

Strategic Policy 7 – Arts, Culture and Tourism

OBJECTIONS

Second Deposit

2 / 252 / 7261	Mr Derek Partridge
2 / 113 / 7468	Ms Pauline Adenwalla
2 / 457 / 8281	Mr Robert Hulse
2 / 26 / 8299	St Martins Property Investments Ltd
2 / 538 / 9335	Ms Valerie Shawcross - AM London Assembly

MAIN ISSUES

1. the treatment of “creative industries” in the UDP;
2. The extension of the Strategic Cultural Area to include the St. Mary’s Conservation Area;
3. The reference in paragraph 2.076 to the proposed uses at Potter’s Field.

INSPECTOR’S REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS

- 2.1.174 None of these objections relates directly to Strategic Policy 7. **Ms Shawcross** objects on the basis that the UDP should make specific provision for creative industries in accordance with Policy 3B.9 of the London Plan and refers to an area at Pullens Yard.
- 2.1.175 It seems to me that the creative industries would fall broadly within the definition of “arts and crafts” and they are often, but not always, linked to tourism. They are, therefore, broadly covered by Strategic Policy 7. In the Council’s response to **Ms Shawcross**, I consider that it has identified a particular difficulty in seeking to implement the London Plan through UDPs which must, of necessity, focus on what can be done through the statutory planning system rather than the Spatial Strategy of the London Plan. The Council is right to point out that the existing uses at Pullens Yard are within Use Class B1 and there is no land use planning control over changes from what might be described as creative industries to other kinds of activity within the same Use Class.
- 2.1.176 I say this with considerable sympathy for those people who are engaged in such creative industries as the manufacture of musical instruments and who, like **Ms Linda Bailey**, tell me of the difficulties that they face as a result of increases in their rents. This is, however, more a matter for landlord and tenant legislation than of land use planning controls. Pullens Yard is a most fascinating area, due not only to its architectural and cultural interest, but because of the creative and imaginative industries which, as I saw, are

accommodated there. The UDP is highly protective of existing employment sites and the different emphasis in some aspects of Central Government policy has led to the objections I have already considered. I do not consider that there is anything further which can be done in the way of policy development to provide further protection for existing employment, of whatever type. All I can do, however, is to urge the Council where appropriate in its capacity as landlord to bear in mind the nature of these creative industries and the valuable contribution that they make to the character of the Conservation Area and the cultural life of Southwark.

*

2.1.177 Secondly, the other objections all extol the virtues and cultural significance of the area to the east of the Strategic Cultural Area (SCA) lying within the St Mary’s Conservation Area with particular concern for the protection of the Brunel Engine House as a museum and the Mayflower Wharf. I agree that this is an important area with major tourist attractions. It is a matter that I consider at Section 1.9.4 of my Report. Briefly, I conclude that the locality is one not just of strategic, London-wide significance but of international importance. **Mr Hulse’s** evidence is especially convincing.

2.1.178 The Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC101) is to what was Objective 4 in the revised deposit plan appears to have been as a result of an editorial decision relating to the format of the plan rather than being in response to a duly-made objection. My recommendation on this point must, therefore, be ‘no modification’.

*

2.1.179 Thirdly, an objection (8299) by **St. Martins Property Investments Ltd** is actually to the text of paragraph 2.076 which forms the background to Policy 1.13. It relates specifically to the reference to the proposed development at Potter’s Field and links to other objections to Part 1 Section 8.3 and to Site 3P. I heard objections from **Berkeley Homes (South East London) Ltd** at the Inquiry concerning this site, and in Section 1.8.3 of my Report I recommend text for this Site agreed by the 2 main parties. It includes reference to the *maximisation of residential development compatible with such arts and/or cultural uses(s)*. This does not, in principle, negate the contents of paragraph 2.076 but a minor modification is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

2.1.180 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with the Southwark Plan 18th July 2005 apart from the following change to *Background*:

.....It also includes Potter’s Field whose redevelopment will include a major new arts or cultural use of London- or nation-wide importance, to enhance this stretch of the River Thames as a destination in its own right and complement other visitor attractions which already exist in the area.....