

**LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH COUNCIL
CORE STRATEGY DPD EXAMINATION HEARINGS (version2)**

**Inspector • Sue Turner RIBA MRTPI IHBC
Programme Officer • Simon Osborn BA TechRTPI
1 Lower Farm Cottages, Puttock End, BelchampWalter, Sudbury,
Suffolk CO10 7BA
Tel 07710 969411, Email simon@poservices.co.uk**

**All sessions will take place in;
The Benn Library, King George's House, Stockwell YMCA, 40-46
Stockwell Road, Stockwell, London SW9 9ES**

DAY 1 **TUESDAY 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 10.00am**

	Topic		Matters for discussion/ key questions
1	Overall Strategy	1	Is it clear how the key spatial planning issues inform the overall spatial vision?
		2	Does the CS explain why the spatial vision is to focus growth on Waterloo/ Vauxhall/ Brixton/ Streatham?
		3	Does the overall strategy cover the 15 year period required by PPS12 in all areas, for example with regard to retail provision?
		5	Is the extent of delegation to lower level DPDs appropriate?
		6	Are references to lower level DPD's clear and consistent?
		7	Does the Key Diagram provide sufficient information about cross boundary issues, for example shopping centres outside the borough?
2	Housing supply	1	Is the housing trajectory based on a robust housing land supply calculation?
		2	Does this demonstrate that there are specific deliverable sites to deliver housing for the first 5 years of the plan and specific developable sites to deliver housing for years 6 – 10?
		3	Does the housing trajectory take account of the timing of delivery of large scale area based projects?
		4	Is the CS sufficiently flexible to deal with the possibility of increased London Plan housing targets in the second part of the plan period?
		5	Is the restriction on residential conversion to flats, set out in Policy S2(e), justified by the evidence?

		6	Has the impact of this restriction on achieving housing targets been fully explored?
		7	Is there any conflict between this restriction and the sustainability objectives of PPS3?
3	Housing mix, type and tenure		
		1	Are the affordable housing targets of 50% and 40% justified by robust evidence, including up to date information on viability?
		2	Is the 70%/30% split of social rented/ intermediate housing justified/ appropriate in the light of the emerging London Plan split of 60%/40%?
<p><u>Participants:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lambeth Council LBL/Day1/1, LBL/Day1/2, LBL/Day1/3 2. SouthLondonLand& The Haywoods Group (Iceni Projects) 028/Day1/2 3. Tesco (GL Hearn) no submission 4. Jones Lang LaSalle 014/Day1/1 5. Waterloo Community Development Group 031/Day1/3 6. Kennington Association Planning Forum 037/Day1/3 			

DAY 2**WEDNESDAY 15 SEPTEMBER 2010 10.00am**

	Topic		Matters for discussion/ key questions
Economic development			
1	General	1	What is the justification for the absence of a numerical target for employment land?
		2	Do the PN policies provide sufficient steer regarding the scale of employment floorspace to inform the Site Allocations DPD?
		3	Does the approach to maintaining a stock of sites and premises outside the KIBAs in commercial use (Policy S3(b)) allow flexibility to take account of market conditions and variations in need across the borough?
		4	Is the requirement for at least half of the site/ floor space to be for business use or the provision of business space at affordable levels justified? Does it allow sufficient flexibility to encourage development?
		5	Is the CS approach to addressing the need for general employment land set out clearly in the spatial approach and spatial vision?
2	KIBAs	1	Is the CS approach to safeguarding employment land and premises based on up to date and comprehensive evidence?
		2	Does the evidence demonstrate that the removal of mixed use employment areas from KIBAs is the best way of addressing the demand for employment floor space and thus addressing worklessness?
		3	Does the removal of mixed use employment areas from KIBAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) allow sufficient flexibility to encourage economic development? b) take account of financial viability/ allow for other uses where they are required to enable development/ redevelopment to come forward? c) provide clarity where KIBA sites are already the subject of discussion?
		5	Are all of the proposed KIBA de-designations and

			boundary changes justified by robust evidence? Are they all clearly set out in the CS and supported by changes shown on the <u>Changes to the Proposals Map (SD2)</u>
3	Retail	6	Are the figures for retail floorspace set out in Policy S3 (d) justified by the evidence base, in particular the Retail Capacity Study 2008?
		7	Have cross boundary matters been dealt with appropriately in Policy S3, particularly with regard to the proposed retail redevelopment at Battersea Power Station?
<u>Participants:</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lambeth Council LBL/Day2/1, LBL/Day2/2, LBL/Day2/3 2. Tesco (GL Hearn) 038/Day2/3, 3. EDF (Adrian Salt and Pang) 4. NativeLand (DP9) 010/Day2/2 5. Frasers Property (Alliance Planning) 012/Day2/2 6. Shell (Jones Lang LaSalle) 026/Day2/1.3 & 026/Day2/1.4 7. Jones Lang LaSalle 014/Day2/1.31.4&1.5 8. Waterloo Community Development Group 032/Day 2/2 & Day2/3 9. Kennington Association Planning Forum 037/Day2/2 			

DAY 3**TUESDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 2010 10.00am**

	Topic		Matters for discussion/ key questions
Places and neighbourhoods			
1	General	1	Do the PN policies go far enough in conveying the nature, amount and phasing of development for each of the places considered?
		2	Are references to Project Banks consistent, referenced to the evidence base and followed through in the arrangements for delivery and monitoring?
2	Waterloo	1	Is the requirement for development to scale down to the river Thames justified by the evidence base?
		2	Does the CS, including adjustments to the MOL boundary, set out a flexible basis for balancing the proposed extension to JubileeGardens and protection of MOL with the objective of facilitating the construction of new arts/ cultural facilities
		3	Is the major development opportunity presented by Waterloo Station and the former International Station (para 5.3.2) clearly identified in Policy PN1?
		4	Does Diagram 1 illustrate the most up to date situation at the Shell Centre with regard to pedestrian routes and planned redevelopment?
3	Vauxhall	1	What is the relationship between the overall Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the Council's own documents, in particular CS Policy PN2 and Vauxhall Area SPD? Is it clear how Lambeth's allocation of homes and jobs has been determined?
		2	Is the relationship between the Opportunity Area and the Southbank House and Newport Street KIBA clear where these designations overlap?
		3	Does Policy PN2 provide clear guidance for the location of tall buildings in Vauxhall?
		4	Is the reference to "an expanded range of employment and residential uses" in Policy PN2 (h) clear?
4	Brixton	1	Does the reference to "further planning guidance"

			in paragraph 5.27 give a sufficiently clear indication of the way forward?
		2	Should the apparent inconsistency between Area 1 on Proposals Map 10 and the Town Centre Boundary on Diagram 3 be addressed by updating/ amending these plans? Should the CS provide clear distinction between the "Core Shopping Area" and the "Town Centre."
5	Streatham	1	Should the town centre boundary be extended to include the whole of Streatham Hub (Diagram 4)?
		2	How does the quantum of retail floor space sought up to 2025 ((10,000 square metres) set out in PN4 align with the borough wide requirement of 5.400 square metres convenience and 3,600 square metres comparison (in Policy S3 (d)?
6	West Norwood/ Tulse Hill	1	How does the quantity of retail floor space to be delivered through the masterplan to 2025 align with the overall retail requirements in Policy S3 (d)?
7	Stockwell	1	Is the role, status and timing of the local community masterplan (para 5.54) explained elsewhere in the CS?
<p><u>Participants:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lambeth Council LBL/Day3/1, LBL/Day3/2, LBL/Day3/3, LBL/Day3/4, LBL/Day3/5, LBL/Day3/6, LBL/Day3/7, 2. Frasers Property (Alliance Planning) 012/Day3/3 3. Network Rail (Savills) 016/Day3/2 4. Shell (Jones Lang Lasalle) 026/Day3/2.1 & 026/Day3/2.4 5. Southbank Centre (RPS) 021/Day3/2 6. Tesco (GL Hearn) 038/Day3/4 & 038/Day3/6 7. Kennington Association Planning Forum 037/Day3/1 (no submission) 8. Jones Lang LaSalle 014/Day3/1 9. Waterloo Community Development Group 032/Day3/2.3 & 032/Day3/2.4 & 032/Day3/2.2 <p>Written Submissions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BFI 013/Day3/2 			

DAY 4**WEDNESDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2010 10.00am**

Topic	Matters for discussion/ key questions
Infrastructure, implementation, delivery and monitoring	
1	1 Is there up to date evidence to demonstrate how the major infrastructure in Annex 2 relates to the growth and development identified in the CS?
	2 What are the critical dependencies on major infrastructure? Where are they identified?
	3 Is the level of contingency planning set out in Annex 1 adequate?
	4 Should the CS set out a clear process for dealing with delivery issues as referred to in para 6.16?
	5 Should the monitoring framework include base figures/ aspirations/ direction of travel where no targets are applicable?
Planning obligations (S10, S4)	
2	1 Does the CS approach to planning obligations provide a clear steer for a SPD? Is the timing and scope of the future SPD clear? OR Does the CS provide an appropriate balance between providing clarity for developers and flexibility for the detailed mechanisms for securing developer contributions to be determined in a future LDF document?
Environmental matters – open space/ tall buildings and strategic views/ sustainable waste / sustainable design and construction/ floor risk/ transportation	
3	Open Space (S5) 1 Does the evidence justify the CS approach of improving quality and access to open space, and seeking an increase in the quantity where possible, instead of setting a quantitative target?
4	Tall buildings/ strategic and local views (S9) 1 Does the evidence summarised in Topic Paper 3 provide robust justification for the CS approach to tall buildings and strategic views?
	2 Is the guidance on tall buildings too prescriptive?
5	Sustainable Waste 1 Does the area of search for new waste sites set out in paragraph 4.40 provide sufficient spatial

	Management (S8)		steer for the allocations in the SA DPD?
		2	Should the criteria for selecting sites be located within the policy?
6	Sustainable Design and Construction (S7)	1	What are the targets and timescales for achieving zero carbon and low carbon development?
		2	If the targets are higher or in advance of government standards then is this supported by local circumstances and justified by the evidence base?
		3	Is it appropriate to delegate setting targets to the DM DPD?
7	Flood Risk (S6)	1	Should the CS define the "major development threshold"?
8	Transport (S4)	1	Is it appropriate for the details of land to be safeguarded for existing and future infrastructure (Policy S4 (d)) to be delegated to a lower level DPD?
		2	Does the CS provide a sufficiently clear strategy for delivering transport infrastructure improvements?
<p><u>Participants:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lambeth Council LBL/Day4/1, LBL/Day4/2, LBL/Day4/3, LBL/Day4/4, LBL/Day4/5, LBL/Day4/6, LBL/Day4/7, LBL/Day4/8, Shell (Jones Lang LaSalle) 026/Day4/3.1, 026/Day4/4.1 & 026/Day4/4.2 Tesco (GL Hearn) no submission Network Rail (Savills) 016/Day4/4 Waterloo Community Development Group 032/Day4/3 & 032/Day4/4.1 & 032/Day4/4.2 Kennington Association Planning Forum 037/Day4/4 <p>Written Submissions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> English Heritage 039/Day4/4 			

DRAFT