



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lisa Thornley
lisa.thornley@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7566

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 17 January 2018

To: Members of the
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Douglas Auld, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey,
Kevin Brooks, Lydia Buttinger, Nicky Dykes, Simon Fawthrop, Charles Joel,
David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Neil Reddin FCCA and
Michael Turner

A meeting of the Development Control Committee will be held at Bromley Civic
Centre on **THURSDAY 25 JANUARY 2018 AT 7.00 PM**

PLEASE NOTE START TIME

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Public speaking on planning application reports is a feature at meetings of the Development Control Committee and Plans Sub-Committees. It is also possible for the public to speak on Contravention Reports and Tree Preservation Orders at Plans Sub-Committees. Members of the public wishing to speak will need to have already written to the Council expressing their view on the particular matter and have indicated their wish to do so to Democratic Services **by no later than 10.00 a.m.** on the working day before the date of the meeting.

The inclusion of public contributions, and their conduct, will be at the discretion of the Chairman. Such contributions will normally be limited to two speakers per proposal, one for and one against, each with three minutes to put their point across.

For further details, please telephone **020 8461 7566**.

A G E N D A

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 16 NOVEMBER AND 13 DECEMBER 2017 (Pages 1 - 20)**

4 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5 pm on Friday 19 January 2018.

Time limit 15 minutes.

5 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/02468/FULL1 - ST HUGHES PLAYING FIELDS, BICKLEY ROAD, BICKLEY, BROMLEY

(Report to follow – the report is expected to be published on Friday 19 January 2018.)

6 MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (MCIL2) DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION (Pages 21 - 28)

7 BROMLEY'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT LONDON PLAN CONSULTATION (Pages 29 - 110)

8 DELEGATED ENFORCEMENT ACTION - JULY 2017 TO SEPTEMBER 2017 AND OCTOBER 2017 TO DECEMBER 2017 (Pages 111 - 118)

9 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

The Chairman to move that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

Items of Business

Schedule 12A Description

10 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/02468/FULL1 – ST HUGHES PLAYING FIELDS, BICKLEY ROAD, BICKLEY, BROMLEY

(Report to follow – see item 5 above.)

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

.....

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 16 November 2017

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey,
Kevin Brooks, Lydia Buttinger, Nicky Dykes, Simon Fawthrop,
Charles Joel, David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor,
Alexa Michael, Neil Reddin FCCA and Michael Turner

33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Douglas Auld. An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Kevin Brooks.

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Dean, Michael and Reddin declared non-pecuniary interests in Item 4, as they were acquainted with Mr Lawrence through the Beckenham Conservative Association. Likewise, Councillors Bosshard, Boughey and Lymer declared non-pecuniary interests as they were acquainted with Mr Lawrence through the Bromley and Chislehurst Conservative Association.

35 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 OCTOBER 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

36 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

The following oral questions were received from Mr Adrian Lawrence, Director, Lanniston Developments Limited:-

Question 1

What is the Council doing to pro-actively promote development in the Bromley Common renewal area, especially in regard to housing and schooling in this most central part of the borough?

Chairman's Response

The Draft Local Plan includes a site allocation for secondary school provision at Turpington Lane (known as Site 32).

The draft Local Plan policies expect development in or close to Renewal Areas to maximise opportunities for enhancement or improvement, strategic and local partners to co-ordinate sustained renewal and prioritise them for neighbourhood-based action and investment. Draft Policy 14 'Development Affecting Renewal Areas' indicates that the Council will, where appropriate, prepare Development Briefs or other guidance.

Question 2

Within the three most recent five year housing supply documents, what percentage of those homes were granted permission by Bromley Council and what percentage by the Planning Inspectorate after refusal by Bromley Council, and what percentage remained not built over a five year period?

Chairman's Response

This is a factual question, so I will give a factual response. Over the five year period 1st April 2012 – 31st March 2017 the Council granted 90% of the planning permissions with 10% being granted by the Planning Inspectorate. Bromley's granting of planning permissions accounts for 85% of the dwellings with permission over this time, and 15% from the permissions granted by the Planning Inspectorate. These figures relate to all sites regardless of size.

As to the rest of the question, these are matters for the Local Plan Examination and should be addressed under that process rather than by Committee questions.

Supplementary Question

The figures quoted relate to residential applications, including those applying for extensions etc. I am referring to the applications submitted for sites allocated within the five year housing supply documents. With 407 units being refused at Committee but allowed on appeal, surely this is a matter which should be looked at internally.

Chairman's Response

Yes, the figures quoted do apply to residential applications, the vast majority of which were at the Blue Circle Site. The remaining applications were granted on appeal.

Question 3

What recognition has there been of the fact that at least 1,000 homes built in recent years have been on Green Belt designated land in the evidence presented in the draft local plan whilst rejecting any sites put forward for housing within current green belt designated land.

Chairman's Response

These are matters for the Local Plan Examination and should be addressed under that process rather than by Committee questions.

Supplementary Statement

I will ask the same question at the Local Plan Examination.

37 ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - PETTS WOOD AREA OF SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER

Report DRR00000

On 18 October 2016, Members of the Executive confirmed a non-immediate Article 4 Direction withdrawing permitted development rights for front roof alterations in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. The Direction was delayed for twelve months and would not come into effect before 11 January 2018.

Members of the DCC Committee were now requested to authorise confirmation of the Article 4 Direction.

Councillor Fawthrop supported confirmation of the Article 4 Direction and moved that a further recommendation be added to note the updated Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character description which included Chislehurst Road and The Chenies. Councillor Livett seconded the motion.

The Chief Planner informed Members that correspondence in support of the Article 4 Direction had been received from Ms Andrea Stevens on behalf of the Petts Wood and District Residents' Association.

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the Article 4 Direction withdrawing permitted development rights for front roof alterations in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character; and**
- 2) the updated Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character description be noted.**

It was reported that the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation would be requested to ratify the Article 4 Direction.

38 OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION ASSESSMENT

Report DRR/17/065

Members were requested to endorse the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment 2017 which would be used for planning purposes. This document contained information relating to the provision of open space, sport and recreation across the borough and provided data to assist in applications related to polices within the 2006 Unitary Development Plan and the draft Local Plan.

Mrs Mary Manuel (Head of Planning Strategy and Projects) and officers in her section, were commended for their work in producing this document.

Councillor Boughey disagreed with the statement in paragraph 7.22 which reported there was no facility provision for young people in and around Chislehurst. A very good children's playground and fitness trail was located in Chislehurst Recreation Ground. Mrs Manuel agreed to amend the document to include these facilities.

Councillor Michael emphasised the importance of developing and providing as much open space, sport and recreation facilities as possible. This document allowed Members to see where shortfalls occurred and developers would use it as an aide to improve provision through the planning process. It would also be useful to other Council departments.

Referring to the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan produced by the Local Authority (page 231), Councillor Allen asked when Members were likely to have sight of this document. Mrs Manuel confirmed she would seek advice on this matter and respond to Councillor Allen in due course.

Officers noted a request that location maps included in the document be larger in future reports.

Councillor Buttinger considered the market segmentation research undertaken by Sport England (pages 174-175) to be outdated and requested that future research be based on the more modern lifestyles of the present time.

RESOLVED that the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment be endorsed.

39 DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICATION OF BROMLEY'S BROWNFIELD LAND REGISTER

Report DRR17/063

In accordance with Brownfield Land Register Regulations (2017), officers were required to prepare and publish by 31 December 2017, a register of

previously developed land (brownfield land) which had been identified and considered as appropriate sites for residential development.

This report would also be considered by the Executive on 6 December 2017.

DCC Members were requested to endorse a summary version of the register and recommend to the Executive that the register comprise the sites as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Chairman confirmed the Council had a statutory obligation to produce the document listing only those brownfield sites which were deemed appropriate for residential development within the Borough.

Councillor Fawthrop sought clarification on how a building could be assessed as appropriate for redevelopment from the first floor up (as stated on page 257 – 155-159 High Street, Orpington). It was confirmed that this could occur where a previous planning application which included residential development from the first floor up had been granted.

Comments from Robinson Escott Planning LLP had been received and circulated to Members. These comments referred to a site in Kemnal Road which Robinson Escott Planning had identified as Brownfield land and considered suitable as redevelopment for residential use. Members agreed that as an application for development of the site had been refused, the site should not be added to the current list.

The Chief Planner reported all sites listed in the current register were of adequate size for redevelopment and had either previously been granted planning permission or was a site identified within the draft Local Plan.

RESOLVED that the summary version of the Brownfield Land Register be endorsed and the Executive be recommended to:-

- 1) agree that Bromley's Brownfield Land Register comprise the sites set out in Appendix 1 of the report; and**
- 2) authorise the chief Planner to finalise details of the Brownfield Land Register prior to publication on 31 December 2017.**

**40 LB BROMLEY FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY PAPER -
NOVEMBER 2017**

Report DRR17/062

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012) specified that local planning authorities identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements. In this regard, Members considered the five year housing supply position for the Council from 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2022.

The report concluded that there was a suitable five year housing land supply in the Borough.

The Chairman acknowledged that Members were familiar with the sites listed in the report which reflected those already identified in the draft Local Plan.

The Chief Planner confirmed to Councillor Dykes that the provision of 120 residential units at the Sherman Road/Tweedy Road site (page 275), formed the initial stage of the proposed mixed use scheme at Bromley North to provide a total of 525 residential units.

In regard to the change of use from office to residential (page 277), Councillor Michael referred to the extended permitted development rights allowing for a change of use from B1(a) to C3 subject to a prior approval process. Whilst raising no particular objections to this, Councillor Michael was concerned with the loss of small businesses and emphasised the need to ensure that sufficient office accommodation was retained.

RESOLVED that the five year housing land supply position for 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2022, be agreed.

**41 LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY'S COMMUNITY
INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY, PROPOSED PRELIMINARY DRAFT
CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION**

Report DRR17/053

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allowed local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects. This would effectively replace much of the existing process of planning obligations commonly known as Section 106 Agreements.

The report outlined the process of CIL and requested Members recommend an appropriate level of charge for consultation purposes and endorse the proposal to undertake a six week period of consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

The Chairman confirmed that the CIL charge would not replace Section 106 Agreements for affordable housing. Following an independent viability analysis of the Borough, it was proposed that Bromley charge £100 per sqm, payable at the start of construction.

The following table listing the rates proposed by adjoining boroughs, was circulated to Members:-

Borough	Borough CIL Charging Rates per square metre for Residential Development
Lewisham	Residential zone 2 - £70
Greenwich	Residential - £70
Bexley	Residential - £60
Croydon	Residential zone 3 - £120
Tandridge	Residential - £120
Sevenoaks	Residential Areas A & B - £125 and £75
Bromley	Residential - £100

Councillor Lymer referred to the staggered CIL approach taken by Sevenoaks Council and asked whether Bromley could do the same. The Chief Planner reported that whilst this was possible, the Council should try to avoid any extra bureaucracy.

Councillor Fawthrop was hopeful that developers may be encouraged to provide more affordable housing as this type of development was exempt from CIL charges.

Councillor Reddin was informed that currently there were no Neighbourhood Plans (page 307) and it was expected that a further report would be presented to Members after the completion of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation process.

RESOLVED that the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule be endorsed and that Members of the Executive be recommended to:-

- 1) approve the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule; and**
- 2) approve and authorise the six week Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation process.**

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 13 December 2017

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey,
Lydia Buttinger, Nicky Dykes, Ellie Harmer, Charles Joel,
David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael,
Neil Reddin FCCA, Michael Turner and Stephen Wells

Also Present:

Councillors Nicholas Bennett J.P. and Peter Fortune

42 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Douglas Auld and Simon Fawthrop; Councillors Stephen Wells and Ellie Harmer attended as their respective substitutes.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Kevin Brooks.

43 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nicolas Bennett JP declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 3 as he was a member of the London South East College Board.

44 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/00429/FULL1 - 1 WESTMORELAND ROAD, BROMLEY BR2 0TB (Bromley Town Ward)

Description of application – Demolition of existing office (Class B1(a)) building and erection of a part 4/part 10 storey building (inclusive of lower and upper ground floor levels) for education use (Class D1) for up to 1260 pupils aged 11-19 years, associated cycle and car parking, refuse and recycling provision, coach drop off zone and associated soft and hard landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received from Mrs Deborah Williams who spoke on behalf of approximately 70 local residents.

Mrs Williams considered the site as the worst place possible for a secondary school to be located. She was fully aware of the shortage of secondary school places and did not object to the SHaW Academy itself, just not at this particular site which was one of the busiest, most polluted junctions in the Borough and an extremely unhealthy site for a school. Concerns were raised

for the safety of children crossing Masons Hill and Westmoreland Road 'en masse' and the effect of vehicle emissions, together with the additional traffic generated with knock-on effects on Kentish Way and the A21. The planning report stated that the junction was already over capacity and the new school would increase the throughput of vehicles however, it still concluded that the impact of additional vehicles would not be significant enough to sustain a refusal of planning permission. Mrs Williams disagreed and voiced amazement that planners had recommended refusal of the Bullers Wood Boys application on the grounds of increased traffic, yet had not done the same for this incredibly busy junction. Moreover, the scheme removed future options for road improvements such as more extensive widening of the junction and improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists, possibly funded by TFL's Liveable Neighbourhoods programme.

There were four popular secondary schools nearby so many children would come from outside the immediate area, increasing pressure on public transport, particularly existing bus routes and Bromley South Station, which was already overstretched. The applicants' travel plan was wildly over-optimistic about the number of children cycling to school. Mrs Williams queried the reported estimate that 6% would cycle when the borough average was 1% and only 0.4% of pupils cycled to Ravensbourne. Mrs Williams also asked if any Members would allow their child to cycle down Westmoreland Road or Masons Hill during the rush hour. The junction would be chaotic as children left at the end of the day – even if times were staggered. Whilst the school proposed a 'no drop off' policy and would pay for a traffic warden to enforce it, this was like King Canute telling the tide not to come in. Speaking as an ex school governor, Mrs Williams acknowledged that parents would drop their children off at school no matter what and one traffic warden would have very little effect.

On this small site, there would be little access to open space and fresh air and children would have to be bussed to other schools for games which would waste time and add to traffic problems. The proposed school would be the tallest in the UK and in the event of a fire, getting over 1500 children and staff out of the building would be difficult enough however, the main concern was muster points. It was not feasible to get that many children safely across very busy roads into the Waitrose and St Marks Square car parks, which would be full of cars, or usher them 500 metres to Ravensbourne, line them up and take registers in time to save any child found to be missing.

The absence of parking on site for staff and visitors, given the lack of free on-street parking in the vicinity, was astonishing. To put this into perspective, 90 staff park in the Ravensbourne car park every day.

The proposed building was out of character with existing period houses in Sandford and Pinewood Roads and would badly affect some residents, with increased height and massing creating a loss of privacy and overlooking by thousands of "eyes in the sky". The drawings on the portal originally showed the building to be three times further away from houses in Pinewood and

Sandford Roads than in reality. Updated drawings conveniently now do not show the houses at all.

The planning report stated there would be a loss of daylight to flats in 2 Sandford Road and Mrs Williams asked if the residents concerned had been specifically warned of this.

Bromley's Area Action Plan designated the site for office space and a hotel. Use for such a large secondary school was a huge deviation from current planning policy, based on a draft local plan that had not yet been approved. Even if the site was ultimately designated for education, it may be suitable for a small primary or a UTC, as previously planned, but not a large secondary school.

Bromley Civic Society stated that the applicant's photographs were inaccurate and misleading as Keston Ridge was not shown in their visualisation. Keston Ridge was a protected view and residents considered the revised design did nothing to protect it.

The school would not be popular with Bromley parents, given the space and facilities available at nearby alternatives. There had been no visible support for the school from parents and only three supporting letters had been submitted compared with 190 objections and a petition of over 400 signatures. The school could end up with a large proportion of pupils from outside the Borough, which would not alleviate Bromley's place shortage.

Planners had taken 96 pages to justify what seemed to be a decision already taken to shoehorn a secondary school into a totally unsuitable site just because it was owned by the ESFA. Mrs Williams urged Members not to lose the opportunity to build the school on a safer site with a larger footprint and cleaner air, which would be an asset to the borough rather than an unpopular white elephant.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from Mr Alan Gunne-Jones, Managing Director, Planning and Development Associates, and Mrs Christine Whatford on behalf of the school sponsors.

Mr Gunne-Jones reported that the application site was located within the town centre and identified as an appropriate location for a tall building. Whilst the Adopted Plan allocated the site for a mixed use development, the replacement Local Plan had designated the site for education use. This was an unchallenged draft policy and not subject to objection in the Examination currently taking place. In principle, therefore, the proposed development was the right use in an appropriate location and in an acceptable format. An extensive review of alternative sites had been undertaken by the Education Funding Agency as well as the Council's planning department as part of the Local Plan review. However, getting the detailed aspects of the development right had been an extensive process involving engagement with Council officers, Planning, Highways, Drainage, Environmental Health, the GLA, TfL, the EA, CABE and other key stakeholders and the wider community at the

pre-application stages as well as post-submission. Much effort was made by all concerned to ensure that this was a technically sound proposal and one which was acceptable to technical agencies and consultees. Where mitigation was required this had been agreed to in the draft Heads of Terms contained within the agenda.

Mrs Whatford made the following representations:-

'Everyone was aware of the crisis the Borough faced with demand for secondary school places and also the skills crisis faced by the science and healthcare industries with many thousands of skilled employees needed in this sector over the next few years and beyond. The proposed school would help address all those issues to meet both local and national need. It would offer 11-19 year olds in the Borough an exciting and innovative technical education whilst helping science and healthcare employers to secure a pipeline of future talent. This project was well-supported with integral involvement of university and further education and employer partners including Kings College Hospital, Oxleas NHS Trust, MyTime Active and Canterbury Christchurch University and London and South East Colleges. This support would ensure that students learned the skills needed by industry and provide them with exceptional exposure to the real world of work thereby securing their chances of achieving successful and fulfilling careers via apprenticeships or higher education. Extensive consultation over the past year had been undertaken on plans for the proposed school, which were reshaped as a result of feedback from the local community. The consultation highlighted there was strong support for an innovative education that offered a clear line of sight to employment as the proposed school would and a guaranteed place at the sponsors university for all those who met the minimum entry requirements.

Bromley needed an additional 23 FE entry in the secondary sector by 2020 and the current application for SHaW Futures Academy alongside expansions already agreed, would increase the provision to an additional 22FE by 2020 when the school was scheduled to open.

Finding a suitable location for the school was extremely difficult. The Council, the sponsors and the EFA all worked together to find a site. As stated on page 51 of the report, this site was identified as part of the Council's search for sites and was placed in Group 1 of sites identified. The applicant had worked hard to develop plans for a unique and exciting school whilst overcoming any potential disadvantages relating to the small footprint of the site.

Students would have use of nearby sports and recreation facilities run by London South East Colleges and MyTime Active which would help mitigate concerns about the lack of outdoor space.

The proposals were all well developed, well thought out and workable. Mrs Whatford urged Members to help realise the vision to provide an outstanding education to local young people whilst helping businesses to manage their

future skills needs which, in turn, would support the local economy for many years to come.

In response to Member questions, Mrs Whatford advised that sponsors were involved in the development of the curriculum and helped with the planning of the school; it was not a financial sponsorship. The employer sponsors would provide work experience places and placements at work. They would also come into the school and assist with the delivery of the curriculum. The University sponsor would also make an input into the curriculum and provide a guaranteed place for any students who met the minimum entry requirements. The aim was to ensure that the skills required by the industries that the employers represent were on the curriculum of the school.

Having studied the drawings, Councillor Joel could not identify the parking for the two mini-buses nor could he locate the zone in which the two 33-seater coaches would come onto the site for turning and manoeuvring purposes. There were only two proposed disabled bays and in an age of equal opportunities this was not adequate. Page 62, paragraph 4 of the report stated that provision should be given for 10% of wheelchair spaces and again, Councillor Joel could not identify these on the plans. At this point, the applicant's architect approached Councillor Joel and identified the parking for mini-buses and the coach drop-off zone.

Councillor Dykes considered the earlier points made about site analysis and selection to be disingenuous as the ESFA had refused to make the site analysis available to Councillors. There was, therefore, no supporting evidence to back the agent's statement that this was a perfect site for education use. The agent could not mitigate the negative impact of the proposal on residents because of the requirements for a secondary school of this size. In regard to site selection, Mr Gunne-Jones reported he had referred to two sources of site selection - one was what the ESFA had done themselves and the second was the process that the Council's planners had gone through as part of the Local Plan review and the report that was submitted to the Education Policy in 2015 where a number of options were considered. 1 Westmoreland Road was included as an allocated site for education use.

With regard to mitigation, Mrs Whatford reported that the school was required to be of a certain size in order to deliver the proposed curriculum. Whilst the building could be narrower and higher, there were a number of reasons why this should not be done. Mitigation of the original design had to be as explained in the report which was around the appearance of the building and attempts to make it less monolithic. The building could not be heavily stepped back as this would not work for a school design. However, the applicant had listened to the GLA and the Council's planning officers and a meeting was held with CABE in order to try and make this a more attractive and acceptable building which did provide some mitigation.

In response to questions by Councillor Reddin, it was reported that at the Council's request, the school's admission policy would be the same as all

other schools in the Borough so the catchment area would be based on distance to school and local children would have priority. How far that boundary went would depend on how many people applied.

In relation to precedent, Mr Gunne-Jones reported that no two schools or sites were the same and although there were other high education buildings in town centre locations, there were no replica of the proposals currently before Members.

Councillor Michael acknowledged the requirement for technical vocational type education for less academic young people and the need for apprenticeships and support for industry. Referring to the current financial status of Kings College Health Trust she queried whether that could have an adverse impact on what the applicant was trying to achieve with the new school. Mrs Whatford responded that whilst the two health trusts involved were not financially well-off since, it was not a question of asking them for money; they had given their support regardless of that and there was no reason to believe that they would not continue to do so.

The Planning Development Control Manager reported that additional letters of objection had been received since the report was published which reiterated comments already summarised. A letter in support of the application had also been received from the Council's Director of Education; this was circulated to Members. An updated drawing had been submitted showing a revised layout of the Masons Hill frontage which took into account the safeguarding line. The only change from the previous drawing were minor changes to the stepped area in front of the site.

Oral representations from the Executive Portfolio Holder for Education, Councillor Peter Fortune, in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Fortune stated there were not sufficient places in the Borough for children to go to school. As discussed many times, elected Members had a responsibility to the Borough's children to ensure there were a suitable number of school places available. This was a statutory responsibility, clearly set out in the Education Act 1996. Since 2010 the Council had added nearly 3,000 permanent places through the expansion of local Bromley schools. Over 3,500 places were added in Free Schools already open such as Eden Park, Harris Primary Beckenham, Harris Primary Shortlands, La Fontaine, Langley Park, not to mention Bullers Wood which was approved just a few months ago. However, in terms of secondary provision and calculating for both this and the ESFA approved yet still homeless Harris Sydenham (being awarded planning permission), the Council were still approximately 7FE short to meet projected demand for 2021/22. Councillor Fortune highlighted the planning process undertaken by academy trusts for school applications and it was clear that a wider appreciation of the relationship between local authorities and academy trusts was not fully understood. The London Borough of Bromley did not apply or build new schools. Whilst Councillors dealt with applications, listened and acted on residents' concerns, it was not they who applied. Previously, when schools were under local authority control, the LEA, would balance all views and

suggest a suitable way forward and would suggest sites and push the planning process through themselves. However, the fundamental shift in the education landscape had altered that option. Residents often asked why the Bromley Education Department or Ward Councillors put a school at certain sites or why when another solution was so apparently obvious nothing else had been done. It was important to understand that the local authority were not the applicants in these school construction cases - that was the individual trust with the support of the ESFA. If Members offered up suggestions for alternative sites, it must be realised that they do not control where autonomous trusts may wish to locate and the suggestion of alternative sites was rarely forthcoming. Various Members would have helped build and construct the Local Plan and would be aware there were a limited number of sites available in the Borough for new school builds at which point the Green Belt and other options would need to be looked at to find appropriate sites.

It was for Members, with guidance from officers, to decide whether the school should be sited elsewhere. Councillor Fortune's role and responsibility was to advise Members that if the school did not progress there would be an increased possibility that the Council would not meet its statutory responsibility on school places – a responsibility which Members were elected to achieve. There would always be opposition to school applications regardless of site location and traffic would always be an issue. As opposition and infrastructure capacity would always be a factor, it was inevitable that in order to meet responsibilities, Members would have to make decisions that displease some people. The number of children in primary schools across the borough had increased massively in recent years and in order to manage that, over the past five years, expansions had been undertaken at various schools across the Borough, excluding the new primary schools in Beckenham and Shortlands. The Borough's children will need a place to go to school. As Councillor Fortune travelled around the Borough visiting primary schools he saw the demand coming down the line which was the Council's responsibility to manage. Members must look to provide future opportunities for those young people who were already growing up in a difficult and challenging world.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Dykes reported she and her Ward colleagues were fully aware of the need for school places in the Borough.

The site had seen many uses over recent years but fundamentally, it was identified as a mixed use development site in the Bromley Town Area Action Plan. Education use was therefore a deviation from the Council's preferred designation for this site. Unfortunately, the ESFA had purchased the land and therefore the Council had no control over the site. The applicant's argument that this was an appropriate site for school development was completely disingenuous. Previous plans for a UTC at the site were deemed suitable and the existing building would only have required refurbishment; this would have gone some way to meet the secondary school need. Then there were plans for a primary school and whilst this would probably have resulted in an increase in traffic, it did not require an increase in the scale, height and

massing of the current building. Therefore, both these proposals would have been more appropriate on this very small and restrictive site and whilst not ideal, education could have been established here. However, Members were now faced with an application for a ten storey cramped development for over 1200 secondary school students. How this came to be would probably remain unknown as the ESFA would not make public their site analysis despite Members' direct requests to do so. Councillor Dykes wished to highlight that the site analysis was in fact incorrect.

The issue of residential amenity was also raised. Alluding to her earlier reference to the mitigation for this application, Councillor Dykes stated that the 2013 application and officer report made it very clear that stepping back of the building was required to reduce the very significant impact on residents in Pinewood Road. Pictures of Pinewood Road were circulated to Members which showed how overbearing the current building was let alone what residents would be faced with should permission of the application be granted. The highest point of the proposed building faced the residential element and Councillor Dykes queried why the previous applicants were required to step back their proposed building but the same had not been requested of the present applicant. There should be a parity on how applications are dealt with. Whilst acknowledging the need for school places in the Borough, Councillor Dykes reminded Members they also had a duty to mitigate the impact of proposals on local residents.

Ward Councillors received many complaints about this particular area and were constantly informed by Highways officers that, being the entrance to the town centre, it was one of the busiest junctions in the borough. Councillor Dykes therefore queried why the application was deemed to be acceptable by officers, despite these impacts being acknowledged. The report stated the comfort level of pedestrians would be compromised; Westmoreland Road was already busy throughout the day with large volumes of traffic and pedestrians. The proposed school would push the junction at Westmoreland Road and Masons Hill to well over capacity in the afternoon and it would impact on the surrounding road network and parking capacity in the vicinity. Parents would very likely cause congestion in wanting to get as close as possible to the school despite excellent transport links. The B228 Masons Hill/Westmoreland Road/High Street was already over capacity and there was a possibility that the proposed school would push all three arms to over capacity. Drop offs and pick ups would block traffic on Westmoreland Road which is a bus route for over 50 bus services.

Despite this category of complaints, the application was deemed to be acceptable. Councillor Dykes would like to have seen an independent analysis as she had with the application for Bullers Wood because during the initial stages of this application, TfL and the London Borough of Bromley raised concerns with the applicant's transport analysis which underestimated car use, bus use, the use of parking spaces and drop-off use. All these key elements had been underestimated and yet an independent study had not been requested.

Finally, the tallest part of the proposed building would partly obscure the view of Keston Ridge. In 2013, the previous applicant had been required to make changes to avoid any such impact. In this regard, Councillor Dykes again questioned why this application was being treated differently to the previous application for a mixed use development when the impact was the same?

Given the status of this application and the lack of sites, Members needed to be a little more flexible and possibly build schools that are appropriate for the sites rather than shoehorn schools into small sites. There was no reason why a smaller school could not be located at this particular site. With the average size of a school catering for around 900 pupils, this one would cater for over 1000. There were five FE schools in the borough, mainly grammar schools but as there were such a severe lack of places, then the Council need to be more creative in deciding what can be located at each site. Members should ask themselves what kind of learning environment they want for the borough's children and determine to do better than a ten storey block with no outdoor space and windows that cannot be opened due to noise and pollution.

It was also worth noting that the school would not be fully operational until 2024 so the impact of this school on the immediate school places need would not be realised for a long time.

Whilst they were aware of the urgent need for school places, Councillor Dykes and her Ward colleagues opposed the application due to the significant impact on the residents of Pinewood Road and Sandford Road and the fact that the applicant had not taken any measures to mitigate this. Councillor Dykes therefore put forward a motion for refusal on the grounds of over-development, impact on residential community, highways, traffic and the impact on the view of Keston Ridge.

Councillor Buttinger seconded the motion for refusal as she considered this to be an inappropriate development for schoolchildren mainly due to the lack of outdoor space and the fact that windows etc. would need to remain closed. The development would also be inappropriate for the residents who live in the nearby area. Whilst a tall storey building would be appropriate for the site, the design needed to have a more sympathetic approach by incorporating a clear stepping down to residential properties together with a reduction in the bulk and scale of the building. Councillor Buttinger also considered the application to be inappropriate for the road users of the junction. The development would impact greatly on traffic and she would expect any future development to have more amenity space for car parking. The statistics for people cycling to school was unrealistic, particularly on a dangerous junction like this one. Councillor Buttinger would be happy to see some form of education use at the site but would expect to see something around half the size of the current proposal.

Councillor Turner agreed this was not an appropriate site for a building of the bulk and scale currently proposed. Whilst he acknowledged the need for school places throughout the borough, Councillor Turner was not convinced of a need at this particular location. The report stated that Ravensbourne

School was 500 metres away and there were also other secondary schools in the vicinity of the site. The applicant made a case that this would be a specialist school catering for those who wish to enter science-related employment or medicine but this was not the case at all as the admissions policy would be the same as any other school with priority being given to those children who lived closest. Councillor Turner's main objection related to transport. It was utterly absurd for a school of this size to provide no parking whatsoever. It was a fact of life that people owned cars and would wish to travel to their place of work by car but there was no provision in this application for public parking in the area. The report stated that the transport assessment concluded there would be about seven additional passengers per bus, however with 1260 pupils, 110 FTE academic staff plus ancillary staff, many would need to travel to school other than by car and would do so either by bus or by train. It was therefore difficult to work out how the figure of seven additional passengers per bus was ascertained. As a result of this proposal, there would be a gross overload of the roads and public transport in the area.

Councillor Wells proposed a motion for permission of the application. This was a school designed to offer a particular kind of vocational education and its curriculum would be based around the sciences with the intention of leading pupils into higher education, apprenticeships and employment directly within the science and health industries. It would attract those who wished to be educated in those areas. It would not, therefore, be a normal secondary school. The requirement was that all secondary schools would have to operate under similar criteria in regard to accepting pupils and on that basis priority would indeed be given to those who applied in the closest proximity to the school. Pupils would come from quite a broad area across the borough. Councillor Wells questioned the assertion that there were four schools within the immediate area. He questioned the statement that there were other alternative local schools to what was proposed here. No-one would disagree that this was not an ideal location for a school however, the former FSA purchased this site and determined that it was acceptable and the Council had made some equivocation about the mixed use/education site because it had been approached with regard to the use of it for a UTC. Under those circumstances, Members found ourselves in the position where they had made it available in terms of educational use and was now being used in a similar way. The proposed school was central to the Borough as opposed to many schools which were built on the periphery of the Borough and because of the Greenwich decision many schools were taking vast numbers of children from outside the Borough. This school was less likely to be affected by that. The issue was around the nature of the school which simply could not function and could not offer the diversity of curriculum that is sought by parents and students unless it was a certain size. 3FE was simply not viable, 5FE at St Olave's only worked because it was a selective school. 6FE was a breakeven in terms of being able to offer the type of curriculum being sought. In recent years, a number of schools had been built higher. Many schools built over a decade ago were ground floor buildings only; the most recently built schools i.e. Shortlands, Harris Beckenham Primary and the new rebuild of Clare House Primary School were all two storey buildings and were a smaller footprint so they did not use a large amount of land. With regard to the parking

issues, Councillor Wells understood that St Marks Square area would include a rework of the Westmoreland Road multi-storey car parking facility. It was possible that a contract could be drawn up with the school to enable staff to park their cars.

Councillor Mellor acknowledged Members' responsibilities and duties as elected Councillors to provide educational places for the Borough's children. However, their duties needed to be weighed against the tertiary implications of their decisions, i.e. the residents, lack of adequate amenity space, intense increase of traffic at a notoriously busy junction. This application was totally unsuitable and after careful consideration, he could not support the recommendation for permission.

Councillor Joel acknowledged other Members' points in relation to the application. Referring to the design scheme and having seen the drawings and photographs, Councillor Joel considered it to be quite an impressive building. In regard to height, it should be borne in mind that in 2013, the DC Committee approved an application for a building of similar height at the same site. Other applications for the H G Wells Centre and the development at St Marks Square were also approved for higher buildings. So, as a general theme, Councillor Joel considered the Council had established a policy for higher buildings. The sports facilities and other usage referred to in the report would be used out of hours so any floodlighting and noise would have an impact on nearby residents. Referring to fire risks, the proposal included sprinkler systems and the whole design of the building would need to comply with the Building Regulation Acts and it was likely that the Fire Department would review this matter and make their comments available to officers and qualify any emergency assembly points.

With regard to drop-off and pick-ups, a number of statements encourage and discourage parents from doing this. Parents would drop their children off as close to the school as possible – the same as any other school in the Borough. Even if double yellow lines and controlled parking was established, the adjoining roads would still be used and the CPZ zones would then have to be expanded and additional parking meters with shorter parking periods would be required to lessen the impact on local residents.

Councillor Joel would like to have seen a more detailed circulation on where the two coaches would enter and exit the site and also showing the turning circles which looked to be very tight at the present time. Parking for two mini-buses was not shown on the plan. The two disabled bays would be restricted to two people with blue badges; this was not sufficient in regard to employment of disabled staff etc. Referring to page 62, paragraph 4, the report stated that provision for 10% of wheelchair spaces should be available for users within the building. Councillor Joel did not support the application.

Councillor Dykes referred to previous comments made in relation to the established height of a tall building at the site. Unlike the current proposed building, the previous application included a significant amount of stepping back and at no point was pushed further forward to residential properties on

Pinewood Road and Sandford Road. The 2013 report and the Inspector's report stated that fundamental to reducing the impact and the reason why it did not impact on residents was because of the stepping back element of the building. This applicant has not been able to do this for the current application so this was a very different application to that considered in 2013.

Councillor Michael was entirely mindful of the need to supply sufficient school places. The Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land should be preserved as much as possible and in the past Councillor Michael had argued for building schools higher. She was also aware that high street schools could work but there was always the question of how much could be put in a site – it was not always possible to expand sites. The provision of just four car parking spaces was totally inappropriate. This site had previously been used for Harris Primary School before it relocated to its permanent home in Shortlands but this was on a much smaller scale. The current proposed school would be too large for the amount of available space and most schools were considerably smaller. If this was half the size Councillor Michael would support the proposal. The lack of play facilities, the fact that windows could not be opened, the impact on residential amenity and the fact that 10 pay and display parking spaces would be removed, thereby placing additional pressure on parking in the locality, did not make the proposal feasible. Councillor Michael would like to see the applicant return with a moderated proposal but as it currently stood she could not support the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations,
RESOLVED (10 – 2 votes) that the APPLICATION be REFUSED on the grounds of over-development, impact on residential community, highways, traffic and the impact on the Keston Ridge.

The meeting ended at 8.35 pm

Chairman

Report No.
DRR18/001

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE

Date: Thursday 25th January 2018

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY 2 (MCIL2)
DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION.

Contact Officer: Terri Holding, Planner
Tel: 020 8313 4344 E-mail: Terri.Holding@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

The Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL2) Draft Charging Schedule (DSC) public consultation towards Crossrail runs 18th Dec - 4th Feb 2018. This report alerts Members to the publication of the document whilst containing background detail, with points and concerns from the LB Bromley perspective enabling a formal response suggested at Appendix 1.

It is suggested that the Council objects to the proposed Charging Schedule due to:

- The adverse impact on provision of local infrastructure such as education, health;
- The limited benefit to Bromley residents of Crossrail 2,
- The impact on other transport projects.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Development Control

Endorses the approach to object and the suggested response at Appendix 1 for submission by 4th February.

That Executive

Authorises and ratifies the response suggested at Appendix 1.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact:
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL)
 2. BBB Priority: Not Applicable:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: Potential additional income of between £40k - £50k (4% of the increased rate) to meet costs of the administration of the MCIL
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Community Infrastructure Levy
 4. Total current budget for this head: Net nil
 5. Source of funding: 4% of MCIL collected
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 2010 as
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: None
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Not Applicable
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 The Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL2) Draft Charging Schedule (DSC) public consultation towards Crossrail runs 18th Dec - 4th Feb 2018. This report alerts Members to the publication of the document whilst containing background detail, with points and concerns from the LB Bromley perspective that will enable a formal response.
- 3.2 The Mayor is a charging authority for the purposes of Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008, and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended). These powers enable the Mayor to set a CIL charge which is paid by most new development in Greater London.
- 3.3 The Mayor brought in his first CIL (MCIL1) in April 2012) in order to contribute to Crossrail's £600m developer contributions funding target. MCIL 1 applies across all of London and to most land uses, with the exception of education, health, and certain uses exempted by statute, such as affordable housing.
- 3.4 MCIL 1 compliments the specific Crossrail s106 contributions scheme, collected only on office, retail and hotel developments in Central London and the Isle of Dogs. All proceeds from MCIL1 are used for Crossrail funding and it is expected that the Crossrail target will be reached by March 2019.
- 3.15 In 2011, LB Bromley strongly objected to the first proposed Crossrail charge in conjunction with the south London boroughs of Croydon, Kingston, Merton, Richmond, Sutton and Wandsworth. In response to the MCIL1 2011 consultation, the South London Boroughs main objections to the Mayoral CIL were:-
- *the methodology used in devising the charging regime,*
 - *that along with other south London authorities there would be limited benefit whilst there would be as number of local authorities outside of London who will benefit substantially from Crossrail but are not subject to a charge,*
 - *that the proposals could have a significant adverse impact on economic prosperity in South London and may deter private sector investment through development and regeneration, in particular in south London's town centres (e.g. Bromley, Kingston, Sutton, Twickenham and Mortlake), which are the focus of development potential. Many new developments are already subject to viability studies, which indicate that existing requirements cannot be met in full,*
 - *that the focus of the Mayor on Crossrail is at the expense of transport improvements elsewhere in London. In the South London sub-region, there is an acknowledged shortfall in transport infrastructure, with poor connections between major trip generators and overriding need for improvements to orbital public transport.*

Current Consultation

- 3.6 The Mayor proposes that:-
- Mayoral CIL continues to be levied from April 2019 (as MCIL2)
 - MCIL2 supersedes the current Crossrail s106 charge, and that
 - The rates for MCIL2 largely reflect a combination of MCIL1 and Crossrail s106 charge adjusted for current viability.
- 3.7 *"The Mayor proposes to use his MCIL2 to help meet part of the cost of the Crossrail 2 project, which is a strategic priority to support the growth and development of Greater*

London. The Mayor may however choose to apply his MCIL2 to any other strategically important transport project that is listed in the London Plan, as may be altered from time to time” (DSC consultation 2017).

3.8 This is the second round of public consultation, following the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule of last August. Having considered comments the Mayor is consulting again on the Draft Charging Schedule until 4th Feb 2018. After this stage the Mayor can make changes to the Draft Schedule and if he does, he must allow a further 4 weeks for public consultation on these changes. The Mayor intends to hold an examination in public (EIP) later in 2018.

3.9 The proposed draft rates are:-

Band 1: (currently £50 rising to **£80 per sqm**)

Camden, City of London, Westminster, Hammersmith and Fulham, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea, Richmond-upon-Thames, Wandsworth.

(No changes in this banding).

Band 2: (currently £35 rising to **£60 per sqm**)

Barnet, Brent, **Bromley**, Ealing, *Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Kingston-upon-Thames, Lambeth, Lewisham, Merton, Redbridge, Southwark, Tower Hamlets, *Waltham Forest, *London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), *Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC).

(Changes are that those marked * join the banding, whilst Greenwich leaves the group).

Band 3: (currently £20 rising to **£25 per sqm**)

Barking and Dagenham, Bexley, Croydon, Greenwich, Havering, Newham, Sutton

(Changes are that Greenwich joins the banding and Waltham Forest and Enfield leave the group).

3.10 CIL Regulation 59 (2) restricts CIL spending by the Mayor to funding roads or other transport facilities, including Crossrail. Unlike the previous consultation on Crossrail funding in 2011, there is no indication on how much exactly will be needed from collection of the MCIL2 towards the next stage of Crossrail, this is because the Government is still considering the project whereas for the previous consultation for MCIL1 it was stated that £300m was required. The supporting information states ‘MCIL2 is expected to meet approximately 15 per cent of project costs’. The Mayor also gives in the evidence base, a clear indication there will be a further MCIL3 from 2024.

3.11 Transport for London has estimated that Crossrail 2 will cost around £30 billion at 2014 prices, but this ‘includes the cost of new trains and Network Rail works, and also includes some costs for national rail improvements which would be required regardless of Crossrail 2’.

3.12 Negotiations on the Crossrail 2 scheme are still underway and there is still no agreed funding package. Should no funding be achievable, the Mayor will be able to apply the MCIL2 to fund other strategic transport projects for which there is a significant funding gap. Until these matters are confirmed the proposed London contribution to costs of Crossrail consists of four funding sources:

- Crossrail 2 net operating surplus – i.e. the net impact of Crossrail 2 on TfL’s rail revenues.
- Over station development – proceeds from development of land and property initially required for consideration (development related with Crossrail 2 will pay Mayoral CIL 2 on the same basis as other developments)
- A Business Rate Supplement (BRS) (once the current BRS repays Crossrail 1 related debt)
- A Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL2).

Local concerns

- 3.14 Under MCIL1 LB Bromley falls in Band 2 (of 3 bandings over Greater London) and therefore currently collects £35 per sqm plus the relevant Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) rate on buildings that are used by people (this excludes buildings for machinery, or structure like pylons), and for a development of 100 square metres or more gross internal floorspace or involves creating one dwelling even where this is below 100 sqm (although any net charge of less than £50 will not be collected).
- 3.15 The Mayor proposes that Borough remains in Band 2 and that from April 2019 LB Bromley would charge £60 per sqm. However by 2019, Bromley will (subject to procedure and adoption), have to collect the MCIL in addition to the local LB Bromley's CIL. The Mayor has, in accordance with CIL Guidance and the Regulations, taken into account when reviewing his rates the borough levies that are in force at the time of evidence gathering. The LB Bromley first consultation stage of Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is being consulted on in January 2018 and will not be in force until later in 2018 early 2019.
- 3.16 The Mayors evidence does not consider any possible local CIL element for Bromley and that may put the viability of the Bromley CIL (BCIL) at risk. Viability work from our consultants Dixon Searle Partnership has shown a buffer when considering the Bromley local rate, and may accommodate the extra charge, given that local house prices have gone up considerably since 2014, some 28%, but under 4% in the last year. But if over the next few years' house prices fall and construction prices rise the consequence will be to erode any 'buffer' and subsequently LB Bromley may have to review the Local CIL sooner than expected as projects in the local plan will not be deliverable if they become unviable.
- 3.17 LB Greenwich has gone down a banding to band 3, but the reasoning is not clearly stated in the evidence documentation from Jones Lang LaSalle. It could be that Bromley remains at band 2 because Bromley has a significant retail town centre, and therefore attracts higher retail rents than boroughs with similar house prices, when boroughs in band 3 lack a focused retail provision (Viability Evidence Base para 3.4.6). However Greenwich has several significant historic tourist attractions, and leisure/arts facilities to bolster its economy which Bromley does not have. Also Greenwich appears in Table 3 'Comparison of house prices, office rents and disposable incomes (London Boroughs)' to have an average house price of £368k, whilst Bromley is listed as £435k, this may be because of more flatted development in Greenwich at the time of data collection.
- 3.18 The other boroughs in South London sub-regional grouping that objected alongside Bromley in 2011 will this time round benefit directly from Crossrail 2, including Sutton which is placed in Band 3, whilst Bromley still does not.
- 3.19 If the Mayor does not use MCIL2 for Crossrail then a major concern for LB Bromley is with regard to using these funds to invest in future transport projects and the way schemes are prioritised and whilst the criteria seems to be consistent across Greater London, Outer London Boroughs like Bromley will always be at a disadvantage. Whilst acknowledging Bromley has not got the same congestion and air quality issues as Central and Inner London, this part of London is light on Mayoral priority schemes (as listed in the London Plan).

Conclusion

3.20 Despite the earlier objection Bromley remains (in this new consultation) in Band 2. Appendix 1 shows a proposed response based on the last consultation response to the GLA in August. In summary the proposed objections to the Mayor's DSC consultation are:-

- the methodology used in devising the charging regime, has put Bromley in Band 2 despite the impact this could have on the viability and sound development of a Bromley CIL,
- that the proposals could have a significant adverse impact on economic prosperity and viability in Bromley especially the Bromley town centre – already new developments are already subject to viability studies, which indicate that existing requirements may not be met in full,
- there is limited benefit whilst there would be as number of local authorities outside of London who will benefit substantially from Crossrail 2 but are not subject to a charge,
- the focus of the Mayor on Crossrail is at the expense of transport improvements elsewhere in London. In the Bromley, there is an acknowledged shortfall in transport infrastructure from the Mayor, and an overriding need for improvements to orbital public transport in this locality.

3.21 When making a response to the document a request can be made for the right to be heard by the examiner appointed to conduct the public examination of the draft schedule. It must be stated in the response that LB Bromley would wish to be notified.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

No specific impacts.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The Mayor has powers as a charging authority set out in Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 to set a CIL charge to be paid by most new development in Greater London. The money raised by the Mayoral CIL is required by law to pay for strategic transport infrastructure needed to support London's development. LB Bromley acts as a collecting authority on behalf of the Mayor.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 LB Bromley retains 4% of any Mayoral CIL monies collected, to cover the cost of the collection administration on behalf of the Mayor.

6.2 Should the rate be increased to £60, it would generate additional income of between £40k and £50k from the 4% that is retained to meet administration costs of the collection.

6.3 It should be noted that if the Mayors evidence continues to exclude the impact of a local CIL for Bromley, it could put the viability of the Bromley CIL at risk. This would impact on the resources available to invest in the infrastructure in the borough.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Mayor has powers as a charging authority set out in Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 to set a CIL charge to be paid by most new development in Greater London. The money raised by the Mayoral CIL is required by law to pay for strategic transport infrastructure needed to

support London's development. LB Bromley acts as a collecting authority on behalf of the Mayor. For the purposes of CIL Regulation 123(4)(a), the Mayor intends that the proceeds of MCIL2 will be put toward the funding of Crossrail 2.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Procurement, Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	MCIL2 draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents Dec 2017.

MCIL2 Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
FREEPOST LON15799
GLA City Hall post point 18
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2BR

MCIL2 Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

In response to the latest consultation LB Bromley object to the new proposals in the consultation for the MCIL2 Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. LB Bromley has three main concerns expressed originally last August and wishes to request for the right to be heard by the examiner appointed to conduct the public examination of the draft schedule.

Firstly, the method used in devising the charging regime as set out in the MCIL Viability Evidence base prepared by your consultants JLL. LB Bromley remains in Band 2 despite the impact this may have on development of a local Bromley CIL. This could have a significant adverse impact on the provision of local infrastructure such as education, health and transport and as a result impact on economic prosperity and viability in Bromley. This is especially so in the Bromley Town Centre – already new developments are subject to viability studies, which indicate that existing requirements may not be met in full. In short, resources are proposed to be diverted from local projects to London-wide programmes that may be of limited local benefit.

The Mayors evidence document takes no account of a potential Bromley CIL rate (Table 5, p.21). Further Bromley will be consulting on its own CIL from this January. We note with some surprise that LB Greenwich has gone down a banding, based on evidence of lower house prices, office rents and disposable income whilst Bromley seems penalised because it has a 'significant retail centre'. Similarly Sutton is placed in band 3 and will benefit directly with a station on the boundary. In the light of the above we request that the banding be reviewed.

Secondly, similar to our response to the MCIL1 in 2011, there is limited benefit for residents of LB Bromley for Crossrail 2, whilst there would be as number of local authorities outside of London who will benefit substantially from Crossrail 2 but are not subject to any charge.

Thirdly, it appears to LB Bromley that there is a focus on Crossrail, and this may be at the expense of transport improvements elsewhere in London. If the Mayor does not use MCIL2 for Crossrail then these funds may be used for other future transport projects but with a lack of any certainty that this will benefit Bromley.

Yours faithfully,

Report No
DRR18/002

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date: **Thursday 25th January 2018**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **BROMLEY'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT LONDON PLAN
CONSULTATION**

Contact Officer: , Gill Slater, Planner
Tel: 0208 313 4492 E-mail: gill.slater@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

The Mayor of London published the New Draft London Plan for public consultation at the beginning of December 2017. When adopted, the new Plan will replace the current London Plan (2016) and, as part of Bromley's Development Plan, will be used in decision making on planning applications along with the UDP/ Local Plan and Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan. Appendix 1 to this report summarises key aspects of the Consultation Draft and includes officers' comments. Bromley's response, based on these comments, will be prepared for Executive approval on 7th February 2018 and submitted before the deadline of Friday 2nd March.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Development Control Committee is requested to note the key aspects of the New Draft London Plan set out in Appendix 1 and recommend the suggested comments to the Executive to form the basis of Bromley's formal response

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: No impact
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Planning Division Budget (Excl. Building Control, Land Charges)
 4. Total current budget for this head: £1.525m
 5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget for 2017/18
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 64ftes
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: No implications
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents in the Borough as well as those making planning applications for development in the Borough.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 The Mayor of London published his New Draft London Plan for public consultation at the beginning of December 2017. As with the current London Plan, this is a Spatial Development Strategy which has been produced in accordance with the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended). When adopted, it will replace the current London Plan which was originally published in 2011 and amended through a number of formal alterations up until March 2016. It will be the overall strategic plan for London, setting out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the Capital for the next 20 to 25 years (that is 2019 to 2041).
- 3.2 Following this consultation period, which concludes on Friday 2nd March 2018, it is anticipated that an Examination in Public, led by an independent Panel, will take place in autumn 2018. The Panel will produce a report recommending changes to the Plan which the Mayor can decide to accept or reject. Subsequent to that, the Secretary of State can direct changes, the London Assembly can decide to reject the whole plan but otherwise the Mayor intends to publish the New London Plan in autumn 2019.
- 3.3 Bromley's Draft Local Plan, which will replace the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), is currently under Examination, with public Hearing sessions having taken place in December 2017. The Council is currently waiting for further instruction from the Inspector, but it is expected that a period of consultation will be required on Proposed Modifications arising from discussion at the Hearings and other matters as advised. Once the Inspector has considered the response to that consultation she will prepare her final report including recommendations for changes to make the plan sound. The Council can then withdraw the UDP and adopt the Local Plan for use in determining planning applications.
- 3.4 Until the New Draft London Plan is adopted, the current London Plan 2016 is the strategic plan with which the Draft Local Plan should be in conformity and which is to be taken into account when making planning decisions.
- 3.5 The sections below summarise the key aspects of the consultation draft new London plan with further details in Appendix 1 with officer's initial comments which it is proposed that these form the basis of the Council's response to the consultation. The deadline for responses is Friday 2nd March and further analysis of the draft documents (including the evidence base) and the implications for the borough is being undertaken and will be reported to Members of DCC and the Executive to inform their considerations. The concerns highlighted by officers will form the basis of any Council objections to policies or parts of policies if these aren't addressed through discussions with the Mayor and the GLA..
- 3.6 Initial key areas of objection relate to the increase in housing supply and the policies as to how the increase has been calculated and the removal of the flexibility of residential parking standards for outer London secured previously through the minor alterations to the London Plan.

Summary of key aspects of the Consultation Draft New London Plan.

- 3.7 A summary of key aspects of each Chapter of the Consultation Draft is set out in Appendix 1. Many policies are similar to those in the current London Plan but significant changes, with implications for Bromley, are set out below. It is important to note that, as part of the Borough's Development Plan, there is no requirement for the policies to be repeated at the local level before they can be implemented, but some policies do allow for a local approach to be taken. Para 0.0.22 states that "*This Plan provides the framework to address the key planning issues*

facing London. This allows boroughs to spend time and resources on those issues that have a distinctly local dimension and on measures that will help deliver the growth London needs. This includes area-based frameworks, action plans and Supplementary Planning Documents, site allocations, brownfield registers and design codes”.

General spatial development patterns

- 3.8 “Growth Corridors”, including Opportunity Areas (such as Bromley Town Centre) and other town centres are the focus for growth. There is less emphasis on the retail elements of town centres and more about seeking opportunities for mixed use and residential development. Out-of-town centres should include residential when redeveloped. See Appendix 1, Chapter 2, comments on Policies SD1 (Opportunity Areas) and SD6 to 9 (Town Centres).

Protection of Green Belt and other open space

- 3.9 The protection of Green Belt and other open space is retained - see Annex 1, Chapter 1 comments on Policy GG2 Making the best use of land, and policies in Chapter 8). However, the clause in current Policy 3.5 which allows boroughs to adopt a presumption against the development of garden land has been removed. See Appendix 1, Chapter 3 comments on Policy D4 (Quality and Design). The London Plan introduces an urban greening formula to inform the provision of green infrastructure.

Housing supply

- 3.10 The current London Plan minimum target of 641 dwellings per annum for the borough is proposed to be raised to 1,424 dwellings per annum. This figure is the result of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which the GLA carried out in 2017. 72% of the proposed higher figure is assumed to be the delivery of units on small sites. Objections are raised to the significant increase in the Council’s draft annual housing target including the methodology used in the GLA’s 2017 SHLAA to calculate the small sites target. See Appendix 1, comments on Chapter 4, Policies H1 Increasing Housing Supply and H2 Small Sites.
- 3.11 The Sustainable Residential Quality Matrix (Table 3.2) of the current London Plan has been removed. The proposed new policy guiding density focuses instead on “optimising” sites, that is, “more efficient use of land”. See Appendix 1, comments on Chapter 3, Policy D6 Optimising housing density.
- 3.12 Policies on affordable housing are focussing on delivering more affordable housing across London. A need of 43,500 new affordable homes across per annum has been identified within the plan. A minimum threshold of 35% is initially set for relevant sites, a 50% threshold is set for public land and industrial sites deemed appropriate for release for other uses. The tenure for appropriate sites is split between the following; 30% low cost rented homes, 30% intermediate products and 40% to be determined by the borough for genuinely affordable products based on identified need.
- 3.13 A new policy sets out criteria for Large Scale purpose built shared living (Policy H18). This form of accommodation, involving communal space and concierge facilities for tenancies of 3 months plus is not of itself affordable but will be required to contribute either a payment in lieu or an ‘in perpetuity annual payment to the local authority’

Education

- 3.14 The plan moves away from the position of ‘strong support for establishment new schools’ (current London Plan Policy 3.18) and introduces specific criteria in relation to education development. See Appendix 1, Chapter 5 comments on Policy S3 Education and childcare facilities).

Economy

- 3.15 Bromley’s town centre status and office guideline are unchanged. There is strategic level support to implement Article 4 Directions to remove Permitted Development Rights for conversion of Class B uses to residential where viable.
- 3.16 New policies are included to support low-cost workspace, including through planning obligations. The plan also supports use of planning obligations to secure local employment and skills development opportunities.
- 3.17 There is now a broader range of borough-level groupings for industrial land management. Bromley is assigned a category of “Retain capacity”, roughly equivalent to its current grouping of “Restricted”. Industrial Land Release Benchmarks are replaced by a principle of no net loss of capacity in designated areas across London.
- 3.18 Foots Cray and St Mary Cray are retained as Strategic Industrial Locations wholly or partly within Bromley Borough.
- 3.16 The plan includes a new policy and criteria for “intensification, co-location and substitution” of industrial and related uses. This expands upon concepts included in the Mayor’s Land for Industry and Transport SPG.
- 3.17 The current policy for Strategic Outer London Development Centres (SOLDC) has been incorporated into a broader policy E8 Sector growth opportunities and clusters, but is largely unchanged in intent. Biggin Hill is now the only recognised SOLDC in London, whilst Crystal Palace is not referenced Boroughs are encouraged with the Mayor to identify and promote the development of SOLDCs.
- 3.19 The plan features new policies for hot food takeaways, including an exclusionary buffer of 400m between new Class A5 uses and current or proposed schools.

Heritage and Culture

- 3.20 The London Plan Policy HC7 ‘Protecting Public Houses’ requires a longer marketing period than Bromley’s draft Policy 23 Public Houses. This longer marketing period (24 months), may have a negative impact the character of the locality and on the vitality and viability of town centers.

Sustainable Infrastructure

- 3.21 There is a greater emphasis on improving air quality throughout the plan, with an “air quality positive” standard being required in some areas (see Appendix 1, comments on Policy SI1). Carbon Reduction targets for non-residential development are increased to “zero carbon” in line with residential and a minimum contribution from energy efficiency is introduced. Waste management policy remains largely the same with boroughs still being able to collaborate to meet their revised apportionment targets.

Transport

3.22 Reference to the Mayor's ambition for enhanced rail access to Bromley via an extension of the DLR has been removed. The Bakerloo Line extension remains a strategic priority for the Mayor, with a possible extension from Lewisham to Bromley (see Appendix 1, Chapter 10, comments on Policy T1 and T3). Bromley Town and Orpington have been identified as areas where higher cycling minimum parking standards should apply (see Appendix 1, Chapter 10, comments on Policy T5). There have been significant changes to parking standards. This has led to parking standards being more restrictive in nature, and there is less flexibility for outer London boroughs. (see Appendix 1, Chapter 10, comments on policies T6 to T6.5).

Funding

3.23 Chapter 11 'Funding the London Plan' incorporates Policy Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligation, but chiefly in the text focuses on the London Infrastructure Plan 2050, a 2014 document which outlined investment required between 2016-2050. Featured is the aim of the Mayor for fiscal devolution with new fiscal tools to fund infrastructure that will unlock growth and new homes.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 When adopted, the New Draft London Plan will replace the current London Plan (2016) and will form part of Bromley's Development Plan. It will therefore be used for decision making on planning applications alongside the Local Plan (when adopted) and the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan. The new London Plan will also influence any new planning policy documents produced by Bromley (such as a reviewed Area Action Plan or a revised Local Plan) as these are required to be "in general conformity" with it.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Although there are no financial implications at this stage, it should be noted that should a higher housing figure be adopted in the future, this may have implications for the Council, with a greater demand for public services due to an increased population.

5.2 There could be future costs associated with the preparation and submission of the Council's representation and attendance at any subsequent hearing sessions into the new London Plan. Any costs will have to be contained within the existing planning budget.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Impact on vulnerable adults and children Personnel Procurement
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	The London Plan (2016) https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/current-london-plan The London Plan – Draft for Public Consultation (December 2017) https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan

London Borough of Bromley
London Plan Draft for Public Consultation – December 2017

Summary and officer comments
Development Control Committee 18th January 2018

Policy	Title
	Chapter 1 Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)
Policy GG1	Building strong and inclusive communities
Policy GG2	Making the best use of land
Policy GG3	Creating a healthy city
Policy GG4	Delivering the homes Londoners need
Policy GG5	Growing a good economy
Policy GG6	Increasing efficiency and resilience
	Chapter 2 Spatial Development Patterns
Policy SD1	Opportunity Areas
Policy SD2	Collaboration in the Wider South East
Policy SD3	Growth locations in the Wider South East and beyond
Policy SD4	The Central Activities Zone (CAZ)
Policy SD5	Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ
Policy SD6	Town centres
Policy SD7	Town centre network (and Annex 1)
Policy SD8	Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents
Policy SD9	Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation
Policy SD10	Strategic and local regeneration
	Chapter 3 Design
Policy D1	London's form and characteristics
Policy D2	Delivering good design
Policy D3	Inclusive design
Policy D4	Housing quality and standards
Policy D5	Accessible housing
Policy D6	Optimising housing density
Policy D7	Public realm
Policy D8	Tall buildings
Policy D9	Basement development
Policy D10	Safety, security and resilience to emergency
Policy D11	Fire safety
Policy D12	Agent of Change
Policy D13	Noise
	Chapter 4 Housing
Policy H1	Increasing housing supply
Policy H2	Small sites
Policy H3	Monitoring housing targets
Policy H4	Meanwhile use
Policy H5	Delivering affordable housing

Policy H6	Threshold approach to applications
Policy H7	Affordable housing tenure
Policy H8	Monitoring of affordable housing
Policy H9	Vacant building credit
Policy H10	Redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration
Policy H11	Ensuring the best use of stock
Policy H12	Housing size mix
Policy H13	Build to Rent
Policy H14	Supported and specialised accommodation
Policy H15	Specialist older persons housing
Policy H16	Gypsy and Traveller accommodation
Policy H17	Purpose-built student accommodation
Policy H18	Large-scale purpose-built shared living
Chapter 5 Social Infrastructure	
Policy S1	Developing London's social infrastructure
Policy S2	Health and social care facilities
Policy S3	Education and childcare facilities
Policy S4	Play and informal recreation
Policy S5	Sports and recreation facilities
Policy S6	Public toilets
Policy S7	Burial space
Chapter 6 Economy	
Policy E1	Offices
Policy E2	Low-cost business space
Policy E3	Affordable workspace
Policy E4	Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function
Policy E5	Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL)
Policy E6	Locally Significant Industrial Sites
Policy E7	Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function
Policy E8	Sector growth opportunities and clusters
Policy E9	Retail, markets and hot food takeaways
Policy E10	Visitor infrastructure
Policy E11	Skills and opportunities for all
Chapter 7 Heritage and Culture	
Policy HC1	Heritage conservation and growth
Policy HC2	World Heritage Sites
Policy HC3	Strategic and Local Views
Policy HC4	London View Management Framework
Policy HC5	Supporting London's culture and creative industries
Policy HC6	Supporting the night-time economy
Policy HC7	Protecting public houses
Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment	
Policy G1	Green infrastructure
Policy G2	London's Green Belt
Policy G3	Metropolitan Open Land
Policy G4	Local green and open space

Policy G5	Urban greening
Policy G6	Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy G7	Trees and woodlands
Policy G8	Food growing
Policy G9	Geodiversity
Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure	
Policy SI1	Improving air quality
Policy SI2	Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
Policy SI3	Energy infrastructure
Policy SI4	Managing heat risk
Policy SI5	Water infrastructure
Policy SI6	Digital connectivity infrastructure
Policy SI7	Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
Policy SI8	Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
Policy SI9	Safeguarded waste sites
Policy SI10	Aggregates
Policy SI11	Hydraulic fracturing (Fracking)
Policy SI12	Flood risk management
Policy SI13	Sustainable drainage
Policy SI14	Waterways – strategic role
Policy SI15	Water transport
Policy SI16	Waterways – use and enjoyment
Policy SI17	Protecting London’s waterways
Chapter 10 Transport	
Policy T1	Strategic approach to transport
Policy T2	Healthy Streets
Policy T3	Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
Policy T4	Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
Policy T5	Cycling
Policy T6	Car parking
Policy T6.1	Residential parking
Policy T6.2	Office parking
Policy T6.3	Retail parking
Policy T6.4	Hotel and leisure uses parking
Policy T6.5	Non-residential disabled persons parking
Policy T7	Freight and servicing
Policy T8	Aviation
Policy T9	Funding transport infrastructure through planning
Chapter 11 Funding the London Plan	
Policy DF1	Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
Chapter 12 Monitoring	
Policy M1	Monitoring

Chapter 1 – Planning London’s Future (Good Growth Policies)

Policy GG1 – Building strong and inclusive communities

In summary - Those involved in planning and development must:

- Continue to generate economic opportunities, everyone able to benefit
- Provide access to good quality services, increasing social integration
- Plan streets and public spaces for comfort and safety, foster sense of community
- Promote town centres for social civic cultural and economic benefits, day evening and night
- Design new buildings and spaces for legibility inclusivity resilient adaptable
- Create accessible London for all, welcoming, dignity without segregation

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy GG2 – Making the best use of land

“To create high-density, mixed-use places that make the best use of land, those involved in planning and development must:

A Prioritise the development of Opportunity Areas, brownfield land, surplus public sector land, sites which are well-connected by existing or planned Tube and rail stations, sites within and on the edge of town centres, and small sites.

B Proactively explore the potential to intensify the use of land, including public land, to support additional homes and workspaces, promoting higher density development, particularly on sites that are well-connected by public transport, walking and cycling, applying a design-led approach.

C Understand what is valued about existing places and use this as a catalyst for growth and place-making, strengthening London’s distinct and varied character.

D Protect London’s open spaces, including the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, designated nature conservation sites and local spaces, and promote the creation of new green infrastructure and urban greening.

E Plan for good local walking, cycling and public transport connections to support a strategic target of 80 per cent of all journeys using sustainable travel, enabling car-free lifestyles that allow an efficient use of land, as well as using new and enhanced public transport links to unlock growth.

F Maximise opportunities to use infrastructure assets for more than one purpose, to make the best use of land and support efficient maintenance.”

Comment

The Council strongly supports the reaffirmation that existing green space designations should remain protected. As a borough with more than 50% open space, Bromley has a key role to play in the achievement of the ambition of 50% green cover across London (para 1.2.6).

Bromley has a rich natural and cultural heritage and its distinctive places and character are highly valued by those who live and do business in the borough. The London Plan should give stronger protection to these valued environments where local people proactively seek to enhance these qualities.

See also comments on draft Policies of Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

Policy GG3 - Creating a healthy city

In summary -

- Ensure coordination to improved mental and physical health
- Promote activity and healthy lifestyles
- Use Healthy Streets approach to priorities health in all planning decisions
- Assess impacts of development on health and wellbeing
- Plan improved access to green spaces and new green infrastructure
- Ensure new buildings are healthy
- Create healthy food environment

Comment

The green and open spaces which give Bromley its special character make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of all Londoners – a “green lung” vital to carbon sequestration, pollution reduction, tempering the heat island effect and offering opportunities for formal and informal sport and recreation. The London Plan should recognise Bromley’s unique contribution to the Capital in this respect.

See also comments on relevant policies in following Chapters.

Policy GG4 - Delivering Homes Londoners need

In summary - Those involved in planning and development must

- ensure that more homes are delivered.
- support the delivery of the strategic target of 50 per cent of all new homes being genuinely affordable.
- create mixed and inclusive communities
- identify and allocate a range of sites, including small sites, to deliver housing locally,
- establish ambitious and achievable build-out rates at the planning stage,

Para 1.4.3 states that “The 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment has identified a significant overall need for housing, and for affordable housing in

particular. London needs 66,000 new homes each year, for at least twenty years and evidence suggests that 43,000 of them should be genuinely affordable if the needs of Londoners are to be met. This supports the Mayor's strategic target of 50 per cent of all new homes being genuinely affordable."

Comment

See comments on Chapter 4, Housing Policies.

Policy GG5 – Growing a good economy

In summary - To conserve London's competitiveness and ensure success is shared, those involved in planning and development should:

- Promote strength and potential of the wider city region
- Diversify and share benefits
- Plan for sufficient employment space in the right locations
- Ensure housing and infrastructure are provided to support growth
- Ensure leadership and innovation
- Promote and support rich heritage and cultural assets
- Maximise public transport, walking and cycling network, town centres to support agglomeration and economic activity

Comment

The policy is broadly supported. See also comments on Chapter 6, economy.

Policy GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience

In summary - To help London become a more efficient and resilient city, those involved in planning and development should:

- Seek to improve energy efficiency and move to low carbon circular economy
- Ensure buildings and infrastructure adapt to changing climate
- Create safe and secure environment
- Integrated approach to infrastructure

Comment

See comments on Chapter 9 – Sustainable Infrastructure.

Chapter 2 – Spatial Development Patterns

Chapter 2 sets out the strategic development framework for London over the life of the London Plan.

Strategic Framework

Para 2.0.2 states that *“London’s green and open spaces are a vital part of the capital. Its parks, rivers and green open spaces are some of the places that people most cherish and they bring the benefits of the natural environment within reach of Londoners. London’s Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land designations (see Chapter 8) serve to protect these strategically-important open spaces, prevent urban sprawl and focus investment and development on previously developed land.”*

However, Para 2.0.3 states that *“If London is to meet the challenges of the future, all parts of London will need to embrace and manage change. Not all change will be transformative – in many places, change will occur incrementally. This is especially the case in outer London, where the suburban pattern of development has significant potential for appropriate intensification over time, particularly for additional housing.”*

Comment

Bromley supports the recognition of the value of open spaces and the focus on previously developed land. However, there is limited capacity for intensification of suburban areas without detrimental effects upon local communities, heritage, character and green infrastructure. It could also lead to a loss of much needed family housing and necessary amenity space for residents, particularly children. Intensification in areas without high levels of public transport would lead to additional pressure on the road network. This strategy does not accord with Para 1.2.7 which recognises the benefits of “distinctive character and heritage”.

Opportunity Areas

Policy SD1 - Opportunity Areas

Updates existing Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas

The new policy includes more of a focus on the role that Opportunity Areas should have on enabling regeneration and reducing inequality, specifically mentioning affordable housing. Boroughs should set out how they will encourage and deliver the growth potential of Opportunity Areas. They should support development which creates employment opportunities and housing choice for Londoners, plan for the necessary social and other infrastructure, include ambitious transport modal share targets and support wider regeneration in the surrounding areas.

Comment

The current London Plan designates Bromley Town Centre as an Opportunity Area and the Council is committed to taking this forward through the Area Action Plan and the Local Plan. Draft Policy 90 states that the Council will prepare an Opportunity

Area Planning Framework to deliver a minimum of 2,500 homes and an indicative 2,000 jobs. The intention is that this framework will form an early review of the Area Action Plan.

Supporting London's Growth

Para 2.13 states that "The Mayor has concluded that an extension to Lewisham via Old Kent Road and New Cross Gate is the best option for an initial Bakerloo Line Extension. There is also the potential for future extensions of the scheme beyond Lewisham. Planning frameworks should identify the development opportunities which are made possible as a result of the Bakerloo Line Extension, as well as how this would be phased to reflect the connectivity and capacity benefits it unlocks.

Figure 2.4 shows an indicative extension plan including Bromley Town Centre Opportunity Area.

Comment

Whilst the DLR extension to Bromley no longer forms part of TfL's current Business Plan, it remains Bromley's preferred option from Lewisham/Catford to Bromley South via Bromley North. This extension will form part of continuing discussions with TfL regarding the next draft of the Business Plan, and the Council will continue to press TfL to secure funding for this extension.

See also comment on Policy T3, Chapter 10.

The "Wider South East"

Policy SD2 – Collaboration in the Wider South East

Updates existing Policy 2.2 – London and the Wider Metropolitan Area

The Mayor will work with partners across the Wider South East to address "appropriate regional and sub-regional challenges and opportunities through recently developed strategic coordination arrangements"

Policy SD3 – Growth Locations in the Wider South East and Beyond

Updates existing Policy 2.3 - Growth Areas and co-ordination corridors.

Para 2.3.1 states that "This Plan aims to accommodate all of London's growth within its boundaries without intruding on its Green Belt or other protected open spaces. As with any successful urban area this does not mean that in- and out-migration will cease, but that as far as possible sufficient provision will be made to accommodate the projected growth within London."

Para 2.3.4 states that "Given the pressure for growth in both London and the WSE, the barriers to housing delivery that need to be overcome to avoid a further increase of the backlog, and potential changes to projections over time, it is prudent to plan

for longer-term contingencies. Therefore, the Mayor is interested in working with willing partners beyond London to explore if there is potential to accommodate more growth in sustainable locations outside the capital.”

Comment

With the risks to existing communities and the environment of accommodating of an ever-growing population within the bounds of the Capital, Bromley supports collaborative working with the Wider South East area. However, it is questioned how the Mayor, through these policies, can significantly influence authorities outside London without any power to direct changes.

(Policy SD4 and SD5 relate to the Central Activity Zone (CAZ) in central London)

Town Centres

Town Centres are addressed in the current London Plan in Policy 2.15 – Town Centres, Annex 2 and Policy 4.7 – Retail and Town Centre Development. The New London Plan puts a greater emphasis on the role of town centres in helping to deliver its vision – an extension of the “Town Centres First” approach. There is greater emphasis on identifying the potential for additional residential capacity in town centres whilst ensuring the network continues to meet the needs of London and its economy.

Policy SD6 – Town Centres

Town centres should be promoted and enhanced as hubs for a diverse range of uses, including “locations for mixed use or housing-led intensification and higher density renewal, securing a high-quality environment and complementing local character and heritage assets”. Clause “C” states that “The potential for new housing within and on the edges of town centres should be realised through higher-density mixed-use or residential development”. Town centres need to be able to adapt and diversify in light of changes in retail patterns and an increase in surplus retail floorspace.

Comment

The continued focus on town centres for multiple uses is supported however it is important to recognise that not all town centres can accommodate higher density development without irrevocably changing their character. Boroughs should be able to determine which town centres are suitable for higher density development rather than there being a blanket assumption.

Policy SD7 – Town Centre Network

The draft policy sets out the requirement to proactively manage town centres to promote sustainable economic growth and the continued need to monitor changing uses through health checks. Clause E notably mentions District Centres and their “potential for higher density mixed-use residential development” as well as other viable functions.

The existing Town Centre Hierarchy is retained, with Bromley as a Metropolitan centre, Orpington a Major centre and District Centres of Petts Wood, Beckenham, Penge, West Wickham and Crystal Palace.

Annex 1 contains descriptions of the characteristics of the network levels – which remain unchanged - and indicates the growth potential of commercial, residential (informed by the SHLAA) and office uses for each centre. This has changed from the current London Plan which has a general growth potential indicator, office guidelines and does not include residential potential.

Bromley is attributed with “high” potential for commercial and residential growth and level “b” in the office guidelines, that is, having “the capacity, demand and viability to accommodate new office development, generally as part of mixed-use developments including residential use”. The definition of level “b” in the current London Plan suggests that there would likely be an overall loss of office floorspace.

Orpington is given “low” commercial growth potential, and “medium” residential. All District centres are given “low” potential for commercial growth, Beckenham and Penge are given “incremental” potential for residential and Petts Wood and West Wickham “medium”.

Lewisham is identified as a potential Metropolitan centre, which would put it on the same level as Bromley Town Centre.

Comment

The “high” potential for residential and commercial growth in Bromley Town Centre is noted. This reflects the area’s status as an Opportunity Area.

Policy SD8 – Town Centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents

This policy reiterates the “Town Centre First” approach of the current London Plan and continues to require a sequential approach to accommodating town centre uses. Out-of-centre development of town centre uses other than viable office locations in outer London should be resisted. The full potential of out-of-centre retail and leisure parks should be realised to deliver housing intensification without a net increase in retail or leisure floorspace. Boroughs should develop policies for the edge and fringes of town centres, revising shopping frontages where surplus to introduce greater flexibility and identify centres that have particular scope to accommodate new commercial development and higher density housing.

Comment

Whilst the sequential approach to town centre uses is supported, there are concerns about introducing residential development into out-of-centre retail and leisure parks due to the less accessible nature of these areas and their parking pressures.

Policy SD9 – Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation

This policy introduces the requirement for each town centre to have a Town Centre Strategy “produced in partnership at the local level in a way that is inclusive and representative of the local community”. Para 2.9.2 goes on to say that these should cover a broad remit “co-ordinating a tailored approach to planning, environmental health, licensing, Healthy Streets, transport strategy, highways management, logistics and servicing, regeneration, air quality, investment and projects. They should be developed with input from relevant stakeholders, including TfL, commercial landlords and investors, Business Improvement Districts and business associations, social infrastructure providers, Historic England, and community and amenity groups.” Article 4 Directions should be introduced where appropriate to remove permitted development rights for conversion to residential in order to sustain vitality and viability and maintain flexibility.

Comment

With 7 potential town centres (listed in Annex1) which would require Town Centre Strategies, there is concern about the resource implications of this requirement in Bromley. It is suggested that boroughs should be allowed to decide which town centres will benefit from this approach.

Strategic and Local Regeneration

Policy SD10 – Strategic and Local Regeneration

Boroughs should identify Strategic Areas for Regeneration (set out in Figure 2.19) and see to identify Local Areas for Regeneration. Policies and proposals should contribute to regeneration by tackling spatial inequalities and environmental economic and social barriers.

Comment

The policy is noted. Bromley has established its own “Renewal Areas” in the Draft Local Plan in response to the current London Plan Policy 2.14.

Chapter 3 – Design

Policy D1 – London’s form and characteristics

Incorporates elements of several existing policies including Policy 7.1 – Lifetime neighbourhoods, Policy 7.4 – Local character, Policy 7.6 – Architecture.

The policy requires Development Plans and proposals to address a wide range of matters in shaping places and developments, including:

- Using land efficiently by optimising density
- Providing conveniently located open and green spaces
- Preventing or mitigating the impacts of noise and poor air quality
- Responding to local character
- Aiming for high sustainability standards
- Respecting and enhancing heritage assets and architectural features
- Maximising opportunities for urban greening

Comment

The policy is generally supported but see also comments on Policy D6 below.

Policy D2 – Delivering good design

The Policy sets a requirement for Development Plans to identify an area’s capacity for growth which strengthens what is valued in a place. This should be based on an evaluation covering a range of elements including:

- Socio-economic data
- Housing type and tenure
- Urban form and structure
- Transport networks
- Air quality and noise levels
- Open space networks
- Historical evolution and heritage assets
- Topography
- Land availability
- Existing and emerging Development Plan designations
- Existing and future uses and demand for new development

The findings of the evaluation taken together with other policies should inform sustainable options for growth and be used to establish the most appropriate form of development for an area. The outcome must ensure that development on all sites is optimised.

Design analysis and visual modelling should be undertaken where appropriate. Masterplans and design codes should be used. Design review should be used to

assess and inform design options early in the planning process in addition to planning advice.

Comment

The policy largely sets out the normal considerations to be taken into account in preparing a Local Plan. See also Policy H2 – Small Sites for the relevance of preparing “design codes”.

Policy D3 – Inclusive Design

Similar to existing Policy 7.2 – An inclusive environment

The aim of the policy remains the same – to ensure development is designed from the outset to be as inclusive as possible. An “inclusive design statement” is specifically required as part of a design and access statement to demonstrate how the principles have been addressed.

Comment

The policy is broadly supported.

Policy D4 – Housing quality and standards

Incorporates elements of existing Policy 3.5 – Quality and Design of Housing Developments and the Housing SPG.

The current space standards are retained unchanged, with the addition of 6 bed, 8 person properties. The standards apply to all tenures and all residential accommodation that is self-contained. Guidance from the SPG including minimum standards for private outdoor open space has been brought into the actual Policy.

Comment

An important element of Policy 3.5 has been lost – that is the presumption against development on back gardens or other private residential gardens. Gardens have been completely missed from the Consultation Draft Plan and do not even feature in the Green Infrastructure section. These spaces should be recognised and protected for their contribution to amenity, healthy lifestyles, biodiversity and habitat corridors, flood risk management, heritage and character.

The Council supports minimum dwelling size standards in principle but remains concerned that is not possible to apply this policy to conversions made under Prior Approval (particularly office to residential). Some residential units coming forward under the Government’s scheme are well below the London Plan standard.

Policy D5 – Accessible housing

The policy reflects current London Plan Housing choice Policy 3.8c) and d).

The supporting text para 3.5.4 advises that M4(3) wheelchair accessible housing should be applied only '*where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating the resident*'.

The supporting text advises that wheelchair user dwellings M4(2) and M4(3), which require 'step free' access, should be provided throughout developments (including floor levels). Guidance is provided regarding the limited circumstances where flexibility with regard to the requirement for lift access to dwellings without ground level entrance may be applied, including the implications of service charges for on-going maintenance.

Comment

The Council supports the policy which reflects draft Policy 4 Housing design, but queries the language in para 3.5.4 which reflects that within the draft Local Plan para 2.1.59 to which the GLA objected to in prompting a proposed modification which has been submitted to examination. The clarification regarding lift provision is noted.

Policy D6 – Optimising Housing Density

Replaces Policy 3.4 – Optimising Housing Potential, and the Sustainable Residential Quality matrix table 3.2

“Development proposals must make the most efficient use of land and be developed at the optimum density. The optimum density of a development should result from a design-led approach to determine the capacity of the site.

Particular consideration should be given to:

- 1) the site context
- 2) its connectivity and accessibility by walking and cycling, and existing and planned public transport (including PTAL)
- 3) the capacity of surrounding infrastructure.

Proposed residential development that does not demonstrably optimise the housing density of the site in accordance with this policy should be refused.”

Para 3.6.1

“For London to accommodate growth in an inclusive and responsible way every new development needs to make the most efficient use of land. *This will mean developing at densities above those of the surrounding area on most sites.* The design of the development must optimise housing density. A design-led approach to optimising density should be based on an evaluation of the site's attributes, its surrounding context and capacity for growth and the most appropriate development form, which are determined by following the process set out in Policy D2 Delivering good design. Policy H1 Increasing housing supply, Policy H2 Small sites and Policy H3 Monitoring

housing targets set out requirements for increasing housing supply across London and identify locations where increased housing capacity can be achieved.”

Para 3.6.3

“The surrounding infrastructure of all types is a key element in determining the optimum density of a site. The capacity of existing and future public transport services, and the connections they provide, should be taken into consideration, as should the potential to increase this capacity through financial contributions and by joint working with Transport for London. Boroughs and infrastructure providers should also consider the cumulative impact of multiple development proposals in an area. In general, the higher the public transport access and connectivity of the site, and the closer it is to a town centre or station, the higher the density and the lower the car parking provision should be.”

Para 3.6.6

“Masterplans and strategic frameworks should be used when planning large-scale development to create welcoming and inclusive neighbourhoods, promote active travel, enable the successful integration of the built form within its surrounding area, and deliver wider benefits to residents, such as access to shared amenity space and high-quality public realm.”

Comment

The Council supports a design-led approach to development sites but it is concerned that Para 3.6.1 seems to suggest that this approach will necessarily result in higher densities. Taking the local context and character into account, as required by other draft policies, may not lead to higher density development being the optimal solution.

Policy D7 – Public Realm

Similar to existing Policy 7.5 - Public Realm

The policy adds new objectives to the existing policy reflecting the growing demand caused by population growth on London’s public realm to accommodate a greater variety /intensity of uses, particularly in high density development. The definition of the public realm is extended to include shopping malls, sky gardens, viewing platforms, museums and stations concourses particularly important in areas of higher density. The policy seeks to facilitate the balance between the various functions of the public realm.

Additional objectives relate to encouraging active travel and discouraging car travel and on street parking, creating a sense of place based on an understanding of function of public spaces, strengthening the relationship between buildings and the public realm, incorporating green infrastructure (SUDs) and play equipment, providing spaces to be enjoyed by all ages, welcome open street events to improve the public realm, identify opportunities for meanwhile uses on phased development sites, and provide drinking water.

The supporting text references The Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to the design and management of streets.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy D8 – Tall Buildings

Similar to existing Policy 7.7 – Location and Design of Tall Buildings

The policy specifically emphasizes the role of tall buildings in accommodating London's growth and requires local plans to identify specific sites suitable for tall buildings as part of a plan led approach. This focuses on areas of growth, change and good transport connectivity, and where permission in principle would be suitable, rather than identifying general appropriate, sensitive and inappropriate locations as per the existing policy. Local Authorities are required to define what they consider as tall buildings in various locations.

The policy sets criteria to take into consideration in the plan making process and in deciding development proposals with emphasis being added on the various types of impact including:

- The visual impacts of development with added references to long range, mid-range and immediate views, in addition to design and the historic environment. Specific guidance is provided in the supporting text re: the design of the top, middle and base of a tall building.
- The functional impacts of the design of the development on the safety of its occupiers, the surrounding public realm, pedestrian flow, access to services and infrastructure, the economy of the area, sky rights and telecommunications and solar energy generation.
- Environmental impacts of the design of the development on the enjoyment of adjoining open spaces and street level conditions.
- The cumulative visual functional and environmental impacts of tall buildings and integration of adequate mitigation measures.

Clause D of the policy specifically includes the requirement for tall buildings to incorporate publicly accessible areas.

In areas of substantial change such as Opportunity Areas, the definition of tall buildings is stated to depend on the context. Tall Building applications referable to the Mayor are identified as including buildings more than 30 m in height. The Mayor commits to work with Boroughs to provide a strategic overview of tall building locations across London and assisting with consultations.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy D9 – Basement development

New Policy

“Boroughs... should establish policies to address the negative impacts of large-scale basement development beneath existing buildings”

Whilst small-scale basement developments can help make more efficient use of land, there have been problems, particularly in inner London, with large subterranean developments. Some boroughs have implemented Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights. The Mayor supports boroughs in restricting large scale basement excavations where it is likely to cause unacceptable harm.

Comment

To date the Council is not aware of negative issues resulting from so called “mega basement” development in the Borough, however it supports the spirit of the policy in protecting people and property and will review the need for local restrictions in the future.

Policy D10 – Safety security and resilience to emergency

The policy is broadly the same as existing Policy 7.13 – Safety, Security and Resilience to Emergency

Boroughs should work with the Metropolitan Police and other agencies to identify community safety needs. Development proposals should maximise building resilience and minimise potential risks, and include proportionate measures to deter terrorism, assist in detection and help mitigate impacts. These measures should be considered at the start of the design process and be aesthetically integrated into the development and wider area.

Comment

The policy is supported.

Policy D11 – Fire safety

New policy.

Development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety and ensure they incorporate appropriate features which reduce risk to life, minimise fire spread, provide escape routes, an evacuation strategy and access for firefighting.

All major development proposals should be submitted with a Fire Statement.

Comment

Whilst Building Regulations set out fire safety requirements, this policy intends to ensure “the highest standards” of fire safety through incorporating it into the design

process in a more holistic way. Whilst improvements in fire safety checks are to be supported, evaluating statements for all major developments would put pressure on resources.

Policy D12 – Agent of change NEW POLICY

The “Agent of Change” principle (included in the NPPF at Para 123) puts the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise-generating activity on the proposed new noise-sensitive development. Development proposals should ensure good acoustic design, explore mitigation early in the design process and separate new noise-sensitive development where possible from existing noise-generating businesses. Development should ensure that existing noise-generating venues can remain viable. New noise-generating development should put in place measures to mitigate and manage any impacts for neighbouring residents and businesses. Boroughs should refuse proposals that have not demonstrated how noise impacts will be mitigated and managed.

Comment

The policy is welcomed and it is noted that the Council will be able to take this policy into account in some permitted development applications, including conversion of office to residential.

Policy D13 - Noise

This policy largely repeats existing Policy 7.15 – Noise. It does not cover aviation related noise which is addressed in draft Policy T8 - Aviation.

- Development proposals should manage noise by:
- avoiding adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life
- reflecting the Agent of Change principle
- mitigating and minimise existing and potential adverse impact without placing unreasonable restrictions on development
- improving and enhancing the acoustic environment
- separating new noise-sensitive development from major noise sources through the use of distance in preference to insulation

Comment

The policy is noted.

Chapter 4 Housing

Policy H1 Increasing housing supply

Policy H1 deals with Increasing Housing Supply. The current London Plan policy is 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.

Policy H1 presents new ten-year targets for net housing completions (2019/20 – 2028/29) in Table 4.1, page 145. The ten year target for the Borough is 14,240 homes and annualised the net target is 1424 homes.

The large site target (sites > 0.25ha) is 395 homes per annum compared to 289 homes per annum at present.

Table 4.2 of the Draft London Plan sets out 10 year targets (2019/20 – 2028/29) for net housing completions on small sites (below 0.25ha in size). The net target for Bromley is 1029 homes per annum compared to 352 at present for small sites.

Policy H1 Increasing housing supply sets out criteria for boroughs to ensure ten year housing targets are achieved. In summary this includes:

Clause B, 1 a-c

- Boroughs should prepare delivery-focused Development Plans;
- Allocate an appropriate range and number of sites suitable for residential and mixed use development and intensification;
- Encourage development on other appropriate windfall sites not identified within Development Plans;
- Ensure delivery of housing capacity identified in Opportunity Areas working closely with the GLA.

Clause B, 2 a-f

To increase housing supply boroughs should optimise potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through Development Plans and planning decisions.

Different brownfield sites are listed and include:

- Sites with existing or planned public transport access levels (PTALS) 3-6 or which are located 800m of a Tube station, rail station or town centre boundary;
- Mixed-use redevelopment of car parks and low-density retail parks;
- Housing intensification on other low-density sites in commercial, leisure and infrastructure uses;
- Redevelopment of surplus utilities and public sector owned sites;
- Small housing sites;
- Industrial sites that have been identified through the processes set out in Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function, Policy E5 SIL, Policy E6 LSIS and E7 Intensification, co-location and

substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function.

The policy sets out four additional clauses (C-F):

- Boroughs should proactively use brownfield registers and permission in principle to increase certainty for those wishing to build new homes;
- Boroughs should publish and annually update housing trajectories based on the targets in Table 4.1 which identify the sources of housing capacity (including windfall) expected to contribute towards achieving housing targets and should work with the Mayor to resolve any anticipated shortfalls;
- Where new sustainable transport infrastructure is planned, boroughs should re-evaluate the appropriateness of land use designations and the potential to accommodate higher-density residential and mixed-use development, taking into account future public transport capacity and connectivity levels;
- On sites allocated for residential and mixed-use development there is a general presumption against single use low-density retail and leisure parks. These developments should provide a mix of uses including housing on the same site in order to make the best use of land available for development.

Paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 highlight that the Mayor has carried out a London-wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). For the purposes of the Draft Plan London is considered as a single housing market area. Because of London's ability to plan strategically boroughs are not required to carry out their own needs assessment (although footnote 36 references that if boroughs wish to do so they are encouraged to carry them out sub-regionally).

Paragraph 4.1.2 specifies that the advantage of strategic planning is that it allows London to focus development in the most sustainable locations, allowing all of London's land use needs to be planned for with an understanding of how best to deliver them across the capital.

The SHMA has identified need for 66,000 additional homes per year compared to 49,000 in the current London Plan.

Paragraph 4.1.3 states that to achieve the housing targets set out in Table 4.1 the overall average rate of housing delivery on both large and small sites will need to approximately double compared to current average completion rates. Recognition is given to the fact that development of this scale will require not just an increase in the number of homes approved but also a fundamental transformation in how new homes are delivered. The London Plan, London Housing Strategy and Mayor's Transport Strategy together provide a framework to help achieve this ambition but achieving this step change in delivery will require increased levels of funding to support the delivery of housing and infrastructure.

Paragraph 4.1.4 – the London Housing Strategy sets out Mayor's proposals for working with boroughs and other partners to deliver the step change in housing supply through:

- Proactive intervention in London's land market to unlock and accelerate housing delivery including on public land and through CPO and other forms of land assembly;
- Increased and better-targeted investment to de-risk development and maximise opportunities for new transport infrastructure;
- Diversification of the housebuilding industry through increased Build-to-Rent development, more support for small and medium sized builders and more supply of Council's and housing associations;

Paragraph 4.1.8 states that the allowance for windfall sites is considered appropriate given the policy framework set out in the Plan, the capitals reliance on recycled brownfield sites on other active land uses, number of additional homes expected through increases in density of existing homes through small housing developments. Boroughs are encouraged to identify as many sites as possible (including small sites) in Development Plans and on Registers. Boroughs are supported in using windfall assumptions in their five-year housing trajectories based on the numbers set out in Table 4.2. In contrast with recent annual trends on small sites the figures in Table 4.2 are considered to better reflect the step change in housing delivery through presumption in favour of small housing developments (Policy H2) and the package of measures in London Housing Strategy.

Comment

The Draft Local Plan sets out in Draft Policy 1 that the Council will make provision for a minimum average of 641 additional homes per annum over the ten year plan period and where possible over the fifteen year plan period.

Appendix 10.1 Housing Trajectory sets out a trajectory total of 10,645 units from 2015/16 – 2029/30, the fifteen year plan period.

Over the ten year period 2020/21 – 2029/30 Appendix 10.1 identifies 6959 units which contrasts significantly with the 14,240 units identified for Bromley in Table 4.1 of the 2017 Draft London Plan.

The Council has objections to the 677 unit per annum uplift for small sites. Paragraph 4.1.3 refers to a fundamental transformation that is required to deliver this significant step change in delivery. Of significant concern is the fact that the timescale for commencement of such delivery is April 2019.

Through participation in the London-wide SHLAA officers assessed sites of 0.25 ha or larger. This exercise resulted in realistic assumptions for sites of this size depending on a variety of site characteristics. All sites that are currently designated as Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Urban Open Space were excluded (unless an extant planning permission existed for the site). Paragraph 4.1.7 states that the differences between different borough targets are a reflection of the variations in the constraints and opportunities affecting development on large sites and the capacity for development on small sites. As set out in paragraph 4.1.7 this exercise was undertaken by officers in partnership with the GLA.

The Council has objections to the methodology used by the GLA to generate the small site target for boroughs which differs to that used in the 2013 SHLAA. The methodology uses a combination of trend data for certain types of development and an estimate of potential intensification in existing residential areas (paragraph 4.1.7). As set out above the small site 'target' for the borough has increased three-fold as a result of the revised methodology.

Use of the small site target in boroughs five year supply could result in challenges in appeal situations if previous targets have not been met. This could result in an increase in Public Inquiries and puts at risk sites that are currently designated as open space (previously omitted from the SHLAA methodology for large sites), residential character, amenity and heritage assets.

The phasing of large sites in the 2017 SHLAA (Appendix E) is based on when sites may be completed. It is considered that this does not adequately reflect the phasing submitted to the GLA by officers and is misleading compared to borough documents that include housing trajectories. It would be beneficial for the evidence to include the general phasing of whole sites to give a more detailed account of delivery on large sites.

See also below Council's response to Policy H2.

NEW POLICY - Policy H2 Small sites (<0.25ha)

The new policy on small sites emphasises in Clause A the small sites should play a much greater role in housing delivery and boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites through planning decisions and plan-making. The policy links to Policy H1 Increasing Housing Supply. In the case of Bromley the small site target has increased from 352 units to 1029 units in the 2017 Draft London Plan. The policy refers to the need for boroughs to recognise in their Development Plans and planning decisions that local character evolves over time and will need to change, in appropriate locations, to accommodate additional housing at a higher density.

Clause B states that Boroughs should prepare area-wide design codes to promote good design, encouraging increased housing provision and higher residential densities on small housing developments. Additionally, boroughs should increase planning certainty by identifying and allocating small sites, listing these on brownfield registers and grant permission in principle on specific sites or prepare local development orders.

Clause D states that to assist in delivering small site development boroughs should apply a presumption in favour of small housing development (1-25 homes through residential conversions, extensions, demolition and redevelopment of existing buildings and infill development within the curtilage of a house) on:

- Infill development on vacant or underused sites;
- Proposals to increase density of existing homes in PTAL 3-6 or within 800m of a Tube station, rail station or town centre boundary;
- Redevelopment or upward extension of flats and non-residential buildings.

Clause E highlights that development should be in accordance with a prepared design code, where there is no design code the presumption means approving small housing development unless it can be demonstrated that the development would give rise to an unacceptable level of harm to residential privacy, designated heritage assets, biodiversity or a safeguarded land use that outweighs the benefits of additional housing. The Mayor will set out design principles as part of his review of GLA design guidance which boroughs should draw upon when preparing design codes.

Clause G specifies that on sites providing 10 or less dwellings or have a maximum combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000 sqm should only require affordable housing requirements as a tariff approach to off-site contributions rather than on-site contributions.

Comment

See also above comments for Policy H1 Increasing Housing Supply

The Council has objections in relation to the proposed policy direction for sites of less than 0.25ha (or sites for 1-25 homes) based on the 2017 GLA SHLAA methodology as referred to in paragraph 4.2.4 of the Draft London Plan. The policy approach results in the Borough's small site target increasing from 352 units per annum to 1029 units per annum. The change in methodology used to calculate small site targets was not consulted upon with the boroughs. The previous methodology used in 2013 was based on past trends of completions on sites of less than 0.25ha over an eight year period. During the most recent SHLAA process boroughs were aware that the methodology might be subject to change, possibly relating to the number of trend years used, but were not aware of the significant changes proposed as set out in the 2017 SHLAA evidence that have resulted in a three-fold increase of the figure for Bromley.

Reference is made to the need for design codes but no advice is given in the supporting text on the status of such codes. Where a design code is not in place the presumption is in favour of approving small housing development unless there is an unacceptable level of harm to residential privacy, heritage assets, biodiversity or a safeguarded land use. It is considered that other relevant policies in the Plan (including design policies) should be reflected in Clause E to ensure that future development on small sites respects its surroundings and does not adversely impact upon the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers.

Clause D, 2) d) specifies that one of the types of small housing development could be the infill development within the curtilage of a house. It is considered that this could include the development of backland or garden land. The Council considers that this type of development should be assessed in relation to: the impact on character, appearance and context of an area, no unacceptable loss of landscaping, natural habitats, play space or amenity space and no adverse impact upon the residential amenity of future or existing occupiers. If a design code is not in place the criteria set out in clause E would not cover the latter aspects.

See also comments in relation to Draft Policy D4 and the lack of reference in the consultation Draft Plan to any presumption against backland / private garden development in borough local plans.

Clause H refers to boroughs seeking affordable housing contributions on sites of 10 units or less. It is considered that reference should be made to whether or not this is a viable option for boroughs within the supporting text.

Policy H3 Monitoring housing targets

The current London Plan policy 8.4 Monitoring and Review is a general policy covering the whole of the Plan.

Policy H3 sets out the Mayor's approach to monitoring the housing targets set out in Table 4.1. The policy specifies that the housing targets should be monitored as follows; in net terms taking into account homes lost through demolition or changes of use, delivery on sites of less than 0.25ha should contribute towards achieving the small sites targets in Table 4.2, net non-self-contained accommodation for students and shared living should count on the basis of a 3:1 ratio with 3 bedrooms counting as a single home and net non-self-contained accommodation for older people (C2) should count on a 1:1 ratio with each bedroom counting as a single home.

Paragraph 4.3.1 refers to targets in Table 4.1 as annual averages, providing a benchmark for assessing the direction of travel towards ten-year housing targets both across London and by borough. The Mayor will monitor both housing completions and the net pipeline of approved homes when assessing progress towards delivering targets. Paragraph 4.3.2 refers to the Mayor working closely with boroughs on their housing trajectories and Development Plans to ensure targets are planned for effectively particularly where issues are identified in terms of completions and the pipeline.

Paragraph 4.3.3 refers to the fact that targets have increased significantly to address need. It is the Mayor's view that the Government's proposed housing delivery test should not unfairly penalise boroughs where housing delivery has been constrained for factors outside of their control. Reference is made to small sites delivery increasing over time so this should be taken into account when monitoring housing delivery during the early years of the Plan.

Comment

The Council has objections relating to the uplift in the Borough's housing target as set out above.

A new policy relating to the monitoring of targets and support from the Mayor for boroughs is supported in principle. Of importance though is how the potential significant uplift in the housing target for the borough could impact upon the Council's five year housing land supply position in the early years following adoption of the Draft London Plan.

As drafted the supporting text does not adequately provide enough guidance to boroughs on how a five year housing land supply could be calculated taking into account the significant uplift in small site targets.

It is acknowledged in paragraph 4.3.3 that the increased small site targets will take time to be delivered. It is therefore considered inappropriate and unrealistic for boroughs to be monitored against these targets until there is more certainty over the methodology that has calculated them and if housing delivery will occur along the lines envisaged in the 2017 SHLAA.

NEW POLICY - Policy H4 Meanwhile use

Boroughs are encouraged to identify opportunities (on land in public and private ownership) for the 'meanwhile use' of sites for housing to make efficient use of land while it is awaiting longer-term development.

- Opportunities for the meanwhile use of land for housing on large-scale phased developments should be identified during the planning process;
- The parameters, particularly its longevity (which may vary) and associated obligations, should be established from the outset and agreed by all parties;
- Meanwhile housing can be provided in the form of 'precision-manufactured homes' which can potentially be reused at a later date on another site.

Comment

The Council welcomes this policy which reflects its approach [involving inviting bids from providers to build modular homes on Council land for homes offsite for homeless households of various sizes].

Confirmation should be provided in the supporting text with regards to if the source of "meanwhile use" contributes to the housing targets in Table 4.1.

Policy H5 Delivering affordable housing

Clause A specifies that the strategic target of 50% of all new homes across London should be affordable. Measures to achieve this aim include:

- Residential and mixed-use developments to provide affordable housing through threshold approach (see Policy H6);
- Use grant to increase affordable delivery beyond that which would otherwise be provided;
- Affordable housing providers with agreements with the Mayor to deliver at least 50% affordable across portfolios;
- Public sector land delivering at least 50% affordable across its portfolio;
- Strategic partners with agreements with Mayor to aim to deliver at least 60% affordable across their portfolio.

Clause B sets out that affordable housing should be provided on site except in exceptional circumstances [where provision could be in the form of payment in lieu or off-site provision].

Paragraph 4.5.1 identifies that delivering more affordable housing is a key strategic issue for London with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifying the need for 43,500 affordable homes per year. This requires an increase of affordable housing from all sources.

Paragraph 4.5.2 specifies that past approaches have not adequately met levels of housing need. To increase certainty, speed up the planning process and increase delivery the Mayor is adopting a threshold approach to viability. Schemes meeting or exceeding the threshold without public subsidy [and consistent with Policy H6] are not required to submit viability information. Schemes that do not meet this threshold or require public subsidy to do so will be required to submit viability information that will be scrutinised. Review mechanisms will be applied to schemes that do not meet the requirements of Policy H6. Threshold approach has been introduced through the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG [August 2017].

Paragraph 4.5.9 states that to avoid incentivising off-site provision or in lieu contributions agreements for this should provide no financial benefit to the applicant relative to on-site provision and should include review mechanisms. Policy target for off-site or cash-in-lieu contributions is 50% affordable housing across the main site and any linked sites when considered as a whole.

Comment

The Council notes the overall approach in aiming to deliver an increased level of affordable housing across London, especially if grant is made available for relevant schemes / providers listed in the policy. This is crucial in light of schemes needing to demonstrate that they have sought to increase the level of affordable housing beyond the level that would otherwise be provided. Reference to the levels of funding likely to be made available or relevant programmes should be included within the supporting text of the policy.

There is some uncertainty though whether the fast-track route will incentivise developers not to enter into the viability tested route which could result in the planning process not being sped up.

Additional guidance is required in relation to off-site and cash-in-lieu circumstances.

Policy H6 Threshold approach to applications

Affordable housing thresholds are dealt with under Policy 3.11 and 3.13 of the current 2016 London Plan.

Clause A specifies that the threshold approach to planning applications applies to proposals capable of delivering more than 10 units or which have a combined floor space greater than 1,000sqm (paragraph 4.6.14 identifies exclusions and 4.6.15 scheme types with bespoke approaches).

Clause B sets out that threshold level of affordable housing is initially set at:

- 1) minimum 35%
- 2) 50% for public sector land
- 3) 50% for SIL, LSIS and other industrial sites deemed appropriate to release for other uses;

35% will be reviewed in 2021 and if appropriate increased through SPG.

Clause C sets out the approach to the Fast Track Route, applications must meet all of the following:

- 1) Meet or exceed relevant threshold level on site without public subsidy;
- 2) Consistent with relevant tenure split;
- 3) Meet other relevant policy requirements / obligations to satisfaction of borough and Mayor;
- 4) Demonstrate taken account of strategic 50% target in Policy H5 and have sought grant where required to increase affordable housing beyond 35%.

A summary of Clause D states that fast tracked applications are not required to provide a viability assessment at application stage. To ensure applicants intend to build out the permission the requirement for an Early Stage Viability Review will be triggered if an agreed level of progress on implementation is not made within 2 years of the permission being granted (or a period agreed by the borough).

Clause E specifies that where an application does not meet the requirements in Clause C it must follow the Viability Tested Route. This requires detailed supporting viability evidence to be submitted in a standardised and accessible format as part of the application. Information should be scrutinised by the borough and Mayor where relevant to ascertain the maximum level of affordable housing. Viability tested schemes should be subject to; an Early Stage Review (relating to progress of implementation within 2 years of planning permission), Late Stage Viability Review (based on when 75% units in a scheme are sold or let or period agreed by borough) and Mid Term Reviews (prior to implementation of phases for larger phased schemes).

Clauses G-J deal with circumstances where amendments are made to schemes and how these will be treated in relation to their assessment of affordable housing provision.

Paragraph 4.6.1 sets out applicants are strongly encouraged to take the Fast Track Route by providing the threshold level of affordable housing and meeting other Development Plan requirements.

Paragraph 4.6.2 highlights that where applicants do not provide the threshold level of affordable housing [or where fixed or minimum affordable housing requirements are not in place] the Viability Tested Route will assess the maximum level of affordable housing that a scheme can deliver. The viability assessment, using the detailed methodology in the Affordable Housing and Viability SPG could find a greater

affordable housing contribution than the threshold level could be viable and thus would be required.

Paragraph 4.6.4 states that the Draft London Plan thresholds have been informed by viability testing. This will help to embed affordable housing requirements into land values and create consistency and certainty across London. The 35% threshold level will be reviewed in 2021 with changes consulted on as part of an update to the SPG.

Paragraph 4.6.5 relates to public sector land. It states the Mayor recognises that public sector land can play a significant role in meeting affordable housing need. Threshold for public sector land is set at 50% to be considered under the Fast Track Route. This is because these sites represent an opportunity to meet a range of objectives including making better use of sites, improving services and delivering more affordable housing. Moreover, as public assets, these landholdings should be used to deliver development and outcomes that are most needed by the public. Where there is agreement with the Mayor to deliver at least 50% across the portfolio of sites, then 35% threshold should apply to individual sites.

Paragraph 4.6.6 states that in light of the difference in land values between industrial and residential development a higher level of affordable housing is expected. Therefore to follow the Fast Track Route industrial sites will need to meet the 50% threshold.

Paragraph 4.6.9 highlights that all schemes are expected to maximise delivery of genuinely affordable housing and make most efficient use of available resources to achieve this. Where grant or public subsidy is available this should be utilised.

Paragraph 4.6.13 states that in Opportunity Areas boroughs may want to consider applying a localised affordable housing threshold for the Fast Track Route or fixed affordable housing requirements. These should increase the affordable housing provision where possible.

Comment

The Council considers that Clause D should make reference to the need for details of the Early Stage Review to be set out in a S106 agreement.

Application of Clause E could increase the need to use of independent consultants to assess viability on relevant schemes depending on the split of schemes between the Fast Track Route and the Viability Tested Route.

Reference should be made in paragraph 4.6.5 that where the 50% affordable housing threshold is not proposed then schemes will be subject to viability assessments. Clarification is need in relation to the last sentence that refers to 35% being an appropriate threshold on public land where 50% is agreed with the Mayor across the whole portfolio of sites. It may be appropriate in this instance to refer to the fact that some sites could be contributing more than 50% [as opposed to at least 50%].

Paragraph 4.6.9 highlights that applications for schemes of 150 units or more must evidence that they have sought to increase levels of affordable housing. Clause C 4) also refers to grant in relation to fast tracked schemes. It is suggested that grant is also referred to within Clause E. Clarification should also be made within paragraph 4.6.9 on whether it is only schemes that are 150 units or more that should seek grant or if this is relevant to all relevant schemes.

Policy H7 Affordable housing tenure

Affordable housing tenure is dealt with under Policy 3.11 Affordable Housing Targets and Policy 3.13 Affordable Housing Thresholds in the current 2016 London Plan (60% affordable and social-rent and 40% intermediate on schemes of 10 units or more).

Clause A of the policy states that the Mayor is committed to delivering genuinely affordable housing. The following tenure split is set out for relevant schemes:

- Minimum 30% low cost rented homes allocating according to need and for Londoners on low incomes (social-rented/London affordable rent);
- Minimum 30% intermediate products which meet the definition of affordable housing including London Living Rent and London Shared ownership;
- 40% to be determined by the borough based on identified need provided they are consistent with the definition of affordable housing.
- Only schemes delivering threshold level of affordable housing with a tenure split that meets the above can follow the Fast Track for viability.

Paragraph 4.7.1 highlights that Table 4.3 of the Draft London Plan shows there is a significant need for low cost rental housing (social-rented/affordable rent). The Table illustrates the overall annual need (2017 London-wide SHMA):

Market	23,037 homes
Intermediate	11,869 homes
Low-cost rent	30,972 homes

The paragraph highlights that the current national funding programme is focused on intermediate products that limits the Mayor's ability to require higher levels of low-cost rented accommodation. The Mayor considers that Policy H7 provides sufficient flexibility to be tailored to meet local needs ensuring a minimum level of affordable homes can be delivered. A review is expected in 2021 and updated through the SPG.

Paragraph 4.7.2 highlights that there is a presumption that the 40% to be decided by the borough will focus on Social Rent/Affordable Rent given the level of need across London. It is recognised that for some boroughs a broader mix may be more appropriate due to viability constraints or because it would deliver a more mixed and inclusive community. Appropriate tenure splits should be determined through the Development Plan process or supplementary planning guidance.

Paragraphs 4.7.3 – 4.7.6 define the Mayor's preferred affordable housing tenures London Affordable Rent, London Living Rent (Intermediate) and London Shared

Ownership (Intermediate). Other affordable housing products may be acceptable if as well as meeting the broad definition of affordable housing they also meet the draft London Housing Strategy definition of genuinely affordable housing and are considered genuinely affordable by boroughs.

Paragraph 4.7.8 highlights that all intermediate rented products (London Living Rent and Discounted Market Rent) should be affordable to households on incomes of up to £60,000. Intermediate ownership products (London Shared Ownership and Discounted Market Sale where they meet the definition of affordable housing) should be affordable to households on incomes of up to £90,000. The GLA Annual Monitoring Report will update thresholds and update information on income thresholds.

Paragraph 4.7.10 specifies that where boroughs set their own eligibility criteria for intermediate units below those stated above these will cascade to London-wide criteria within three months to ensure units are not left vacant. Re-sales and re-lets should be made available to those meeting the London-wide income caps.

Paragraphs 4.7.11 – 4.7.12 elaborate on the tenure mix for schemes including affordable housing. To follow the fast track route schemes must adhere to the tenure split set out in Policy H7. Where a scheme is delivering more affordable than set out in the policy threshold, the additional affordable housing tenure is flexible, and should be agreed by the borough, Registered Provider and applicant. Where a scheme is assessed under the Viability Tested Route and evidence demonstrates the threshold cannot be met the affordable housing split in H7 is the starting point for negotiations. It will be for the borough and the Mayor to decide if there should be a greater number of affordable homes or fewer homes at a deeper discount. S106 agreements should stipulate tenure mix and be consistent with the viability assessment.

Paragraph 4.7.13 highlights that schemes that are largely affordable may be considered under the Fast Track Route but affordable units should be genuinely affordable and the tenure mix supported by the borough and where appropriate the Mayor.

Comment

The Council supports the tenure breakdown and flexibility to determine 40% of affordable provision based on identified need. Flexibility is provided within paragraph 4.7.2 which is also supported.

There is concern that the level of affordable housing needed and specified in Draft Policy H5 may not be able to be delivered with grant if national funding is focussed on intermediate products compared to affordable rent/social rent products.

The Council supports the description of London Affordable Rent that specifies the Mayor expects rents charged for homes let for London Affordable Rent to be set at benchmarks substantially below this level [80% of market rent] based on traditional social rents. Paragraph 4.7.4 specifies that more detail is contained in the Mayor's

Homes for Londoners Affordable Homes Programme 2016-21 funding guidance but it may be useful to elaborate on this in the SPG or update via the Annual Monitoring Report in terms of what is considered to be acceptable rent levels by bedroom size.

Intermediate unit eligibility specified in paragraphs 4.7.8 and 4.7.10 accords with the current London Plan and Annual Monitoring Reports.

Paragraphs 4.7.11 – 4.7.13 noted.

Policy H8 Monitoring of affordable housing

Overall monitoring of the current 2016 London Plan is dealt with under Policy 8.4 Monitoring and Review. Draft Policy H8 is specifically related to affordable housing.

The policy sets out 4 main clauses as follows:

- A. Boroughs are required to have clear monitoring processes to ensure affordable housing secured on or off site is delivered in line with the S106;
- B. Monitoring processes should ensure cash in lieu is used to deliver additional affordable housing;
- C. Boroughs should ensure review mechanisms (where appropriate) are implemented and the number of extra homes delivered or cash in lieu secured is recorded;
- D. Boroughs must publish monitoring information annually to ensure transparency in the planning process so the public know how funds are being spent. This information should be shared with the GLA so it can form part of the monitoring process.

Comment

The Council supports the above policy that will ensure affordable housing delivery will be monitored effectively.

Policy H9 Vacant building credit – NEW POLICY

The London Plan notes that the Vacant Building Credit (VBC), which applies to sites where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, and reduces the requirement for affordable housing contributions accordingly has significant implications for delivery of affordable housing in London.

The policy advises that in most circumstances, its application will not be appropriate in London advising that where the VBC could provide an incentive for development

on sites containing vacant buildings that would not otherwise come forward for development, it should only be applied where all of the following criteria are met:

1. the building is not in use at the time the application is submitted
2. the building is not covered by an extant or recently expired permission
3. the site is not protected for alternative land use
4. the building has not been made vacant for the sole purpose of redevelopment. [involving the demonstration of at least five years continuous vacancy, of which at least two years with active marketing]

Comment

The Council notes the policy which assists in ensuring the delivery of affordable housing and welcomes the clarity with regard to the application of VBC.

Policy H10 Redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration -

The policy reflects current London Plan Policy 3.14 Existing Stock resisting the loss of housing (including the loss of hostels, staff accommodation, and shared and supported accommodation that meet an identified housing need) unless replaced at existing or higher densities with at least the equivalent level of overall floorspace., unless the existing floorspace.

The policy is expanded with regard to

- the raising from supporting text (para 3.82 London Plan 2016) to policy of the requirement for existing affordable housing loss to be replaced by equivalent or better quality accommodation, providing at least an equivalent level of affordable housing floorspace, (clause B),
- the requirement for existing affordable housing in estate regenerations to be reprovided on an equivalent basis with regard to social rented floorspace, with rental levels based on the replaced provision, (clause C),
- Schemes replacing existing affordable / estate regenerations required to follow the Viability Tested Route (Policy H6)

Comment

The Council notes the policy but considers that the appropriate density will be dependent upon the detail of any scheme and the local environment.

Policy H11 Ensuring the best use of stock

The policy reflects current London Plan Policy 3.14 Existing Stock, clause D in seeking to reduce the number of vacant dwellings. The policy supports mechanisms which seek to ensure stock is occupied in boroughs with identified issues of homes being left empty as 'buy to leave'.

The policy introduces a new clause requiring boroughs to take account of the impact on the housing stock of applications for homes to be used as holiday rentals for more than 90 days a year.

Comment

The Council notes the policy and is itself exploring potential for conversion of vacant properties for use as temporary or settled provision.

Policy H12 Housing Size Mix

The policy significantly expands on current London Plan Policy 3.8 Ba and brings into policy elements of the Mayoral Housing SPG (2016) Standard 7

The policy states that Boroughs should not set prescriptive dwelling size mix requirements (in terms of number of bedrooms) for market and intermediate homes, although it and sets out the criteria to which regard should be had in considering the appropriate mix of unit sizes. These criteria include the potential for custom-build and community-led housing schemes and the role of one and two bed units in freeing up family housing, whilst advising that generally, schemes consisting mainly of one-person units and/or one-bedroom units should be resisted.

It adds further criteria with regard to low cost rent to ensure affordable housing meets identified local needs with regard to local issues of overcrowding, the impact of welfare reform and the cost of delivering larger units and the availability of grant.

Comment

The Council notes the criteria within the policy which local authorities should 'have regard to', and will consider these criteria as appropriate on a site by site basis in the determination of planning applications.

Policy H13 Build to Rent – NEW POLICY

The policy sets the criteria for schemes of at least 50 units to qualify as a Build to Rent schemes, where the affordable housing need not include social rent. Rather it can be secured, in perpetuity, solely as Discounted Market Rent (genuinely affordable, preferably London Living Rent level).

The policy details how schemes which are partly build to rent are to be assessed and allows for Boroughs to set their own thresholds to reflect local housing market circumstances and affordable housing need, subject to stipulations in the guidance.

Note the Mayoral Housing SPG (2016) build to rent section has been previously deleted.

Comment

The Council notes the policy and the advice in para 4.13.1 that the planning system should take a 'positive approach' to the build to rent sector.

Policy H14 Supported and specialised accommodation

The policy expands on current London Plan Housing choice Policy 3.8 c) d) and g) relating to accessible housing and 'other supported housing'. It supports the delivery, retention and refurbishment of supported and specialised housing which meets an identified need and notably provides 8 examples of such accommodation:

1. move-on accommodation for people leaving hostels, refuges and other supported housing, to enable them to live independently
2. accommodation for young people
3. re-ablement accommodation (intensive short-term) for people who are ready to be discharged from hospital but who require additional support to be able to return safely to live independently at home, or to move into appropriate long-term accommodation
4. accommodation for disabled people (including people with physical and sensory impairments and learning difficulties) who require additional support or for whom living independently is not possible.
5. accommodation (short-term or long-term) for people with mental health issues who require intensive support
6. accommodation for rough sleepers
7. accommodation for victims of domestic abuse
8. accommodation for victims of violence against women and girls.

Comment

The policy reflects the Council's support for specialist housing generally (Draft Local Plan Policy 11). The Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Homelessness and other strategies identify supported and specialised housing needs in Bromley.

Policy H15 Specialist older persons housing

The policy expands on current London Plan Policy 3.8 Housing Choice e) and sets into policy the requirement for Boroughs to '*work positively and collaboratively with providers to identify sites which may be suitable for specialist older persons housing taking account of: 1.local and strategic housing needs information and the indicative benchmarks set out in Table 4.4*'

Table 4.4 sets an annual benchmark of 210 units per annum for Bromley an increase of 5 on the figure currently within Annex 5 (Table A5.1).

Table 4.4 no longer sets out a tenure split but advises that where a split differing from the affordable housing policy is proposed this should be set out in DPD or supplementary planning guidance. However the Mayoral Housing SPG (2016) already acknowledges that most specialist housing for older Londoners is in the social rented sector whilst more than 60% of older people in London are home owners.

Para 4.15.5. advises that boroughs should 'plan proactively to meet the identified need for older persons but that the benchmarks are to inform local level assessments.

The supporting text (para 4.15.3) seeks to clarify the definitions of C2 and C3 to be applied in London. Advising that extra care accommodation providing 24 hr emergency support and range of domiciliary care packages are Use Class C3 and that residential nursing care accommodation which provides non-self contained residential accommodation is Use Class C2. However units of self contained nursing care still appear to fall between the two classes

Note – under draft London Plan Policy H3C each C2 care bed counts towards the housing target as a single home.

Comment

The Council notes that the benchmarks within Table 4.4 are not targets and this should be confirmed within the supporting text para 4.15.5.

The Council considers that the Policy should provide further clarify regarding the Use Class interpretation for self contained nursing care units

Policy H16 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation - NEW POLICY

Previously incorporated within London Plan Policy 3.8 Housing Choice i), traveller accommodation is now a stand-alone policy. The new policy introduces a new and different definition for Gypsies and Travellers than the Governments Planning definition, notably including those whose 'cultural preference not to live in bricks and mortar' makes their current accommodation unsuitable. The draft policy requires that Boroughs, such as Bromley, who have undertaken a needs assessment should update it, as part of the Development Plan review process to take account of the proposed London Plan definition.

Where Boroughs have not undertaken a needs assessment since 2008 they will be required to adopt targets set out in the GLA Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Topic Paper 2017.

Comment

The Council objects to the London specific definition of Gypsies and Travellers which will artificially increase the need within London compared to neighbouring authorities outside London. By addressing this higher need the effect will be to overprovide traveller pitches within London's boundaries relative to the surrounding area. Given the land intensive nature of traveller pitches relative to other forms of residential development this relative overprovision would be contrary to the sustainable use of land and detrimental to the requirements of the London Plan to deliver housing targets.

The Bromley Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2016) was prepared to support the draft Local Plan (currently at examination), in line with "Gypsy and Traveller

Accommodation Needs Assessments Guidance (2007)” and the Governments Planning definition of Gypsies and Travellers.

Subject to the findings of the Inspector sets targets for Bromley over the next 10 years which can be accommodated from within the proposed Local Plan allocations. The Council objects, as it did in 2009, to the proposed ‘fall back’ targets for Boroughs who have not undertaken an assessment are set within the GLA Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Topic Paper 2017. The targets based on the 2008 GTANA and are skewed by a formulaic approach to psychological aversion which does not reflect the need experienced through Council waiting lists. The ‘mid point approach’, which was considered, subsequently reduced and ultimately rejected altogether in the development of the London Plan 2010, produces artificially high targets.

Policy H17 Purpose-built student accommodation – NEW POLICY

The policy expands on current London Plan Policy 3.8 Housing Choice j) stating that boroughs should seek to ensure that local and strategic need for purpose-built student accommodation is addressed, subject to a number of criteria. Notably it requires units to be occupied by students and that accommodation is secured for occupation by members of one or more specified higher education institutions (clause A3). Proposals not meeting these criteria will be considered as large-scale purpose-built shared living and assessed against draft Policy H18.

Units of Purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) are an element of housing need and every three student bedrooms equals a single conventional housing unit for the purposes of housing targets.

Comment

The Council notes the policy and the housing target contribution and welcomes the required link to a specific institution

Policy H18 Large-scale purpose-built shared living – NEW POLICY

The policy advises that Large-scale purpose-built shared living Sui Generis use developments, where of good quality and design, may have a role in meeting housing need if, at the neighbourhood level, the development contributes to a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood. The policy requires a management plan, and that the development meet a numbers detailed criteria, notably:

- it meets an identified need and is well connected to local services and employment
- units are all for rent with minimum tenancy lengths of no less than three months it is under single management
- communal facilities and services are provided that are sufficient to meet the requirements of the intended number of residents and include 7 elements including
- communal facilities (kitchen, lounge, outdoor space, laundry /drying facilities)at least:
- a concierge & community management

- bedding and linen changing and/or room cleaning services.

The private units must provide adequate functional living space and layout but do not themselves contribute to affordable housing (not self contained and fail to meet minimum standards) however, a cash in lieu contribution towards conventional C3 affordable housing will be sought, either as an upfront cash in lieu payment to the local authority for the provision of new C3 off-site affordable housing or, as an in-perpetuity annual payment to the local authority.

Comment

The Council notes the policy. The supporting text should clarify the contribution of Large-scale purpose-built shared living to the housing target figures in line with the draft London Plan Policy H3C.

Chapter 5 Social Infrastructure

Policy S1 Developing London's Social Infrastructure

The policy includes requirements similar to current London Plan Policy 3.16 expanded with respect to

- An emphasis on area-based planning to deliver Social Infrastructure, including Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks, Area Action Plans, Development Infrastructure Funding Studies, Neighbourhood plans or masterplans. (clause B)
- The encouragement of the best use of public sector estate, including co-location (Clause D)

Comment

The Council proposes to review the Bromley Town Centre AAP which will address the social infrastructure to support the increase in residents and employees of the town centre. Similarly the Draft Local Plan Development Briefs may be produced in Renewal Areas (draft Policy 14)

The Council supports the co-location of services with draft Local Plan Policy 21c specifically encouraging 'hubs'.

Policy S2 Health and Social Care

The policy includes requirements similar to current London Plan Policy 3.17 expanded with respect to

- Greater emphasis on working with CCG's and other NHS / community groups to deliver
- The need to support 'new models of care'
- Opportunities for co-location / reconfiguration

Comment

*The Council engages with health stakeholders and Bromley Adult Social Care
The Council supports the co-location of services with draft Local Plan Policy 21c specifically encouraging 'hubs'.*

Policy S3 Education and Childcare Facilities

The policy moves away from the position of 'strong support for establishment new schools' the current London Plan Policy 3.18. The supporting text no longer acknowledges the extant August 2011 joint policy statement by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education and Policy 3.18 clause D is proposed to be deleted. 3.18D currently advises that 'free schools should only be refused where there are demonstrable negative local impacts which substantially outweigh the desirability of establishing a

new school which cannot be addressed through the appropriate use of planning conditions or obligations’.

The draft policy adds a series of requirements for site selection, notably, entrances away from busy roads, suitable accessible outdoor space.

Comment

The Council is concerned that the policy fails to acknowledge the difficulty of finding sites for schools, particularly in a legislative environment where the Local Authority is no longer the provider of schools. The Council notes the site requirements in section B of the policy, but considers that these site specific requirements are most appropriately assessed by the Local Council who ultimately retain the duty to ensure the provision of places.

Policy S4 Play and Informal Recreation

The policy expands on the requirements of the current London Plan Policy 3.6 ‘Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation Facilities’ by raising to policy a number of features from the Mayoral SPG ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods : Play and Informal Recreation’, notably the requirement for at least 10 square metres of play provision per child. The supporting text allows for the play needs of predominantly older children to be addressed through the enhancement existing provision (within 400m of the development) by appropriate financial contribution. Additionally the policy resists the net loss of play provision unless it can be demonstrated that there is no ongoing or future demand.

Comment

The Council supports the provision of appropriate amenity space for new residential development.

Note – Improved open space and leisure provision are listed as within the emerging scope of Bromley’s Regulation 123 list, and ‘Upgrading of park playground facilities’ set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (draft Local Plan Appendix 10.13)

Policy S5 Sports and Recreation Facilities

The policy includes requirements similar to current London Plan Policy 3.19 Sports Facilities and Policy 6.10 Walking (split between policy S5 and draft Policy T2 Healthy Streets in Chapter 10 Transport). The requirement to regularly assess the need for sports and recreational facilities is retained and the supporting text highlights recent Sport England data with regard to swimming pools, artificial grass pitches and sports halls. [Note : The Council’s ‘Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment’ 2017 is published and available on the Council’s website.] Clause C omits reference to the Green Belt and relevant chapter (only references the new Metropolitan Open Land policy) and reference to the 2009 Mayoral Sports Legacy Plan is also deleted.

Comment

There are numerous facilities in Bromley which are within the Green Belt. The Council is therefore concerned that the policy no longer cross references Green Belt policies.

Policy S6 Public Toilets – NEW POLICY

The policy requires large scale commercial developments that are open to the public to provide and secure the future management of free publically-accessible toilets during opening hours, or 24 hours a day in areas of public realm.

The policy also expects 'Changing Places' toilets (BS 8300 for people with profound / multiple impairments) in larger developments where users are expected to spend a long time or where there is no other local provision.

Comment

The Council welcomes the approach to accessible toilets. This reflects Bromley's Community toilet scheme, which is a joint venture with local businesses.

Policy S7 Burial Space

The policy replaces Policy 7.23 Burial Spaces. It supports proposals for new cemetery provision and it takes a clearer position with regard to protecting cemeteries and re-using burial spaces. The policy continues to require that boroughs ensure provision is made for burial needs of the different communities but the previous emphasis on proximity to communities has been replaced by the encouragement of cross borough / sub regional working to address sub-regional shortages.

Comment

The Council supports the protection of cemeteries and the reuse of burial space but has concerns regarding the implications of a sub-regional approach and the pressure that might place on Bromley's open spaces, particularly with regard to built development (chapels and crematoria)

Chapter 6 – Economy

Office uses

Policy E1 Offices

Policy E1 Offices combines and updates current London Plan Policies 4.2 Offices and 4.3 Mixed Use Development and Offices.

The new policy retains a number of priorities for office development, including retention and expansion of office floorspace in town centres and other sustainable locations (including, where appropriate, through mixed use developments) and diversification of the offer to accommodate a wider range of businesses. This range now includes “micro enterprises”, in addition to small, medium and larger business.

Bromley Town Centre retains its existing town centre status of Metropolitan Centre and office guideline of B (found in Annex One Town Centre Network). However, the new policy also solely assigns Croydon Town Centre the status of “strategic outer London office location”. The current London Plan advises boroughs to monitor the impacts of changes to Permitted Development Rights for conversion of offices to residential use. Under the new London Plan, there is now strategic level support to implement Article 4 Directions removing these Permitted Development Rights in viable locations with clear geographic boundaries. There is also greater support for affordable workspace in an office context.

Comments

The policy framework as it relates to office provision in Bromley remains largely unchanged in new London Plan, although it is noted that there is now greater emphasis on the role of Croydon Town Centre, a competitor with Bromley Town Centre in the South London office market. Strategic level support for boroughs to implement new Article 4 Directions where viable is supported in principle, allowing the Council greater management over the development outcomes of proposals on office sites.

Low-cost workspace

Policy E2 Low-cost business space

This is a new policy including requirements for proposals which would result in the loss of Class B1 space in an area identified as having a shortage of “lower cost space”. The new policy also encourages proposals for “large scale” B1 uses to consider scope for providing smaller units for small and medium-sized enterprises. It defines “large scale” uses as containing floorspace greater than 2,500 sqm Gross External Area (GEA).

Policy E3 Affordable workspace

Policy E3 is a new policy that expands upon provisions covered in a limited capacity under current London Plan Policy 4.9 Small Shops.

It contains explicit support for the use of planning obligations to provide “affordable workspace” at sub-market rates, for a specific social, cultural or economic development purpose. The current London Plan Policy 4.9 includes a similar provision but only to provide or support affordable retail units.

Comments

The increased focus in the new London Plan on supporting low-cost workspace for small and medium-sized enterprises through various planning mechanisms is noted.

Industrial and related uses

Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function

Policy E4 updates current London Plan Policy 4.4 Managing Industrial Land and Premises.

Under Policy E4, the borough-level groupings for release of industrial land (now referred to as categorisations) have been reimagined, demonstrating a shift away from release/protect groupings under the current London Plan, to a broader release-retain-provide spectrum. This reflects an improved outlook for the industrial land market identified in the new London Plan's evidence base, as well as a rate of release for non-industrial uses above what was projected at the commencement of the current London Plan. Bromley is placed in the “Retain capacity” category, which is roughly equivalent to the “Restricted” grouping currently assigned, and should seek to intensify industrial floorspace capacity and follow a principle of no net loss across designated industrial areas. This is no longer the strongest category for protection of industrial land; six boroughs have been placed in a “Provide capacity” category, which calls for intensified capacity in existing and/or new locations.

The new policy omits the industrial land release benchmarks outlined in the current London Plan (and specified in the Mayor's Land for Industry and Transport SPG), focusing instead on a general principle of no net loss of floorspace across designated Strategic Industrial Locations and Locally Significant Industrial Sites in London.

There is an acknowledgement of recent changes to Permitted Development Rights for conversion of light industrial and warehouse units to residential use and strategic level support to implement Article 4 Directions where viable. Similar to Policy E2, there is also a new provision encouraging proposals for “large scale” industrial uses to consider scope for providing smaller units catering to small and medium-sized enterprises. It defines “large scale” uses as containing floorspace greater than 2,500 sqm Gross Internal Area (GIA).

The new policy also elaborates upon the wording of the current London Plan through the following changes:

- Emphasis on “intensification, co-location and substitution” concepts which were discussed to a lesser extent in the Land for Industry and Transport SPG. These concepts are covered in greater detail in their own policy (Policy E7).
- Policy direction for industrial areas to make provision for waste management is expanded to now include “secondary materials”
- Whereas Policy 4.4 makes allowance for “hybrid” space including industrial and office space, the new policy interprets “hybrid” space as mixes of industrial and related uses only.

Comments

The new borough wide categorisation is consistent with Draft Local Plan policy, which seeks to retain and intensify floorspace in SIL and LSIS. Strategic level support for boroughs to implement new Article 4 Directions where viable is supported in principle, allowing the Council greater management over the development outcomes of proposals on industrial and warehouse sites.

It is noted that the new policy contains a similar provision to Policy E2, with regard to large scale business unit proposals. However, this provision measures these units as greater than 2,500 sqm GIA, whereas the similar provision in Policy E2 measures a large-scale unit as greater than 2,500 sqm GEA. The Council should seek clarification from the Greater London Authority as to whether a consistent measurement should be used in both policies.

Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations

Policy E5 updates current London Plan Policy 2.17 Strategic Industrial Locations.

The new policy carries over a requirement for Local Plans to define a SIL boundary and include local policies, but now makes reference to the new policy direction for “intensification, co-location and substitution”. As in the current London Plan, Foots Cray and St Mary Cray are recognised as SILs wholly or partly located in the Borough.

Comments

The new policy now includes more detailed mapping for these SILs, which includes designated land at the Foots Cray-Ruxley Corner and St Mary Cray ends of the Cray Business Corridor, but excludes land at Crayfields designated under the Draft Local Plan. The Council’s proposal to define the Cray Business Corridor SIL (with Foots Cray-Ruxley Corner and St Mary Cray as bookends of a larger employment area) is not inconsistent with current or proposed London Plan policies for boroughs to define their own SIL boundary through a Local Plan.

Policy E6 Locally Significant Industrial Sites

Policy E6 is a new policy which elevates guidance for defining and preparing local policies for LSIS contained in the Land for Industry and Transport SPG but not the current London Plan.

Intensification, co-location and substitution of industrial and related uses

Policy E7 Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function

Policy E7 is a new policy outlining a key direction for facilitating changes in industrial land stock to meet forecast need.

The concepts of intensifying, co-locating and substituting industrial or related land uses are outlined to a lesser extent in the Land for Industry and Transport SPG (under SPG 3 and 11), but the planning processes and desired development outcomes are elaborated upon in the new London Plan. There are new criteria for considering potential for mixed use industrial and residential (or other non-individual uses) as part of a Local Plan-led process in designated areas or for individual proposals on non-designated sites. The SPG outlines similar guidance but the new policy provides clarifications on how uses could successfully co-locate. The new policy also elaborates on the process for considering, with neighbouring authorities, the scope for substitution of uses where it results in mutual advantage. This could only occur through a Local Plan-led process and not through ad hoc planning applications.

Comments

The Draft Local Plan has been prepared in response to the current London Plan and the SPG, including designation of employment areas and identification of appropriate mixes of uses in these areas. This new policy elevates and elaborates upon concepts already outlined in the SPG and is broadly consistent with the Draft Local Plan.

Sector growth opportunities and clusters

Policy E8 Sector growth opportunities and clusters

Policy E8 updates current London Plan Policy 4.10 New and Emerging Economic Sectors is carried over into this new policy. Additionally, provisions relating to Strategic Outer London Development Centres (SOLDCs), currently included in London Plan Policy 2.16 Strategic Outer London Development Centres, are now incorporated entirely into this new policy.

Provisions relating to SOLDCs are largely carried over from the current London Plan, although a new paragraph is included to ensure that development complements the growth of town centres and other business locations and supports environmental and transport objectives of the plan. This elevates guidance previously included only in the Mayor's Town Centres SPG.

Comments

It is noted that Biggin Hill is retained as the only recognised SOLDC under the new London Plan. The Council supports the continued recognition of Biggin Hill SOLDC, the retention of provisions from the current London Plan relating to SOLDCs and the

elevation of guidance only outlined in the Town Centres SPG. The new policy is broadly consistent with the Council's balanced approach to planning for Biggin Hill SOLDC contained in the Draft Local Plan.

The Council seeks clarification on the status of the Crystal Palace SOLD as identified in the current London Plan, which has been omitted from the new London Plan.

Retail uses

Policy E9 Retail, markets and hot food takeaways

Policy E9 combines and updates current London Plan Policies 4.7 Retail and Town Centre Development, 4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector and related facilities and services and 4.9 Small Shops.

The new policy generally carries over provisions from Policies 4.7 and 4.8 relating to retail development and clusters. It also introduces new detailed buffer requirements relating to hot food takeaways and their proximity to schools. It imposes an exclusionary buffer of 400m between new hot food takeaways and existing or proposed schools, but allows boroughs to set a locally-determined boundary if sufficiently justified. It also encourages boroughs to manage over-concentrations of hot food takeaways in town centres. The policy also carries over provisions in current London Plan Policy 4.9 for large-scale commercial proposals to support the provision of small retail and other commercial units.

Comments

This policy mostly carries over provisions from the current London Plan and is broadly consistent with the Draft Local Plan. One exception is the imposition of an exclusionary buffer between new hot food takeaways and existing and proposed schools, which adds a level of restriction above and beyond Draft Local Plan Policy 98.

Visitor Infrastructure

Policy E10 Visitor Infrastructure

Policy E10 updates current London Plan Policy 4.5 London's visitor infrastructure.

The current London Plan Policy 4.5 includes an aspiration to achieve 40,000 additional hotel bedrooms across London by 2036. This aspiration has been omitted from the new London Plan policy. The new policy also contains a series of detailed requirements for considering the adequacy of design of serviced accommodation for visitors with disabilities. This differs from the current Policy 4.5 which contained a general requirement for visitor accommodation to ensure a certain percentage of bedrooms are wheelchair accessible.

Comment

The policy is noted. Further clarification should be provided to differentiate between Visitor Infrastructure and 'Purpose Built Shared Living' (Draft London Plan Policy H18)

Skills and opportunities

Policy E11 Skills and opportunities for all

Policy E11 updates current London Plan 4.12 Improving opportunities for all.

The new policy acknowledges the use of planning obligations as an option for boroughs to secure skills development opportunities in both construction and end-use phases of a proposal and elaborates on what outcomes should be achieved through this. The current London Plan policy relates specifically to “strategic development proposals”, whilst the supporting text encourages boroughs and developers to investigate local employment opportunities through individual developments. However, it does not explicitly encourage investigating the use of planning obligations for the purpose of improving skills development and training.

Comments

The increased focus in the new London Plan on supporting local employment and skills development through various planning mechanisms is noted.

Chapter 7 Heritage and Culture

Policy HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth

This new policy integrates some of the objectives identified in the adopted 2016 London Plan policies 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archeology and 7.9 Heritage Led Regeneration. It goes a step further by stressing the importance of the historic environment to the regeneration of London, and of incorporating heritage assets to the planning and design processes from the outset, explicitly building on and referencing the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) around heritage and design.

- The policy includes the requirement to not only identify heritage assets as per the 2016 London Plan policy 7.8 but for Local Authorities to develop evidence in their local plans demonstrating a clear understanding of the historic environment including sites and areas and their relationship to their surroundings to inform planning decisions, improve access to the historic environment and inform the integration of London's heritage in regenerative change. This includes the requirement in line with the NPPF to set out a clear vision for the role of the heritage in place making, including through bringing heritage at risk assets back into use.
- The policy references the requirement to mitigate harm to heritage assets areas of archeological significance and landscapes in line with the tests in the NPPF.
- Following the continued requirement for development proposals to conserve the significance of heritage assets, Clause C adds the requirement to manage the cumulative impact of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings.

Comment

The introduction of this new policy which builds more explicitly on the aims and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework around heritage and design than existing policies 7.8 and 7.9 of the adopted 2016 London Plan, is welcomed.

Policy HC2 World Heritage Sites

This policy is a continuation of the London Plan policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites and carries forward its key principles with reference being added to development proposals being supported through the appropriate heritage assessment. Bromley's Darwin's Landscape Laboratory is no longer referenced in the policy although it remains on the UNESCO's tentative list of World Heritage Sites.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views

This policy was covered by the 2016 London Plan policy 7.11 and elements of 7.4 Local Character in the 2016 London Plan. Strategic Views include significant buildings or urban landscapes identified by the Mayor that help to define London at a strategic level and are managed through the London View Management Framework. The London Borough of Bromley does not include any of the strategic views identified by the Mayor and clauses A to F of policy HC3 are therefore not relevant to Bromley in that respect.

Clause G of this policy however introduces the requirement for Borough to identify important local views in their Local Plans and Strategies in partnership with other relevant boroughs whenever these cross boundaries. Boroughs are advised to use the principles of policy HC4 *London View Management Framework* for the designation and management of Local Views.

Comment

The introduction of clause G of the policy is welcomed as it provides clarification regarding the principles which should be used to designate and manage local views and supports the approach taken by the Council in its Draft Local Plan Skyline Policy 48 which makes references to these principles for the management of local views vistas gaps and skyline having regards to the impact of development in the foreground, middle ground and background of these views.

Some of Bromley's Views of Local Importance reach out to include parts of Lewisham and Bexley Councils. Similarly, a local view starting in Croydon from Addington Hill goes through a wide stretch of the London Borough of Bromley. The Council will continue to work with these Boroughs with regards to the continued management and identifications of local views across boundaries where appropriate.

Policy HC4 London View Management Framework

This policy's equivalent is policy 7.12 Implementing the Views Management Framework in the 2016 London Plan. The LVMF includes the views and panoramas which reach out from viewing place in Central London towards buildings and urban landscapes significant to London at a strategic level and identified in policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views. Bromley does not include any of these views which are strategic to London as a whole. Policy HC4 however includes the principles for the management of views which clause G of policy HC3 advises Local Authorities to have regards to manage development within local views.

Comment

Policy noted although Bromley does not include any of the views within the London Views Management Framework.

Policy HC5 Supporting London's Culture and Creative Industries

The policy reflects London Plan policy 4.6 *Support for and Enhancement of Arts Culture Sport and Entertainment* supporting the continued growth and evolution of London's diverse cultural facilities and creative however is more explicitly focused on the promotion of cultural venues and of the creative industries in creative enterprise zones and clusters.

The measures which can be taken by Local Plans to support that growth and evolution, are expanded with additional reference made to:

- Supporting the development of new cultural venues in places with good public transport connectivity, in addition to town centers,
- Identifying protecting and enhancing strategic clusters of cultural attractions,
- Considering the use of vacant properties and land for creative/cultural pop-ups or meanwhile uses in various locations,
- Ensuring that Opportunity Areas and large-scale mixed-use developments include new cultural venues and/or facilities and spaces for outdoor cultural events,

The policy in Clause B encourages Local Authorities to identify Creative Enterprise Zones (rather than designating cultural quarters as in the adopted 2016 London Plan) in their Local Plans to strengthen existing or enhance emerging clusters in area of deprivation.

Clause C introduces policy principles for the management of Creative Enterprise Zones where they are identified in Local Plans to provide innovative and flexible workspace, the right type of infrastructure and mix of uses and support the wider objectives of the business location.

Comment

The introduction of this policy which provides more specific guidance in relation to the promotion and management of cultural venues, clusters and enterprise zones is noted.

Policy HC6 Supporting the Night-Time Economy

The policy expands on 2016 London Plan policy 4.6 *Support for and Enhancement of Arts Culture Sport and Entertainment* with added emphasis on Local Authorities being proactive in developing and promoting the night time economy in town centres and areas of high transport connectivity.

- Bromley Town Centre continues to be identified as an Area of National and International Significance and Beckenham Town Centre as an area of more than local significance for the night time economy in London.
- Clause A introduces the requirement for Boroughs to develop a vision for the night time economy and support growth and diversification in areas of strategic night time activity building on the Mayors vision for a 24 hour city. The supporting text recognises that 24 hour activities are not recognised everywhere in London and that this should be balanced against the needs of

local residents and that appropriate management strategies/mitigation measures should be considered to reduce any negative impacts.

- Clause B requires Local Plans, Town Centre Strategies and Planning Decisions to promote the night time economy in town centres and areas well served by public transport at night. Measures which can be taken to ensure a successful and balanced nightlife economy are listed, including improving access and safety across all users, diversifying the range, opening hours and sources of night time activities, and addressing the cumulative impact and concentration of licenced premises.
- Clause C promotes the integrated management of all aspects of the night time economy.
- The supporting text encourages Boroughs, particularly in Outer London, to work with TFL to identify areas of significance for the night time economy particularly in town centres well connected to the Areas of Regeneration identified by the Mayor. They should work with businesses, landowners and investors to address barriers to access to the night time economy.

Comment

The Council notes the thrust of this new policy on supporting the night time economy and welcomes the recognition in the policy that 24 hour activities are not suitable everywhere in London and should be balanced against the needs of local residents.

The Council notes that the Crystal Palace District Centre previously identified as a an area of more than local significance for the night-life economy in Map 4.3 of the adopted 2016 London Plan is no longer featured in the London Plan 2018 for consultation.

NEW POLICY: Policy HC7 Protecting Public Houses

This new policy responds to the report produced by the GLA in April 2017 London's public houses, GLA Economics, April 2017 which points out the decline in the number and range of uses of Pubs in London as well as their cultural, economic and social importance by introducing a range of new measures for their protection and enhancement:.

- New requirement in Clause A for Boroughs to protect public houses where they have particular significance to local communities and contribute to wider policy objectives related to town centers/ the night time economy& enterprise zones, and to support proposals for new pubs where they stimulate these areas, particularly as part of mixed use development.
- Clause B sets out that loss of pubs should be refused unless authoritative marketing evidence demonstrates long term redundancy with supporting text setting out the stringent evidence required including demonstrating that the pub has been marketed for 24 months in a functional condition both locally and London wide.

- Clause C seeks to resist redevelopment of facilities associated to pub use or of space within its curtilage (for example to residential) where it could compromise its operation or viability.

In the supporting text:

- Requirement for Boroughs to take a positive approach to designating pubs as Assets of community value and to consider the individual character/functions/activities and potential for flexible working of pubs in developing strategies and policies: criteria for assessing the significance of pubs are included.
- When considering proposals for new pubs Boroughs are required to take account of potential negative and cumulative impacts.

Comment

Bromley is concerned that the policy requires a longer marketing period than Bromley's draft Policy 23 Public Houses and the impact this longer period may have in respect of vacancies, the character of the locality and on the vitality and viability of town centers.

Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment

Policy G1: Green infrastructure

The policy generally reflects the 2016 London Plan Policy 2.18 Green Infrastructure: The Multi-functional Network of Green and Open Spaces, and the term is used other in numerous places in the plan within both policies and supporting text.

- This sets the broad strategic approach to ‘green aspects’ of development in London and the network of open and green spaces it contains;
- It requires Boroughs to prepare green infrastructure; and
- to identify green infrastructure assets
-

The overall tenor of the policy is not at variance with that of the current London Plan, although it is more specific in regard to the need to produce strategies.

Comment

Whilst The Council supports the principle of this policy which protects open green space, it is concerned that it does not address the particular contribution of private gardens to the aim of making London 50% green.

Policy G2: London’s Green Belt

The policy reflects Policy 7.16 in the current London Plan, stating that:

- The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development
- Development proposals that would harm the Green Belt should be refused
- The enhancement of the Green Belt to provide appropriate multi-functional uses for Londoners should be supported.
- The extension of the Green Belt will be supported, where appropriate. Its de-designation will not.

Comment

The Council supports this policy which continues the GLAs approach of protecting London’s Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF.

Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land

This policy broadly reflects Policy 7.17 of the current Local Plan, extending the principles of national Green Belt policy to MOL and making reference to exceptional

circumstances having to apply in order to change the boundaries. The policy states that:

- Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) should be protected from inappropriate development;
- The extension of MOL designations should be supported where appropriate;
- Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken through the Local Plan process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining boroughs; and
- That Boroughs should designate MOL by establishing that the land meets at least one of a set of criteria.

However the supporting text states in paragraph 8.3.2 that 'The principle of land swaps could be applied to MOL where the resulting MOL meets at least one of the criteria set out in the policy' (the criteria for defining land as MOL).

Comment

The Council supports the continued protection of Metropolitan Open Land, however has concerns regarding the operation of the land swap arrangements where proposed through planning applications for the development, given the requirement in Policy G3 C that any alterations to the MOL boundary should be undertaken through the Local Plan process.

Policy G4: Local Green and Open Space

This policy is broadly a continuation of Policy 7.12 Protecting Open Space and Addressing Deficiency of the 2016 Draft Local Plan with some significant variations:

- The policy continues to support the creation of new areas of publicly accessible open space in areas of Open Space Deficiency although there is no longer a requirement for this provision to be of a "local" open space category as in the 2016 London Plan (as in the context of Bromley, this would have been Urban Open Space or smaller urban open spaces).
- Loss of open space is no longer resisted where there is no demonstrated deficiency in the category of open space being considered for development, with re-provision only being required where need is being demonstrated through the local needs assessment. Loss of open space continues to be resisted in areas where there is a demonstrated deficiency in the relevant category of open space.
- There is no continued reference to the London Parks and Green Spaces Forum to facilitate the cross borough planning and management of green and open spaces in the policy.

Comment

The Council supports the principle of G4 and clause A and welcomes the protection of non-strategic open space, which would include Urban Open Space, open spaces and private gardens. However this appears to conflict with other policies in the draft London Plan that no longer presume to protect private residential gardens which make a valuable contribution to London's open spaces.

There is concern around the wording of the consultation London Plan policy in Clause D which opens up the possibility of designated Open Space to be built upon in areas where there is no deficiency in spaces in that category.

The title of the Policy may be ambiguous as it may seem to be making reference to the Local Green Space designation as introduced in the National planning Policy Framework and included in Bromley's Draft Local Plan which clearly is not the intention of this policy.

Policy G5 - Urban Greening

Urban Greening Policy 5.10 in the 2016 London Plan which together with other policies of Chapters 5 and 7 helped deliver aspects of urban greening as set out in this policy.

- Clause A of the policy introduces the requirement for all Major Development Proposals to contribute to the greening of London as fundamental to site and building design through high quality landscaping.
- Part B of the policy introduces the requirement for Boroughs to develop their own 'Urban Greening Factor' based on the current GLA model provided in Table 8.2 for assessing the type and amount of greening required to offset the impact of development, tailored to local circumstances. The greening factor may be applied to small developments as well and it is recognised that residential development will require a higher standard related to its impact than commercial development. The range of greening measures referred in the supporting text has been increased to include rain gardens and nature based SUDs to tackle environmental challenges and provide amenity space.

Comment

The introduction of this policy is cautiously welcomed. However, urban greening should not be relied on to offset the loss of open space, including private gardens. The Policy introduces a requirement for Local Authorities to apply the generic Mayoral Urban Greening Factor to major applications. The Council welcomes the opportunity to consider developing its own local urban greening factor which may be applied to applications below the threshold, responding to local circumstances.

Policy G6- Biodiversity and Access to Nature

The 2016 London Plan included Policy 7.19 of the same name. The policy includes minor variations and increases the focus on development providing biodiversity gains and addressing deficiencies in areas of access to wildlife.

- Reference is added in Clause B to using the relevant procedures not only to identify SINCs but green corridors as well.
- Added emphasis is being placed on enabling developments create or improve biodiversity value through creating habitats of value in an urban context (Clause B), positively considering developments which provide habitats which result in positive gains for biodiversity and reduce areas of deficiency to wildlife (Clause E), with any biodiversity enhancements to be considered from the start of the design process (Clause D).
- Reference is no longer made to including policies and proposals in the Local Plan for “protected species” defined through national and European legislation but to “*priority species and habitats*” identified at the local level only. Reference is no longer made to London Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets for increasing species populations or as a tool to assist with planning decisions however the supporting text clarifies that the Mayor will be producing a London Environment Strategy to which the Biodiversity Strategy will be appended. This will identify procedures for the identification of SINCs as well as priority habitats.

Comment

The Council supports the policy and welcomes the Mayor’s intention to produce a London Environment Strategy identifying procedures to identify SINCs, Green Corridors and Priority Habitats.

It would be useful for the policy to make reference to the desirability for Local Plans to have policies for the protection of the protected species identified in national and European legislation in order to be comprehensive.

Policy G7 Trees and woodlands

This is a continuation of the 2016 London Plan Policy: 7.21 of the same name with added emphasis on tree planting. Clause A of the policy adds the requirement for “*new trees and woodlands*” to be planted,” in *appropriate locations to increase the extent of London’s Urban Forest*” whilst clause B introduces the requirement for Local Authorities in their Development Plans to “*identify opportunities for tree planting in strategic locations.*” The supporting text makes reference to the Mayor’s new target of increasing London’s tree cover by 10% by 2015.

Comment

The Council welcomes the policy and the continued protection of trees and woodlands.

Policy G8 Food Growing

The equivalent policy in the 2016 London Plan was 7.22 Land for Food. The policy relates to the development plans. The focus of the policy, apart for a renewed commitment to protecting allotments, has shifted from supporting food growing in the Greenbelt and creating new spaces through the Capital Growth scheme to identifying food growing opportunities on specific sites through innovative mechanisms, including on development and school sites:

- Clause A of the policy requires Local Authorities to “*encourage provision of space for community gardening, including for food growing, within new developments*”.
- There no longer is a specific requirement to encourage and support farming and land based sectors in the Greenbelt specifically as in the former London Plan policy 7.22. In the supporting text para.8.8.2 it is recognised that as small scale food growing becomes harder to deliver innovative solutions should be considered, such as green roofs and walls, re-utilising existing under-used spaces and incorporating spaces for food growing in new schools.

Comment

The general thrust of the policy is welcomed reflecting Bromley’s approach in its emerging Local Plan, notably draft policy 24 on allotments and leisure gardens and the supporting text to draft Policy 123 ‘Sustainable Design & Construction which references food growing (proposed minor modification).

Policy G9: Geodiversity

The policy is virtually unchanged from Policy 7.20 London Plan 2016.

This policy expresses the GLAs continued approach of protecting London’s Geologically important sites, whilst unlike the current London Plan, no reference is made to their guidance ‘London’s Foundations (2012)’, the policy itself is virtually unchanged. The Draft Local Plan covers the points and the same sites identified on the accompanying map (Figure 8.1 - Geodiversity sites) are shown on the Draft Local Plan maps.

Comment

The policy and the 6 recommended RIGS and 2 potential RIGS within Bromley (as previously identified in the London Plan 2016 are noted.

Chapter 9 – Sustainable Infrastructure

Air quality

Policy SI1 – Improving Air Quality

Updates existing Policy 7.14 – Improving Air Quality

Reflecting the Mayor’s priority, the new London Plan strategy for improving air quality is more challenging than in the current plan. Where the current London Plan Policy 7.14 references Air Quality Management Areas (a national requirement), the new London Plan Policy SI1 focuses on “Air Quality Focus Areas” – locations which not only exceed the EU annual mean limit value for nitrogen dioxide, but are also locations with high human exposure. Figure 9.1 shows two Air Quality Focus Areas in Bromley borough – one in Bromley Town Centre and one at Elmers End. Whilst all other development should be at least “Air Quality Neutral”, development in Opportunity Areas, and those subject to an EIA, should propose methods to achieve “Air Quality Positive”.

Comment

Bromley has a designated Air Quality Management Area and monitors air pollution in accordance with regulatory requirements. Whilst there may be opportunities in Bromley Town Centre, with its planned development sites, to make improvements to air quality, development around Elmers End would appear to be limited at this point.

Climate change and energy

Policy SI2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions

Combines elements of existing Policies 5.2 – Carbon reduction, 5.6 – Decentralised energy in development proposals and 5.7 – Renewable energy

Currently Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires all major residential developments to be “zero carbon” and non-residential developments to reduce emissions by 35% above Building Regulation standards, in accordance with the energy hierarchy. The Draft London Plan policy newly proposes a minimum reduction contribution from energy efficiency measures (10% for residential, 15% for non-residential), and extends the “zero carbon” target to all development, not just residential.

Comment

A minimum contribution from energy efficiency is cautiously supported although flexibility is still needed where unusual development constraints and costs occur. The step up to “zero carbon” for non-residential proposals may cause viability concerns and it should be clear that this should not compromise the delivery of development.

Policy SI3 – Energy Infrastructure

Combines elements of existing Policies 5.4A – Electricity and gas supply, 5.5 – Decentralised energy network and 5.6 - Decentralised energy

In Opportunity Areas, town centres and other growth areas, boroughs and developers should engage at an early stage with energy companies to establish future energy requirements and infrastructure needs. Energy masterplans should be developed for large scale development schemes.

In Heat Network Priority Areas (areas of Bromley are identified in Figure 9.3) major development proposals should have a communal heating system. Development should be designed to connect to an existing network or designed for connection at a later date.

Para 9.3.11 mentions that land will be required for energy supply infrastructure, including energy centres.

Comment

The Area Action Plan for Bromley Town Centre already includes a policy on energy networks. The first energy centre is to be included in the Site K (former Westmoreland Road car park) development at Bromley South. It is not clear how the “land for energy centres” in the supporting text will be identified and whether this to be within developments or additional land.

Policy SI4 – Managing heat risk

Very similar to existing Policy 5.9 – Overheating and cooling

Development proposals should minimise internal heat gain, major development proposals should demonstrate how they will reduce the potential for overheating on accordance with the cooling hierarchy.

Comment

The policy is broadly supported however it should be noted that this policy would not be able to be applied to residential conversions allowed by Prior Approval. Office conversions – often with large windows – are of particular concern.

Policy SI5 – Water Infrastructure

Combines existing Policies 5.14 – Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure and 5.15 – Water Use and Supplies

Water supplies should be protected and conserved in a sustainable manner. Development proposals should minimise the use of mains water in line with the Optional Requirement of the Building Regulations, achieving mains water consumption of 105 litres or less per head per day. This continues the benchmark from the existing London Plan policy. Development Plans should promote the

protection and improvement of the water environment in line with the Thames River Basin Management Plan. Development proposals should seek to improve the water environment and ensure that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is provided.

Comment

The water use standard is already applied and the Draft Local Plan, in response to Thames Water advice, contains a new policy on managing wastewater.

Policy SI6 – Digital connectivity infrastructure

Updates existing Policy 4.11

Development proposals should achieve greater digital connectivity than set out in Part R1 of the Building Regulations (at least 30mbps), ensure sufficient ducting space, meet requirements for mobile connectivity without reducing that in the surrounding areas and support the effective use of the public realm to accommodate well-designed and located mobile infrastructure.

Comment

The policy is broadly supported.

Waste management

Policy SI7 - Reducing Waste and supporting the circular economy

Updates existing Policy 5.16 – Waste self-sufficiency, introducing the concept of the Circular Economy – where materials are retained in use at their highest value for as long as possible then re-used or recycled, leaving a minimum of residual waste.

Waste reduction, increases in material re-use and recycling and reductions in waste going for disposal will be achieved by promoting a more circular economy, encouraging waste minimisation, ensuring zero biodegradable or recyclable waste goes to landfill by 2026 and meeting or exceeding the recycling targets:

- Municipal waste – 65% recycling /composting by 2030 (this is currently 60% by 2031)
- Construction, demolition and excavation waste – 95% recycling by 2020

Referable applications should promote circular economy outcomes and aim to be net zero waste. A “circular economy” statement should be submitted.

Policy SI8 – Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency

Updates existing Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency. The policy is broadly the same but the forecasts and apportionment targets have been updated.

In order to manage London's waste sustainably

- The equivalent of 100% of London's waste should be managed in London by 2026
- Existing sites should be safeguarded
- Capacity of existing sites should be optimised
- New sites should be provided where required

Development Plans should

- identify how waste will be reduced
- allocate sufficient land to manage apportionment tonnages (boroughs can collaborate to achieve this)
- identify the following as suitable locations
 - existing facilities
 - SILs and LSIS

Criteria for evaluating proposals for new sites, or expansions, are provided.

<u>Consultation draft apportionment targets for Bromley</u>	<u>Current London Plan targets</u>
2021 – 192,000 tonnes	2021 – 199,000 tonnes
2041 – 204,000 tonnes	2036 – 247,000 tonnes

Comment

The Council notes the changes to the apportionment targets for the Borough and supports the continued strategy to allow boroughs to collaborate in meeting their apportionment requirements.

Policy SI9 – Safeguarded waste sites

This is currently a clause within Policy 5.17 - Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency

- Existing waste sites should be safeguarded and retained in waste management use
- Waste facilities located in areas identified for non-waste related development should be integrated with other uses as a first principle
- Waste plans should be adopted before considering the loss of waste sites. The proposed loss of an existing waste site will only be supported where appropriate compensatory capacity is made within London

Comment

There is some concern about the blanket retention of all existing permitted sites without caveat, particularly small privately managed sites and those in the Green Belt which include inappropriate but established uses. Should a site cease operation, re-providing that capacity in a more suitable location may not be possible within the Borough boundary and it is unclear how “appropriate compensatory capacity” could realistically be achieved.

Minerals

Policy SI10 – Aggregates

The policy is very similar to existing Policy 5.20 – Aggregates

Relevant boroughs (not including Bromley) are apportioned a land bank figure of aggregates for the life of the Plan. Boroughs should identify and safeguard aggregate resources including recycling facilities and consider extraction opportunities. Policies should ensure that appropriate use is made of planning conditions for aftercare.

Comment

The policy is broadly supported.

Policy SI11 – Hydraulic Fracturing – NEW POLICY

Development proposals for fracking should be refused

Comment

The policy is supported.

Flood risk and drainage

Policy SI12 – Flood Risk Management

Similar to existing Policy 5.12 – Flood Risk Management

Boroughs should manage flood risk in a sustainable and cost effective way in collaboration with the Environment Agency, developers, infrastructure providers and each other. Development Plans should be informed by Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and development proposals by site specific assessments as appropriate. Boroughs should identify flood risk issues and ensure development proposals minimise flood risk and mitigate potential problems.

Policy SI13 – Sustainable drainage

Similar to existing Policy 5.13 - Sustainable Drainage, with the addition of proposals to restrict impermeable paving.

Boroughs should identify areas where there are particular surface water flooding issues. Development proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and use the drainage hierarchy. Proposals for impermeable paving should be refused where appropriate, including on small surfaces such as front gardens and driveways.

Comment

The policies are broadly supported. The borough's Strategic Flood Risk assessment supports the Draft Local Plan policy in reducing problems of surface water flooding by requiring development in contributing areas to reduce its impact. It is unclear how useful the encouragement to refuse small impermeable areas would be given permitted development rights, but it is agreed that the cumulative effect of paving small areas is a concern that should be addressed and this could complement the Council's own policy.

Waterways

Policy SI14 - Waterways – strategic role

Contains elements of existing Policy 7.24 – Blue Ribbon Network and 7.29 -

Relevant Development Plans should designate Thames Policy Areas.

Policy SI15 – Water transport

Combines existing Policies 7.25 – Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon network for passengers and tourism, and 7.26 – Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon network for freight transport

Development proposals should protect and enhance passenger transport piers. The viability of safeguarded wharves will be kept under review. Proposals should not conflict with freight handling capacity.

Policy SI16 – Waterways – use and enjoyment

Similar to existing Policy 7.27 – Blue Ribbon network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use

Development Plans should protect and enhance waterway infrastructure to enable water-dependent uses and protect and enhance existing access to, and alongside, waterways.

Policy SI17 – Protecting London's waterways

Similar to existing Policy 7.28 – Restoration of the Blue Ribbon network

Development proposals to facilitate river restoration, including opportunities to open culverts, naturalise river channels, protect the foreshore and increase the heritage and habitats value should be supported.

Development proposals should support and improve the protection of the distinct open character and heritage of waterways

Comment

The policies are broadly supported. The Council have committed, in the Draft Local Plan, to take opportunities for improving the river channels in the borough, particularly the River Cray, through any development that may occur.

Chapter 10 - Transport

Strategic Approach to Transport

Policy T1 - Strategic Approach to Transport

(and Table 10.1 Indicative Transport Schemes)

Similar to existing Policy 6.1 and Table 6.1

Policy T1 provides an overarching approach to ensure the delivery of the Mayor's strategic transport priorities. There is a particular focus on better integration of land use and transport, to ensure the provision of a robust and resilient transport network which is essential in maximising growth.

Significantly, the proposed DLR Extension to Bromley has been removed in Table 10.1.

The Policy also requires development plans and proposals to support:

- A shift from car use provides the only long-term solution to road congestion challenges, and 80% of all trips should be made by foot, cycling, or public transport by 2041.
- All the proposed transport schemes set out in Table 10.1.
- All development should make the most effective use of land to ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated.
- Rebalancing the transport system towards walking, cycling and public transport, including ensuring high quality interchanges, will require sustained investment.

Comments

The Council is concerned that reference to the Mayor's ambition for enhanced rail access to Bromley via an Extension of the DLR has been removed in Table 10.1 and is not included in TfL's current Business Plan up to 2021. The Council will continue to press TfL to secure funding for this extension.

Policy T2 - Healthy Streets

This is a new policy.

Development proposals should deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. Opportunities should also be identified to improve the balance of space given to people to dwell, cycle, walk, and travel on public transport, so space is used more efficiently and streets are greener and more pleasant.

In Opportunity Areas, new and improved walking, cycling, and public transport networks should be planned at an early stage. Proposals should:

- Demonstrate how they deliver improvements that support the ten HS indicators in line with TfL guidance;
- Reduce the dominance of vehicles; and
- Be permeable by foot and cycle and connect to local networks as well as public transport.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy T3 - Transport Capacity Connectivity & Safeguarding

Combines and updates existing policies 6.2 and 6.4

Development Plans should ensure the provision of sufficient and suitably located land for the development of the current and expanded public and active transport system to serve London's needs, including by:

- Safeguarding existing land and buildings used for transport or support functions; and
- Identifying and safeguarding new sites and route alignments, as well as supporting infrastructure, in order to provide transport functions and planned changes to capacity (including proposals in Table 10.1).

Priority should be given to delivering upgrades to Underground lines, and securing the Bakerloo Line Extension.

Comment

The Council is concerned that reference to the Mayor's ambition for enhanced rail access to Bromley via an Extension of the DLR has been removed in Table 10.1 and is not included in TfL's current Business Plan up to 2021. The Council is intending to safeguard land and route alignments for the DLR from Catford to Bromley South via Bromley North as per Draft Local Plan Policy 36 and will continue to press TfL to secure funding for this extension.

Bakerloo Line Extension - Supporting London's Growth (page 34)

Transport for London submitted a representation on Bromley's Draft Local Plan in December 2016. TfL confirmed it was currently developing plans for a Bakerloo Line Extension, and whilst noted that the phase one extension from Elephant and Castle to Lewisham is included in TfL's business plan for delivery by 2028/9, the Council

should reference the extension in Draft Local Plan Policies 35 and 36 to assist the onward delivery of the extension to the town centre and to Hayes alongside the safeguarding of land for the extension where new track is needed. This was reaffirmed in TfL's Hearing Statement in November 2017, which acknowledged that although the timescale for a potential extension beyond Lewisham is beyond the Local Plan period (2030), it would be appropriate to safeguard land and the route alignment where required.

Bromley responded by stating that TfL's current focus is an extension of the Bakerloo line to Lewisham. Beyond 2030 a future phase may be considered but this is outside the life of the Draft Local Plan. However, Metroisation of services may influence any future phase.

The Council also acknowledged it has been working closely with TfL to identify parts of the network which will benefit from improvements which will reduce bus journey times. However, no projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (appendix 10.3) to be delivered over the life of the draft Local Plan.

Whilst the DLR extension to Bromley no longer forms part of TfL's current Business Plan, it remains Bromley's preferred option from Lewisham/Catford to Bromley South via Bromley North. This extension will form part of continuing discussions with TfL regarding the next draft of the Business Plan, and the Council will continue to press TfL to secure funding for this extension.

Policy T4 Assessing and Mitigating Transport Impacts

Similar to existing policy 6.3

- Transport assessments should be submitted with development proposals to ensure that any impacts on the capacity of the transport network are fully assessed.
- Travel plans, parking design and management plans, construction logistics plans and delivery and servicing plans will be required in accordance with relevant Transport for London guidance.
- Mitigation, either through direct provision of facilities and improvements, or through financial contributions, will be required to address any adverse impacts that are identified.
- Cumulative impacts of development on public transport and the road network capacity including walking and cycling, as well as associated impacts on public health should be taken into account and mitigated.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Parking

Policy T5 Cycling and Table 10.2 Minimum Cycling Parking Standards

Updates existing Policy 6.9 and Table 6.3

Cycling Parking Standards remain consistent with existing London Plan policy except for:

- Bromley Town and Orpington have been identified as areas where higher minimum cycle parking standards apply (Fig. 10.2).
- Long-stay spaces for Use Class C3-C4 1 bed dwellings increased from 1 space per unit to 1.5 spaces per unit.

DPDs should support the delivery of a London-wide network of cycle routes, with new roles and improved infrastructure and should provide cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.2.

Comment

The policy is noted. Local Plan Draft Policy 30 states that minimum cycle parking standards must be met as per London Plan requirements. Bromley Town and Orpington have been identified as areas where higher minimum cycle parking standards apply (Fig. 10.2).

Policy T6 Parking

Policy T6.1 Residential Parking

Table 10.3 Maximum Residential Parking Standards

Updates existing Policy 6.13 and Table 6.2

- Car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity.
- Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or plan to be) well connected by public transport.
- The Maximum car parking standards set out in Policy T6.1 and T6.5 should be applied to development proposals and used to set local standards within Development Plans.
- Outer London boroughs wishing to adopt minimum residential parking standards must only do so for parts of London that are PTAL 0-1.
- Where sites are redeveloped, existing parking provision should be reduced to reflect the current approach and not be re-provided at previous levels that exceed the standards set out in this policy.

- Differences in car use and ownership between inner and outer London are recognised, with trip distances and trip patterns sometimes making walking and cycling difficult in outer London.
- New residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards set out in table 10.3. These standards are in a hierarchy with the more restrictive standard applying when a site falls into more than one category.
- All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or ultra-low emission vehicles. At least 20 percent of spaces should have active charging facilities.
- In a development with 10 or more units, at least one designated disabled persons parking bay per dwelling for three percent of dwellings is available from the offset (3:10).

Notable Changes/Potential Issues with Draft Local Plan

Comparison of Previous and Proposed Maximum Residential Car Parking Provision

Outer London PTAL	London Plan 2016	Draft London Plan 2017
0-1	2	1.5
2	1.5	1
3	1.5	0.75
4 (and Opportunity Areas)	1.5	0.5
5-6	1	Car Free

- Flexibility for minimum residential parking standards has been constrained to PTAL 0-1, now not applicable for parts of PTAL 2*.

Comment

Policy T6 Point A - “car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity.”

- *This is a concern for the Council as there is potential for significant under-provision of car parking. If car parking provision for new residential development were to be based on potential transport investment, then should that provision fail to materialise, developments will be built with abysmal levels of parking. As a result, residents will be forced to park in surrounding roads and will exacerbate parking misery.*

Policy T6 Point H - “Outer London boroughs wishing to adopt minimum residential parking standards through a Development Plan Document (within the maximum standards set out in Policy T6.1 Residential parking) must only do so for parts of London that are PTAL 0-1.”

- *This should go beyond PTAL 0-1 and be extended to PTALs 2 and 3. Minimum levels of parking for residential development are required in order to ensure new developments do not generate additional intrusive or obstructive on-street parking as a result of inadequate provision.*

Table 10.3 Maximum Residential Parking Standards -

- *The proposed Table 10.3 is a particular concern for the Council. Bromley has a higher car ownership per household than the Outer London average. Bromley exceeds the average of households owning 2 or more cars by 5%, and 3 or more cars by 1%. Compared to the Greater London average, there are 10% more households in Bromley with two or more cars. The Council therefore maintains its position that boroughs are best placed to decide the appropriate parking standards for their areas given their detailed knowledge and understanding of the issues, and the nature of the localities.*
- *Bromley's parking survey also found that car ownership across the developments surveyed was 1.18 cars per household (higher than the 1.15 Borough average from the 2011 census). There is a higher car ownership in wards with lower average levels of public transport accessibility. Wards in the south of the borough, including Biggin Hill, Darwin, and Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom, have the highest levels of car ownership at above 1.5 cars per household. When considering PTAL zones, previous surveys have found that the average range of vehicle ownership in the Borough falls between 0.7 (6a) and 1.1 (2). With no underground stations within the Borough, and PTALs failing to reflect the accessibility for the journeys that the local residents need to undertake to local facilities and services, they are a poor indicator of public transport accessibility for residents in these areas.*

Policy T6.2 Office Parking

Table 10.4 Maximum Office Parking Standards

Updates existing Policy 6.13 and Table 6.2

- Maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.4 should be applied to all new office development.
- Standards for B2 and B8 employment uses should also have regard to these standards.
- Outer London Boroughs wishing to adopt more generous standards are required to do so through an evidence-based policy in their DP that identifies parts of the borough in which higher standards will be applied, along with justification.
- Boroughs should not seek to adopt more generous standards borough wide.

Appendix 1

- Non-residential disabled persons parking should be provided as set out in Policy T6.5.
- Maximum parking provision more restricted to encourage non-car use modes of travel.

Comparison of Previous and Proposed Maximum Office Car Parking Provision (GIA)

Location	London Plan 2016	Draft London Plan 2017
Outer London	1 space per 100-600sqm	1 space per 100sqm
Outer London Generous Standards	1 space per 50-100sqm	1 space per 50sqm
Outer London Opportunity Areas		1 space per 600sqm

- Maximum parking provision more restricted to encourage non-car use modes of travel.

Comment

The Council is concerned about the proposed parking provision applied to Outer London Opportunity Areas.

Policy T6.3 Retail Parking and Table 10.5 Maximum Retail Parking Standards

Updates existing Policy 6.13 and Table 6.2

- The maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.5 should be applied to new retail development.
- Opportunities should be taken to make the most of all existing parking.
- If on-site parking is justified it should be publicly-available.
- Disabled persons parking should be provided as set out in Policy T6.5.
- PTAL 5 and 6 now has a blanket provision irrespective of retail use.
- Outer London retail either in an Opportunity Area or that is less than 500sqm in PTAL 0-4 provides up to 1 space per 75sqm (*prev. 30-50sqm*).
- All other retail in PTAL 0-4 provides up to 1 space per 50sqm (*prev. 15-50sqm*).

Comparison of Previous and Proposed Maximum Retail Car Parking Provision (GIA)

Location	London Plan 2016	Draft London Plan 2017
All Areas of PTAL 5-6	1 space per 25-75sqm (depending on use)	Car Free
Outer London retail below 500sqm		1 space per 75sqm
Outer London Opportunity Areas		1 space per 75sqm
Rest of Outer London		1 space per 50sqm
	PTAL 1-4 Only	
Food: up to 500sqm	1 space per 30-50sqm	
Food: up to 2500sqm	1 space per 18-30sqm	
Food: over 2500sqm	1 space per 15-25sqm	
Non-Food	1 space per 30-50sqm	

Garden Centre	1 space per 25-45sqm	
Town Centre/Shopping Mall/Department Store	1 space per 30-50sqm	

Comment

The policy is noted. Local Plan Draft Policy 30 states that, with the exception of residential parking standards, all other parking standards must be met as per London Plan requirements.

Policy T6.4 Hotel and Leisure Uses Parking

Updates existing Policy 6.13 and Table 6.2

- In locations with a PTAL 4-6, any on-site provision should be limited to operational needs, disabled persons parking and parking required for taxis, coaches and deliveries or servicing.
- In locations with a PTAL 0-3, schemes should be assessed on a case by case basis and provision should be consistent with in the Healthy Streets Approach.
- All operational parking must provide infrastructure for electric or other Ultra-Low Emissions vehicles, including active charging points.
- Disabled persons parking should be provided as set out in Policy T6.5.

Comment

The policy is noted. Local Plan Draft Policy 30 states that, with the exception of residential parking standards, all other parking standards must be met as per London Plan requirements.

Policy T6.5 Non-Residential Disabled Persons Parking

Table 10.6 Non-Residential Disabled Persons Parking Standards

Updates existing Policy 6.13 and Table 6.2

- All non-residential elements of a development should provide at least one on or off-street disabled persons parking bay.
- Disabled persons parking should be provided in accordance with the levels set out in Table 10.6.
- **Inclusion of non-residential disabled persons parking standards to Education Use Class.**
- No other change to parking standards.

Comment

The policy is noted. Local Plan Draft Policy 30 states that, with the exception of residential parking standards, all other parking standards must be met as per London Plan requirements.

Policy T7 Freight and Servicing

Updates existing Policy 6.14

Area based plans, such as OAPFs and AAPs should include freight and servicing strategies, and proposals should facilitate sustainable freight and servicing, including through the provision of adequate space for servicing and delivery off-street. To support carbon-free travel from 2050, the provision of hydrogen refuelling stations and rapid electric vehicle charging points at logistics and industrial locations is supported.

Comment

The policy is noted.

Policy T8 Aviation

Similar to existing Policy 6.6

The Mayor supports the role of London's airports in enhancing London's spatial growth, particularly within Opportunity Areas. Proposals that would lead to changes in airport operations or air traffic movements must take full account of their environmental impacts and the views of affected communities. Development of business and general aviation activity should generally be supported providing this would not lead to additional environment harm.

Comments

The Council cautiously supports this policy in line with the retention of Biggin Hill as a recognised SOLDC in the Draft London Plan.

Policy T9 Funding Transport Infrastructure through Planning

Updates existing Policy 6.5

- The Mayor will charge MCIL to secure funding towards transport infrastructure of strategic importance such as Crossrail 2.
- Planning obligations, including financial contributions, will be sought to mitigate impacts from development, which may be cumulative.
- In the absence of an agreement on Crossrail 2, the Mayor will still collect the charge and fund other strategic transport projects for which there is a significant funding gap.

Comments

Appendix 1

Currently there is a second round of public consultation on proposals to increase the developer contribution through Mayoral CIL collection in Bromley to £60 from £35 per square metre to which (last summer) the Council has objected.

Chapter 11 – Funding the London Plan

Existing Policies 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3

Chapter 11 sets out the policy framework for viability and planning obligations and broader issues of investment and the importance of a major part of that investment coming forward from the public and private sector. It also sets out the need for a more supportive regulatory environment where private sector investment is involved, requiring new fiscal tools for the Mayor. “The most critical areas for investment to achieve the step change in housing delivery that London needs are increased investment in transport infrastructure and fundamental changes to the housing market. There is also a need to invest in enabling infrastructure, such as green infrastructure, water, energy, digital connectivity and social infrastructure.” The supporting develops aims of ‘London Infrastructure Plan 2050’ (GLA) on fiscal devolution and the supporting text states the London Finance Commission recommended the full devolution of property taxes, including council tax, business rates and stamp duty, as well as permissive powers to develop new mechanisms, subject to consultation. This would allow for the development of a consistent approach with Section 106 payments and the Mayoral and borough Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Policy DF1 - Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations

New Policy DF1 Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations replaces existing Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations. Where obligations are proven unviable in a development the policy advises applicants and decision-makers prioritise affordable housing and necessary public transport improvements then health and education infrastructure, and after those affordable workspace, culture and leisure facilities. Previously focus was given to climate change and air quality, social infrastructure (as a grouping) and provision of small shops. Encourages boroughs to take account the impact on health, education, affordable workspace and culture and leisure facilities, when developing a local CIL Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list.

Comment

Existing policy 8.1 ‘Implementation’ is a higher strategic level policy with consideration given to creation of Mayoral Development Corporations and Housing Zones, and encouraging the Boroughs in developing their own Community Infrastructure Levy’s to ensure provision of infrastructure; the thrust of these aims has been fulfilled. Again the specific previous policy 8.3 ‘Community Infrastructure Levy’ is now subsumed into DF1 whereby boroughs are encouraged to consider the Mayors priorities when setting out their Regulation 123 lists. This Borough is developing a local CIL and authorisation has been given by Executive for the first public consultation to begin in January 2018. Whilst the Borough has an emerging scope for the local Regulation 123 list developed directly from the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule list of topic areas for projects, the specific list will not be confirmed until the next consultation phase later in 2018.

In response to the ‘2050’ consultation in 2014 the Leader Cllr Carr stated the importance ‘to make long term plans for the Capital to ensure infrastructure in Outer South East London is provided in full so as to realise opportunities for growth’.

Chapter 12 Monitoring

Policy M1 – Monitoring and Appendix 10.12 Proposed Monitoring Framework

Existing Policy 8.4

Monitoring is now included as its own chapter within the London Plan and is no longer integrated with funding and implementation. The policy ensures that the implementation of the London Plan will be kept under review using the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) set out in Table 12.1. The measure for each indicator shows the direction and scale of change that the London Plan policies are seeking to achieve. They do not themselves represent additional policy. Performance against the KPIs will be reported in the GLA's Authority Monitoring Report (AMR).

There are only 12 proposed KPIs compared with the current London Plan's 24 KPIs - streamlined and easier to monitor.

Comment

The policy is noted.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
DRR 18/003

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 25 January 2018

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: DELEGATED ENFORCEMENT ACTION - JULY 2017 TO
SEPTEMBER 2017 AND OCTOBER 2017 TO DECEMBER 2017

Contact Officer: John Stephenson, Planning Appeals and Enforcement Manager
Tel: 0208 461 7887 E-mail: John.Stephenson@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

Enforcement action has been authorised under Delegated Authority for the following alleged breaches of planning control. In accordance with agreed procedures Members are hereby advised of the action taken.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Members to note this report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: N/A
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: PLANNING DIVISION
 4. Total current budget for this head: £N/A
 5. Source of funding: N/A
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirements
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: N/A
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Enforcement action and prosecutions have been authorised by the Chief Planner under Delegated Authority during the period 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2017 in respect of development undertaken without the benefit of planning permission at the sites attached at appendix 1.

4. A total of 391 enforcement cases were closed in the past 6 month period having reached a satisfactory conclusion without the need to instigate further formal enforcement action.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children, Policy Implications, Financial Implications, Personnel Implications, Legal Implications, Procurement Implications.
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	N/A

This page is left intentionally blank

ENF Ref	Complaint	Site	Ward	Recommendation	Decision date
15/00379	Building not in accordance with plans	Copers Cope Road	Copers Cope	Prosecution Currently at Court	15/08/2017
16/00104	Erection of a stable block, with additional residential accommodation together with hardstanding and change of use of grazing land to residential use	Land near Warren Road, Junction on the east side of Chelsfield Lane, Orpington	Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	Prosecution Awaiting court date	04/09/2017
15/00118	Material change of use land for the storage of a container	Carlton Parade, Orpington	Cray Valley East	Prosecution Compliance due 20 January 2018	04/09/2017
16/00302	Unauthorised change of use of first floor to 2 one bedroom flats and 1 three bedroom flat.	High Street Penge SE20 7DS	Penge & Cator	Enforcement Notice	07/09/2017
17/00062	Unauthorised change of use of land and storage of containers	Lime Tree House, Station Road, St Mary Cray, Orpington, BR5 3EH	Cray Valley East	PCN – complied with case closed NFA	07/09/2017
15/00398	Alleged unauthorised change of use of outbuilding at rear of premises to holiday lets	Windsor Drive, Orpington, BR6 6EY	Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	PCN – issued	07/09/2017
16/00497	Unauthorised change of use of building at rear of premises to residential accommodation	Windsor Drive, Orpington, BR6 6EY	Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	PCN- issued	07/09/2017
16/00371	Unauthorised alterations to the shopfront	High Street Beckenham, Kent BR3 1EW	Copers Cope	Operational Development Enforcement Notice Notice - issued	09/09/2017
17/00241	Unauthorised structure	Land adj to Iona Skeet Hill Lane, Orpington	Cray Valley East	Enforcement action – OPDEV Notice - issued	13/09/2017

17/00490	Unauthorised storage of a 32 seater coach in a residential garden	Wakely Close, Biggin Hill, TN16 3RR	Biggin Hill	Untidy Site Notice issued	11/09/2017
15/00262	Unauthorised creation of an extra flat, not in accordance with permission	Anerley Hill, SE19 2AE	Crystal Palace	Enforcement Notice	14/09/2017
14/00447	Office unit being used for residential accommodation	Sanderstead Road, Orpington	Cray Valley East	Enforcement Action, material change of use	14/09/2017
15/00194	Unauthorised building works for detached buildings including clearing trees	Ruxley Cottage, Maidstone Road, Sidcup, DA14 5BG	Cray Valley East	Enforcement Notice	14/09/2017
16/00341	Building works not in accordance with permission 15/01053	Wickham Road, Beckenham	Kangley & Eden Park	Prosecution Complied with	19/09/2017
17/00525	Untidy Site	Blandford Road, Beckenham	Clock House	Untidy Site Notice issued	26/09/2017
15/00045	Untidy Site	Winnipeg Drive, Orpington, Kent BR6 6NW	Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	Untidy Site Notice Issued	26/09/2017

Instructions issued OCT, NOV, DEC

ENF Ref	Complaint	Site	Ward	Recommendation	Decision date
17/00351	Unauthorised extractor fan	17 Penge Lane, SE20 7DU	Penge & Cator	Enforcement Notice	04/10/2017
17/00288	Alleged overgrown front and rear gardens	8 Kingwood Close, Orpington, BR6 8PA	Farnborough & Crofton	Unity Site ISSUED	04/10/2017
17/00272	Untidy Site	Ripton House, 254 Croydon Road, Beckenham	Clock House	Untidy Site ISSUED	04/10/2017
16/00608	Alleged unauthorised change of use to shop front without permission in a conservation area	69 High Street, Beckenham, BR3 1AW	Copers Cope	Enforcement Notice	17/10/2017
15/00274	Unauthorised conversion of house to two flats	2 Boyland Road, Bromley, BR1 4QF	Plaistow & Sundridge	Enforcement Notice	18/10/2017
16/00098	Unauthorised illuminated advertisement sign	Stock Hill Dental Care, Stock Hill, Biggin Hill, TN16 3TJ	Plaistow & Sundridge	Other	18/10/2017
17/00295	Unauthorised change of use for storage of a shipping container	11 Blyth Road, Bromley, BR1 3RS	Bromley Town	Enforcement Notice	31/10/2017
16/00344	Walls & Gates / raised area constructed in Green Belt	Summer Shaw, 156 Cudham Lane, North Cudham Sevenoaks TN14 7QR	Darwin	Enforcement Notice	31/10/2017
17/00533	Accumulated waste materials dumped on site	Land Adjacent 4 Lullingstone Close, Orpington	Cray Valley West	Untidy Site Notice	31/10/2017
16/00433	Unauthorised fencing	16 Romney Drive, Bromley, BR1 2TE	Bickley	Enforcement Notice	19/10/2017
17/00429	Empty House overgrown gardens	110 Avondale Road, Bromley, BR1 4EZ	Plaistow & Sundridge	Untidy Site ISSUED	18/10/2017
16/00616	Alleged unauthorised building works to form additional habitable accommodation	Austin Avenue Bromley BR2 8AJ	Bromley Common & Keston	Enforcement Notice	10/11/2017
17/00102	Breach of condition	The Princess Royal University Hospital	Farnborough & Crofton	Breach of condition Notice ISSUED	17/11/2017
17/00050	unauthorised outbuilding and overheight decking (raised platform)	Jackass Lane, Keston	Bromley Common & Keston	Enforcement Notice	24/11/2017
12/00729	alleged over-intensive use of site and alleged unauthorised portacabin constructed in field adj	land adj to Tintagel, Cornwall Drive	Cray Valley West	Enforcement Notice CLOSED	29/11/2017

16/00497	unauthorised change of use of building at rear of premises to residential accommodation	Windsor Drive, Orpington	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Enforcement Notice ISSUED	29/11/2017
17/00602	Breach of condition	Park Road, Beckenham	Copers Cope	PCN	01/12/2017
16/00607	not in accordance with the approved plans	Buttermere Road, Orpington	Cray Valley East	Prosecution	05/12/2017
17/00486	unauthorised advertisement hoarding	land adj Top Award, Crofton, Orpington	Farnborough & Crofton	Prosecution	06/12/2017