

Introduction

This evidence is prepared by Union4 Planning on behalf of Caddick London Ltd and Bizspace.

Caddick are an established, national developer of employment space and homes across the UK. They have a significant number of developments under planning in London that will deliver several thousand new homes and new employment space as part of major mixed-use regeneration proposals.

Bizspace are an established provider of managed workspace, including the provision of offices, workshops and storage space across London and the South East. They own the Lilford Business Centre which comprises a mix of mainly B1 offices with some workshop space on the Camberwell Trading Estate, Lambeth.

Together, Caddick and Bizspace are proposing a substantial investment in the development of new, efficient, low carbon, employment space in Lambeth as part of mixed use development that also provides new homes in the form of largescale shared living, designed to meet identified local requirements. This has included pre-application submissions to Lambeth and GLA and informed the representations to this Local Plan consultation. This all forms the context to this evidence which should be read in conjunction with these submissions.

This evidence is based on the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Submission Version and the proposed changes set out in June 2020 (SD17a).

The main evidence dealing with matters of soundness are set out within the evidence on Matters 3 and 4 and are not repeated here. These do however, lead us to certain conclusions in respect of the following questions raised.

Main Matter 1: Legal Requirements, Scope of the Local Plan and Duty to Cooperate

1.1 Legal Requirements: Does the Local Plan meet all its legal requirements (e.g. in relation to the Local Development Scheme; Statement of Community Involvement; and Local Development Regulations 2012)? Are there any other legal compliance issues?

It is not considered that the Plan adequately addresses the legal obligation that local plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Inherent in this requirement is that existing needs should be met. For the reasons set out in Matter 3, we consider that the Plan fails to meet the need for housing and fails to consider positively opportunities for major mixed use development that would contribute to this requirement.

It is also a legal requirement for the Plan to have regard to and accord with national planning policies. For the reasons set out within Matters 3 and 4 it is considered that this requirement is not met.

Further, the Plan sets out in policy H13 measures that seek to impose rent controls on private large-scale, purpose built shared living accommodation. It is not clear what the legal basis for the proposed rent controls is or how this is justified in terms of the relevant planning statute. Notwithstanding the lack of any clear rationale or policy basis at a national level for this approach, there must be significant doubt that this is lawful.

1.2 Scope of the Local Plan**(i) Does the scope of the Local Plan accord with Section 3 of the NPPF (the Framework) (2019 version) (Plan-making) and the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan?**

As set out in national planning policy, local plans should aim to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. They should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. Again, for the reasons set out in relation to matters 3 and 4 we do not consider this is the case here. The Plan does not seek to maximise housing delivery and imposes constraints on the renewal of employment space and on mixed use development that are neither positive, compliant with national policy nor effective in promoting investment in jobs and homes.

They should also be shaped by early, proportionate, and effective engagement with communities, local organisations and businesses. We do not believe that is the case here. In spite of numerous requests for meetings or engagement with the policy team dating back to 2018, no dialogue has been forthcoming on the issues raised in our representations and no changes have been made to address them.

For these reasons we consider that plan is not positively prepared and fails to maximise the opportunities for economic growth, the regeneration of brownfield land and the provision of sufficient homes which as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs.

There also appears to be no real consideration of reasonable alternative development strategies in relation to the future of KIBAs and the degree to which such an approach may better meet need and be more sustainable.

1.3 Duty to Cooperate (DTC):**(i) Given that the legal responsibility for the Duty to Cooperate (DTC) rests with the individual London Boroughs, and also given the London-wide housing shortfall of 140,000 homes over the ten years from 2019/20 to 2028/29 (based on paragraph 6 of the Secretary of State's letter dated 13 March 2020), should the Council be addressing this shortfall in this Plan in cooperation with its neighbouring LPAs?**

In the circumstances where there is outstanding uncertainty over the changes to be made to the London Plan in order to address the Directions and comments made by the Secretary of State in his letter of the 13 March, and in light of the comments of the Secretary of State that the action sought must be shared with the London Boroughs, it is the case that each of the Boroughs should do what they can to reassess their policies where their plans are in the process of formulation (as they are here) and address what they reasonably can of the shortfall.

It is clear that there are additional sites such as that at Lilford Road that can be identified to contribute to meeting this need and actions that can be taken to address the identified policy constraints that will help to boost the short and medium term housing trajectory. It is clear that some of these opportunities can and would thereby contribute to meeting the immediate housing and economic needs of London.

(ii) Where does the Council consider the balance to lie between the London Plan (Intend to Publish version) and the individual Boroughs and Development Corporations in addressing the London-wide housing shortfall?

Lambeth Local Plan Examination

Given that the Plan seeks to meet targets set by the Intend To Publish (ITP) London Plan, which are themselves derived from the SHLAA and are capacity based, there is every reason for Lambeth to reconsider the constraints that limit supply, notably KIBA policy ED3, in order to address its reasonable share of the additional unmet need identified within the examination of the London Plan and referenced in the letter of the Secretary of State of the 13 March 2020. It is quite correct that they should not be alone in this challenge, each Borough should make its own reasonable contribution and be realistic about its ability to do so. However, where there are examples of areas where more could be done within reason to meet these unmet needs, then these actions should be taken.