

Transport for London – Written Statement on Matter 10 / Site Allocations

New Southwark Plan Examination

NSP25 - Camberwell Bus Garage and NSP26 Abellio Walworth Depot

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

Although there may be potential for future redevelopment or reconfiguration while retaining operational bus garage uses on these sites, we are concerned about the proposed wording in the August 2020 NSP. The allocation refers to ‘over the station development’ despite the fact that these sites are bus garages not bus stations. To be clear, a bus garage provides depot, storage and maintenance facilities for buses whereas a bus station provides passenger facilities. In its response to the August 2020 NSP TfL has suggested alternative wording which we would like to see included in the site allocations to ensure consistency with Publication London Plan policy T3 B1, and to make the position clear to prospective developers (noting that TfL is also the freeholder of the site in Walworth).

TfL’s current view is that the bus garage capacity provided by these sites will continue to be required and indeed they are essential to the roll out of electric buses.

There are a number of requirements that must be met to ensure safety, operational efficiency and continuity of operation, as well as ensuring the amenity of new residents if either or both garages were to be part of a mixed-use redevelopment. This will add to both the cost and complexity of development. If garage capacity were to be reduced as a result of redevelopment, alternative sites meeting the operational and other criteria would need to be found to ensure continuity of efficient and safe bus operations. Any proposals for the bus garages will need to draw on experience from TfL, including both its Operational Property

department and those with expertise on bus operations as well as involve the bus company operating from each site.

Following discussion between TfL and Southwark officers, amended wording has been proposed for both site allocations to 'retain capacity for the local bus network'. On balance and when read alongside Policy T3 of the Publication London Plan, we believe that this change should address TfL's principal concerns.

NSP53 - Bricklayers Arms

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

A station on the Bakerloo line extension (BLE) at this location is not supported by TfL and is no longer being advocated by Southwark Council. The proposed alignment for the BLE as publicly consulted upon by TfL in 2019 and which we expect shortly to be safeguarded by the Secretary of State for Transport by way of statutory safeguarding directions does not serve the Bricklayers Arms site. Amending the alignment to serve the site would negatively impact on the efficiency of the route and passenger journey times whilst also adding additional cost. Subsequent conversations have taken place between Southwark Council and TfL to consider development options for the wider Bricklayers Arms area which do not include a station. It is considered that removal of the existing highway infrastructure will be costly and complex. Any future development and highway arrangement must safeguard the strategic function of the A2 Old Kent Road. Development options are being reviewed and supported by a recently awarded central government grant.

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

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

TfL has been working with Southwark Council and the respective landowners to secure such a comprehensive approach. The statutory safeguarding directions

anticipated to be made shortly will include the Tesco land as a station site with the south part of the Southernwood retail park being part of the tunnel alignment. Following agreement by all parties on the wording, a planning permission is due to be issued shortly by Southwark Council for Southernwood which allows development of the northern part to come forward in Phase 1 with a section 106 obligation securing the Old Kent Road frontage hotel development post BLE tunnel design being confirmed and the rest of the site as part of Phase 2.

NSP71 - Aylesham Centre and Peckham Bus Station

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

Although there may be potential for future redevelopment or reconfiguration while retaining an operational bus station use on this site and we have been working with Southwark Council to explore viable options, we are again concerned about the proposed wording. This is not consistent with the London Plan and confuses a bus station with a bus garage by stating: ‘If the bus garage is required...’ Peckham bus station provides passenger facilities rather than depot, storage and maintenance facilities for buses. TfL has suggested alternative wording which we would like to see included in the site allocations to ensure consistency with Publication London Plan policy T3 B1 and to make the position clear to prospective development partners.

Bus station facilities that are equivalent or better than those existing must be retained as part of any redevelopment. There are a number of requirements that must be met to ensure safety and operational efficiency, while also ensuring a successful place and suitable residential amenity. This will add to both the cost and complexity of development. As owner of part of the site, and given TfL’s statutory responsibilities, we must continue to be fully involved in any proposals that affect the TfL land ownership and existing transport operations.

Small business space is not an adequate substitute for bus infrastructure and would be contrary to Publication London Plan policy T3 B1 which requires

existing land and buildings used for public transport to be safeguarded unless alternative facilities are provided to the satisfaction of TfL.

Following discussion between TfL and Southwark officers, amended wording has been proposed to 'retain bus capacity'. On balance and when read alongside Policy T3 of the Publication London Plan, we believe that this change should address TfL's principal concerns.

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

Taking into account its town centre location and PTAL, and to ensure compliance with London Plan parking policies, any redevelopment of the site should be entirely car free (apart from disabled persons' parking) unless the criteria in Publication London Plan policy T6.3 G are met.