

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:

Appendix 1

- 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.

Appendix 1

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 Governments 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.

Appendix 1

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 needed 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

Appendix 1

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.

Appendix 1

- 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 in 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

Appendix 1

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.

Appendix 1

- 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.