

### SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020

This schedule of potential changes to the DRLLP PSV and PCPM January 2020 has been prepared by Lambeth Council in accordance with paragraph 1.5 of the Planning Inspectorate's Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations (June 2019). The potential changes shown in the schedule have not been the subject of public consultation or sustainability appraisal. Lambeth Council does not intend the proposed changes to be treated as part of the plan to be examined, which remains the DRLLP PSV and PCPM January 2020.

This schedule is in two parts: part 1 lists potential changes to the DRLLP PSV and part 2 lists potential changes to the PCPM

Proposed changes to the wording of the DRLLP PSV 2020 are shown in **red**. Deleted text is shown using **strikethrough** and additional text is **underlined**. *Text in italics describes a change to be made, rather than presenting an extract from the Local Plan text itself.*

#### Part 1 – potential changes to the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Proposed Submission Version January 2020 (DRLLP PSV)

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC001	n/a	Contents page	Places and Neighbourhoods	Typo
PC002	n/a	Contents page	Tall <del>and large</del> buildings	Correction
PC003	n/a	Contents page	Annex 4 – Key Industrial <u>and</u> Business Areas	Correction
PC004	n/a	Contents page	Site 13: <u>Plot bounded by 7-93 Wandsworth Road, Parry Street, Bondway including the bus station SW8 (Vauxhall Island Site)</u> <del>Plot bounded by Parry Street, Bondway and 7-93 Wandsworth Road SW8 (Vauxhall Island Site)</del>	Correction
PC005	n/a	Contents page	Site 18 – <del>260 – 367 Norwood Road SE27</del> <u>286 – 362 Norwood Road SE27</u>	Correction
PC006	10	1.27	<i>Amend bulletpoint as follows:</i> <del>the potential to extend</del> <u>extension of the Croydon</u> Tramlink to Crystal Palace and Streatham	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC007	17	2.27	<u>ONS Claimant Court Count</u>	Typo

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC008	20	2.40	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> However, much of Lambeth's public transport infrastructure <u>During peak periods rail services in Lambeth are</u> <del>is</del> currently at or over capacity, particularly services from <u>Clapham Junction to Waterloo and Herne Hill to Victoria and Blackfriars</u> (Lambeth Transport Strategy Baseline Report 2017). Investment is needed to improve conditions for passengers, to provide full access to all stations and to enable the planned increases in resident and working population. <u>The implementation of Crossrail 2 and metroisation will be required to meet future demand.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC009	43	2.124	<i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence as follows:</i> Community, play and youth facilities, <u>libraries</u> , and meeting spaces are therefore an essential part of the social infrastructure required by neighbourhoods.	In response to representation by Friends of Libraries (R083)
PC010	47	3.3	<i>Add as last sentence to para 3.3:</i> <u>If a target is required beyond the ten year period 2019/20 to 2028/29, it will be based on the 2017 SHLAA findings, local evidence of housing capacity and by rolling forward the borough's small housing sites figure in accordance with paragraph 4.1.12 of the London Plan.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC011	64	D3(c)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> Generally, Community Infrastructure Levy will be applied, alongside other investment, to help deliver infrastructure. Site-specific planning obligations may <u>also</u> be used to secure delivery of <u>on-site</u> infrastructure.	Clarification in response to representation by Department of Education (R033)
PC012	67	D4	<i>Amend clause (b) and (i) as follows:</i> b) ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate the impact of the development and/or additional facilities and requirements made necessary by the development. <u>Depending on the nature of the development</u> , <del>This</del> <u>this</u> may include:	Clarification in response to representations by Department of Education (R033) and HUDU on behalf of CCG (R036)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			i) <del>on-site</del> provision of infrastructure, <del>such as whether</del> transport, education, health, libraries, sport and leisure, <del>waste, energy</del> , emergency services and cultural and community provision;	
PC013	68	4.17	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i></p> <p><del>The adoption of a Lambeth Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014 required publication of a CIL Regulation 123 list which defines infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure project to which CIL funding will be applied and in respect of which, by default, section 106 planning obligations would not normally be sought. <u>From December 2020 annual Infrastructure Funding Statements will report on CIL receipts and spend.</u> In addition, the adoption of CIL limits the use of planning obligations as pooled funding to a maximum of five section 106 agreements, even when that infrastructure is not included in Regulation 123 list. However, the <u>Section 106 planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Planning obligations must meet the statutory tests in the CIL Regulations (necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development).</u> <u>The provision of affordable housing, local improvements and/or additional facilities and requirements (including employment initiatives and on-site provision of specific infrastructure) and securing appropriate scheme implementation and control of phasing where necessary will be delivered through section 106 planning obligations. The obligations sought will depend on the nature of the development proposed. Further information about the requirements for the obligations listed in Local Plan Policy D4 is provided in relevant policies elsewhere in the plan. The policies in this plan and requirements for developer contributions have been tested for their cumulative impact on development viability and are therefore considered</u></del></p>	<p>Clarification in response to representations by: Department of Education (R033); HUDU on behalf of CCG (R036); Transport for London (R048); WeAreWaterloo Business Improvement District (R030); and Home Builders Federation (R023).</p>

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>deliverable. In situations where it has been demonstrated that planning obligations cannot viably be supported by a specific development, the priorities set out in London Plan Policy DF1 D will apply.</u>	
PC014	69	4.18	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i></p> <p><u>For some obligations, Charging charging approaches for monetary contributions in lieu of on-site provision</u> affordable housing provision on small sites, for off-site children's play space and to offset the impact of visitor attractions are set out in Annex 10, <u>with further information in the relevant policies about how and when these charging approaches will be used.</u> The detailed requirements for other planning obligations will be set out as necessary in further planning guidance. <u>Planning obligations secured for improvements to open space and play space can be spent on all types of open space/play space, including those on housing estates. A monetary contribution to the monitoring of planning obligations will be sought and this will be calculated on a case-by-case basis according to the nature of the proposed development and the obligations secured. The overall level of monitoring fees will not exceed 5 per cent of the total value of the obligations secured in any given case. The council will report on developer contribution receipts and spend in an annual Infrastructure Funding Statement.</u></p>	Clarification in response to representation by Home Builders Federation (R023).
PC015	78	5.20	<p><i>Amend para 5.20 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>To be eligible for the Fast Track Route as set out in the London Plan, applications proposing 10 or more than 25 units (gross) must meet all of the following criteria:</u></p> <p>i) <u>meet and exceed the relevant threshold level of affordable housing on site without public subsidy (subject to paragraph 5.28 below);</u></p>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC016	79	5.21	<i>Amend para 5.21 as follows:</i> <u>Affordable housing is required on site in schemes providing more than <del>25</del> 10 units (gross) and this is an essential requirement to be eligible for the Fast Track Route.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC017	80	5.26	<i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence as follows:</i> <u>If the level of affordable housing provided exceeds the threshold level, there is scope for flexibility in the tenure of the <del>the</del> those affordable units provided above the threshold level, provided these homes are genuinely affordable as defined in London Plan policy H6.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC018	81	5.28	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>The council acknowledges that schemes providing between 10 and 25 units (gross) may find it difficult to provide on-site affordable housing given the small numbers of units involved and difficulties in some cases in finding registered providers of affordable housing willing to manage them. In these cases, where a difficulty of this nature has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the council (through evidence of contact made with registered providers), the council will consider proposals to <del>Where schemes proposing between 10 and 25 units (gross) provide the threshold level of affordable housing as an in lieu payment under the Fast Track route. (and are therefore eligible to follow the Fast Track route).</del> the . The value of the in lieu payment should be based on the relevant threshold as a percentage of on-site units. The payment in lieu should be calculated through two appraisals – one with the level of affordable housing required by policy and the other with 100 per cent market housing: the payment in lieu will equate to the difference between the two residual values. Applicants should use the methodology set out in Annex 10, making use of the online calculator provided on the council’s website.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC019	108	H11(a)	<i>Amend clause (a) as follows:</i> <u>Estate regeneration schemes must achieve at least 50 per cent affordable housing in the final scheme, based on habitable rooms. Applicants should demonstrate <b>through a viability assessment that</b> they have sought to maximise the proportion of affordable housing in the scheme and should where possible provide more than 50 per cent.</u>	Clarification in response to representations by Savills for Bellway Homes (R035) and L&Q (043)
PC020	109	5.100	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>This policy applies to <b>social housing</b> estate regeneration schemes led by the council and/or other registered providers of affordable housing <b>and their development partners</b>. This policy should be read and applied in conjunction with London Plan policy H8.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by JLL for Grainger plc (R068)
PC021	109	5.101	<i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of para as follows:</i> <u>The <b>policy requirement for at least 50 per cent percentage of</b> affordable housing will be assessed on the basis of the overall proportion of affordable housing that will result in the final estate regeneration scheme, once all phases have been completed.</u>	Clarification in response to representations by Savills for Bellway Homes (R035) and L&Q (R043)
PC022	110	5.106	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>Where shared ownership units are provided as part of an estate regeneration scheme and the occupant 'staircases out' to own the unit outright, the proceeds from the sale of the unit will be retained by <b>the registered provider of affordable housing that manages the estate Homes for Lambeth</b> and recycled into provision of other affordable housing elsewhere in Lambeth. This will be secured through a section 106 legal agreement associated with the planning permission for the proposal.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by L&Q (R043)
PC023	113	H12	<i>Correct typo in first sentence as follows:</i> The council supports Build to Rent developments that meet the definition in London Plan policy H1 <b>13</b> .	Correction

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC024	121	ED1(b)	<p><i>Amend as follows:</i></p> <p><u>b) Proposals for smaller offices (up to 1,000m<sup>2</sup> gross external area) will be supported in the Central Activities Zone, Opportunity Areas and all town centres all locations, subject to other plan policies relating to the existing use of the land, environment, transport and design. Proposals for smaller offices outside of town centres will be subject to the sequential test in section 7 of the NPPF and other plan policies.</u></p>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC025	132	ED3(c)	<p><i>Correct London Plan reference in clause:... policy E7 sections B and <u>D</u><del>E</del></i></p>	Correction
PC026	132	6.28 and 6.29	<p><i>Delete paragraphs 6.28 and 6.29 and replace with the following text:</i></p> <p><u>KIBAs are Lambeth's Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) and are listed in Annex 4 and shown on the Policies Map. In accordance with London Plan policy E4, Lambeth's KIBAs are a vital part of the local economy representing the borough's strategic supply of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function and the Central Activities Zone in particular. The London Plan places Lambeth within the Central Services Area (CSA). CSA status requires a particular focus on sustainable 'last mile' distribution/logistics, 'just-in-time' servicing (such as food service activities, printing, administrative and support services, office supplies, repair and maintenance), waste management and recycling, and land to support transport functions, to service the functioning of the Central Activities Zone. Waste management and recycling are also particularly important uses in KIBAs given the requirement to meet the London Plan waste apportionment (see Local Plan policy EN7).</u></p> <p><u>Lambeth undertook a review of its KIBAs to inform the partial review of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 in the context of the Mayor's evidence on industrial land and capacity</u></p>	To address the implications of the Secretary of State direction to the Mayor, and to address the Mayor's comments.

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p><u>in the revised London Plan (Lambeth Review of KIBAs 2019, updated 2020). This study included an analysis of occupancy and development activity in the existing KIBAs in Lambeth and assessed whether any changes were needed to current designations, as well as considering potential for intensification. It also assessed potential for designation of additional land as KIBA. The assessment was carried out in parallel with Lambeth’s input to the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017. It also took account of comments in response to public consultation on the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan in 2018, and of the parallel assessment of waste management capacity in the borough (Waste Evidence Base updated 2020). Overall, the study presents a strong picture, finding very high levels of occupancy and industrial/business related development activity in the majority of existing KIBAs in Lambeth. However, changes to the boundaries of nine existing KIBA are proposed in the study as a result of changing circumstances, as is one full de-designation. Four new KIBAs are proposed but the result is an overall net loss of designated industrial land.</u></p> <p><u>The level of industrial floor-space capacity lost in Lambeth in recent years, in combination with these boundary changes, means that any scope for intensification within KIBAs must be prioritised for industrial floor-space capacity, rather than to allow space for non-industrial uses. Lambeth does not need to rely on KIBA land to meet and exceed its London Plan housing target. KIBA land must be prioritised instead to meet the requirements of Lambeth’s CSA location and the London Plan waste apportionment. Industrial intensification appropriate within the KIBAs includes intensification for light and general industry including emerging industrial-related sectors; storage and logistics/distribution including ‘last mile’ distribution close to</u></p>	



**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p><u>central London, wholesale, consolidation centres and collection points business and waste management uses use; utilities infrastructure; some rail and bus infrastructure; flexible (B1c / B2 / B8) hybrid spaces to accommodate services that support the wider London economy and population; low-cost industrial and related space for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (including many in the creative, cultural and digital industries and other sectors such as food-making and distribution); and research and development of industrial and related products and processes (Use Class B1b). New B2 and B8 uses are particularly encouraged. The approach to industrial intensification should follow that set out in the London Plan and the guidance in the Mayor's Industrial Intensification Primer.</u></p> <p><u>Given the position explained above, only three KIBAs or parts of KIBAs are identified on the Policies Map as having potential for industrial intensification and co-location with other uses, based on particular circumstances affecting those locations. See the Review of KIBAs for further information. For sites in KIBAs with potential for industrial intensification and co-location, the appropriate amount of industrial floor-space to be re-provided will be assessed as the existing quantum of floor-space and/or actively used yardspace, or 65 per cent plot ratio (defined as total proposed industrial floor-space divided by total proposed site area), whichever is greater for the site in question; unless a site specific policy in the Site Allocations DPD specifies an alternative approach. This is based on the methodology in the Mayor's evidence on London Industrial Land Demand (CAG October 2017).</u></p>	
PC027	136	ED4(b)	<i>Amend London Plan reference E7 <del>sections D and E</del> to <u>sections C and D</u></i>	Correction
PC028	138	Para 6.43	<i>Amend London Plan reference <del>E2B</del> to <u>E2C</u></i>	Correction
PC029	141	ED6(b)	<i>Amend clause (b) and introduce new clause (d) as follows: (b) Elsewhere, <del>industrial (B2), storage and distribution (B8), business (B1) and appropriate sui generis uses</del> <u>industrial uses</u> will be supported. <del>Proposals for nightclubs</del></i>	Clarification in response to representations from Arch Company Properties LP

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p>in railway arches outside of town centres will not be permitted. <u>Proposals for change of use of railway arches from commercial B2, B8, B1 and appropriate sui generis industrial uses to other commercial or community uses will not be permitted be considered against other development plan policies relevant to the proposed use. Proposals for contiguous sets of railway arches are encouraged to enable a comprehensive approach.</u></p> <p><u>(d) Class C and residential sui generis uses will not be permitted in railway arches.</u></p>	(R055) and Network Rail (R065)
PC030	141	ED6(c)	<p><i>Amend clause as follows:</i> Proposals to use railway arches for <u>car</u> parking will not normally be supported <u>permitted.</u></p>	Clarification
PC031	141	ED6(d)	<p><i>Amend existing clause (d) (new clause (e)) as follows:</i> <u>Where necessary to make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, applications affecting railway arches will be required to improve the immediate environment around the arches, including the public realm. This will include accessibility, safety, servicing and lighting appropriate to the location and the opening up of routes that contribute to the 'Low Line' project. In some circumstances the loss of useable railway arch floorspace may be supported as part of major development proposals where it is demonstrated this is necessary to increase site permeability and/or achieve public realm improvements.</u></p>	Clarification in response to representations from Arch Company Properties LP (R055) and Network Rail (R065)
PC032	141	6.50	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i> In relation to sections (a) <del>and (b)</del> of the policy, 'appropriate sui generis uses' will be assessed on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the use proposed in relation to neighbouring and surrounding uses. <u>'Industrial uses' in part (b) are as defined in London Plan policy E4A.</u></p>	Correction and clarification
PC033	141	6.51	<p><i>Add as last sentence to para 6.51:</i> <u>Applicants are strongly encouraged to bring forward proposals for contiguous sets of railway arches, to enable a comprehensive approach and more effective consideration</u></p>	In response to representations from Arch

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>against the wider place-shaping objectives set out in the policies for places and neighbourhoods in section 11 of the Local Plan.</u>	Company Properties LP (R055) and Network Rail (R065)
PC034	147	ED7	<i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> part of clause (c) as follows:</i> Development in town centres <u>and Central Activities Zone retail clusters</u> will be supported if:	Clarification in response to representation by Tulley Bunting on behalf of BFI (R013)
PC035	148	6.64	<u>'many of Lambeth's town centres'</u>	Typo
PC036	161	6.91 – 6.92	<i>Amend and split para 6.91 into two paragraphs as follows:</i> 6.91 <u>Lambeth has many cultural venues and facilities which are identified in the London Cultural Infrastructure Map and the Lambeth Cultural Infrastructure list.</u> The council wishes to safeguard and improve leisure, recreation, arts and cultural facilities, <u>such as art centres, art galleries, museums, cinemas, dance and music performance venues and theatres, (including theatres)</u> where they meet local and wider needs, especially in town centres, unless adequate replacement provision is made. <u>These uses will be primarily assessed against Local Plan policy ED13. Some more local community facilities, such as community halls and meeting spaces, libraries, indoor play, indoor recreation and sports facilities, as well as pubs and open spaces, also make an important contribution to the cultural life of the borough because they provide space for cultural activities and events. These uses will be primarily considered against Local Plan policies S1, S2, ED9 or EN1 as appropriate, but, in some cases Local Plan policy ED13 may also apply depending on the nature of their usage and having regard to the London Cultural Infrastructure Map and Lambeth Cultural Infrastructure list.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by TfL Commercial Development (R041)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p><b>6.91a</b> Major development proposals for leisure, recreation, arts and cultural facilities should be accompanied by a visitor management plan, which addresses how the impacts of high volumes of visitors <del>will</del> <u>would</u> be managed, including any implications for <del>council</del> <u>public services, including local transport services</u>. <del>An indicative charging benchmark as regards any monetary contributions is set out in Annex 10.</del> <u>Planning obligations will be sought to mitigate any negative impacts identified. Financial contributions towards management and maintenance arrangements will be calculated in accordance with the charging approach set out in Annex 10. Proposals for arts and cultural programming will be considered against Local Plan policy Q4. All proposals should address the requirements of public safety set out in policy Q3.</u></p> <p><i>Remove last sentence of existing para 6.92 as follows:</i></p> <p>6.92 The London Plan designates the whole of the South Bank/Bankside as a Strategic Cultural Area in recognition of its role as a strategically important area for arts, culture and entertainment and one of London’s leading international cultural and tourist destinations. In Lambeth, the South Bank Strategic Cultural Area extends from Westminster Bridge to the borough boundary with Southwark, bounded by Belvedere Road and Upper Ground. This includes County Hall, the Southbank Centre (a national arts complex comprising the Festival Hall, Hayward Gallery, <del>Saison Poetry Library</del> <u>National Poetry Library</u>, Queen Elizabeth Hall and Purcell Rooms), the National Theatre and the British Film Institute (BFI). The regeneration of the South Bank is a priority for the council as well as all major stakeholders in the area. This is recognised in the vision and strategic objectives of the Local Plan and in policy PN1 – Waterloo. <del>Lambeth has many other cultural venues</del></p>	

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<del>and facilities which are identified in the London Cultural Infrastructure Map and the Lambeth Cultural Infrastructure list.</del>	
PC037	161	6.93	<i>should refer to section d) of the policy rather than c)</i>	Typo
PC038	164	ED14 (d) and (e)	<p><i>Amend clauses (d) and (e) as follows:</i></p> <p><u>d) Proposals to extend existing visitor accommodation will only be supported in the locations set out in clauses a), b) and c) above, subject to the other requirements of this policy being met.</u></p> <p><u>e) In all locations set out in clauses a), b) and c) above, proposals for visitor accommodation (C1) will be acceptable only where it can be demonstrated that the development does not compromise a site's capacity to meet the need for conventional dwellings, especially affordable family homes.</u></p>	Clarification in response to representations by ROK Planning for Waterloo Hub Hotel Limited (R049) ROK Planning for Southbank Hotel Management Company Limited (R050)
PC039	167	6.104	<p><i>Amend last bulletpoint as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>whether a site has an extant <del>or historic</del> planning permission for C3 housing.</u></li> </ul>	In response to representations by WSP Indigo for Espalier Ventures and MELT Property (R044) ROK Planning for Waterloo Hub Hotel Limited (R049) ROK Planning for Southbank Hotel Management Company Limited (R050) Barton Wilmore for London Hotel Group (R077)
PC040	167	6.108	<p><i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of para as follows:</i></p> <p><u>To ensure that hotels provide facilities for business visitors, new hotels will be expected to provide ancillary <del>business facilities spaces</del> such as meeting rooms and</u></p>	In response to representation by TfL

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>flexible working areas, unless it is demonstrated not to be feasible because the hotel is too small to accommodate them.</u>	Commercial Development (R041)
PC041	169	ED15(b)(i)	<i>Amend as follows:</i> <u>A minimum of 25 per cent of all jobs created by the development (in both the construction phase and net additional jobs for the first two years of end-use occupation of the development) to be secured by the council for local residents.</u>	Clarification In response to representations by: TfL Commercial Development (R041) Savills for GSTT (R053) DP9 for HB Reavis (R060) DP9 for Hondo Enterprises (R076) DP9 for MEC London Properties (R080)
PC042	171	6.117	<i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of para as follows:</i> <u>The ESP will need to contain realistic estimates of the number and types of jobs the developer envisages being created by the construction phase, and the number and types of net additional jobs created by the and-end-use phases, and actual figures will need to be supplied through 6-monthly monitoring reports.</u>	Clarification in response to representations by: TfL Commercial Development (R041) Savills for GSTT (R053) DP9 for HB Reavis (R060) DP9 for Hondo Enterprises (R076) DP9 for MEC London Properties (R080)
PC043	174	7.4	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>Local Plan policies Policies S1 and S2 apply to facilities in the D1 and D2 use classes such as healthcare, childcare, higher, and further and adult education, training, community halls and meeting spaces, libraries, indoor play, indoor recreation and sports facilities and places of worship. They also apply to other public service uses (such as fire, ambulance, policing, criminal justice and community safety facilities)</u>	Clarification in response to representation by Sport England (R007)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			which are not in a given use class and are categorised <i>sui generis</i> . Local shops, cafes, pubs, post offices and markets are covered by the policies in section 6 of this plan, as they fall within the 'A' use classes. <u>Outdoor sport facilities and playing fields will be considered under Local Plan policy EN1.</u>	
PC044	185	7.25	<i>Add as new para:</i> <u>Proposals involving the loss of school playing fields will be considered under Local Plan policy EN1.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by Sport England (R007)
PC045	191	T1(c)	Amend clause as follows: In managing the road network, Lambeth will give priority to <del>traffic</del> <u>the movement of people in accordance to</u> the following <del>declining order</del> <u>hierarchy</u> and this should be reflected in development proposals:  i) walking; ii) cycling; iii) buses; iv) <u>Licenced Taxis</u> and <u>Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs)</u> <del>minicabs</del> ; v) motorcycles/scooters; vi) <del>freight transport</del> ; vii) private cars.  <u>The council will also promote and prioritise sustainable freight (see Local Plan policy T8).</u>	Clarification in response to representation by United Cabbies Group (073)
PC046	197	T2(c)	<i>Add additional sentence to para as follows:</i> <del>In considering development proposals that are likely to generate an increase in the number of walking trips, Lambeth will seek to secure</del> <u>Development proposals should deliver</u> an improved environment for pedestrians, appropriate to the scale and nature of <u>the proposal</u> <del>each development</del> , with particular regard to <del>their</del> accessibility, safety, convenience and directness of movements, including <del>footway widening</del> , provision of	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			new routes and desire lines, and enhancement of existing routes <u>with reference to the Lambeth Healthy Routes Plan. <b>All development should reduce road danger, to help deliver 'Vision Zero' in the borough.</b></u> Major development proposals should identify key routes and destinations and assess existing and predicted pedestrian flows to, <u>through and from the site. They should provide safe, direct, and attractive routes that accommodate these flows and will be expected to provide improvements that will encourage additional walking trips, including, where appropriate, Legible London signage instead of trips by car. Development proposals should facilitate the improvement of footways to minimum standards where these are not currently met, including through the provision of land for adoption as highway, and enable footway widening where increased footfall is expected. Reductions in footway space should normally be maintained and where possible increased will not be permitted.</u>	
PC047	200	T3(e)	<i>Amend last sentence as follows:</i> <u>Where appropriate, pool bikes should also be provided-, in addition to the cycle parking required to meet the minimum standards.</u>	Clarification In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC048	200	T3(f)	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> In all developments at least 25 per cent of the total cycle parking provision should be of the most accessible type, such as 'Sheffield' stands, <u>of which 5 per cent of the total cycle parking provision</u> should be designed and clearly designated for larger and adapted cycles. These stands should be spaced further apart and close to access points, to cater for users with disabilities and cargo bikes. For a development requiring 100 cycle parking spaces, this would equate to 20 spaces with standard Sheffield type stands and a further 5 in stands spaced further apart and close to access points. In all cases at least one Sheffield stand should be provided, close to the access point. <u>The provision of folding bikes with storage will be considered where a high level of cycle-rail trips are expected.</u>	In response to representations by HB Reavis (R060) and Hondo (R076)



**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC049	201	T3(h)	<i>Add additional sentences to para as follows:</i> Development proposals will be expected to <u>enable and</u> contribute towards improvements to <u>cycle access, including the delivery and improvement of local and strategic routes and links, as identified in the Lambeth Healthy Routes Plan. All development should reduce road danger, to help deliver 'Vision Zero' in the borough.</u> <u>cycle routes, where appropriate, to ensure that new development has exceptional links to cycle routes and key destinations within the borough and beyond. In appropriate locations, developers will be required to contribute land and/or finance towards the delivery of new cycle hire docking locations and other public facilities ancillary to cycling, such as cycle pumps/servicing facilities. A minimum of three years free membership of the Cycle Hire scheme for each dwelling regardless of tenure, should be provided in new residential developments. Uptake of cycle hire business accounts should be encouraged for occupiers of commercial developments through the travel plan process.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC050	201	T3(h)	A minimum of three years free membership of the Cycle Hire scheme for <del>each dwelling</del> <u>all residents</u> regardless of tenure, should be <u>made available provided</u> in new residential developments.	Correction, for consistency in approach to policy T7(d)
PC051	201	T3(g)	<i>Add new last sentence:</i> <u>In all developments at least one charge point should be provided to allow for re-charging of electric cycles and a charge point should be provided for a minimum of 1 in 10 cycle parking spaces. Charge points should be accessible to all cycle stand types, particularly those intended to accommodate larger/cargo cycles which may be more likely to require electric assistance.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC052	202	8.18	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> Lambeth will seek the provision of convenient and secure bicycle cycle parking facilities particularly at key locations such as shopping areas, employment areas and transport interchanges, but also throughout residential areas. Staff and residents' cycle parking spaces should be off-street, covered, <u>well-lit</u> and secure. Visitors are	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			usually better provided for by providing parking near entrances <u>and active frontages</u> in prominent, convenient locations. The requirements for cycle storage are set out in design Local Plan policy Q13, <u>and developers should also refer to the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS)</u> . Residents' cycle parking should normally be within the curtilage of the dwelling or, where this is not possible, in a secure, covered area where only a few (usually a maximum of 10) have access. <del>In appropriate locations, developers will be required to contribute land and/or finance towards the delivery of new cycle hire docking stations, where a specific need has been identified by the council in discussion with Transport for London (TfL).</del>	
PC053	202	8.19	<i>Add new last sentence:</i> <u>Contributions of land and/or finance towards delivery of new cycle hire stations will be sought both within and adjacent to the London Cycle Hire Scheme operating area and in areas where the council is promoting complementary cycle hire schemes. <u>Cycle hire caters for a different market/model of cycle usage to personal cycle ownership, so cycle hire access should be provided in addition to and not in lieu of the minimum cycle parking requirements.</u></u>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC054	202	8.20	<i>Add new para as follows:</i> <u>Pools bikes are a bank of shared cycles available for use free of charge for a defined period.</u>	Clarification In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC055	203	T4(a)(xii)	<i>Amend as follows:</i> <u>potential</u> extension of the Croydon Tramlink to Crystal Palace and Streatham;	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC056	205	8.25	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>Although there are no planned stations in the borough, Crossrail 2 will have a significant beneficial impact on public transport capacity in Lambeth, by relieving rail services between Clapham Junction, Vauxhall and Waterloo, interchange with underground services at Vauxhall, the Jubilee line at Waterloo and the Victoria and Northern lines through the borough.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC057	211	T7(d)(ii)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> be permit free where the development <u>has a PTAL of 4-6 and/or where the development falls within an existing or planned controlled parking zone.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC058	211	T7(d)(iii)	<i>Amend sub-clause as follows:</i> avoid reliance on the public highway <u>for parking needs, to meet the parking requirements of development, including in relation to parking for people with disabilities, motorcycle and coach parking.</u> <u>Where evidence is presented that it is not possible to accommodate parking requirements within the site the council will seek planning obligations in the form of a commuted sum, considering both the cost of implementation and maintenance of any parking bay and infrastructure for electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles, as well as the opportunity cost of lost kerbside space, for example in terms of parking revenues. The approach to calculating commuted sums is set out in Annex 10.</u>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC059	211	T7(d)(iv)	<i>Amend sub-clause as follows:</i> <u>provide make</u> car club membership <u>available to for-all</u> residents in new residential development and in mixed development that includes housing, and provision of car club spaces where appropriate: all development schemes should promote and provide for car club membership or car pool schemes in place of private parking;	Clarification in response to representation by Homes Builders Federation (R023)
PC060	213	8.35	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> Lambeth will expect car-free development in <u>most</u> areas, <u>with no general parking at all in areas with</u> excellent, very good or good public transport <u>accessibility (PTAL 4,5 and 6)</u> and <u>limited aim to maximise</u> parking elsewhere. <u>Lambeth's standards in areas with lower access to public transport reflect already low levels of car ownership in such areas, as well as projected modal shift to sustainable modes and the need to accommodate growth while decreasing car usage. Refer to 'Lambeth Car Parking Standards Supplementary Information' paper for more details.</u> Public transport accessibility is assessed using Transport for London's Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL), <u>which measures access to public transport.</u>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC061	213	8.36	<p><i>Add two new sentences to end of para as follows:</i>  <u>Non-residential parking for people with disabilities should be provided in line with London Plan standards, which require at least one bay, and state that ‘adequate provision’ should be made for people with disabilities. The appropriate level of parking for people with disabilities will depend on local factors including the nature of the development, site constraints, and existing provision. The availability of step-free access to public transport is also a relevant consideration, and where appropriate the developer will be expected to facilitate improvements to this. <i>Wherever possible, the minimum initial requirement for parking for people with disabilities should be provided on-site in order to ensure convenient access and effective allocation of spaces to users of the development. A more flexible approach may be considered in meeting future demand over and above the initial requirement, subject to highway constraints.</i></u></p>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC062	213	8.37	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i>  ‘Car-free developments’ are developments where no on-site parking is provided and residents will be excluded from the council’s residents’ parking permit scheme. <u>Where development involves the redevelopment of existing dwellings, all of the dwellings within the new development should be permit free. Car-free schemes enable more efficient use to be made of the development site and should be complemented by a travel plan.</u> Section 106 agreements will be used to secure car-free developments. Car-free developments do not necessarily restrict provision for visitor permits and provision for disabled <u>Blue Badge</u> parking will be made as appropriate, <u>in accordance with London Plan policy T6.1. Site-specific solutions for Blue Badge parking will be considered on a case by case basis.</u> The council will ensure that <del>disabled</del> parking spaces <u>for people with disabilities</u> are not sold with individual residential units but will be made available for lease, in accordance with an approved car parking management plan.</p>	Clarification in response to representation by HB Reavis (R060)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC063	214	8.39	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i></p> <p>'Car clubs' and 'pool car schemes' are shared pools of cars available locally for short term hire and are a <u>convenient cheap</u> alternative to car ownership. They allow for occasional car use but discourage unnecessary car journeys. There is now good coverage across Lambeth of car club bays and the council is aiming for a car club bay within 400m of each other to ensure convenient provision for all Lambeth residents. Car club spaces will be required where appropriate, preferably <u>with public access on street</u> to allow <u>general public use</u>. <u>The provision of car clubs is particularly relevant in areas less well served by public transport.</u> <u>All car club spaces, including on-street bays, should be supplied with an electric vehicle charging point to allow zero emissions vehicles to operate from the bay.</u> Provision of car club membership will be required for all residents from first occupation of a development scheme. <del>Car clubs and pool car schemes will also be promoted as an alternative to car parking and individual car ownership in employment areas for use by businesses and workers.</del> Planning obligations will be used to secure such contributions.</p>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC064	216	T8(b)	<p><i>Amend clause as follows:</i></p> <p>New development, and in particular non-residential and mixed-use development, will <u>only be permitted where adequate provision is made for servicing appropriate to the scale, form and location of the proposed development, including provision for commercial vehicles, ensuring that it is appropriate and acceptable in terms of impact on amenity of adjacent properties and road and traffic conditions of the location.</u> <u>Off-site consolidation to reduce the number of deliveries should be considered for larger developments or where access to the site is constrained, while smaller developments should also include consolidation strategies such as common and local procurement.</u> Innovative local delivery and last mile logistics <del>schemes will be encouraged</del> <u>approaches should also be considered to further reduce traffic impacts and reduce emissions, and minimise potential conflict with vulnerable road users.</u></p>	Clarification in response to representation from HB Reavis (R060)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC065	216	T8(f)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> Developers and their contractors will be <u>expected to adhere to the Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) standard</u> <u>and be registered through the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) or equivalent.</u> <del>They will be and</del> required to demonstrate in a construction logistics plan that they have considered the impacts of other construction activities in the vicinity of the site and where appropriate have co-ordinated construction activities with the developers and/or contractors of adjoining sites.	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC066	217	T8(i)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> <u>Zero emissions vehicles should be used for servicing wherever possible and consolidated deliveries are expected to be of this type.</u> <u>Servicing by cycle and other non-motor vehicular modes should be used wherever possible.</u> Any on-street loading bay required for a development should be supplied with an electric vehicle rapid charge point to allow zero emissions vehicles to operate from the bay.	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC067	218	8.46	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> Cycle safety measures should be included in construction logistics plans for new developments, particularly to provide safe routes for cyclists during the construction period. <u>Construction vehicles should meet or exceed minimum Direct Vision Standards.</u> <del>and construction vehicles should be</del> being fitted with cycle safety equipment, including side bars, blind spot mirrors and detection equipment to reduce the risk of collisions on the borough's roads. <del>See also policy Q12 in relation to refuse/recycling storage.</del>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC068	219	T9(a)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> Proposals for <del>minicab and p</del> Private <del>h</del> Hire <del>v</del> Vehicle (PHV) offices and <u>Licenced Taxi taxi</u> ranks will be supported in town centres and other areas where they <u>will meet a demonstrable</u> <del>are likely to meet-transport need</del> needs and where they demonstrate through a transport assessment that their operation would not adversely impact on	Clarification in response to representation by United Cabbies Group (R073)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			traffic congestion, local parking supply, capacity or need, pedestrian movement or road safety.	
PC069	219	8.47	<i>Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of para as follows:</i> Minicabs, taxis and private hire vehicles are part of the transport system and aid the overall aim of seeking a lesser dependence on car ownership. <u>While not considered to be sustainable travel modes,</u> they provide an important service for people with mobility difficulties and should be part of ensuring safe transport options are available late at night.	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC070	219	8.47, 8.48 and 8.49	<i>Amend paras as follows:</i> 8.47 <u>Minicabs, Licenced Taxis</u> and <u>Private Hire Vehicles (PHV)</u> are part of the transport system and aid the overall aim of seeking a lesser dependence on car ownership. <u>It is recognised that Licenced Taxis have unique characteristics which differentiate them from other PHVs, such as greener vehicles, better wheelchair accessibility, and higher standards of driver training. They Licenced Taxis and PHVs</u> provide an important service for people with mobility difficulties and should be part of ensuring safe transport options are available late at night. Interchange between public transport and <u>Licenced Taxis</u> and <u>PHVs</u> is important; however, proposals for such facilities must not compromise safety, traffic congestion and residential amenity. Designated <u>Licenced Taxi</u> ranks should be part of the transport network in town centres and other locations where there is a busy late night economy. Provision should be made in major schemes and within <u>Licenced Taxi</u> ranks to set down passengers and for pre-booked pickups by <u>PHVs</u> .  8.48 Proposals for <u>minicab and PHV</u> offices and <u>Licenced Taxi</u> ranks can often have significant transport impacts including highway safety concerns from passengers alighting, vehicles turning in unsafe locations and reducing the amount of parking available to residents, visitors and other commercial uses. Proposals should be accompanied by a transport assessment and management plan that demonstrate	Clarification in response to representation by United Cabbies Group (R073)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p>there will not be an unacceptable impact. This should include assessments showing how adverse transport impacts will not be diverted onto surrounding streets, particularly residential areas. In particular it must be demonstrated that sufficient parking would be maintained for other commercial users in the area. <u>Proposals for Licenced Taxi ranks should include provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</u></p> <p>8.49 <u>Where a high demand for minicabs, Licenced Taxis, PHVs and 'ride hail' services is identified and where pick up and drop off is expected to take place on street, impacts should be mitigated through agreement of preferred pick up and drop off locations on the adjacent highway.</u></p>	
PC071	228	9.5	<p><i>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of para as follows:</i> Existing <u>public and private</u> open space includes Metropolitan Open Land, common land, historic parks and gardens, district and local parks, nature conservation areas, play areas and adventure playgrounds, outdoor sports facilities <u>and playing fields</u>, allotments, cemeteries and burial space, amenity <del>land</del> <u>areas</u> within housing estates, communal squares and gardens, <u>roofs that are fully accessible to the public as open space (not private amenity space), areas of water, and the River Thames Foreshore and Thames Path in accordance with London Plan policy.</u></p>	Clarification in response to representation by Sport England (R007)
PC072	239	9.37	<p><i>Add as new last sentence to para the following:</i> <u>Historic England produce best practice guidance notes on the historic environment and sustainable design and construction.</u></p>	In response to representation by Historic England (R022)
PC073	250	EN7(a)	<p><i>Insert new additional sub-clause (ii):</i> <u>Contributing to the Mayor's target for London's waste capacity and net self-sufficiency by identifying sufficient capacity and land to meet Lambeth's identified waste needs, including the borough's apportionment target.</u></p>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)



**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC074	250	EN7(a)	<i>Amend sub-clause (iii) as follows:</i> safeguarding existing waste transfer and management sites for waste management use <del>unless</del> <u>and encouraging the intensification of capacity on existing sites where appropriate.</u> The loss of a waste site for other uses will only be supported where appropriate compensatory provision <del>is made</del> <u>capacity is provided</u> in appropriate locations elsewhere in the borough. Compensatory provision should <u>be at or above the same level of the waste hierarchy of that which is lost and normally meet or exceed</u> the maximum <u>achievable</u> throughput <del>of that the site</del> <u>over the last five years could have achieved;</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC075	252	9.66	<i>Amend first sentence as follows:</i> Lambeth is one of four London boroughs (along with Wandsworth, Hammersmith & Fulham and Kensington & Chelsea) for which the Western Riverside Waste Authority (WRWA) is the statutory waste disposal authority for <u>the municipal household waste collected by its constituent councils.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by WRWA (R004)
PC076	252	9.67	<i>Amend 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> sentences of para as follows:</i> The shortfall in capacity equates to <u>around 136,600 tonnes by 2036</u> <del>2.8 hectares by 2034.</del> Lambeth already has a number of waste facilities which can help towards <u>managing its waste and, where appropriate, the intensification of these sites is encouraged.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC077	253	9.68	<i>Amend title of table in para as follows:</i> <u>Capacity gap (tonnes) and indicative equivalent land take (hectares)</u>  <i>And amend last row 1<sup>st</sup> column of table as follows:</i> <u>Equivalent Indicative land take</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC078	253	9.69	<i>Amend para as follows:</i>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			The council has undertaken an assessment of locations and sites <u>suitable</u> for additional waste management facilities in the borough. This is set out in the Waste Evidence Base 2013 <del>2019</del> <u>2019</u> . This identifies the borough's designated Key Industrial and Business Areas (KIBAs) as particularly appropriate for new waste management uses. <u>Waste management and recycling facilities are one of the priority uses for Lambeth's industrial land (see Policy ED3).</u> KIBAs represent Lambeth's main stock of <u>safeguarded industrial land. The benefits of directing new waste facilities towards KIBAs includes co-location with other industrial uses. This helps to reduce the risk of waste facilities being located next to more sensitive development, such as residential. KIBAs have already been assessed for their suitability for industrial uses and are safeguarded for these uses. KIBAs also tend to have access which is wide enough for larger vehicles and are well-connected to main road networks.</u>	
PC079	256	9.81	<i>Add as new para 9.81 the following:</i> <u>Monitoring indicators IND24, IND25 and IND26 will report on new waste capacity, loss of waste sites and compensatory capacity, and waste exports. Where monitoring demonstrates that waste management capacity to meet the apportionment target is unlikely to be achieved by 2026, in line with the London Plan net self-sufficiency target, the council will work with the GLA to proactively engage with operators to encourage delivery of additional waste management capacity in the borough.</u>	In response to comments by the Mayor of London (R054)
PC080	270	Q7(x)	<i>Amend point (x) as follows:</i> (x) it does not prejudice the optimum future development of, or access to, adjoining sites <u>by omitting openings on party walls and avoiding direct overlooking, unacceptable overshadowing or undue sense of enclosure.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by Bywater Homes (R063)
PC081	276	Q11(b)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> b) Subordination will <del>generally</del> be a key consideration when <del>considering</del> <u>assessing</u> proposals for extensions. Development which unacceptably dominates <del>or overwhelms</del> the host building will not be <del>supported</del> <u>permitted</u> . Subordination, in all its forms, is	Clarification in response to representation by James Burton (R026)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			particularly important in relation to heritage assets. <u>To protect outdoor amenity space, as a general rule, no extension should reduce <del>private rear</del> amenity space to less than <del>30m2 for for dwelling houses of 10m2 for houses or 10m2 for flats the minimum required for that dwelling type by Policy H5.</del></u>	
PC082	284	Q13(a)(vii)	<i>Add new sub-clause (vii)</i> <u>vii) Be fully compliant with the London Cycling Design Standards.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC083	284	Q13(b)(v)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> consider the <u>removal less</u> of an on-street parking bay in favour of an on-road cycle store to be shared between residents where it can be <del>show</del> <u>shown</u> that there is no other <u>practical</u> <del>viable</del> alternative <u>due to site constraints</u> . <u>The cost, including the opportunity cost of kerbside space, is to be borne by the development.</u>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC084	285	Q13(c)	<i>Amend as follows:</i> <u>All cycle storage should be</u> Be fully compliant with the minimum standards set out in the London Plan and exceed these where a high demand for cycling is expected. <del>When considering proposals for commercial development, appropriate levels of visitor cycle parking will be expected.</del>	Clarification in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC085	285	10.58	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> In order to encourage the increased use of cycling for sustainable transport, <u>health and wellbeing</u> (see <u>Local Plan</u> policy T3), the council will require all development to provide safe, covered and secure cycle storage <u>of the highest quality that is accessible to all users preferably in the form of individual bike lockers.</u> <del>Vertical wall mounted storage is discouraged as it requires the bike to be lifted up which is not easy for all cyclists. It will only be allowed where it can be demonstrated that there is no other alternative.</del> <u>Within the cycle storage a minimum of 25 per cent of provision in the form of single-height horizontal stands ('Sheffield' type stands) is required in all developments. A minimum of <del>40 per cent of these stands (10 per cent of overall)</del></u>	In response to representations by HB Reavis (R060) and Hondo (R076)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p><del>provision)</del> <u>5 per cent of the total cycle parking provision</u> should be spaced sufficiently far apart to accommodate adapted or cargo cycles. For the remaining provision, <u>less accessible solutions, such as two tiered racks and ‘walk in’ vertical wall mounted storage should only be considered where it can be demonstrated that available space requires this. Vertical storage where the cycle must be lifted off the floor will not be accepted. Only options where it is possible to lock the frame and wheel of the cycle to the stand are acceptable. Communal bike stores should provide charging facilities for e-bikes. The council sets a premium on the quality of parking provided and, where space is limited, will consider a flexible approach allowing for the introduction of more space efficient options after first occupation.</u> All cycle parking should be provided in accordance with contemporary cycle parking standards as contained within the London Plan, <u>with reference to the London Cycle Design Standards.</u></p>	
PC086	302	10.97(ii)	<p><i>Amend point (ii) in para as follows:</i> <u>support the principle of climate change mitigation alterations and adaption responses and <del>sustainable design and construction</del> within the historic built environment in accordance with established conservation best practice;</u></p>	Clarification in response to representation by Historic England (R022)
PC087	307	10.112	<p><i>Amend para as follows:</i> New work should preserve significance, reinforce appropriate local characteristics and, where possible, secure enhancement of the listed building. High-quality craftsmanship will be required to ensure that authentic detailing is achieved using original materials. Authenticity is essential in this respect. Inferior modern materials and inferior modern detailing are not considered acceptable for the replacement or reinstatement of historic fabric <u>of or features. <del>With window replacements all glazing should be single glazed with a putty finish in the traditional manner. The acceptability of double glazing will be judged on a case by case basis using best-practice guidance from Historic England. See also Policy EN4.</del></u></p>	Clarification in response to representation by Crispin Royle-Davies (R014)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC088	315	Q24(a)(x)	<i>Delete clause (a)(x)</i> <del>(x) Development fronting the river should provide riparian life-saving equipment where necessary and appropriate.</del>	Removal of repetition in response to representation by Port of London (R020)
PC089	332	11.3	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>The South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood plan has been prepared by the South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours neighbourhood forum for the cross-border neighbourhood area. It was made by Lambeth in December 2019.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by London Borough of Southwark (R034)
PC090	332	11.4	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>There are a number of key stakeholders and a large number of active local business and community groups in the area, including South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours, South Bank Employers' Group (SBEG), South Bank Business Improvement District and 'We are Waterloo' WeAreWaterloo Business Improvement District, the Waterloo Community Development Group, the Jubilee Gardens Trust, Oasis and Coin Street Community Builders. The South Bank Manifesto 2018, produced by the South Bank Partnership, reflects the shared ambitions and key priorities of major landowners and a range of other organisations in the area.</u>	Corrections in response to representations by WeAreWaterloo Business Improvement District (R030) and Waterloo Community Development Group (R040)
PC091	334	11.10	<i>Amend last sentence as follows:</i> <u>The council will seek to work with partners to manage and, where relevant, apply appropriate planning obligations and to mitigate the impact of an increasing number of visitor numbers whilst also enhancing the visitor experience.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by the Jubilee Gardens Trust (R074)
PC092	334	11.11	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>The area has important road, cycling and walking connections across the river into Westminster, along the river westwards towards Vauxhall and Nine Elms and eastwards to Bankside and London Bridge. Although car ownership is relatively low, Waterloo is forecast to see an overall increase in car trips motor vehicle trips due to projected growth in the area. Measures are therefore required to address this.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>including traffic management measures to reduce traffic and increase walking and cycling, working towards the objective of 'car free Waterloo'.</u>	
PC093	340	PN1(g)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> <u>promoting a high quality, permeable, safe and accessible public realm that is durable, well designed and maintained to reinforce Waterloo's status as a world class place. The combination of the riverfront, streetscapes, piazzas, squares and green spaces contribute to the broader public realm and are places for people and residents to meet, socialise, activate and dwell as well as move through. Development and uses should recognise and add value to this important asset through the inclusion of flexible places for people, residents and events, and actively contribute to the enhancement of the collective public realm and increase the amount of green infrastructure in the area. See guidance in the Waterloo and South Bank Public Realm Framework.</u>	Clarification in response to representation by Waterloo Community Development Group (R040)
PC094	341	PN1(h)(vi)	<i>Amend subclause (vi) as follows:</i> Respects views from the Royal Festival Hall towards Jubilee Gardens, the London Eye and the Westminster World Heritage Site and <del>from</del> <u>through</u> the Belvedere Road <del>viaduct arch</del> <u>railway bridge</u> towards Jubilee Gardens.	Clarification in response to representations by Waterloo Community Development Group (R040), Friends of Jubilee Gardens (R045) and M Evers (R065)
PC095	342	PN1(h)	<i>Amend last sentence as follows:</i> <u>Management, Maintenance and servicing requirements (including for sustainable watering) should be planned and designed from the outset. Supporting infrastructure and Servicing arrangements should not harm the openness of the MOL and should address Local Plan policy EN1(a)(iii).</u> There should continue to be provision of public toilets in Jubilee Gardens.	Clarification in response to representation by the Jubilee Gardens Trust (R074)
PC096	342	PN1(i)	<i>Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> to last sentence of clause (i) as follows:</i> Traffic management measures to deter unnecessary <del>car</del> <u>motor vehicle</u> trips and innovative measures to reduce the impact of freight and construction traffic will be	In response to representations by Waterloo Community Development

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			promoted, including increased use of the River Thames and existing piers for transporting people and freight.	Group (R040) and M Evers (R065)
PC097	342	PN1(m)	<i>Amend clause (m) as follows:</i> <u>supporting the development of a MedTech health cluster by supporting the strategies of St Thomas' Hospital, Guy's and St Thomas' Charity and King's College London at Royal Street in accordance with an agreed high-level masterplan-design principles for the estates to achieve new health facilities; replacement housing, open space and community facilities; capacity for Combined Heat and Power; new commercial development including workspace for small and medium enterprises; and related and supporting facilities such as accommodation for staff. Creation of a new primary care centre in the wider Waterloo area will be supported.</u>	Clarification in response to Guy's and St Thomas' Charity (R053) Stanhope PLC (R067) Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust (R069)
PC098	357	11.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>growth poles in the form of new Central <del>Activity</del> Activities Zone (CAZ) retail clusters at Battersea Power Station and Vauxhall;</u></li> </ul>	Correction
PC99	357 360 437	11.18 and 11.31 and 11.119	<p><i>Amend 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of para 11.18 as follows:</i> <u>a transformational step-change in public transport provision including the Northern Line Extension from Kennington to Battersea Power Station with a Lambeth station at Nine Elms to be open in <del>Autumn 2021</del>by-2020, supported by a comprehensive package of rail, bus, cycling, pedestrian and highway improvements around the Vauxhall transport interchange expected to be delivered by 2022;</u></p> <p><i>Amend last sentence of para 11.31 as follows:</i> <u>.... These initiatives, along with the opening of the Northern Line extension in <del>Autumn 2021</del> 2020, will help unlock a range of opportunities for the borough's residents and businesses that would not otherwise come forward.</u></p> <p><i>Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of para 11.119 as follows:</i></p>	Correction in response to comments by Transport for London (R048)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			.... <u>In <del>Autumn 2021</del> 2020 the Northern Line extension spur from Kennington will open and will give direct access to the emerging CAZ retail cluster at Battersea....</u>	
PC100	358	11.24	<u>Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> to last sentence of para as follows:</u> <u>Public realm improvements will be delivered through the completion of the 'Missing Link Phase 3' and Vauxhall Park will be improved in 2020 during 2019.</u>	Correction in response to representation by Brixton Society (R066)
PC101	362	PN2 Map	<u>Correct the location of the northern line extension/station at Battersea Power Station.</u>	Correction
PC102	364	PN2	<u>Amend as follows:</u> <u>A retail cluster will be created at Vauxhall, known as Vauxhall Cross. Mixed-use development will be supported that contributes to the creation of this centre including town-centre uses such as retail, employment, housing, leisure, entertainment and other creative, cultural and community uses in line with its Central <del>Activity</del> Activities Zone (CAZ) designation and as part of the wider London Plan Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea Opportunity Area (now known as Nine Elms Vauxhall).</u>	Correction
PC103	371	Site 11	<u>Amend postcode as follows:</u> <u>SW8 <del>4RG</del></u>	Correction
PC104	377	Site 13	<del><u>Plot bounded by Parry Street, Bondway and 7-93 Wandsworth Road SW8 (Vauxhall Island Site)</u></del> <u>Plot bounded by 7-93 Wandsworth Road, Parry Street, Bondway including the bus station SW8 (Vauxhall Island Site)</u>	Correction
PC105	385 and 386	PN3 Map	<u>Correct town centre boundary</u>	Correction
PC106	386	PN3 Map	<u>Remove conservation areas from the map</u>	Correction
PC107	388	PN3(d)	<u>Amend clause (d) as follows:</u> <u>outside of the primary shopping area, indoor markets (as shown on the Policies Map) and evening economy management zone, ground floor uses in the town centre should be in A, D or B use. The proportion of units in A4 and nightclub use should not exceed 5 per cent and no more than 2 in 5 consecutive ground floor units should be in A4 or</u>	Clarification in response to representation by Brixton Society (R066)



**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>nightclub use. This should take account of unimplemented planning permissions for change of use.</u>	
PC108	390	PN3(p)	<i>Amend last part of clause as follows:</i> ...opportunity for relocating <del>the town centre waste compactors</del> <u>market infrastructure</u> on land off Electric Lane.	Correction
PC109	390	PN3(r)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> <u>Brixton Road – Brixton’s ‘high street’ has seen significant highway improvements: further <del>expected</del> improvements include the delivery of the Streatham to Oval cycle way through the town centre including safety improvements to key junctions, traffic management and air quality improvement measures, improved connections to surrounding areas;...</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC110	412	11.76	<u>...Key Industrial <del>and</del> Business Areas,</u>	Correction
PC111	424	11.97	<i>Amend as follows:</i> <u>The Station to Station Business Improvement District covers the town centre, the Park Hall Road Trading Estate and the West Norwood Commercial Area, focussing on growing existing business and supporting public realm improvements. The Norwood Action Group <del>and Norwood Forum are is an</del> active community <del>group groups.</del></u>	Correction in response to representation by Norwood Action Group et al (R027)
PC112	430	PN7(c)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> <u>The council will work with stakeholders to promote improvements to public transport services to the area, including accessibility improvements to the rail stations and the wider objective to improve the reliability and frequency of rail services across the area. The council will work with TfL to reduce traffic dominance caused by Tulse Hill gyratory, <del>including through the potential re-introduction of seeking to introduce two-</del> way working, creating better, safer connections for walking and cycling and an improved environment.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC113	437	11.117	<u>...Key Industrial <del>and</del> Business Areas,</u>	Correction

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC114	441	PN8(i)	<u>Amend clause as follows implementing the council's Healthy Route Network in the area, including improvements to Cycleway 7 on the A3 corridor, Cycleway 5 on quieter streets and the direct link to Waterloo via Kennington Lane. The council will support TfL in the delivery of <del>expected</del> <del>planned</del> routes on the A23 linking to Brixton and the A202 linking to Camberwell.</u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC115	446	11.133 and 11.134	<p><u>Amend paragraphs as follows:</u></p> <p><u>11.133 In recent years local community groups have formed and come together with the purpose of regenerating their area and to consider how the area can respond to change. The Loughborough Junction Action Group (LJAG) is one of a number of a local resident-led groups of volunteers whose stated purpose is to improve the environment and lives of people living <del>and working</del> in Loughborough Junction. Other local groups include the Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum and the LJ Works Steering Group. In 2013, LJAG worked with the council to produce the Loughborough Junction Plan.</u></p> <p><u>11.134 <del>Projects designed to enhance the resilience of the neighbourhood have brought</del> <del>Bringing</del> the community together via art <del>which</del> is important in Loughborough Junction as the area as a high proportion of artists working in artists' studios and railway arches. LJAG has already initiated the 7 Bridges Project, with improvements to the bridges at Cambria Road and Loughborough Road already delivered. The project aims to improve the railway bridges which define the area with colour, light and art in order to engender a sense of identity for Loughborough Junction as a separate and distinct neighbourhood and to showcase local artists. Projects such as urban farming at Loughborough Farm <del>and Community Cafe</del> and activities at the Marcus Lipton Youth Centre <del>and Grove Adventure Playground</del> and the area's places of worship have also proven successful.</u></p>	Corrections and clarification in response to representation by Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC116	447	11.135a	<i>Add as new para after 11.135:</i> <u>The Denmark Hill campus of King's College Hospital is partially located in Lambeth. The Hospital Trust wish to reconfigure their estate at this campus. The council will work with King's College Hospital Foundation Trust to consider this through the preparation of a masterplan.</u>	In response to representation by ID Planning for King's College Hospital Foundation Trust (R024)
PC117	447	11.139	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>Loughborough Junction remains an industrial area and within the wider Loughborough Junction area there are <del>six</del> seven Key Industrial and Business Areas, providing an important source of the borough's light industrial and creative employment space. Industrial and employment uses in the area include waste management uses, a number of motor repair workshops, artists' studios, recycling centres and an electricity sub-station. Light industrial units are particularly prominent and are located within a number of yards with distinct characteristics. The creation of additional employment and training opportunities, both in existing and new businesses, particularly for young people, is key to the regeneration of the area. This requires space for local businesses to start up and grow, good transport connections and programmes to support people to find work.</u>	Correction and clarification in response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)
PC118	448	11.142	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>The area is served by a number of bus routes and Loughborough Junction station. The station does not provide step-free access and generally requires refurbishment. Rail services are overcrowded at peak times and passenger numbers at the station are increasing have declined. The council will promote access and environmental improvements at the station and longer term options to improve rail services as part of TfL's 'metroisation' proposals.</u>	Correction in response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC119	448	11.143	<i>Add new last sentence to para as follows:</i> <u>Loughborough Junction has one of the lowest levels of car ownership in the country. Many residents walk and cycle to get around the area and use public transport to access other areas. The council's Healthy Route Network responds to this and identifies the need for improved walking and cycling links to adjacent areas. There is also an aspiration to open up additional routes through and around the railway viaducts to improve the permeability and accessibility of the area as part of an extension to the Low Line project. <b>Expansion of London Cycle Hire will be explored with TfL, to be funded through developer contributions.</b></u>	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC120	448	11.144	<i>Amend para as follows:</i> <u>As an area with a high concentration of flats and few private gardens, high quality public open space and parks with well-connected and safe access routes <b>with more trees planted along main roads</b> are particularly important for health and wellbeing and to improve air quality in the area.</u>	In response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)
PC121	449	11.145	<i>Amend last sentence of para as follows:</i> <u>Despite these assets, much of Loughborough Junction is categorised as being deficient in access to multiple types of open space and opportunities to <b>increase improve</b> access to open green space will be sought.</u>	Clarification in response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)
PC122	452	PN10 (a) (i), (ii), (vi)	<i>Amend clause (a) and its sub-clauses (i) (ii) (vi) as follows:</i> a) <u>The council will work with local stakeholders to support the role of Loughborough Junction as a local centre with a clear identity and sense of place. This will be done by using the railway bridges, <b>viaducts and railway arches</b> as a catalyst for change, making greater use of under-used spaces and places and bringing forward new housing where appropriate. The council will:</u>	Clarifications in response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<p>i) <u>support sensitive new development which makes better use of under-used spaces and places to <b>improve amenity</b>, increase public safety and the appearance of the area;</u></p> <p>ii) <u>support improvements to the local centre's retail and leisure offer <b>and community facilities</b> so residents can access essential services within walking or cycling distance of their homes;</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>vi) <u>support proposals that increase the permeability, accessibility, navigability and safety of the area through improvements to existing walking and cycling routes and the creation of new, <b>healthy</b>, safe and accessible routes and opening up of key routes to previously inaccessible sites. Proposals to open up routes alongside railway arches and to contribute to the Low Line project will be supported. Proposals that harm accessibility in the town centre will be resisted;</u></p>	
PC123	453	PN10(b)	<p><i>Amend clause (b) as follows:</i>  <u>When considering proposals affecting existing community facilities, in addition to the requirements of Local Plan policies S1 and/or EN1, The the council will ensure the maintenance of an adequate supply of <b>community facilities in the area to meet the need of local users, including</b> supervised facilities for children and young people, <b>as well as other community facilities to meet local needs.</b></u></p>	Clarification in response to representation by Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R032)
PC124	453	PN10(d)	<p><i>Amend clause (d) as follows:</i></p>	Clarification in response to Loughborough Junction

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
			<u>New and existing walking and cycling routes should be enhanced to reduce crime and <del>of the</del> fear of crime through improved lighting, particularly under bridges, through arches, and alongside viaducts, and frontages should be activated to create surveillance. Bike-hire stations, and car club/hire facilities, and electric vehicle charging points should be provided throughout the area.</u>	Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)
PC125	454	PN10(g)	<p><u>...Loughborough Road Key Industrial and Business Areas.</u></p> <p><i>Amend sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) as follows:</i></p> <p>ii) Higgs Yard – <del>pedestrian crossings to the station and traffic calming measures that improve improvements to</del> the pedestrian and cycling environment <u>at the junction of Coldharbour Lane/Herne Hill Road and improved improve the relationship of the Higgs development with the adjacent railway arches.</u></p> <p>iii) Hardess Yard – improvements to workspace and reinstatement of the route from <u>Hinton Road to Hardess Street. Working with the freeholder of the arches and leaseholders, the council will explore the potential to create dual aspect units in the railway arches, including those facing the Higgs development, where possible.</u></p>	Correction and clarifications in response to Loughborough Junction Action Group and Loughborough Junction Neighbourhood Forum (R028)
PC126	457	11.152	<p><i>Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence as follows:</i></p> <p><u>The <del>London Plan</del> Bromley Local Plan 2019 identifies Crystal Palace Park and Crystal Palace train and Overground station in the London Borough of Bromley as a Strategic Outer London Development Centre due to the area's existing and potential leisure, tourism, arts, cultural and sports functions.</u></p>	Correction in response to representation by London Borough of Bromley (R015)
PC127	457	11.153	<p><i>Amend last sentence of para as follows:</i></p> <p><u>There are 17 <del>four</del> bus routes, including four night buses serving the area, <del>one night bus and one express bus service.</del></u></p>	Correction

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Ref no.	Page no. in DRLLP PSV	Policy/ paragraph number	Potential change	Reason
PC128	460	PN11(b)	<i>Amend clause as follows:</i> supporting the <u>potential</u> extension of the Tramlink to Crystal Palace and/or improvements to rail frequencies on the Beckenham Junction corridor to provide improved access for the area; Gipsy Hill station is only fully accessible to one platform and development should seek to enable step-free access to both platforms;  <i>And subsequently amend Key of Map on page 459 as follows:</i> <u>Potential</u> Tramlink extension	In response to comments by Transport for London (R048)
PC129	476	Annex 4	Annex 4: Key Industrial <u>and</u> Business Areas	Correction
PC130	499	Annex 10	<i>Amend sub-title as follows:</i> <b>Monetary Contributions in lieu of Affordable Housing Provision on <u>Small Sites (between 10 and 25 dwellings)</u> under the Fast Track approach:</b>	Correction
PC131	506	Annex 11	Location W3 Waterloo Roundabout <u>130m</u> <del>30m</del> AOD point block	Correction of typo as per Erratum Notice published during Regulation 19 consultation (examination library ref PD01a)
PC132	515	Annex 12	<i>Remove policy reference as follows:</i> <del>PN4(h)</del>	Correction
PC133	536	Glossary	<b>Public Transport <u>Accessibility Level</u> (PTAL)</b>	Correction in response to comments by Transport for London (048)
PC134		Evidence Base	<i>Add to Evidence Base the following:</i> <u>Open Spaces Strategy 2013</u> <u>Open Spaces Strategy 2007</u> <u>Open Spaces Strategy 2004</u>	Correction of accidental omission
PC135		Evidence Base	<i>Add to Evidence Base the following:</i> <u>Topic Paper 9: Particular types of housing</u>	Addition

**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Part 2 – potential changes to the Proposed Changes to the Policies Map January 2020 (PCPM)

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Page no. in PCPM</b>	<b>Table or Map no.</b>	<b>Potential change</b>	<b>Reason</b>
PC136	77	Map 12	<i>Amend boundary of the Immediate Setting of the World Heritage Site to align with the proposed change to the boundary of the MOL at Hungerford car park, so that the area not designated as MOL is not included within the Immediate Setting, as shown in the map on next page.</i>	Correction in response to a representation by Southbank Centre (R010) – this amendment should have been included in the PCPM in January 2020 but was accidentally omitted.



**SD17 - Schedule of potential changes May 2020**

Map 12 – Proposed new Westminster World Heritage Site zones

