

Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form



| | | |
|------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Ref: | R053 | (for official use only) |
|------|-------------|-------------------------|

Name of the document (DPD) to which this representation relates:

| |
|--|
| Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Proposed Submission Version January 2020 (DRLLP PSV Jan 2020) and associated Proposed Changes to the Policies Map January 2020 (PCPM Jan 2020) |
|--|

Please return to: localplan@lambeth.gov.uk

or by post: Planning Policy Team, London Borough of Lambeth, PO Box 734 Winchester SO23 5DG
by 11pm on 13th March 2020.

Please read the Guidance Note and Privacy Notice attached to this form before completing the representation form or submitting your comments

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal details (please see applicable privacy notices in Section 5 of the guidance note)

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 you wish to make a representation about.

Part A

1. Personal details*

2. Agent's details (if applicable)

* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title,

Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the

full contact details of the agent in 2.

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Title | MS | MR |
| First name | GAIL | IAIN |
| Last name | MACDONALD | BUZZA |
| Job title [†] | PROPERTY DIRECTOR | ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR |
| Organisation [†] | GUY'S AND ST THOMAS' HOSPITAL | SAVILLS |
| Address | | 33 MARGARET STREET |
| | | LONDON |
| | | |
| | | |
| Postcode | | W1G 0JD |
| Telephone | | 020 7075 2811 |
| Email [†] | | ian.buzza@savills.com |

[†] where relevant

Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

Part B – please use a separate sheet for each representation

3. To which part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 does this representation relate? (Identify specific reference if possible)

Paragraph no. Policy no. Policies Map

4. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is:

(please tick)

4.1 Legally compliant

Yes

No

4.2 Sound[^]

Yes

No

4.3 Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

No

[^] The considerations in relation to being 'sound' are explained in the notes at the back of this form. If

you have ticked 'No' to 4.2, please continue to Q5. Otherwise please go to Q6.

5. Do you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is unsound because it is not:

(please tick)

5.1 Positively prepared

5.2 Justified

5.3 Effective

5.4 Consistent with national policy

(Please tick only one option. A separate form should be used if you wish to raise more than one concern.)

6. Please give details of why you consider the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 or their compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments and then go to Q9.

SEE ENCLOSED REPRESENTATION

(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)

Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in Q5 above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) You will need to say why this change will make the part of the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020 that you identified in Q3 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of this part of policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify your representation and your suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change to the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 or associated PCPM Jan 2020, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes I do wish to participate at the oral examination

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing sessions(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

If you have selected 'No', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

SEE ENCLOSED REPRESENTATION

(if required continue on the additional comments page attached)

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination. You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

10. Please tick relevant boxes if you require notification of any of the following to your address stated in Part A:

That the DRLLP PSV Jan 2020 and associated PCPM Jan 2020 have been submitted for independent examination

The publication of the inspector's recommendations following the independent examination

The adoption of the Revised Lambeth Local Plan and Policies Map.

Signature

pp Johnson

Date

13 MARCH 2020

Please use this section for any additional/continued comments

13 March 2020



Local Plan Consultation
Planning Department
London Borough of Lambeth
Lambeth Town Hall
Brixton Hill
London
SW2 1RW

Iain Buzza
iain.buzza@savills.com
33 Margaret Street W1G 0JD
T: +44 (0) 20 7499 8644
savills.com

By email only: localplan@lambeth.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan: Regulation 19 Consultation March 2020.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the emerging draft Local Plan (Regulation 19).

We write on behalf of Guy's and St Thomas' Charity which owns a 5.4 acre site in the Waterloo area referred to as the Royal Street site.

Established over 500 years ago, the Charity's purpose is to improve the health of people in the London boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark, two of the UK's most diverse and deprived areas. This is achieved through the Charity working with a range of partners to identify, test and scale new approaches to health and healthcare, and by supporting Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust through a combination of fundraising and the Charity's own philanthropic support.

The Charity has an endowment of over £800m of assets which forms the backbone of its resources. A considerable part of this comprises the Charity's property portfolio, which includes significant land holding in Lambeth.

With regards to the Royal Street site the southern portion of the site falls within the Site Allocation 1 Land north and south of and including 10 Royal Street (Founders Place), as set out on in the draft Local Plan. Guy's and St Thomas' Charity has engaged in the preceding rounds of public consultation and look forward to continuing to develop an appropriate framework to create the certainty of outcome required to enable this key site to be brought forward for development with confidence.

In addition to the Guy's and St Thomas' Charity engagement with the Local Plan process, the Charity has been actively engaged with the Council through the pre-application process to discuss the development potential of the site. The Charity has now selected Stanhope as its development partner who will be working in partnership to deliver a development scheme onsite. Stanhope and the Charity are currently exploring options to optimise the site to deliver a mixed-use proposal. Gerald Eve has submitted a separate representation on behalf of Stanhope, and the Charity is in full support of the matters discussed.

The Charity recognises the importance of the planning policy framework to help it and its partners realise their respective ambitions for growth and expansion. In large, the Charity is supportive of the Council's approach and strategy for growth set out in the draft Local Plan. However, there are some changes to Policies PN1, ED2 and ED15 which we consider are required in order to make the Plan legally compliant and sound. Where concerns are raised against matters of the plan which we consider could prejudice the Charity's ability to realise its ambitions, we have suggested proposed amendments to the plan in advance of the Examination in Public.

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East..

Savills (UK) Limited. Chartered Surveyors. Regulated by RICS. A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2605138.
Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD



PN1 Waterloo and South Bank

The Proposed Submission Version no longer supports the aspiration to enhance Waterloo and the South Bank's role as a town centre of metropolitan significance. Instead the plan now proposes to support and enhance the Central Activities Zone retail cluster and identify the Lower Marsh/The Cut/Leake Street Policy Area within it. At part ii) this area is identified as a location for specialist and independent retail. Topic Paper 4 (para 2.8) and the officers comments in the DRLLP 2018 Consultation Report Part 1 (rep 140/19) state that *"proposals for further retail development within the wider CAZ retail cluster would need to demonstrate that they would complement and not undermine the special character of Lower Marsh/The Cut"*. Clarification is sought that no part of the Royal Street site, in particular the railway arches, are not in the Wider CAZ Retail Cluster.

Part m) of the Policy PN1 (previously part j) refers to 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 for the estates."* The deletion of the term "combined estate" and the inference that the Charity acts on behalf of the Trust and King's College London is welcomed given the separate nature of these organisations and their respective land holdings.

However, the policy still makes reference to an "agreed high-level masterplan" for the estates which we do not consider is justified or appropriate given that both the Charity and the Trust's sites are in many ways to be progressed independently from one another. The requirement for an agreed masterplan document may place an onerous burden on the Charity and Stanhope who are working in partnership with, but ultimately, independently of the Trust and any delay in the promotion of its development proposals for the Royal Street site would not be acceptable. As per our previous representations, the use of the term *"agreed high-level design principles"* would allow for a more flexible and less prescriptive approach to strategic design issues across the sites. Additionally, we maintain that the proposed land-uses should not be limited to those set out in the draft policy. It is not considered that this degree of prescription is justified in this CAZ site, particularly where Policy SD4 of the London Plan Intend to Publish Version (LPITP) states that a "rich mix of strategic functions as well as local uses should be promoted and enhanced."

We therefore suggest the following amendments to the wording of the policy to ensure its soundness and legal compliance through compliance with the London Plan:

*m) 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 **design principles** masterplan for the estates **which could to achieve but is not limited to;** 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.*

Policy ED2 Affordable Workspace

The Charity's in principle support for the provision of affordable workspace is unchanged. However, concerns remain over the lack of flexibility in the Council's approach to securing affordable workspace on major schemes. Representations made on behalf of Stanhope mirror the Charity's original comments made in 2018. These argue that flexibility should be built into the policy reflecting the fact that affordable workspace can be delivered across a range of use classes and that affordable workspace alone will not deliver the benefits the policy is seeking to deliver. Additionally, with respect to the insertion of clause f) requiring the submission of viability information where proposals do not provide the level of affordable workspace required, the Charity supports Stanhope's representation. This states that schemes which deliver alternative options equal to a policy compliant offer of affordable workspace should be considered to be policy compliant and eligible for the fast track route without the need for a financial viability assessment.

The Charity endorses Stanhope's representations and shares the view that policy ED2 of the draft Local Plan as currently drafted is not sound.

Policy ED15 Employment and Training

As previously stated, the Charity supports the aim of the draft policy to support employment and training schemes within Lambeth and to maximise local employment opportunities to help address skills deficits in the local population. However, we maintain that the requirement at part b) i) for a minimum of 25 per cent of jobs created by the development in the construction phase *and* for the first two years of occupation to be secured for local residents to be extremely onerous and at odds with the aims of the LPITP. The LPITP seeks to enhance London's position as a global city which attracts talent from all over the world and the requirement for a minimum of 25 per cent of end-use jobs for the first two years conflicts with the reality of London's position as a Global City.

The Royal Street site is located in the CAZ and it is therefore expected that the businesses that will occupy the floorspace will attract a diverse, international workforce. The site is also extremely close to the boundaries of other London boroughs such as Southwark and Westminster. As such, it should be expected that the site should deliver benefits for the whole of London as a global city.

The policy as currently drafted fails to comply with policy GG5 of LPITP which seeks to conserve and enhance London's global economic competitiveness. The policy as drafted is both onerous and unrealistic and could make any development on the site less attractive to the market and as a result dilute the opportunity currently open to the borough.

Our previous representation made reference to a worked example based on proposals for the site which were discussed with officers through pre-application engagement. This exercise highlighted that with a commercial floorspace quantum of 92,318sqm, some c1,407 employees for the first two years of occupation would need to be residents of the London Borough of Lambeth. This policy requirement will no doubt place a burden on employers and impact on recruitment abilities. This could in turn have an unintended consequence on the viability of the employment space and in turn the viability of the wider development.

In addition to the conflict with the London Plan, the policy wording is also considered to be in conflict with the NPPF which at paragraph 16 notes that local plans should be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable.

As currently written, the policy is neither justified or consistent with national policy and the LPITP. The policy as currently drafted is therefore not sound. To this end, we suggest the following amendment:

"b) Applications for major development must include a site-specific Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) and the developer will be expected to agree to deliver the commitments secured in the ESP. The ESP should as a minimum address, in detail, how the developer intends to deliver the following requirements:

j) A minimum of 25 per cent of all jobs created by the development ~~(in both the construction phase and for the first two years of end-use occupation of the development)~~ to be secured by the council for local residents."

Site 1 – Land north and south of and including 10 Royal Street, SE1 (Founders Place)

Whilst we acknowledge that the Council intends to review existing site allocation policies through the forthcoming Site Allocations SPD, the Charity wishes to restate its comments as expressed in our December 2018 representation. In summary, these are:

- The boundary of Site Allocation 1 is amended to take account of Becket House and the railway arches to the east of the site to reflect the extent of the Charity's land ownership.
- The text at "Preferred use" is amended to accurately reflect the tenure of the existing housing which should be replaced in any comprehensive re-development scenario. The existing housing is not "affordable housing"

- Part (ii) of design principles and key development considerations which states that 10 Royal Street and Holy Trinity Urban Centre should be remained should be deleted given that these buildings are of limited significance, a principle established by the 2007 appeal decision.

Summary

In summary, the Charity is broadly supportive of the aims and objectives of the draft local plan. However, we have concerns about the approach to the Lower Marsh/The Cut/Leake Street Special Policy Area which may run contrary to the Policy SD4 of the LPITP. Additionally, the requirement for an agreed masterplan for the site places an undue burden on the Charity ahead of the promotion of its development proposals for the site. The identification of agreed high-level design principles would represent a more proportionate approach. We also maintain our view that the list of proposed land uses is overly prescriptive and at odds with the LPITP which seeks a rich mix of strategic and local uses in the CAZ.

We acknowledge that the Council will be reviewing the Site 1 site allocation through a review of the local plan but nevertheless wish to restate our concerns about the soundness of the current wording.

Lastly, we consider that the Council's proposed approach to the provision of affordable workspace as expressed in draft policy ED2 and local employment as expressed in draft policy ED15 is not sound.

For these reasons, we consider the plan as drafted fails to meet the tests of the NPPF, fails to comply with the London Plan and fails to adopt a justified and appropriate approach to the Royal Street site. Therefore, the plan as currently drafted is neither sound, nor legally compliant.

We look forward to acknowledgement of receipt of these representations. Please do not hesitate to contact us on the details at the head of this letter should you require any further information.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Savills", written in a cursive style.

Savills