Class B8) provide a platform for other businesses, often SMEs, to work and grow from which in turn supports a significant number of job opportunities by providing low cost space to SMEs in a central London location that they could not otherwise. Self-storage therefore plays a vital role in localised job creation and this should therefore be recognised in planning policy.

We therefore request that draft Policy P28 is amended to reflect the significant contribution that self-storage makes and suggest the following wording:

1. On strategic protected industrial land (SPIL):

1. Only industrial uses (E, ~~B1b, B1c~~, B2, B8, sui generis industrial use classes) and uses ancillary to the industrial uses, will be permitted; and
2. Development must retain, grow ~~and~~ or intensify industrial uses including

<p>increasing the number of <u>jobs employment opportunities either on site or within the borough.</u></p> <p>2.1 Make use of railway arches for employment uses (B use classes).</p> <p>2.2 Seek to increase the number of jobs.</p> <p>2. The area of SPIL which is host to the Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) will be retained as SPIL unless the criteria of policy P64 P62 are fulfilled"</p>	
<p>Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum NSPPSV132.21</p> <p>"Document EIP 27A Policy: P28 Strategic protected industrial land, P29 Office and business development, P30 Affordable Workspace and P32 Business Relocation</p> <p>Not positively prepared, effective or justified</p> <p>The baseline study (2015) supporting P28 was deeply flawed for example in missing out railway arches. The reduction of industrial land is at a rate x2 than the GLA benchmark and without making additional designation. The London Plan states there should be no net loss. There is a need for radical revision of industrial designation. The policy and its evidence is not effective as there is no flexibility for uncertainty around the Bakerloo line for example. The plan is currently unsound because it causes industrial uses to be too often replaced by offices and there is no evidence of the plan taking into account the changing market needs in the new pandemic situation. P30 is problematic and self-defeating in that it still allows for in lieu payments and for retail (A Class) to replace workspace (B Class). The Affordable Workspace Demand Map appears vague and some definitions seem questionable for example "Discount market rents: A rent that is less than the market rent."</p> <p>The additional wording in P31 about on retention of small shops and in P32 on demolished floorspace, yard space and engagement with (including practical arrangements for and statements from) local businesses in</p>	<p>The evidence base used to support policy P28 including analysis of railway arches is set out in the Industrial Background Paper (SP401). Policy P29 requires a marketing strategy to ensure the use and occupation of the employment space to be delivered would meet current market demand; this ensures we deliver the right types of employment space in the right locations, including from office to industrial uses.</p> <p>P30 policy has an 'on site first' approach to delivering affordable workspace. Sometimes it will not be possible for a scheme to provide it on site, so to meet the policy requirement, the option is to provide an in lieu payment. This will go towards delivering affordable workspace elsewhere in the borough. The policy also allows for affordable retail or cultural uses instead of employment uses however this would only be in exceptional circumstances where a named occupier is in need of affordable space and can be identified.</p> <p>The definition of discount market rent does not include specific rent levels because this could change depending on current market rents and different rents in different areas. Our evidence base (SP422) explains this approach in more detail. The discount also depends on the type of affordable workspace being provided. This is negotiated in detail on a scheme by scheme basis.</p>

reference to relocation plans are positive however the plan still needs a detailed audit of the local economy to be justified with robust evidence - this should include an understanding of the social and educative value of diverse local economies and be an ambitious basis for the promotion of circular economy principles.

The plan should be stronger on promoting mixed use through good design either through a new policy or through improving the clarity of existing references (in order to be positively prepared and to avoid undermining some strategic policy aspirations): An integrated approach is needed to consider industrial a/ business and residential factors together to promote and achieve mixed use developments. 'Mixed (and integrated) communities' and '(industrial) mixed use development' is referred to in SP2, SP3, Area Visions,

Site Allocations, P28 (Strategic protected industrial land), P29 (Office and business development) and P30 (Affordable workspace) however this is typically in vague terms. While the following additional reasoning in P28 for example is potentially positive it relies on evidence/studies which are yet to be undertaken (e.g. design criteria): "...for mixed use development and industrial co-location. Development will include an innovative new approach to create new town centres which include community facilities, retail, office, education and health uses. Industrial development will be included alongside or underneath new homes with specific design criteria to ensure businesses can operate successfully without harming residential amenity." This could be a positive and ambitious basis for a design led strategy at the scale of area visions and site allocations in the context of the pandemic situation (new emerging workspace and amenity needs) and the climate emergency. Innovative approaches could be informed by an understanding of how areas like Bermondsey operated historically as well as study of precedents in collaboration with other boroughs."

With regard to the detailed audit of the local economy, this is included in our evidence base documents for retail and business, the retail background paper and the site allocations methodology paper.

Specific design criteria is included in the Old Kent Road AAP where much of the mixed use development including industrial co-location is proposed. NSP site allocations also specify design requirements for particular sites including mixed use development.

Southwark Law Centre
NSPPSV167.12

"P28 Strategic protected industrial land
We are concerned about the rapid loss of industrial land in Southwark, particularly in the area of greatest concentration which is, as policy 28 details, in the Old Kent Road area.
We submit that this policy has not been positively prepared and it is not effective and meeting the desire for industrial co-location in evidenced policy terms, therefore it is unsound.
"

The evidence base used to support policy P28 is set out in the Industrial Background Paper (SP401). The Old Kent Road AAP also sets out detailed guidance for industrial co-location and is supported by evidence.

Union 4 on behalf of Caddick Development
NSPPSV497.4

"We welcome the above paragraph, but we would again question whether the current wording of Policy P28 adequately reflects these objectives for intensification and co-location.
The Intend to Publish version of the London Plan requires boroughs to identify as many sites, including small sites, as possible via their Development Plan Documents and to maximise housing delivery through positive policies, allocations, small sites and windfalls. We do not consider Policy P28, as currently drafted, to be consistent with Policy GG2 of the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan as proposed, which seeks to intensify and optimise the use of land within the urban area for a variety of uses and which recognises the challenges facing London.
Policy E7 of the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan refers to industrial intensification and co-location. The policy is clear in stating that development plans and planning frameworks should be proactive and consider, in collaboration with the Mayor, whether certain logistics, industrial and related functions in selected parts of Significant Industrial Sites (SIL) could be intensified to provide additional industrial capacity. Further to this, Policy ED7 states that intensification can also be used to facilitate the consolidation of an identified SIL to support the delivery of residential and

The sites proposed as SPIL on the NSP proposals map will remain as industrial sites only suitable for industrial retention or intensification. However some sites currently in industrial use are proposed for industrial co-location with new homes under site allocation policies in the NSP, LSIS designation on the proposals map or policies and the masterplan for the Old Kent Road AAP.

other uses, such as social infrastructure, or to contribute to town centre renewal.

We would submit that policies pertaining to industrial land in Southwark should clearly recognise the relationship between intensification and co-location with appropriate residential uses, including co-living accommodation, which has the potential to provide a synergy with employment uses as part of a carefully considered mixed-use development.

This approach would also be consistent with the advice from the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government to the Mayor of London on 13 March 2020, which emphasised the importance of industrial land policies not taking an overly restrictive approach."

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 645 344">P29 Office and business development</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 539 421">Guys and St Thomas' Charity NSPPSV76.6</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 506 494">"Loss of Office Floorspace</p> <p data-bbox="188 501 1111 817">The Trust requests that proposals which result in the loss of office floorspace in Draft Policy P29 'Office and Business Development' are not resisted if the proposal is in relation to necessary healthcare provision as part of wider estate regeneration proposals. As stated previously, the Trust requires flexibility between different uses of healthcare services in order to be able to adapt to the changing healthcare demands and local needs. As a result, the Trust requests less restrictions to be put in place on proposals from public health bodies which would result in the loss of office floorspace whereby the primary use of the site is by healthcare staff."</p>	<p data-bbox="1140 424 2065 596">The policy relates to the loss of employment floorspace (previously use class B). Offices which are ancillary to the primary use class would be considered on the basis of need to support that primary use. However the general policy premise would continue to apply to support re-provision and growth of employment uses where identified.</p>
<p data-bbox="188 898 640 962">WYG on behalf of John Lyons Charity NSPPSV 214.5</p> <p data-bbox="188 1007 730 1035">"Policy 29: Office and Business Development</p> <p data-bbox="188 1042 1111 1214">Policy P29 'Office and business development' requires development to retain or re-provide existing employment floorspace in town centres, opportunity areas and Central Activities Zones. The Charity supports the direction of the policy, however the Charity has concerns regarding the need for a marketing strategy and exceptional circumstances listed under point 2 of the policy.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1220 1111 1431">We do not agree with the request to "provide marketing strategy for the use and occupation of the employment space to be delivered to demonstrate how it will meet current market demand". The policy and indeed the whole Plan recognises the need for employment space in Southwark and therefore requesting further information is considered overly onerous and unjustified and accordingly this point should be removed.</p>	<p data-bbox="1140 970 2065 1431">The policy to require a marketing strategy to be provided for the use and occupation of the employment floorspace to be delivered to demonstrate how it will meet market demand is not considered to be onerous. This is to ensure planning applications deliver employment space is suitable to the local market and meeting demand. This enables a range of workspaces to suit demand in different parts of the borough depending on the location and suitability of the site. It ensures good quality commercial space is designed to meet demand and occupier expectations and standards, enabling the space to be attractive to the target market. Whilst many commercial spaces can be designed to be flexible, often, fit out requirements, layout and design can change depending on the type of business use, e.g. office or light industrial. In light industrial uses, servicing, lift, ceiling heights, broad spans and less columns are important design considerations.</p>

<p>Point 2 allows, in exceptional circumstances, the loss of employment floorspace but it must be demonstrated through by a marketing exercise for “two years immediately prior to any planning application. This should be for both its existing condition and as an opportunity for an improved employment use through redevelopment which shows there is no demand”. This timeframe is unnecessarily restrictive, effectively removing a site from the market for two years, creating long-term voids and could have a knock-on effect on surrounding businesses.</p> <p>Point 3 states that “Development that results in a loss of employment floorspace anywhere in the borough must provide a financial contribution towards training and jobs for local people”. There is no information provided on the basis for which this financial contribution would be calculated, and these details should be included within the supporting text.”</p>	<p>The 2 year marketing period is considered appropriate. There are low vacancy rates in Southwark and demand for a range of workspaces remains high, therefore it is not considered this policy requirement would result in the proliferation of vacant or underused units but act as an incentive for effective marketing to ensure the units are occupied by the demand our evidence shows.</p> <p>The requirements for financial contributions are set out in the S106 SPD (EIP49).</p>
<p>WSP on behalf of Apex Investment Groups NSPPSV474.8</p> <p>"Policy P29: Office and Business Development We object to this policy on the basis that it is unsound and inconsistent with national policy. It is onerous and overly prescriptive about the types of uses which can be located on sites in OA’s.</p> <p>The recent amendment to the Use Classes Order (September 2020) strives for increased flexibility in uses within mixed commercial areas, and at the very least, the policy should be updated to refer to the full range of Class E uses as employment generating uses being acceptable within business and commercial areas.</p> <p>The requirement for a marketing exercise to be undertaken on sites within the CAZ, town centres and OA’s on sites allocated for development where retention or uplift in employment floorspace is not feasible, is not consistent with the aims of newly updated Use Classes legislation. The recent update to the Use Classes Order has been designed to provide increased flexibility to commercial and business centres to facilitate a range of uses appropriate to</p>	<p>We will be addressing the changes to the use classes order and their effect on the policies in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspectors.</p> <p>The policy to require a marketing strategy to be provided for the use and occupation of the employment floorspace to be delivered to demonstrate how it will meet market demand is considered appropriate. This is to ensure planning applications deliver employment space is suitable to the local market and meeting demand. This enables a range of workspaces to suit demand in different parts of the borough depending on the location and suitability of the site. It ensures good quality commercial space is designed to meet demand and occupier expectations and standards, enabling the space to be attractive to the target market. Whilst many commercial spaces can be designed to be flexible, often, fit out requirements, layout and design can change depending on the type of business use, e.g. office or light industrial. In light industrial uses, servicing, lift, ceiling heights, broad spans and less columns are important design considerations.</p>

<p>these areas, including retail and leisure uses. Allocated sites within the CAZ, town centres and OA's should be able to operate under the full range of uses specified by Class E, provided they will not give rise to residential amenity issues. Accordingly, this element of the policy should be deleted."</p>	
<p>Old Bermondsey Forum NSPPSV132.22</p> <p>"Document EIP 27A Policy: P28 Strategic protected industrial land, P29 Office and business development, P30 Affordable Workspace and P32 Business Relocation Not positively prepared, effective or justified The baseline study (2015) supporting P28 was deeply flawed for example in missing out railway arches. The reduction of industrial land is at a rate x2 than the GLA benchmark and without making additional designation. The London Plan states there should be no net loss. There is a need for radical revision of industrial designation. The policy and its evidence is not effective as there is no flexibility for uncertainty around the Bakerloo line for example. The plan is currently unsound because it causes industrial uses to be too often replaced by offices and there is no evidence of the plan taking into account the changing market needs in the new pandemic situation. P30 is problematic and self-defeating in that it still allows for in lieu payments and for retail (A Class) to replace workspace (B Class). The Affordable Workspace Demand Map appears vague and some definitions seem questionable for example "Discount market rents: A rent that is less than the market rent." The additional wording in P31 about on retention of small shops and in P32 on demolished floorspace, yard space and engagement with (including practical arrangements for and statements from) local businesses in reference to relocation plans are positive however the plan still needs a detailed audit of the local economy to be justified with robust evidence - this should include an understanding of the social and educative value of diverse</p>	<p>The evidence base used to support policy P28 including analysis of railway arches is set out in the Industrial Background Paper (SP401). Policy P29 requires a marketing strategy to ensure the use and occupation of the employment space to be delivered would meet current market demand; this ensures we deliver the right types of employment space in the right locations, including from office to industrial uses.</p> <p>P30 policy has an 'on site first' approach to delivering affordable workspace. Sometimes it will not be possible for a scheme to provide it on site, so to meet the policy requirement, the option is to provide an in lieu payment. This will go towards delivering affordable workspace elsewhere in the borough. The policy also allows for affordable retail or cultural uses instead of employment uses however this would only be in exceptional circumstances where a named occupier is in need of affordable space and can be identified.</p> <p>The definition of discount market rent does not include specific rent levels because this could change depending on current market rents and different rents in different areas. Our evidence base (SP422) explains this approach in more detail. The discount also depends on the type of affordable workspace being provided. This is negotiated in detail on a scheme by scheme basis.</p> <p>With regard to the detailed audit of the local economy, this is included in our evidence base documents for retail and business, the retail background paper and the site allocations methodology paper.</p>

<p>local economies and be an ambitious basis for the promotion of circular economy principles.</p> <p>The plan should be stronger on promoting mixed use through good design either through a new policy or through improving the clarity of existing references (in order to be positively prepared and to avoid undermining some strategic policy aspirations): An integrated approach is needed to consider industrial a/ business and residential factors together to promote and achieve mixed use developments. 'Mixed (and integrated) communities' and '(industrial) mixed use development' is referred to in SP2, SP3, Area Visions,</p> <p>Site Allocations, P28 (Strategic protected industrial land), P29 (Office and business development) and P30 (Affordable workspace) however this is typically in vague terms. While the following additional reasoning in P28 for example is potentially positive it relies on evidence/studies which are yet to be undertaken (e.g. design criteria): "...for mixed use development and industrial co-location. Development will include an innovative new approach to create new town centres which include community facilities, retail, office, education and health uses. Industrial development will be included alongside or underneath new homes with specific design criteria to ensure businesses can operate successfully without harming residential amenity." This could be a positive and ambitious basis for a design led strategy at the scale of area visions and site allocations in the context of the pandemic situation (new emerging workspace and amenity needs) and the climate emergency. Innovative approaches could be informed by an understanding of how areas like Bermondsey operated historically as well as study of precedents in collaboration with other boroughs."</p>	<p>Specific design criteria is included in the Old Kent Road AAP where much of the mixed use development including industrial co-location is proposed. NSP site allocations also specify design requirements for particular sites including mixed use development.</p>
<p>Southwark Law Centre NSPPSV167.13</p> <p>"P29 Office and business development We submit this policy is not effective as it has not been considered in light of the impact of the pandemic on offices and businesses and the recovery period which will take up a significant proportion of the time in which the</p>	<p>The NSP plans for development over the next 15 years, and the evidence base demonstrates a high demand for office floorspace. It is important the plan is sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances however the longer term effects of the pandemic would need to be justified by evidence and there is no current evidence which justifies a change in approach in the NSP policies.</p>

New Southwark Plan is the adopted local plan for the borough. "

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 510 344">P30 Affordable workspace</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 808 421">Montagu Evans on behalf of Nathaniel Henry Clark NSPPSV38.5</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 1111 673">"Draft NSP Policy P29 states that where specified, development must retain or increase the amount of employment floorspace on site. As drafted, Policy P30 would conflict with policy P29 by discouraging the refurbishment, renewal and expansion of existing commercial buildings through reducing the floorspace available for a profitable return, making the renewal and upgrade of existing buildings unattractive.</p> <p data-bbox="188 679 1104 995">Turning to the application of the current policy wording in practice, where 500 sqm (GIA) of employment floorspace is proposed as part of a planning application, the draft policy seeks 10% of the gross employment floorspace be provided as Affordable Workspace ("AWS"). This would seek affordable workspace provision on existing employment floorspace alongside the uplift in floorspace. This would impede refurbishment proposals and small scale extensions to existing buildings by requiring existing floorspace to be converted to AWS, reducing the value of existing commercial floorspace and the likelihood of this type of development being viable.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1002 1111 1423">For example, for a building that currently provides 10,000 sqm of office floorspace, if a 500 sqm extension were to be proposed, this would result in the requirement for 1,050 sqm of affordable workspace to be provided. This approach is clearly not viable and would strongly discourage smaller scale development proposals from coming forward. As such, it is highly likely that any proposals for small extensions would not be deliverable due to the resultant lower value of any additional space, combined with the decrease in value of the existing space arising from affordable workspace provision. Typically, benefits such as affordable housing and AWS in other London boroughs are sought on the uplift in floorspace from a new development, not the total area. Otherwise such a policy would act as a disincentive for development. Consequently, the policy should be amended so that</p>	<p data-bbox="1140 466 2067 890">The policy proposes 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace to be affordable workspace. It is clarified in the reasons that the policy applies to all new build developments providing over 500sqm of new employment floorspace regardless of any existing employment uses that will be demolished. For extensions to buildings or changes of use, the policy applies to the new floorspace created if the extension or change of use is over 500sqm. It is considered this clarity in approach would not therefore discourage the refurbishment, renewal and expansion of existing commercial buildings. However larger extensions measuring over 500sqm would be expected to contribute to affordable workspace requirements, e.g an extension of 500sqm would generate the need for 50sqm affordable workspace (10%).</p> <p data-bbox="1140 932 2056 1216">The proposed 500sqm threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations identified for employment uses. The threshold is informed by the evidence of need for affordable workspace in the borough, and by the average size of a micro business unit at 50sqm. This is the minimum unit size which could be accommodated in proposals which include separate micro business units. In circumstances where this is not feasible to provide on site, an in-lieu payment will be required to secure off-site provision of affordable workspace.</p>

affordable space provision should only be required on the floorspace uplift over and above what is already provided on site.

Turning to the 500sqm employment floorspace threshold, notwithstanding the current objection to this from the Mayor and various other parties, it is relevant to note that The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, Regulation 122 states that planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development; and
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

It is clear that the currently proposed development threshold within the draft policy wording does not accord with part c of Regulation 122 and should be amended as it is not fair nor reasonable in the context of the scale of development to seek the provision of affordable workspace from minor development proposals. Therefore the overall threshold for seeking affordable workspace provision should be increased so that it applies to major developments providing more than 1,000 sqm of employment floorspace in order to promote smaller scale commercial development in the borough.

In order to safeguard viability and promote small scale employment proposals and refurbishment projects that seek to upgrade and renew existing employment stock, AWS provision should only be sought on major redevelopment proposals and should be on the basis of 10% of the proposed uplift in gross employment floorspace. We would request that the wording of draft Policy P30 is amended to the following:

“2. Major developments providing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

2.1 Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discounted market rents...”

The first part of the policy retains the previous requirement and confirms it applies to B class uses. In addition it adds the requirement for replacement business space to be like for like in terms of floorspace and bespoke to the requirements of businesses. Part 1 of the policy is copied below: Development must: 1 Retain small and independent businesses (B Class Uses). Where existing small and independent businesses are at risk of displacement from a development there should be full consideration of the feasibility of providing affordable and suitable space for existing occupiers in the completed development; Replacement business space should be like for like in terms of floorspace or bespoke to suit the requirements of the business; and or 2. Explore the opportunities for long term management of employment space and the delivery of affordable workspace by workspace providers. We welcome the flexibility with regards to either option being available whereas both were required previously however we maintain previous comments made in our representations in February 2018 and May 2019 that these requirements in relation to maintaining existing businesses have the potential to disincentivise certain sites from coming forward which may impact on the delivery of wider planning objectives. For example, the redevelopment of the Six Bridges Estate has been identified by Southwark as necessary to facilitate the wider regeneration and to achieve key planning objectives for the Old Kent Road area such as delivery of housing, affordable housing, industrial uses and public realm enhancements. There is a need to ensure no net loss of employment floorspace on this site and for the site to deliver 'innovative mixing' and co-location of industrial and residential uses which in a new concept. This innovation in itself is likely to be challenging to deliver with additional viability, design, management, market uncertainties and phasing considerations when compared with typical sites. Coupled with the requirements of this policy, there is the potential to add additional practical challenges such as management, design and viability issues on the site. Royal London is supportive of the principle of supporting small and independent businesses and will work collaboratively with its tenants where plans for redevelopment are identified. It is considered that the requirements of the policy go beyond the role of the planning system which is not tied to specific businesses. Policy should therefore not seek to protect the existing occupiers - separate controls are provided through the landlord and tenant system and will always have been subject to separate commercial negotiation. In addition to the requirements in Part 1, Part 2 also requires that

The policy is considered necessary to ensure existing small and independent businesses at risk of displacement are considered in the redevelopment of schemes and where they could benefit from affordable workspace being required. We welcome a discussion with developers on individual sites to work with the council on the strategy to accommodate business relocation in the wider Old Kent Road opportunity area.

developments that provide employment floorspace (B class use) must also provide at least 10% of proposed employment floorspace as affordable workspace. We support the flexibility for a payment in lieu option to be available, if due to practical reasons and the complexities outlined above when delivering a site such as Six Bridges; an on-site element is challenging to achieve.

NHS London Urban Healthy Developments Unit
NSPPSV48.2

"Given the changing nature of work and the potential change in demand for office and commercial space with more people working at home there is a need for a wider range of uses generating employment and activity in many parts of the borough, and health and medical facilities can help provide this. NHS (not for profit) health and medical facilities should be considered as priorities for affordable workspace within Clause 2 of the Policy. This would help meet the Council's visions across the borough enabling medical and wellbeing services to locate in accessible locations (and often more expensive locations) by including them within 'affordable workspace'.

As the Council highlights, there is substantial demand from businesses and cultural users and this contributes to high rents, which are unaffordable to the NHS which will be competing for space in the same locations. Primary care facilities in Southwark need to expand capacity to meet the needs of the already growing population, and the expansion of services within primary care, for example, physiotherapists, paramedics and pharmacists.

We support Guys and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust's (GSTT) response to the consultation (page 3) "It is requested that the policy is amended to make it clear that the office floorspace associated and ancillary to health services from a public health body would be able to occupy the affordable workspace.

Given that Clause 1.1 will require to be rewritten to refer to the new use

The policy relates to employment floorspace (previously use class B). Offices which are ancillary to the primary use class would be considered on the basis of need to support that primary use. However the general policy premise would continue to apply to support re-provision and growth of employment uses where identified, and the requirement for affordable workspace.

Where affordable workspace is required, the fact box sets out occupiers should be from a specific sector that has a social, cultural or economic development purpose, including charities, voluntary and community organisations. Also includes occupiers in support of educational outcomes through connections to schools, colleges or higher education. The council would anticipate further discussion on the specific requirements for the re-provision of employment floorspace and the definition of affordable workspace on specific health sites, in line with the policies as drafted. It is not considered necessary to amend the policy as the policy as currently worded is sound and sufficiently flexible to take into account site specific circumstances.

We will be addressing the changes to the use classes order and their effect on the policies in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspectors.

classes order and we assume will reference Use Class E rather than Class B, this should include health and medical uses within the main body of the policy.

We note that GSTT's representation continues in relation to clause 4 of the policy " The Trust would like to request that the exceptional circumstances referred to is widened to include health facilities, to support the delivery of social infrastructure in large developments. Including health facilities as an exceptional circumstance will provide support to developers and healthcare providers such as the Trust, in being able to deliver new healthcare infrastructure. The Trust objects to the Plan unless this amendment is made. "

4 ` In exceptional circumstances affordable retail (A class), affordable health facilities or affordable cultural uses (D class), `which provide a range of affordable access options for local residents, may be provided as an `alternative to affordable workspace (B class). This will only be acceptable if there is a demonstrated need for the affordable use proposed and with a named occupier. If the alternative affordable use is no longer required in the future, the space should be made available for affordable workspace (B class) in accordance with the criteria above. The reprovision or uplift of employment (B class) floorspace must still be provided in the scheme overall.

Should Clause 2 not be amended to include not for profit healthcare to fall within the priority for affordable workspace then Clause 4 exceptional circumstance should include health and medical uses.

As stated earlier this policy along with other parts of the plan will need to be revised to reflect the new Use Classes Order, and with health and medical facilities falling within the new Use Class E together with a wide range of business, commercial and other uses it would be logical for these to be

<p>considered alongside businesses in this policy. "</p>	
<p>ROK Planning on behalf of Unite Group Plc NSPPSV198.5</p> <p>"Unite support part 2.1 of draft policy P30 which sets out the requirement to deliver at least 10% of proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents. Unite additionally support the definition of Discount Market Rents provided within draft policy P30 as "a rent that is less than the market rent". Unite would reinforce that planning policy cannot dictate rental levels and thus specific discount levels should not be set."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Guys and St Thomas Charity NSPPSV76.3</p> <p>"With regard to affordable workspace, we note that Policy P30 has been updated to confirm that it, 'applies to all new build developments providing over 500sqm of new employment floorspace regardless of any existing employment uses that will be demolished.'</p> <p>The 10% quantum is still proposed and whilst there is some helpful wording about potential occupiers added which includes, 'charities, voluntary and community organisations or social enterprises; creative and artists' workspace; rehearsal and performance space and makerspace; occupiers for disadvantaged groups starting up in any sector; occupiers in support of educational outcomes through connections to schools, colleges or higher education; existing businesses in Southwark who need to relocate; small businesses located in Southwark; and start-ups or small businesses otherwise identified,' given our site's inclusion within the Health Cluster redevelopment we would</p>	<p>Where affordable workspace is required, the fact box sets out occupiers should be from a specific sector that has a social, cultural or economic development purpose, including charities, voluntary and community organisations. Also includes occupiers in support of educational outcomes through connections to schools, colleges or higher education. The council would anticipate further discussion on the specific requirements for the re-provision of employment floorspace and the definition of affordable workspace on specific health sites, in line with the policies as drafted. It is not considered necessary to amend the policy as the policy as currently worded is sound and sufficiently flexible to take into account site specific circumstances.</p>

request that consideration is given to include that, the development and use of specifically a health facilities building, including medical research use, should also be noted as an exceptional circumstance to this provision.
"

Avison Young
NSPPSV426.1

"Our representation is concerned with Policy P30 Affordable Workspace, specifically Part Two, which as currently drafted states:

"2. Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

1. Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discount market rents; and
2. Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years;
3. Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and
4. Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and
5. Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace."

We note the significant need for affordable workspace across the borough and as such, we fully support the principle of securing it in principle. However, we consider that very minor amendments are made to the policy to ensure that small office developments are not disincentivised from being delivered.

In particular, the proposed threshold for seeking a contribution towards affordable workspace is currently set at 500 sqm net additional floorspace, however as a result of the significant cost of refurbishing office floorspace, including to meet the latest BCO guidelines (2019), along with the need to

Policy E3 of the ITP London Plan sets out that boroughs should consider detailed affordable workspace policies in light of local evidence of need and viability. The evidence base includes the BNPP viability study (SP423) and the Avison Young affordable workspace in Southwark – evidence of needs report (SP422). These studies support the policy approach. The proposed 500sqm threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations identified for employment uses. The threshold is informed by the evidence of need for affordable workspace in the borough, and by the average size of a micro business unit at 50sqm. This is the minimum unit size which could be accommodated in proposals which include separate micro business units. In circumstances where this is not feasible to provide on site, an in-lieu payment will be required to secure off-site provision of affordable workspace. This is an exceptions approach in which the Avison Young study supports and provides a number of recommendations for the use of in-lieu payments.

We consider the policy to be sound and the requirements to be deliverable and viable however we would expect any sites not meeting the policy requirement to provide a viability assessment.

provide ancillary floorspace for which little value can be added (for example the provision of cycle parking and showers which is not chargeable per sq ft), then this puts small scale office development at the margins of viability.

It is notable that Policies E2 (D) and E3 (C) of the Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish Version, December 2019) sets a threshold of 2,500 sqm for the provision of affordable workspace. Policy E3 (C) allows for a lower locally set threshold where justified as part of a local Development Plan Document, considering local evidence of need and viability.

We note that Policy P30 goes beyond the requirements set out in the Policy E2 and E3 by setting a significantly lower threshold of 500 sqm (as opposed to 2,500 sqm set out in the Draft London Plan) for which sufficiently robust evidence and viability testing does not exist.

In our view seeking affordable workspace contributions on minor planning applications for employment floorspace would not be viable or practicable.

The 'Housing and Affordable Workspace Policies Further Viability Sensitivity Testing' evidence base document prepared by BNP Paribas has not specifically tested the impact of Policy P30 on minor refurbishment schemes where only modest increases in floor space are proposed. The viability testing evidence base document recognises that the delivery of affordable workspace will not always be financially viable in all the scenarios tested, however, this is not sufficiently referenced in the emerging policy.

In addition, as a result of the current economic climate and the on-going impact of Covid-19, there is a great deal uncertainty surrounding the viability and role of office floor space in the future, and we consider that the proposed policy as drafted would exacerbate this uncertainty and disincentivise small scale office development.

Amendments Sought

In our view, Policy P30 does not legal tests of soundness, but could be considered capable of meeting this test if the following amendments are made:

- The threshold for which affordable workspace contributions will be sought should be increased to capture 'major' developments that create more than 1,000 sqm of additional floor space only;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should expressly state that any contribution towards affordable workspace should be subject to an assessment of the viability of the planning application." 	
<p>Guys and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust NSPPSV76.7</p> <p>"Affordable Workspace With regard to the Council's proposed approach to Affordable Workspace, set out in Draft Policy P30 'Affordable Workspace', the Trust will be seeking to be recognised as an occupier of affordable workspace to benefit from the requirement of affordable workspace provision in all new office developments (over 500sqm) within the Borough. It is requested that the policy is amended to make it clear that the office floorspace associated and ancillary to health services from a public health body would be able to occupy the affordable workspace. Furthermore, Draft Policy P30 includes some exceptions to the provision of Affordable Workspace. The Trust would like to request that the exceptional circumstances referred to is widened to include health facilities, to support the delivery of social infrastructure in large developments. Including health facilities as an exceptional circumstance will provide support to developers and healthcare providers such as the Trust, in being able to deliver new healthcare infrastructure."</p>	<p>Where affordable workspace is required, the fact box sets out occupiers should be from a specific sector that has a social, cultural or economic development purpose, including charities, voluntary and community organisations. Also includes occupiers in support of educational outcomes through connections to schools, colleges or higher education. The council would anticipate further discussion on the specific requirements for the reprovision of employment floorspace and the definition of affordable workspace on specific health sites, in line with the policies as drafted. It is not considered necessary to amend the policy as the policy as currently worded is sound and sufficiently flexible to take into account site specific circumstances.</p>
<p>South East London CCG NSPPSV453.2</p> <p>"CCG are responding in particular to Section CPC0149 & CPC0150 P30 Affordable workspace and I am quoting the HUDU response here to demonstrate our support for their response:</p>	<p>The policy relates to employment floorspace (previously use class B). Offices which are ancillary to the primary use class would be considered on the basis of need to support that primary use. However the general policy premise would continue to apply to support reprovision and growth of employment uses where identified, and the requirement for affordable workspace .</p>

Given the changing nature of work and the potential change in office and commercial space with more people working at home there is a need for a wider range of uses generating employment and activity in many parts of the borough and health and medical facilities can help provide this. NHS (not for profit) health and medical facilities should be considered as priorities for affordable workspace within the Clause 2 of the Policy. This would help meet the Council's visions across the borough, enabling medical and wellbeing services to locate in accessible locations (and often more expensive locations) by including them within 'affordable workspace'.

As the Council highlights, there is substantial demand from businesses and cultural users and this contributes to high rents which are unaffordable to the NHS, which will be competing for space in the same locations. Primary care facilities in Southwark already need to expand capacity to meet the needs of the growing population, and the expansion of services within primary care, for example, physiotherapists, paramedics and pharmacists. We support GSTT's response page 3: "It is requested that the policy is amended to make it clear that the office floorspace associated and ancillary to health services from a public health body would be able to occupy the affordable workspace". However, this should not be read to imply that we would only wish to use space for NHS administration, but also for the provision of healthcare services.

Therefore, given that Clause 1.1 will require to be rewritten to refer to the new use classes order and we assume will reference Use Class E rather than Class B, this should include health and medical uses within the main body of the policy.

We note that GSTT's representation continues in relation to clause 4 of the policy "The Trust would like to request that the exceptional circumstances referred to is widened to include health facilities, to support the delivery of social infrastructure in large developments. Including health facilities as an exceptional circumstance will provide support to developers and healthcare providers such as the Trust, in being able to deliver new healthcare infrastructure. The Trust objects to the Plan unless this amendment is made. "

Where affordable workspace is required, the fact box sets out occupiers should be from a specific sector that has a social, cultural or economic development purpose, including charities, voluntary and community organisations. Also includes occupiers in support of educational outcomes through connections to schools, colleges or higher education. The council would anticipate further discussion on the specific requirements for the reprovision of employment floorspace and the definition of affordable workspace on specific health sites, in line with the policies as drafted. It is not considered necessary to amend the policy as the policy as currently worded is sound and sufficiently flexible to take into account site specific circumstances.

We will be addressing the changes to the use classes order and their effect on the policies in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspectors.

The CCG similarly objects to the plan on these terms and requests that such an amendment is made.

Should Clause 2 not be amended to include not for profit healthcare to fall within the priority for affordable workspace then Clause 4 'exceptional circumstance' should include health and medical uses.

Clause 4 should state 'In exceptional circumstances affordable retail (A class), affordable health facilities or affordable cultural uses (D class), which provide a range of affordable access options for local residents', may be provided as an 'alternative to affordable workspace (B class). This will only be acceptable if there is a demonstrated need for the affordable use proposed and with a named occupier. If the alternative affordable use is no longer required in the future, the space should be made available for affordable workspace (B class) in accordance with the criteria above'.

As stated by HUDU, we recognise that this policy along with other parts of the plan will need to be revised to reflect the new Use Classes Order, and with health and medical facilities falling within the new Use Class E together with a wide range of business, commercial and other uses it would be logical for these to be considered alongside businesses in this policy.

"

TfL Commercial Development
NSPPSV182.9

"P30: Affordable Workspace (Formerly P28)

The Draft London Plan sets out, within Policy E3 Affordable Workspace, considerations for the delivery of affordable workspace in developments; A) the defined circumstances in which planning obligations may be used to secure affordable workspace; B) where there may be a need for it; and C) Boroughs are encouraged to consider more detailed affordable workspace policies in light of local evidence of need and viability.

However, as set out within previous TfL CD representations, Policy P30 of the New Southwark Local Plan goes far beyond the scope of Policy E3 of the emerging London Plan. Paragraph 2.1 of Policy P30 is as follows:

"Major Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment

It is considered that this policy is justified and positively prepared. The policy is intended to support businesses from the sectors identified in Policy E3 of the London Plan (e.g. sectors that deliver social, cultural or economic development purpose including not for profit businesses).

Where affordable workspace is required, the fact box sets out occupiers should be from a specific sector that has a social, cultural or economic development purpose, including charities, voluntary and community organisations, amongst other criteria.

This policy, including the requirement for 10% affordable workspace is informed by the evidence base including the BNPP viability study (SP423) and the Avison Young affordable workspace in Southwark – evidence of needs

floorspace (B class use) must: Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents.”

As we have identified in previous representations, TfL CD recognise the importance of affordable workspace in the borough and agree that in appropriate circumstances, larger commercial schemes should provide an element of affordable workspace.

TfL CD have previously raised concerns regarding the cumulative viability impact that is likely to occur when schemes are universally required to deliver affordable workspace in addition to other requirements such as affordable housing and community infrastructure levy. Many of TfL's schemes already have high infrastructure costs associated with safeguarding our operational requirements and so additional costs or financial impacts such as affordable workspace are likely to significantly impact on what can be delivered.

In addition, the implications for public sector and other developer-occupiers has not been considered. For example, TfL may use land it owns to build offices to serve its transport functions. As a non-profit, public and sustainable transport body, TfL's operational and management buildings should not be required to subsidise 'for-profit' businesses through the provision of affordable workspace. Flexibility or an exceptions test should be incorporated in this policy, which reflects the flexibility of the approach set out in the Intend to Publish London Plan.

Furthermore, we do not believe that the evidence base document “Housing and Affordable Workspace policies further viability sensitivity testing” (July 2019) recommendation for “suitable flexibility to ensure that appropriate development, providing a suitable mix of uses to support the identified needs of the LBS comes forward” (paragraph 4.15) has been reflected in the policy. While 10% affordable workspace could remain as a guide level for commercial developments over 500sqm, the policy should contain flexibility to enable schemes to provide under 10% where they are providing a high level of discount to market rents. This will provide quality affordable workspace which meets the demands of smaller businesses in the borough

report (SP422). These studies support the policy approach. The proposed 500sqm threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations identified for employment uses. The threshold is informed by the evidence of need for affordable workspace in the borough, and by the average size of a micro business unit at 50sqm. This is the minimum unit size which could be accommodated in proposals which include separate micro business units. In circumstances where this is not feasible to provide on site, an in-lieu payment will be required to secure off-site provision of affordable workspace.

<p>who have the most need for affordable workspace as part of development schemes. Such an approach to use a sliding scale has recently been adopted by other London Boroughs."</p>	
<p>WSP on behalf of Apex Investment Group NSPPSV474.9</p> <p>"Policy P30: Affordable Workspace It is unclear how affordable workspace will be applied to Class E. Notwithstanding this, the provision of affordable workspace must be demand-driven. The Council should work closely with developers to identify if any demand for certain types of affordable workspace exists within a given area. There should be no restrictions on the types of businesses who can occupy space created in response to Policy P29, provided they are uses falling within Class E. Affordable workspace within developments should be returned to Class E floorspace at full market rent, if the developer has difficulty leasing out the unit to one of the businesses identified on the Council's list of workspace providers and it transpires that there is a lack of demand for affordable workspace within the development."</p>	<p>We will be addressing the changes to the use classes order and their effect on the policies in our responses to the matters raised by the Inspectors.</p> <p>Affordable workspace should be secured for 30 years as required by the policy. We would expect a detailed marketing strategy to be submitted by the developer as a requirement in S106 agreements and this would include a wider range of methods of attract businesses in the local area, or wider borough, or any of the businesses identified as an affordable workspace occupier as outlined in the fact box accompanying the policy. This would extend wider than just businesses identified on the council's workspace provider list although this does provide an excellent guide to encourage partnering with workspace providers in early plans for the design and management of the affordable workspace on site.</p>
<p>Savills on behalf of Safestore NSPPSV157.7, .8</p> <p>"P30 Affordable Workspace 1. Development must: 1. Retain small and independent businesses (B class uses). Where existing small and independent businesses are at risk of displacement from a</p>	<p>The policy is sufficiently flexible to take into account different circumstances and the definition of affordable workspace occupiers takes into account many different ways of accommodating affordable workspace. The definition of small and independent businesses is considered to be appropriate and the provision of affordable workspace includes space for existing businesses</p>

development there should be full consideration of the feasibility of providing affordable and suitable space for existing occupiers in the completed development. Replacement business space should be like for like in terms of floorspace or bespoke to suit the requirements of the business; and or 2. Explore the opportunities for long term management of employment space and the delivery of affordable workspace by workspace providers.

2. Major Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

1. Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents; and

2. Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years; at discounted market rents appropriate to the viability of the businesses the space will be targeted for; and

3. Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and

4. Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses on occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and

5. Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace.

3. If it is not feasible to provide affordable workspace on site, an in lieu payment will be required for off-site affordable workspace.

4. In exceptional circumstances affordable retail (A class) or affordable cultural uses (D class), which provide a range of affordable access options for local residents, may be provided as an alternative to affordable workspace (B class). This will only be acceptable if there is a demonstrated need for the affordable use proposed and with a named occupier. If the alternative affordable use is no longer required in the future, the space should be made available for affordable workspace (B class) in

which the policy has the intention of supporting.

The changes suggested include wording about viability. We consider the policy to be sound and the requirements to be deliverable and viable however we would expect any sites not meeting the policy requirement to provide a viability assessment.

accordance with the criteria above. The re-provision or uplift of employment (B class) floorspace must still be provided in the scheme overall.

Safestore advocate planning policies that support local economies and SMEs because its business model also supports and enables the growth of these businesses. However, we consider this policy to be overly prescriptive and likely to act as a deterrent for the redevelopment of employment floorspace within the borough for the following reasons.

Draft Policy P30 as currently worded could significantly interfere with landownership and the ability of land owners to manage their assets and ensure that those assets perform in the best way possible, to the benefit of the borough's economy and its residents.

There are already mechanisms in landlord and tenant agreements that are enshrined in law, that ensures that any tenant that is displaced by development is financially compensated should they choose not to opt out of their statutory protections. Indeed it should be noted that there are many instances where land owners and tenants have agreed to waive these statutory protections in order to allow short term occupation for businesses and enable regeneration to take place in the medium term. For example, an occupier business may request to waive their statutory rights to allow them to grow and vacate the unit in the short term without triggering their statutory protections, in return for reduced rental rates.

Draft Policy P30 as currently worded is therefore at odds with the above instances where tenants and land owners have reached their own agreements regarding displacement. The draft Policy could place additional and undue burdens upon land owners such that it could make the redevelopment of existing commercial assets undesirable due to the increased number of requirements that a land owner will be asked to meet. These requirements would come with time and cost implications that could simply deter land owners from future commercial property development projects, which in turn could suppress the quality and quantum of the borough's commercial unit stock and ultimately job opportunities over the Plan period.

Moreover, the definition of small (less than 50no. employees) and independent (operating from 3no. sites or less) businesses is considered to be an arbitrary way of measuring a businesses' success and its ability to react to displacement. An efficient, well organised and successful business could quite easily operate from fewer than 3no. different sites, or employ fewer than 50no. people, and still have the financial and logistical capabilities to positively respond to displacement.

Furthermore, the use of 'and' within part 1 'Retain small and independent businesses (B class uses)' is open to misinterpretation. After clarification with the borough's Planning Policy Officers, it was established that this draft policy seeks to protect businesses that fall into the category of either being a small or independent businesses, and not a business that would be defined as both with reference to the definitions listed in the fact box on page 128.

Whilst it is understood that this draft policy seeks to protect SME floorspace and local employers, it is considered that the current wording would not be effective in doing so. For example, it is theoretically possible to have an instance where a redevelopment site contains a small branch (i.e. less than 50 people on site) of a much larger business which should not be considered to be an SME or local employer, but due to the current wording of Draft Policy P30, would be treated as such. A similar scenario could be a business that does not employ more than 50 employees on any given site, but does have a national presence."

In addition to the above, it is also increasingly common for businesses to seek to consolidate their operational bases and encourage working from home. It is therefore quite possible that businesses that previously fell outside of the 'small and independent' definition, would now fall back into this definition by consolidating to 3 locations or less. The current pandemic has forced one of the biggest structural changes in how businesses operate in a generation and given that policy was drafted prior to this event, we do not consider that having regard to the number of operational sites (i.e 3no. or less) is an appropriate measure anymore.

In any of the above scenarios, we do not consider those hypothetical

businesses should be deemed small or independent.

We also question the ability of an Applicant to accurately calculate the overall number of employees a business has at any one time as there are a number of variables included within this. For example, sub-contractors servicing a long term project on a retainer agreement may not be included within the parent company employment figures, when in reality that sub-contractor does in fact play an integral role in the company operation and is effectively in their employment. It may also not be feasible to approach an existing business on site for this information due to the confidential nature of development proposals.

In light of the above, we propose that a suitable methodology for calculating the number of jobs an existing business may support should be clearly set out within an accompanying SPD as there is currently a great deal of uncertainty as to how this could be achieved in a sensitive and confidential way.

With regard to point 2 of Draft Policy P30, it is of our view that there are multiple ways in which affordable workspace can be provided and that this does not always have to be in the form of 'typical' workspace at a discounted rent. Safestore have operated within the LBS since 1997 and have therefore served local businesses throughout the most challenging economic conditions, including the previous financial crash in 2008 and through the current pandemic. Particularly during these difficult times (although by no means exclusively) it is Safestore's experience that the price of a space is not the main consideration for fledgling and local businesses, but rather it is a combination of flexible terms and the ability to vacate and upsize / downsize at short notice to manage business risk that are crucial considerations. Draft Policy P30 as currently worded does not recognise the positive contributions made by specific building types and uses such as self storage and their role in providing inherently affordable workspace.

Furthermore the practicality of providing on-site affordable workspace units for B8 storage and distribution centres has not been considered. A self-storage centre (and indeed other Use Class B8 distribution centres)

requires the ground floor area to be available for easy to access storage and indeed, this space is often the most commercially valuable element of that form of development, meaning that business models rely upon the ground floor use in order to succeed. It is therefore not viable for many self-storage operators to relinquish the ground floor space for external affordable workspace operators, including for the provision of separate stair cores and lobbies providing access to affordable workspace on upper levels (notwithstanding the operational and security issues that upper level affordable workspace would pose for self-storage operators).

With regard to point 3, which outlines that a payment in lieu could be provided for off-site affordable workspace, this is welcome but should be subject to a scheme's viability.

For the reasons set out above we consider that draft Policy P30 in its current form should be deleted, given that it presents such a significant number of harmful issues to both commercial landlords and in particular self storage operators such as Safestore, and re-drafted as per the following:

1. Development must:

1. Retain small and independent businesses (B class uses) where practical and viable. Where existing small and independent businesses are at risk of displacement from a development there should be full consideration of the viability and feasibility of providing affordable and suitable space for existing occupiers in the completed development. Replacement business space should be like for like in terms of floorspace or bespoke to suit the requirements of the business; and or

2. Explore the opportunities for long term management of employment space and the delivery of affordable workspace by workspace providers.

2. Major Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

1. Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents where this is found to be viable following a financial viability assessment of the proposed development and, where the provision of affordable workspace is found to be feasible and not detrimental to the operation of the

<p>businesses within the proposed development; and</p> <p>2. Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years; at discounted market rents appropriate to the viability of the businesses the space will be targeted for; and</p> <p>3. Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and</p> <p>4. Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses on occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and</p> <p>5. Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace.</p> <p>3. If it is not feasible to provide affordable workspace on site, an in lieu payment will be required for off-site affordable workspace, subject to a financial viability assessment.</p> <p>4. The Council will consider alternative approaches to affordable workspace provision on a case by case basis where appropriate for the proposed development and use.</p> <p>"</p>	
<p>Montagu Evans on behalf of WPP 2005 NSPPSV477.3</p> <p>"B. POLICY P30 – AFFORDABLE WORKSPACE Draft NSP Policy P30 currently states the following:</p> <p>1. development must:</p> <p>i. "Retain small and independent businesses (B class uses). Where existing small and independent businesses are at risk of displacement from a development there should be full consideration of the feasibility of providing affordable and suitable space for existing occupiers in the completed development. Replacement business space should be like for like in terms of floorspace or bespoke to suit the requirements of the business; and</p> <p>ii. Explore the opportunities for long term management of employment</p>	<p>The policy proposes 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace to be affordable workspace. It is clarified in the reasons that the policy applies to all new build developments providing over 500sqm of new employment floorspace regardless of any existing employment uses that will be demolished. For extensions to buildings or changes of use, the policy applies to the new floorspace created if the extension or change of use is over 500sqm. It is considered this clarity in approach would not therefore discourage the refurbishment, renewal and expansion of existing commercial buildings. However larger extensions measuring over 500sqm would be expected to contribute to affordable workspace requirements, e.g an extension of 500sqm would generate the need for 50sqm affordable workspace (10%).</p>

space and the delivery of affordable workspace by workspace providers.

2. Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

- i. Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discount market rents; and
- ii. Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years;
- iii. Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and
- iv. Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and
- v. Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace.

3. If it is not feasible to provide affordable workspace on site, an in lieu payment will be required for off site affordable workspace.

4. In exceptional circumstances affordable retail (A class) or affordable cultural uses (D class), which provide a range of affordable access options for local residents, may be provided as an alternative to affordable workspace (B class). This will only be acceptable if there is a demonstrated need for the affordable use proposed and with a named occupier. If the alternative affordable use is no longer required in the future, the space should be made available for affordable workspace (B class) in accordance with the criteria above. The re-provision or uplift of employment (B class) floorspace must still be provided in the scheme overall.”

We support the aspirations of this policy in that it seeks to deliver affordable workspace in the borough. However, part 2i of the draft policy is considered to be overly onerous and unviable, particularly within the current economic climate. It does not comply with paragraph 80 of the NPPF which states that “planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt”. This is further emphasised by the Intend to Publish London Plan Policy E3 which states that “Boroughs, in their

The proposed 500sqm threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations identified for employment uses. The threshold is informed by the evidence of need for affordable workspace in the borough, and by the average size of a micro business unit at 50sqm. This is the minimum unit size which could be accommodated in proposals which include separate micro business units. In circumstances where this is not feasible to provide on site, an in-lieu payment will be required to secure off-site provision of affordable workspace.

Development Plans, should consider detailed affordable workspace policies in light of local evidence of need and viability". The viability of the current Policy was queried by the Mayor in the previous round of consultation (Reference NSPPSV66) who commented, "The Mayor welcomes an approach that seeks affordable workspace from developments, however he questions the viability of the 500sqm of employment floorspace threshold. Southwark should ensure that the proposed threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations that fall with class B.

Draft NSP Policy P29 states that where specified, development must retain or increase the amount of employment floorspace on site. As drafted, Policy P30 would conflict with policy P29 by discouraging the refurbishment, renewal and expansion of existing commercial buildings through reducing the floorspace available for a profitable return, making the renewal and upgrade of existing buildings unattractive.

Turning to the application of the current policy wording in practice, where 500 sqm (GIA) of employment floorspace is proposed as part of a planning application, the draft policy seeks 10% of the gross employment floorspace be provided as Affordable Workspace ("AWS"). This would seek affordable workspace provision on existing employment floorspace. This would impede refurbishment proposals and small scale extensions to existing buildings by requiring existing floorspace to be converted to AWS, reducing the value of existing commercial floorspace and the likelihood of this type of development being viable.

For example, for a building that currently provides 10,000 sqm of office floorspace, if a 500 sqm extension were to be proposed, this would result in the requirement for 1,050 sqm of affordable workspace to be provided. This approach is clearly not viable and would strongly discourage smaller scale development proposals from coming forward. As such, it is highly likely that any proposals for small extensions would not be deliverable due to the resultant lower value of any additional space, combined with the decrease in value of the existing space arising from affordable workspace provision. Typically, benefits such as affordable housing and AWS in other London boroughs are sought on the uplift in floorspace from a new development, not

the total area. Otherwise such a policy would act as a disincentive for development. Consequently, the policy should be amended so that affordable space provision should only be required on the floorspace uplift over and above what is already provided on site.

Turning to the 500sqm employment floorspace threshold, notwithstanding the current objection to this from the Mayor and various other parties, it is relevant to note that The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, Regulation 122 states that planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development; and
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

It is clear that the currently proposed development threshold within the draft policy wording does not accord with part c of Regulation 122 and should be amended as it is not fair nor reasonable in the context of the scale of development to seek the provision of affordable workspace from minor development proposals. Therefore the overall threshold for seeking affordable workspace provision should be increased so that it applies to major developments providing more than 1,000 sqm of employment floorspace in order to promote smaller scale commercial development in the borough.

In order to safeguard viability and promote small scale employment proposals and refurbishment projects that seek to upgrade and renew existing employment stock, AWS provision should only be sought on major redevelopment proposals and should be on the basis of 10% of the proposed uplift in gross employment floorspace. We would request that the wording of draft Policy P30 is amended to the following:

“2. Major developments providing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

2.1 Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discounted market rents...”

Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum

NSPPSV132.23

The evidence base used to support policy P28 including analysis of railway

"Document EIP 27A Policy: P28 Strategic protected industrial land, P29 Office and business development, P30 Affordable Workspace and P32 Business Relocation

Not positively prepared, effective or justified

The baseline study (2015) supporting P28 was deeply flawed for example in missing out railway arches. The reduction of industrial land is at a rate x2 than the GLA benchmark and without making additional designation. The London Plan states there should be no net loss. There is a need for radical revision of industrial designation. The policy and its evidence is not effective as there is no flexibility for uncertainty around the Bakerloo line for example. The plan is currently unsound because it causes industrial uses to be too often replaced by offices and there is no evidence of the plan taking into account the changing market needs in the new pandemic situation.

P30 is problematic and self-defeating in that it still allows for in lieu payments and for retail (A Class) to replace workspace (B Class). The Affordable Workspace Demand Map appears vague and some definitions seem questionable for example "Discount market rents: A rent that is less than the market rent."

The additional wording in P31 about retention of small shops and in P32 on demolished floorspace, yard space and engagement with (including practical arrangements for and statements from) local businesses in reference to relocation plans are positive however the plan still needs a detailed audit of the local economy to be justified with robust evidence - this should include an understanding of the social and educative value of diverse local economies and be an ambitious basis for the promotion of circular economy principles.

The plan should be stronger on promoting mixed use through good design either through a new policy or through improving the clarity of existing references (in order to be positively prepared and to avoid undermining some strategic policy aspirations): An integrated approach is needed to consider industrial a/ business and residential factors together to promote and achieve mixed use developments. 'Mixed (and integrated) communities'

arches is set out in the Industrial Background Paper (SP401). Policy P29 requires a marketing strategy to ensure the use and occupation of the employment space to be delivered would meet current market demand; this ensures we deliver the right types of employment space in the right locations, including from office to industrial uses.

P30 policy has an 'on site first' approach to delivering affordable workspace. Sometimes it will not be possible for a scheme to provide it on site, so to meet the policy requirement, the option is to provide an in lieu payment. This will go towards delivering affordable workspace elsewhere in the borough. The policy also allows for affordable retail or cultural uses instead of employment uses however this would only be in exceptional circumstances where a named occupier is in need of affordable space and can be identified.

The definition of discount market rent does not include specific rent levels because this could change depending on current market rents and different rents in different areas. Our evidence base (SP422) explains this approach in more detail. The discount also depends on the type of affordable workspace being provided. This is negotiated in detail on a scheme by scheme basis.

With regard to the detailed audit of the local economy, this is included in our evidence base documents for retail and business, the retail background paper and the site allocations methodology paper.

Specific design criteria is included in the Old Kent Road AAP where much of the mixed use development including industrial co-location is proposed. NSP site allocations also specify design requirements for particular sites including mixed use development.

<p>and '(industrial) mixed use development' is referred to in SP2, SP3, Area Visions, Site Allocations, P28 (Strategic protected industrial land), P29 (Office and business development) and P30 (Affordable workspace) however this is typically in vague terms. While the following additional reasoning in P28 for example is potentially positive it relies on evidence/studies which are yet to be undertaken (e.g. design criteria): "...for mixed use development and industrial co-location. Development will include an innovative new approach to create new town centres which include community facilities, retail, office, education and health uses. Industrial development will be included alongside or underneath new homes with specific design criteria to ensure businesses can operate successfully without harming residential amenity." This could be a positive and ambitious basis for a design led strategy at the scale of area visions and site allocations in the context of the pandemic situation (new emerging workspace and amenity needs) and the climate emergency. Innovative approaches could be informed by an understanding of how areas like Bermondsey operated historically as well as study of precedents in collaboration with other boroughs."</p>	
<p>Southwark Law Centre NSPPSV167.13</p> <p>"P30 Affordable workspace We submit that this policy has not been positively prepared in light of the impact of the coronavirus pandemic on the economy. Firstly, a full economic impact assessment should inform the business recovery policies referred to in the updated New Southwark Plan. Secondly, this policy is not justified, effective and achievable because we know there is a huge demand for affordable workspace and efforts to accommodate this have not been reflected in this policy. We submit that the amount of affordable workspace required from developers should be much higher to meet the actual demand in the borough. "</p>	<p>The NSP plans for development over the next 15 years, and the evidence base demonstrates a high demand for affordable workspace. It is important the plan is sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances however the longer term effects of the pandemic would need to be justified by evidence and there is no current evidence which justifies a change in approach in the NSP policies.</p> <p>We consider the huge demand for affordable workspace has been reflected in this policy by requiring all developments proposing 500sqm or more of employment floorspace to deliver 10% affordable workspace.</p>
<p>ROK Planning on behalf of Tribe</p>	

<p>NSPPSV499.4</p> <p>"POLICY P30 – AFFORDABLE WORKSPACE Tribe support part 2.1 of draft policy P30 which sets out the requirement to deliver at least 10% of proposed gross new employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents. Tribe additionally support the definition of Discount Market Rents provided within draft policy P30 as “a rent that is less than the market rent”. Tribe would reinforce that planning policy cannot dictate rental levels and thus specific discount levels should not be set."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Union 4 on behalf of Caddick Developments NSPPSV498.5</p> <p>"We note that Policy P30 refers to ‘affordable workspace’ and requires that developments proposing 500 sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at Discount Market Rents. We are concerned about the potential implications this policy might have on businesses within the wider borough and how this might impact on the viability of commercial development for employment space. The current wording of Policy P30 may have the effect of dissuading an existing established business from redeveloping its floorspace, as 10% of the replacement floorspace may be required as affordable workspace. If the policy applies to the redevelopment of existing employment space, this may inhibit existing business owners who are seeking to redevelop and upgrade their employment space. Therefore, rather than assisting small local businesses, this policy may actually have the opposite effect. One of the proposed changes in Policy P30 requires collaboration “with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace”. However, we consider that there is a lack of clarity with regard to the qualifying criteria for affordable workspace providers. We would advise that clarity is required in relation to how businesses will be assessed</p>	<p>The policy would not apply to refurbishment of premises however if a small business wanted to redevelop the premises and the floorspace is over 500sqm this would trigger the policy requirement. However existing small or independent businesses in Southwark are part of the definition of affordable workspace occupiers therefore the policy would continue to support small businesses falling within the definitions outlined in the fact box to redevelop and grow.</p> <p>There are a number of ways the council considers the criteria for workspace providers to be added to our Southwark workspace provider list. However the criteria for affordable workspace providers is established in more detail at individual planning application stage and the consideration of affordability for end users.</p>

as prospective tenants of the affordable workspaces and whether they will retain unfettered access to those spaces, irrespective of their commercial performance. We would conclude that the current wording of Policy P30 means that is not positive prepared, justified or effective."

Montagu Evans on behalf of Nathaniel Henry Clark
NSPPSV38.4

"Draft NSP Policy P30 currently states the following:

1. Development must:

- i. "Retain small and independent businesses (B class uses). Where existing small and independent businesses are at risk of displacement from a development there should be full consideration of the feasibility of providing affordable and suitable space for existing occupiers in the completed development. Replacement business space should be like for like in terms of floorspace or bespoke to suit the requirements of the business; and
- ii. Explore the opportunities for long term management of employment space and the delivery of affordable workspace by workspace providers.

2. Developments proposing 500sqm GIA or more employment floorspace (B class use) must:

- i. Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discount market rents; and
- ii. Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years;
- iii. Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and
- iv. Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and
- v. Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace.

3. If it is not feasible to provide affordable workspace on site, an in lieu

The proposed 500sqm threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations identified for employment uses. The threshold is informed by the evidence of need for affordable workspace in the borough, and by the average size of a micro business unit at 50sqm. This is the minimum unit size which could be accommodated in proposals which include separate micro business units. In circumstances where this is not feasible to provide on site, an in-lieu payment will be required to secure off-site provision of affordable workspace.

payment will be required for off site affordable workspace.

4. In exceptional circumstances affordable retail (A class) or affordable cultural uses (D class), which provide a range of affordable access options for local residents, may be provided as an alternative to affordable workspace (B class). This will only be acceptable if there is a demonstrated need for the affordable use proposed and with a named occupier. If the alternative affordable use is no longer required in the future, the space should be made available for affordable workspace (B class) in accordance with the criteria above. The re-provision or uplift of employment (B class) floorspace must still be provided in the scheme overall.”

We support the aspirations of this policy in that it seeks to deliver affordable workspace in the borough. However, part 2i of the draft policy is considered to be overly onerous and unviable, particularly within the current economic climate. It does not comply with paragraph 80 of the NPPF which states that “planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt”.

This is further emphasised by the Intend to Publish London Plan Policy E3 which states that “Boroughs, in their Development Plans, should consider detailed affordable workspace policies in light of local evidence of need and viability”. The viability of the current Policy was queried by the Mayor in the previous round of consultation (Reference NSPPSV66) who commented, “The Mayor welcomes an approach that seeks affordable workspace from developments, however he questions the viability of the 500sqm of employment floorspace threshold. Southwark should ensure that the proposed threshold is appropriate and viable for the range of employment uses and locations that fall with class B.

”

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 479 344">P32 Business relocation</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 546 424">Savills on behalf of Safestore NSPPSV157.9, .10</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 488 494">"P32 Business relocation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="188 501 1066 638">1. Where existing small or independent businesses or small shops may be displaced by development a business relocation strategy, written in consultation with affected businesses, must be provided. The business relocation strategy must set out viable relocation options. <li data-bbox="188 644 1111 1425">2. All business relocation strategies must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="188 683 1111 785">1. Existing amount of non-residential floorspace (GIA) separated by use class, including vacant units and yards. This should include any floorspace demolished; and <li data-bbox="188 791 1070 855">2. Schedule of existing businesses operating on the site including business sector, estimated number of employees and lease terms; and <li data-bbox="188 861 1021 925">3. Proposed levels of non-residential floorspace (GIA) and yard space, separated by use class, business sector and estimated number of employees; and <li data-bbox="188 932 1025 1034">4. Details of engagement with existing businesses on site regarding re-provision of premises or relocation options; and <li data-bbox="188 1040 1102 1142">5. Details of engagement with the council, local agents, businesses, business associations and workspace providers to secure occupiers for new employment space. <li data-bbox="188 1149 1070 1212">3. Where existing businesses are accommodated in new development the strategy should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="188 1219 1088 1283">1. Specific business requirements including servicing, fit out and ownership or lease terms; and <li data-bbox="188 1289 1048 1385">2. Temporary relocation arrangements or scheme phasing to allow the continuation of the business during construction. Temporary relocation should be contained on site or as close to the original site as possible; and <li data-bbox="188 1391 1070 1425">3. Options for temporary relocation should consider the cost and practical 	<p data-bbox="1137 427 2065 849">The respondent requests a number of deletions to the policy wording and is concerned that occupiers may not wish to engage with applicants in planning negotiations and that there may be commercial sensitivities. The policy wording is considered to be sound, in that this information is required to establish the circumstances around existing businesses on the site. The council has surveyed some existing businesses in the borough and did not consider it too difficult to find out the estimated number of employees. The council also requests this information for businesses who may wish to register on the Old Kent Road business network, for example. In order to understand the existing businesses present on the site, this information should be submitted with a planning application however the detail of the relocation strategy may be reserved for S106 negotiations.</p>

arrangements for businesses where multiple moves may not be feasible.

4. Where existing businesses are proposed to be relocated the strategy should include:

1. Reasons why existing businesses cannot be located on site; and

2. Details of relocation options explored with individual businesses and the assistance and support that will be provided. Statements from the businesses are required to show evidence that the relocation option is suitable for the viable continuation of the business; and

3. Identification of alternative premises in Southwark. Where no suitable premises exist, premises should be identified in adjacent boroughs; and

4. Statements from existing businesses should they wish to cease trading rather than relocate; and

5. Collaboration with other landowners to establish whether suitable workspace for existing businesses could be accommodated in different phases of the development programmes.

Safestore are supportive of enterprises having every opportunity to continue trading if they are displaced as part of any development proposal. However, we consider that parts of Draft Policy P32 to be overly restrictive and could inadvertently prevent development from coming forward in the borough.

Firstly, we would again refer to the previously discussed legal protections that already exist for tenants subject to displacement and how the draft policies as currently proposed could conflict with that legal framework and existing agreements.

Notwithstanding the above, we do not consider it feasible to engage with existing businesses subject to displacement regarding the suitability of alternative premises for their relocation as we do not consider it likely that every existing business subject to displacement will wish to work with an Applicant in a constructive manner to facilitate these discussions. As currently worded, the draft policy would mean that any failure to obtain endorsement from an existing business to be displaced as being contrary to the Development Plan, irrespective of whether an Applicant had done all they could to comply with the policy.

Furthermore, we do not consider it appropriate to engage within these discussions prior to the determination of a planning application due to the commercial sensitivities surrounding such discussions. Any requirement to submit a Business Relocation Strategy should be secured by planning condition once the Applicant has a degree of certainty within which to enter these discussions. We also do not consider it appropriate to require (and ultimately make publicly available) the lease terms which have been agreed with individual tenants following private negotiations. This information is highly sensitive and cannot reasonably be expected to be provided by commercial landlords. Finally, for the reasons previously set out in relation to issues calculating the existing number of employees a business may have, we do not consider it appropriate to require such information as part of a Business Relocation Strategy.

"

"CONTINUED FROM ABOVE

Draft Policy P32 as currently worded is therefore considered to be too onerous in its requirement for a single business to be expected to go to such lengths as to having to relocate potentially a number of existing businesses each with different needs, adding further cost, complication and uncertainty to the development process. Furthermore and notwithstanding the current definition of a small or independent business as detailed within the NSP, it is also considered quite possible that any of those small and independent businesses may also have the capability to allow them to locate a suitable alternative premises in any case, further underlining the requirement to re-consider the way in which draft Policy 32 is worded. For the reasons set out above, we would suggest that draft Policy P32 in its current form is deleted and redrafted as per the following:

1. Where existing small or independent businesses or small shops may be displaced by development a business relocation strategy, written in consultation with affected businesses, must be provided following the grant of planning permission and secured by planning condition.. The business relocation strategy must set out viable relocation options.

2. All business relocation strategies must include:

1. Existing amount of non-residential floorspace (GIA) separated by use class, including vacant units and yards. This should include any floorspace demolished; and

2. Schedule of existing businesses operating on the site including business sector, estimated number of employees and lease terms; and

3. Proposed levels of non-residential floorspace (GIA) and yard space, separated by use class, business sector and estimated number of employees; and

4. Details of engagement with existing businesses on site regarding re-provision of premises or relocation options; and

5. Details of engagement with the council, local agents, businesses, business associations and workspace providers to secure occupiers for new employment space.

3. Where existing businesses are accommodated in new development the strategy should include:

1. Specific business requirements including servicing, fit out and ownership or lease terms; and

2. Temporary relocation arrangements or scheme phasing to allow the continuation of the business during construction. Temporary relocation should be contained on site or as close to the original site as possible; and

3. Options for temporary relocation should consider the cost and practical arrangements for businesses where multiple moves may not be feasible.

4. Where existing businesses are proposed to be relocated the strategy should include:

1. Reasons why existing businesses cannot be located on site; and

2. Details of relocation options explored with individual businesses and the assistance and support that will be provided. Statements from the businesses are required to show evidence that the relocation option is suitable for the viable continuation of the business; and

3. Identification of alternative premises in Southwark. Where no suitable premises exist, premises should be identified in adjacent boroughs; and

4. Statements from existing businesses should they wish to cease trading rather than relocate; and
5. Collaboration with other landowners to establish whether suitable workspace for existing businesses could be accommodated in different phases of the development programmes.

"

NSPPSV344.10

CBRE LTD on behalf of Royal London

Policy P32 sets out detailed and onerous requirements with regards to business relocation strategies that apply where small or independent businesses are displaced by development.

As set out above, Royal London is supportive of the principle of supporting small and independent businesses and will work collaboratively with its tenants where plans for redevelopment are identified. Other policies are already in place which protect employment use (e.g. Policy P29: Office and business development; Policy SP28 Strategic protected industrial land; and within the policies in the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan).

There will commercial sensitivities surrounding the information requested which it is not appropriate to play out through the planning system. Separate controls are provided through the landlord and tenant system. The requirements of this policy have the potential to discourage allocated sites coming forward for redevelopment and the delivery of wider strategic planning objectives of the NSP. As noted throughout these representations, the redevelopment of sites such as the Six Bridges Estate are already complex to deliver with complicated phasing, viability and design considerations. Overly onerous additional requirements should therefore be avoided for such sites.

In order to for the NSP to be effective and deliverable, and consistent with national policy it is requested that Policy P32 is removed. If it must remain in some form, we request that the policy should be applied flexibility with the scale of requirements to be considered on a site by site basis and that the

The policy wording is considered to be sound, and sufficiently flexible in that this information is required to establish the circumstances around existing businesses on the site. The council also requests this information for businesses who may wish to register on the Old Kent Road business network, for example. In order to understand the existing businesses present on the site, this information should be submitted with a planning application however the detail of the relocation strategy may be reserved for S106 negotiations.

<p>level of prescription in the policy is reduced.</p>	
<p>Q Square on behalf of Regent Land and Development NSPPSV476.5</p> <p>"P32 (Business Relocation) This policy seeks to ensure that existing businesses are provided with new accommodation as part of redevelopment proposals or that assistance is provided with regards to relocation. This policy should also identify the importance of ensuring that any re-provision strategy takes account of the need for developers to achieve market value for any new non-residential floorspace. Soundness test Consideration of market value is necessary for the Council's policy requirement to be effective."</p>	<p>The policy requires that the relocation option is suitable for the viable continuation of the business. The rents would be considered as part of the required submission of details of engagement and relocation options discussed with existing businesses. Additionally, large redevelopment schemes may be required to deliver affordable workspace as per Policy P30. In this case accommodating an existing business at rents that continue to be affordable for the business may be an option for delivering this policy requirement.</p>
<p>Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum NSPPSV132.24</p> <p>"Document EIP 27A Policy: P28 Strategic protected industrial land, P29 Office and business development, P30 Affordable Workspace and P32 Business Relocation Not positively prepared, effective or justified The baseline study (2015) supporting P28 was deeply flawed for example in missing out railway arches. The reduction of industrial land is at a rate x2 than the GLA benchmark and without making additional designation. The London Plan states there should be no net loss. There is a need for radical</p>	<p>The evidence base used to support policy P28 including analysis of railway arches is set out in the Industrial Background Paper (SP401). Policy P29 requires a marketing strategy to ensure the use and occupation of the employment space to be delivered would meet current market demand; this ensures we deliver the right types of employment space in the right locations, including from office to industrial uses.</p> <p>P30 policy has an 'on site first' approach to delivering affordable workspace. Sometimes it will not be possible for a scheme to provide it on site, so to</p>

revision of industrial designation. The policy and its evidence is not effective as there is no flexibility for uncertainty around the bakerloo line for example. The plan is currently unsound because it causes industrial uses to be too often replaced by offices and there is no evidence of the plan taking into account the changing market needs in the new pandemic situation.

P30 is problematic and self-defeating in that it still allows for in lieu payments and for retail (A Class) to replace workspace (B Class). The Affordable Workspace Demand Map appears vague and some definitions seem questionable for example "Discount market rents: A rent that is less than the market rent."

The additional wording in P31 about on retention of small shops and in P32 on demolished floorspace, yard space and engagement with (including practical arrangements for and statements from) local businesses in reference to relocation plans are positive however the plan still needs a detailed audit of the local economy to be justified with robust evidence - this should include an understanding of the social and educative value of diverse local economies and be an ambitious basis for the promotion of circular economy principles.

The plan should be stronger on promoting mixed use through good design either through a new policy or through improving the clarity of existing references (in order to be positively prepared and to avoid undermining some strategic policy aspirations): An integrated approach is needed to consider industrial a/ business and residential factors together to promote and achieve mixed use developments. 'Mixed (and integrated) communities' and '(industrial) mixed use development' is referred to in SP2, SP3, Area Visions,

Site Allocations, P28 (Strategic protected industrial land), P29 (Office and business development) and P30 (Affordable workspace) however this is typically in vague terms. While the following additional reasoning in P28 for example is potentially positive it relies on evidence/studies which are yet to be undertaken (e.g. design criteria): "...for mixed use development and industrial co-location. Development will include an innovative new approach to create new town centres which include community facilities, retail, office,

meet the policy requirement, the option is to provide an in lieu payment. This will go towards delivering affordable workspace elsewhere in the borough. The policy also allows for affordable retail or cultural uses instead of employment uses however this would only be in exceptional circumstances where a named occupier is in need of affordable space and can be identified.

The definition of discount market rent does not include specific rent levels because this could change depending on current market rents and different rents in different areas. Our evidence base (SP422) explains this approach in more detail. The discount also depends on the type of affordable workspace being provided. This is negotiated in detail on a scheme by scheme basis.

With regard to the detailed audit of the local economy, this is included in our evidence base documents for retail and business, the retail background paper and the site allocations methodology paper.

Specific design criteria is included in the Old Kent Road AAP where much of the mixed use development including industrial co-location is proposed. NSP site allocations also specify design requirements for particular sites including mixed use development.

education and health uses. Industrial development will be included alongside or underneath new homes with specific design criteria to ensure businesses can operate successfully without harming residential amenity." This could be a positive and ambitious basis for a design led strategy at the scale of area visions and site allocations in the context of the pandemic situation (new emerging workspace and amenity needs) and the climate emergency. Innovative approaches could be informed by an understanding of how areas like Bermondsey operated historically as well as study of precedents in collaboration with other boroughs."

WYG on behalf of John Lyons
NSPPSV214.6

"Policy P38: Business Relocation
The Charity supports the requirement for a relocation strategy and supports the additional wording that has been added to this version of the Plan."

Noted.

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 427 344">P33 Railway Arches</p> <p data-bbox="188 355 573 421">Turley on behalf of the Arch Co NSPPSV475.5</p> <p data-bbox="188 464 667 493">"DRAFT POLICY P33 – RAILWAY ARCHES</p> <p data-bbox="188 501 1115 707">48. Draft Policy P33 contains overly-prescriptive requirements in relation to land use. It is not clear from the wording but it could feasibly be inferred that all railway arch sites must provide all of the uses listed in P33.1. This aspect of the policy should be re-worded, either to state that these uses 'may' be provided or would be 'encouraged' as part of an appropriate mix of uses to be determined on a site specific basis.</p> <p data-bbox="188 715 1048 815">49. In addition, P33 should note that development in relation to railway arches may including residential, where part of a wider associated land holding.</p> <p data-bbox="188 823 1106 890">50. We support the promotion of a low line working route but this should be subject to feasibility and safety.</p> <p data-bbox="188 898 1102 999">51. These proposed amendments are required to address issues of plan soundness relating to the provision of reasonable alternatives and to enable the delivery of sustainable development."</p>	<p data-bbox="1140 424 2063 707">The policy is clear in that it sets out development in railway arches must provide commercial activities and lists those commercial activities that would be appropriate. Other policies relating to business, retail or community uses would also apply in railway arches, e.g. re-provision requirements. Railway arches in SPIL would need to provide industrial uses. The Council has an Article 4 Direction restricting the change of use of arches to residential and this type of development is unlikely to be appropriate. The policy already specifies safety regarding the Low Line in point 3.</p>

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 519 343">P34 Town and local centres</p> <p data-bbox="188 355 515 419">Living Bankside Amir Eden NSPPSV239.11</p> <p data-bbox="188 464 1057 600">"Town and Local Centres Whilst Borough and Bankside is considered a district town centre it or its surrounding areas should be home to a large supermarket due to large residential population in SE1."</p>	<p data-bbox="1137 424 2051 488">Noted. The council encourages the provision of retail uses in site allocations in the Borough and Bankside area.</p>
<p data-bbox="188 681 412 745">John Taylor NSPPSV519.14, 15</p> <p data-bbox="188 790 1052 853">The policy is seriously deficient in that it does specify whom these centres are primarily intended to serve.</p> <p data-bbox="188 895 1111 1031">"Development must": After point 2, I propose after ""centre"" inserting the phrase "and serve first and foremost the adjacent community rather than seeking to be a destination from further afield."</p> <p data-bbox="188 1072 1075 1176">My reason: Seeking to be a 'destination' promotes over-development and gigantism. It adds to the strain on the bus and tube network, to the detriment of local people."</p>	<p data-bbox="1137 754 2033 818">The reasons set out that each town centre has a unique identity that helps create a sense of place for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p data-bbox="1137 863 2051 967">It is considered point 2 as currently worded is appropriate as it requires that the scale and nature of development is appropriate to the role and catchment of the centre.</p> <p data-bbox="1137 1011 2051 1115">The council supports the point that town centres serve the local community first, however attracting visitors can also bring benefits for local residents and improve the economic prosperity of Southwark's town centres.</p>
<p data-bbox="188 1401 757 1428">NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit</p>	

NSPPSV482.5

We welcome the addition of healthcare and community services in paragraph 2) under Reasons, however, this is not reflected in the policy. Healthcare facilities as outlined in our response to P30 above need to be affordable to the NHS. Given the range of potentially competing uses in town and local centres the premises which would be most accessible for the community (and particularly those with greatest health needs) may be in locations where owners are seeking higher rents.

Healthcare and community services are appropriate uses in town centres and the policy supports these (point 1 mentions community uses).

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="181 312 730 344">P40 Hotels and other visitor accommodation</p> <p data-bbox="181 352 779 424">Avison Young on behalf of London Hotels Group NSPPSV417.3</p> <p data-bbox="181 464 1111 600">This representation relates specifically to the ‘soundness’ of draft Policy P40 (Hotels and other visitor accommodation) of the ‘Proposed Changes to the Submission Version (August 2020), which now states (with tracked changes from the Amended Policies (January 2019) version of Policy P36):</p> <ol data-bbox="181 608 1111 855" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development for hotels and other forms of visitor accommodation must not harm the local character or amenity by the design, scale, function, parking and servicing arrangements respond positively to the local character and protect the amenity of the local community and visitors to the hotel.. 2. A minimum of 10% of the total floorspace must be provided as ancillary facilities in hotel developments that incorporate a range of publicly accessible daytime uses and offer employment opportunities. <p data-bbox="181 863 1111 1142">We note that the Amended Policies (January 2019) version of the then Policy P36 introduced that ‘a minimum of 10% of the total floorspace must be provided as ancillary facilities in hotel developments that incorporate a range of daytime uses and offer employment opportunities’. Our objection in April 2019 was that there are strong grounds to conclude that hotel ancillary facilities should be encouraged but not required in the New Southwark Plan. We considered that the wording was overly prescriptive and fails the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="181 1150 1111 1398">The Council’s Consultation Reponses document1 to our letter dated 12th April states that; “The requirement for 10% ancillary space is viewed to be justified to ensure the vitality and viability of Southwark’s public spaces, streets and developments. P36 sets out that the provision of these spaces creates additional employment and encourages the use of hotels by communities and visitors.”</p> <p data-bbox="181 1406 1111 1430">We note that the Council has subsequently published a Background Paper</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 424 2074 496">The respondent objects to part 2 of the policy setting out a requirement for 10% ancillary facilities in hotel developments.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 536 2074 1031">The NPPF requires policies to be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable, and contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. The change in wording to require 10% ancillary facilities responds to these requirements and makes the policy clearer. The respondent agrees that Southwark has an excess supply in relation to demand to hotels. Representations from the local community have highlighted that hotels should contribute to the community in which they are located. The primary purpose of hotels is to attract visitors, and there is no unmet demand for hotel rooms in Southwark, so requiring a small amount of ancillary facilities to incorporate publically accessible spaces and offer employment opportunities would also meet the requirement to provide the identified need for community and employment facilities. This is reflected in the relevant vision areas in the NSP.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 1070 2074 1286">The NLA research document was referenced as it contains research and engagement with hotel providers and identifies that the ground floor and lobby space of traditional hotels is changing in the way hotels function and how they are designed. Therefore this was referenced to demonstrate the industry is generally responding positively to changes to bring hotels and community uses together.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 1326 2074 1430">The policy requirement is justified due to the need to generate employment growth and ensure good design to ensure hotels meet the needs of the local community they are situated within.</p>

titled 'Hotel and visitor accommodation' December 2019² and have reviewed this. We remain supportive of the principle in para. 31 of that document in that;

"Southwark remains supportive of new hotels as long as other plan commitments and the requirements of site allocations and development management policies can be met".

The Council states that the requirement to provide a minimum floor area of ancillary use is based upon;

"13. An additional requirement was added to the Amended Policies version of the NSP (January 2019) which required a minimum of 10% of the total floorspace to be provided as ancillary facilities in hotel developments that incorporate a range of daytime uses and offer employment opportunities. This was added in recognition of the need for hotels to contribute positively towards civic and community amenity space to foster good integration with the local community and provide local employment. Previously the policy encouraged these uses however it is considered an important requirement and 10% of floorspace was considered reasonable and tangible. Many hotels are now incorporating public spaces within the ground floor as a feature of the design and enhancing technology to improve the traditional experience of a hotel lobby. Spaces are being transformed the functional to the 6 social, incorporating ideas such as retail pop-up shops, co-working spaces, public restaurants, bars, community or civic spaces, classes and workshops.⁵".

The Council refers to the 'New London Architecture, London's Hotels – expanding social spaces, 2019' document, as footnote 5. This external document has been reviewed and we note the purpose of the report as a research paper which examines changing trends, rather than being based upon empirical evidence. It cannot therefore have weight in directing a Background Paper, nor can it directly inform Policy in demanding an explicit requirement.

The reference to 10% floorspace is entirely arbitrary and does not consider the operational differences between hotels across the Borough. Indeed, this is very clear in the NLA document which acknowledges that the services provided by hotels vary between the product and the market that they serve.

For instance, a budget hotel will provide a different product, and therefore have different operation requirements when compared to a more expensive hotel. This much is noted on page 16 of the NLA document which states; “Where a mixture of offers may be slightly less relevant is with budget hotels. If their purpose is to make an area accessible and to be functional, somewhere to sleep but little else, then cocktail bars and destination restaurants are less important. What budget hotels can do is bring people into an area who will then visit local restaurants, shops, and attractions.” Indeed, the wider contribution of a hotel to the vitality and vibrancy of a local area through external expenditure is noted³, as opposed to a comprehensive requirement to provide publicly accessible ancillary space. The document that the Council relies upon to justify the 10% requirement is therefore clear in that there are operational factors which determine the layout and functions provided within a hotel.

Our position therefore remains that we seek the re-wording of Draft Policy P40 Part 2 to reflect the Submission Version New Southwark Plan, which stated:

2. Supporting ancillary facilities in hotel developments will be permitted where they incorporate a range of daytime uses and offer employment opportunities

"Indeed, the wider contribution of a hotel to the vitality and vibrancy of a local area through external expenditure is noted³, as opposed to a comprehensive requirement to provide publicly accessible ancillary space. The document that the Council relies upon to justify the 10% requirement is therefore clear in that there are operational factors which determine the layout and functions provided within a hotel.

Our position therefore remains that we seek the re-wording of Draft Policy P40 Part 2 to reflect the Submission Version New Southwark Plan, which stated:

2. Supporting ancillary facilities in hotel developments will be permitted where they incorporate a range of daytime uses and offer employment opportunities

In the following section, we have assessed the soundness of Draft Policy P40 in accordance with Para 35 of the NPPF, which states that a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Overall, we continue to consider that Part 2 of Draft Policy P40, as now revised in the Proposed Changes to the Submission Version (August 2020) (i.e. requires a minimum of 10% for ancillary facilities and for the facilities to be publicly accessible) is ineffective, unjustified through a lack of evidence and contrary to the objectives of providing additional guest accommodation and delivering a most efficient use of the land set out the current and draft London Plan and NPPF.

Unjustified through Lack of Evidence

In the Background Paper titled 'Hotel and visitor accommodation' December 2019, the Council now introduces an evidence base which assesses the supply and demand for visitor accommodation in the borough. Nevertheless, we consider the introduction of a requirement to provide a minimum area of ancillary and publicly accessible floorspace to be unfounded.

No representations were also made on this basis to Draft Policy P36 in the Submission version of the New Southwark Plan (Proposed Submission Version), which was consulted on between December 2017 and February 2018.

Furthermore, the Council's evidence base does not align with the strategic objective of the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan, nor does it provide any reasoned justification behind the proposed requirement for ancillary and publicly accessible floorspace. We therefore consider that the decision to reword Policy P40 twice to state that hotel developments are required to include 10% ancillary space and now to require these spaces to be publicly accessible is unjustified.

We continue to note that a hotel's ancillary offering is dependent on a number of factors, such as guest profile, brand / operator, location and the size and nature of the hotel. Furthermore, the now additional requirement for such space to be publicly accessible does not consider the operational requirements of a hotel and the potential for conflicts between guests and members of the public. As such, we consider that the application of Draft

Policy P40 is over-prescriptive and unreasonable as it fails to consider the variety evident in the hotel sector.

Finally, Draft Policy P40 Part 2 fails to consider the ancillary hotel services, which do not require additional floorspace and which will already be integrated into the function of the hotel. These include transportation services, room entertainment or valet services. These ancillary uses also enhance the guest experience and can generate additional employment but are not recognised under Policy P40. The definition of ancillary facilities subsequently should be included in the final version of the New Southwark Plan.

Ineffectiveness at Achieving Policy Objectives

We continue to challenge the effectiveness of the 10% ancillary space requirement to provide “a range of daytime uses and offer employment opportunities”. A main planning benefit of applications for new / intensification of C1 Use is the creation of new jobs, where the Homes & Communities Agency estimates that one full time job is created per one to five bedrooms subject to hotel type (Employment Density Guide 2015). The 10% ancillary requirement could therefore result in fewer guestrooms and a reduction in employment potential.

Secondly, we must stress that the apparent basis for 10% ancillary floorspace which is publicly accessible is aspirational and emerges from a research document rather than any empirical evidence. Whilst we welcome the aspirations of Draft Policy P40 Part 2 and acknowledge that some hotels could better support a range of daytime uses, this should not be required by policy. Moreover, a blanket application of Draft Policy P36 Part 2 risks creating redundant or under-utilised spaces in some hotels, where there is a lack of demand for daytime uses or over-competition from similar premises. This has the potential to be in conflict with the objectives for Policy P40 Part 1 which seeks to ensure that function (of the hotel must) respond positively to the local character.

Inconsistency with the London Plan and NPPF

A need for additional visitor accommodation is a common theme in the London Plan and emerging New London Plan. The Intend of Publish version

of the London Plan estimates that an additional 58,000 bedrooms of serviced accommodation are required in London by 2041 to accommodate heightened demand (equating to 2,230 bedrooms per annum across London). This represents an increase compared to the current Local Plan (a target of 40,000 net additional hotel rooms by 2036).

The Council's Background Paper titled 'Hotel and visitor accommodation' December 2019 suggests that the Borough has net demand of 1,795 serviced accommodation rooms until 2041, and that an excess supply over demand of 279 hotel rooms exists in the Borough in that timeframe⁴.

We therefore accept the position that the Council is supportive of new hotels as long as other plan commitments and the requirements of site allocations and development management policies can be met. Both plans also identify appropriate locations for hotel use and supports hotel use where it will not compromise local amenity or the balance of local land uses. Therefore, we consider that Draft Policy P40 Part 1 is consistent with the London Plan in this respect.

However, Part 2 represents a departure from the emerging Policy E10 of the London Plan, whereby there is no such requirement to provide ancillary and publicly accessible floorspace, and which could present an obstacle to achieving the increases in guest accommodation targeted in the London Plan. As such, we also consider that Draft Policy P40 Part 2 is inconsistent with the NPPF. In particular, Section 11 of the NPPF encourages an effective use of land, which the requirement for 10% ancillary space contradicts. In addition, to support town centre growth, paragraph 87 of the NPPF states:

"When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored."

Our proposed re-wording of Draft Policy P40 subsequently seeks policy greater flexibility and reiterates that different hotels will have different needs or capabilities to provide ancillary facilities in accordance with the NPPF.

"	
<p>Living Bankside Amir Eden NSPPSV239.15</p> <p>"Hotels and other visitor accommodation Hotels and other visitor accommodation should not be accepted in areas such as Borough and Bankside where there is a saturation of hotels and other visitor accommodation."</p>	<p>The policy is supportive of new hotels as long as other plan commitments and the requirements of site allocations and development management policies can be met. If hotels are provided the policy requires that they deliver community and employment benefits in 10% ancillary space.</p>

Representation	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="188 316 304 344">P41 Pubs</p> <p data-bbox="188 357 353 421">John Bussey NsPPSV373.9</p> <p data-bbox="188 466 331 494">"P41: PUBS</p> <p data-bbox="188 501 353 529">Not Effective</p> <p data-bbox="188 536 1115 641">I support this policy but the Plan should include the New London Plan Policy D13 Agent of Change to limit any actions that residents of new developments can make with regard to existing noise generators such as pubs.</p> <p data-bbox="188 647 474 676">Alternative – As above"</p>	<p data-bbox="1137 427 2069 708">Policy P55 relates to protection of amenity to present or future occupiers or users and Policy P65 relates to mitigating and managing noise by separating noise sensitive developments from major noise sources by distance, screening or internal layout, in preference to sound insulation. These policies would be considered alongside developments for new residential development taking into account nearby uses such as pubs. The ITP London Plan policy is relevant in terms of making planning decisions and the agent of change principle would apply.</p>