

2 / 88 / 8649	Laing Homes South East Thames
2 / 491 / 8677	B.A.T.S Investments Ltd
2 / 96 / 8715	GVA Grimley
2 / 493 / 8821	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 494 / 8826	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd
2 / 495 / 8827	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 496 / 8828	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 1 / 8829	Galliard Homes
2 / 497 / 8830	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8831	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 498 / 8832	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8833	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8834	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8835	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
502 / 8836	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd

### **Pre-Inquiry Changes**

P / 538 / 9820	Ms Valerie Shawcross - AM London Assembly
P / 450 / 9863	British Land Company PLC & Canada Quays Ltd

## **Appendix 3 – Residential Density Standards**

### **First Deposit**

1 / 36 / 5465	Ms K Whittam
1 / 61 / 5702	Falcon Point Management Committee
1 / 47 / 5736	Berkeley Homes (City and East London)
1 / 7 / 5881	Fairview New Homes Ltd
1 / 2 / 5883	St George (South London) Ltd
1 / 3 / 5884	George Wimpey Central London
1 / 4 / 5885	Bellway Homes Ltd
1 / 5 / 5886	Berkeley Group Plc & St James Group Plc
1 / 6 / 5887	Barton Willmore
1 / 14 / 5888	Royal London Asset Management Ltd
1 / 23 / 5889	Newington Trust Estate
1 / 110 / 5890	Defence Estates (SE & G)
1 / 111 / 5891	B Phillips
1 / 112 / 5892	F N Forman
1 / 57 / 5893	Ms Pauline Benington
1 / 16 / 5894	Mr J H Taylor
1 / 97 / 5895	Mr Simon Hughes – MP
1 / 17 / 5896	Ms Lisa Rajan – Cllr
1 / 27 / 5897	Shopping Centres Ltd
1 / 13 / 5900	Mr Martin Cook
1 / 168 / 5901	Mr Norman Khambatta
1 / 99 / 5902	Mr Adrian Greenwood
1 / 99 / 5903	Mr Adrian Greenwood

1 / 45 / 5904	SOUHAG
1 / 113 / 5916	Ms Pauline Adenwalla
1 / 123 / 6090	Mr Henry Bottomley
1 / 132 / 6092	Mr James Rigg
1 / 133 / 6098	Mr Kam Hong Leung
1 / 134 / 6102	Ms Beatrice Leung
1 / 135 / 6106	R Webb
1 / 136 / 6111	Ms Gina Pinnick and Mr Robert Spencer
1 / 137 / 6115	Mr John F Staunton
1 / 138 / 6122	Surrey Docks City Farm
1 / 143 / 6155 (CW)	Redriff Tenants Association
1 / 146 / 6171	Mr John Padmore
1 / 147 / 6176	Mr Mark Parker
1 / 150 / 6191	Ms Jean and Mr Peter Ziehfrend
1 / 149 / 6194	Mr Toby James
1 / 151 / 6213	Mr Graham Smith
1 / 152 / 6217	Ms Mercedes Pingarron
1 / 154 / 6230	Brunswick Quay Residents' Association
1 / 155 / 6237	Ms Hanna Picken
1 / 159 / 6276	Canada Water Forum
1 / 161 / 6288	United House Residents Association
1 / 164 / 6301	Mr and Mrs Stan Koura
1 / 166 / 6313	Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership
1 / 167 / 6329	P Watson
1 / 177 / 6395	Ms Gwen Jones
1 / 178 / 6402	Drs M and T Michaelides
1 / 180 / 6432	Mr Brian Addis
1 / 180 / 6436	Mr Brian Addis
1 / 181 / 6444	Mr Mark Farrugia
1 / 184 / 6472	Mr Ray Gilbert and Ms Beatrice Dautroy
1 / 186 / 6492	Church of the Immaculate Conception
1 / 188 / 6504 (CW)	Ms Elizabeth Marsh
1 / 189 / 6508	Ms Laura Wirtz
1 / 190 / 6514	Mr and Mrs S M Stewart
1 / 191 / 6518	Ms Lisa Murray
1 / 43 / 6559	Mr Richard Lee
1 / 145 / 6863	A F Thomas
1 / 202 / 6926	Nunhead Action Group
1 / 97 / 6957	Mr Simon Hughes – MP
1 / 62 / 7063	Mr Toby Eckersley – Cllr
1 / 11 / 7102 (CW)	Pool of London Partnership
1 / 139 / 7129 (CW)	Mr T Long
1 / 144 / 7130	JA Coxon

### **Second Deposit**

2 / 253 / 7320	PFG PLC
2 / 95 / 7834	Ms E Conn
2 / 4 / 7889	Bellway Homes Ltd
2 / 452 / 8207	Conrad Phoenix (Canada Water)
2 / 459 / 8333	Malcolm Judd & Partners

2 / 459 / 8335	Malcolm Judd & Partners
2 / 2 / 8633	St George (South London) Ltd
2 / 493 / 8854	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 493 / 8868	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 493 / 8871	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 493 / 8874	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 493 / 8876	Abbotsquest Ltd
2 / 494 / 8894	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd
2 / 495 / 8895	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 496 / 8896	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 1 / 8897	Galliard Homes
2 / 497 / 8898	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8899	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 498 / 8900	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8901	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8902	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8903	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
2 / 502 / 8904	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd
2 / 494 / 8905	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd
2 / 495 / 8907	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 496 / 8908	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 1 / 8909	Galliard Homes
2 / 497 / 8910	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8911	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 498 / 8912	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8913	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8914	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8915	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
2 / 502 / 8916	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd
2 / 494 / 8917	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd
2 / 495 / 8918	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 496 / 8919	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 1 / 8920	Galliard Homes
2 / 497 / 8921	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 498 / 8922	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8923	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8924	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8925	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
2 / 502 / 8926	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8927	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 494 / 8928	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd
2 / 495 / 8929	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 1 / 8930	Galliard Homes
2 / 496 / 8931	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 497 / 8932	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 498 / 8933	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8934	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8935	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8936	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
2 / 502 / 8937	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8938	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 494 / 8939	Maple Leaf Property Investments Ltd

2 / 495 / 8940	Buxton Homes South East Ltd
2 / 496 / 8941	Mulberry Park Investments Ltd
2 / 1 / 8942	Galliard Homes
2 / 497 / 8943	Joel Developments Ltd
2 / 498 / 8944	WN Developments Ltd
2 / 499 / 8945	Canary Central Ltd
2 / 500 / 8946	Dolla Bay Investments Ltd
2 / 501 / 8947	Safe Haven Homes Ltd
2 / 502 / 8948	Old Marylebone Investments Ltd
2 / 277 / 8949	Acorn Homes Construction Services Ltd
2 / 27 / 9060	Shopping Centres Ltd
2 / 122 / 9261	Friends of East Dulwich Station
2 / 122 / 9262	Friends of East Dulwich Station
2 / 122 / 9263	Friends of East Dulwich Station
2 / 27 / 9272	Shopping Centres Ltd

### **Pre-Inquiry Changes**

P / 202 / 9788 (CW)	Nunhead Action Group
P / 26 / 10008	St Martins Property Investments Ltd

## **MAIN ISSUES**

1. Whether standards of residential density should be the subject of a UDP policy or SPG;
2. Whether Policy 4.1 and Appendix 3 provide a sound basis for the determination of planning applications;
3. Whether appropriate densities are being sought at Canada Water and in other parts of the Borough.

## **INSPECTOR'S REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS**

2.4.9 Policies 3.10 and 4.1 are closely related to each other and, in different but related ways, amplify national policy concerning the need to secure the full and effective use of land and the need to achieve high residential densities at appropriate locations. I therefore consider them, and the cross-referenced Appendix 3, together.

-0-

2.4.10 The Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005 rightly includes these standards within it, at Policy 4.1 and to the cross-referenced Appendix 3. The wide range of each of them will allow a good deal of flexibility in the preparation of residential schemes, and I endorse that approach. They reasonably apply the designations in the London Plan's density/parking matrix to the local circumstances of the Borough. In view of the importance of

these standards as a basis for the determination of planning applications and national policy that criteria relating to planning applications should not be relegated to SPG, I endorse the Council's stance in this latest edition of the UDP. As I explain later, however, density is but one criterion and in many cases it will be the outcome of a proposal, not the sole starting point.

\*

- 2.4.11 On the second issue, **St Martins Property Investments Ltd** says that the division of the Borough into 3 types of Zone (now 4 with the 4 Public Transport Accessibility Zones [PTAZ]) for the setting of density standards is simplistic. On its own, it would be. But the wide range of standards in the Central Activities, Urban and Suburban Zones and the need to rely on other important matters means that a flexible approach must be taken in their application to particular proposals. They are a useful start and a valuable, though blunt, tool in the determination of planning applications. In that context, their presence is better than their absence. In other words, location and public transport accessibility of a site must be taken into account rather than just its physical characteristics and setting. Similar considerations apply with the PTAZs, although no range of densities is specified.
- 2.4.12 **Conrad Phoenix (Canada Water) Ltd** suggests amendments to Appendix 3 paragraph 3.5, but I think they would serve little purpose. These Zones are identified solely because of their relatively good public transport accessibility, and I see no need to labour the point as in the suggestion. The Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005 satisfactorily indicates the main considerations (design and amenity) that might justify schemes in them above Urban Zone densities. I accept the Objector's point that good, indeed an exemplary standard of, design should be sought at all times, but arguably an outstanding quality should be required as part of the justification for a density above the norm.
- 2.4.13 Conservation and respect for the prevailing scale and character of the surroundings may be important considerations in assessing a proposal in a PTAZ. It would therefore be unwise to give general encouragement to high density development within it, as does the Objector's suggested Policy 5X and Reasons. In general, tall buildings would be more appropriate in the Central Activities Zone, thereby according better with existing character, function and densities. Elsewhere they should be regarded as exceptional, rather than meriting general encouragement.
- 2.4.14 The same Company advocates a policy for PTAZs. They are important matters in the Council's control of development and are rightly shown on the Proposals Map. Rather than merely identifying them, as in Appendix 3.5, they should have the

support of a policy. I put forward a recommended draft for the Council's consideration.

- 2.4.15 There are some related matters. The upper limits of these ranges should be taken as maxima. Even so, there could be exceptional cases where material considerations justify a higher density. That should not result in confusion, with or without attendant planning conditions and/or obligations, as **Shopping Centres Ltd** fears. This might be where public transport is especially good or there is a guarantee, perhaps by way of a planning obligation, that it will be so by the time that the development is completed.
- 2.4.16 To avoid any hostage to fortune, however, it would normally be better for the Council to take account of any proposed improvements to public transport services in, for example, its preparation of a Local Development Framework. Flexibility can, of course, work both ways and accordance of a scheme with a density standard does not guarantee the grant of planning permission for it. That may be especially so in a Conservation Area, where national and local policies for its preservation and enhancement are likely to take precedence.
- 2.4.17 The London Plan Policy 4B.3 requires the *highest possible intensity of use compatible with the local context, the design principles in Policy 4B.1 and with public transport capacity*. The combination of PTAZs, the wide range of densities already mentioned and such UDP Policies as 3.10 and 3.11 concerning the efficient use of land and quality of design respectively does not conflict with Policy 4B.3. Nor does it conflict with the wider objectives of the London Plan and PPG 3 of increasing densities in appropriate places, particularly those served by good public transport. As the Council accepts, a scheme within a PTAZ *may exceed urban zone provisions where the increased scale of development is appropriate in terms of design and amenity*. That is a reasonable approach.
- 2.4.18 Density standards are rightly based upon public transport accessibility, between which there is a strong relationship, and the character of an area. The character of the Suburban Zones varies a great deal, both within and between them, but generally their residential areas are of low to medium density with more open space than in other Zones. In my judgement, these standards are soundly based. In any event, as indicated, they are but one consideration. The policies and other provisions of the Plan allow due weight to be accorded to each material consideration in the determination of planning applications, including the provision of open space. These considerations should meet the valid points made by **Mr Hughes, Mr Taylor** and others.

- 2.4.19 **Mr McCarthy** says that Policy 4.1 ignores the fact that a community may already have too high a density of development. The Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005 strikes out the introduction to the Policy and hence the guidance that residential schemes should normally increase the number of dwellings on a site. Policy 3.10 seeks the efficient use of land, but rightly acknowledges such important safeguards as the protection of residential amenity and respect for the local context. This should ensure that any existing problems are not made worse as a result of undesirable intensification, or the badly designed intensification to which the **Dulwich Society Wildlife Committee** refers, at Bankside or anywhere else in the Borough.
- 2.4.20 Whilst a reduction in density may be justified in some redevelopment schemes, I do not agree with **Mr Phillips** that a general reduction should be sought. There is an urgent need for housing in London and the Borough should make its contribution as the London Plan requires. Development at prevailing existing densities would be unlikely to achieve that aim. The basic choice is between higher densities or providing housing on other land, including open space. The Council generally prefers the former, and so do I. And higher densities do not necessarily mean poorer quality.
- 2.4.21 I agree with the Council that where there is a common boundary between Zones there is more scope for debate upon the appropriate density to be applied to a particular site. Thus, whilst I endorse the Council's inclusion of Lordship Lane and Nunhead in the Suburban Zone, I note its comment that the flexibility of Policy 4.1 could be applied to the land fronting Lordship Lane to which **Laing Homes South East Thames** refers. I note the points made by **B.A.T.S Investments Ltd** about its site at Rope Street, but it is not my task to review decisions that the Council has already made on planning applications.
- 2.4.22 The boundaries of PTAZs embrace various land uses, including residential and commercial. Rightly, the centre of Peckham is a PTAZ in acknowledgement of its relatively good public transport accessibility, which is of benefit to all land uses and their occupiers. As **PFG Plc** says, the loop at Sternhall Lane is mainly residential, but I agree with the Council that that is no reason to exclude it from the PTAZ. Whether the remaining Class B1 floorspace should be converted to residential use is a matter for the Council's determination of a planning application. Policy 1.5 would be a material consideration.
- 2.4.23 There is some inconsistency in the guidance on densities in the various Zones with *should aim to achieve*, *should achieve* and *are expected* in the text. *Should* should suffice.

- 2.4.24 The drafting of Policy 3.10 should ensure that nothing of importance would normally be sacrificed to over-development. Criteria i and iv include any effect on patients and staff at, for example, a hospital. I see no reason to conclude that the result of these particular provisions would be inequitable or difficult to apply in practice, as is suggested.
- 2.4.25 **Venaglass Limited** says that Policy 3.10 is arbitrary and should be deleted, and that any planning decision should be based upon objective criteria. I agree with the second point, and I have no doubt that the Council would give reasons why any scheme constituted under- or over-development, causing demonstrable harm. Both sorts can do so. The Policy is suitably entitled, accords with national policy and includes suitably worded criteria pertinent to the efficient use of land, including the protection of amenity. It should stay.
- 2.4.26 In summary, I conclude that planning applications must be determined on the basis of good judgement that takes account of all material considerations and accords due weight to each one. That is no more than should be expected. Policies 3.10 and 4.1 and Appendix 3, tempered by other material considerations, should give the Council a sound and reasonable foundation for that approach to its decision-making.

\*

- 2.4.27 I turn now to the third issue. I deal with much of **Mr Bottomley's** and **Malcolm Judd and Partners'** objections in my examination of Canada Water. There is a marked difference between Canada Water and the rest of Rotherhithe, including the Surrey Docks peninsula, in terms of character and public transport services. Canada Water is better served by public transport with its interchange for buses, trains and underground. Its inclusion in an Urban Density Zone rightly acknowledges these important circumstances and accords with the advice in PPG 3 paragraph 58 concerning the greater intensity of development that should be sought at places with good public transport accessibility. And that accessibility has the potential for improvement.
- 2.4.28 Apart from narrow strips of land alongside the River Thames with their preponderance of flats, Rotherhithe is more suburban in character. This is mainly because of the prevailing low-rise dwellings and the significant amount of open space. Some of it has a sylvan quality. Public transport, mainly by way of buses, is less frequent. Rightly, this part of the Borough is a Suburban Zone and development should generally respect its existing character and densities. A number of Objectors make these and similar points, many referring to the *low, clean and green suburban character of Rotherhithe*, and they are right. The combination of the flexibility of Policy 4.1 and the density



standards and the requirements of Policy 3.10 should ensure that new development will not result in the profligate or inefficient use of land to which PPG 3 paragraphs 57 and 58 refer.

- 2.4.29 The **British Land Company Plc & Canada Quays Ltd** suggests that the north western boundary of the Canada Water PTAZ be extended to include land bounded by Clack Street to the east, Albion Street to the north and Neptune Street to the west. This, it says, would for various reasons assist in the comprehensive masterplanning of Canada Water and the regeneration of the locality. But the Council's research in its Density Topic Paper shows that the land concerned has a lower PTAL level than the core of Canada Water and so the higher densities that a PTAZ implies is not warranted in the suggested extension. The comprehensive masterplanning to which the Companies refer could, in principle, take place, but development or re-development would have to be at a scale that accorded with site characteristics and the degree of accessibility to public transport.
- 2.4.30 On a related point, I agree that the PTAZ should be changed as shown on CD/5.64.2 Figure 4.1. I am treating this plan as being part of the Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005.
- 2.4.31 Bermondsey Spa was transferred from the Central Activities to the Urban Zone at the Revised Deposit stage. This correctly reflects the prevailing character of this part of the Borough with its general low rise development, its Victorian and Edwardian terraces and post-war estates. I agree with the comments of **Mr Simon Hughes MP** made at the First Deposit stage that the density provisions of the Central Zone are incompatible with the existing development of the area.
- 2.4.32 I endorse the inclusion of Bankside in the Central Activities Zone. This accords with the London Plan Policy 5B.2 and Map 5B.2, as does the Council's approach of maximising density within it while taking account of local amenity, land use mix and transport capacity. **Abbotsquest Ltd** and others say that the reference to buildings of 6-8 storeys high in the Central Activities Zone should be deleted. This is, however, no more than guidance, and the Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005 reasonably accepts that this will *normally* apply and that *there will be sites where taller buildings are appropriate*. No change is needed.
- 2.4.33 My overall conclusion on this issue is that the Council is seeking to achieve appropriate densities throughout Southwark. The standards will assist it in its endeavours, but they must be tempered by other, sometimes outweighing, considerations.

- 2.4.34 There are other matters. **St George (South London) Ltd** refers to planning obligations, a matter that I deal with elsewhere. An obligation could apply to such social infrastructure as education and community facilities, but must meet the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. This will be a material consideration in any event, and I see no need to repeat any of its contents in this part of the UDP. There is no reason to believe that unacceptable development will take place, even when the subject of a planning obligation.
- 2.4.35 The **Friends of East Dulwich Station** make good points about the need for developments to include roof terraces and/or green roofs, access to private open space at ground floor level and various unwelcome effects that can result from residential schemes. These matters, in so far as they are subject to controls in the use and development of land, are considered in other parts of the UDP including Policies 3.9, 3.27 and 3.28. There is no need to repeat those provisions in Policy 4.1 or Appendix 3.
- 2.4.36 **St Martins Property Investments Ltd** says that it is difficult to see how ground level direct access to private outdoor space could be provided where the flats are above commercial premises. I agree that access to, and security of, these premises may make the arrangements difficult to ensure, but I doubt that it would always be impossible. Appendix 3.3 puts it no higher than *should be provided*, and on that basis the intention should remain. It need not put at risk adequate provision of communal open space.
- 2.4.37 Policy 4.7 considers non self-contained residential accommodation for particular occupants like students. I see no reason why density standards and Policy 3.10 should not be relevant in any such proposals, along with any other material considerations.
- 2.4.38 I deal elsewhere with the point made by **Abbotsquest Ltd** and others about density calculations for mixed use development. I conclude that it is in general a useful method.
- 2.4.39 There is nothing in these, or any other, provisions of the UDP to prevent the redevelopment, comprehensive or piecemeal, of the Aylesbury Estate.
- 2.4.40 **Mr Greenwood and Mr Simon Hughes MP** say that developments should have the approval of a majority of local residents. Certainly consultation is important, but the determination of planning applications must normally be with the elected members of the local planning authority, Southwark Council.

## RECOMMENDATION

2.4.41 I recommend that Policies 3.10 and 4.1 and Appendix 3 be modified in accordance with the Southwark Plan 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005 apart from:

3.003

***Within this zone, developments should achieve densities of 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare.***

3.005

***Within this zone, developments should achieve densities of 300-700 habitable rooms per hectare.***

3.007

***Within this zone, developments should achieve densities of 200-350 habitable rooms per hectare.***