

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

## Accommodating Growth Workshop

2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

### Development corridors in London and the South East

#### Facilitator in bold

Respondents in regular text

*These notes are a summary of the conversation*

---

*Session 1, Table 8*

#### **Gareth Fairweather, Transport for London (facilitator)**

Jorn Peters, Greater London Authority (note taker)

Alison Bailey, Chiltern & South Bucks

Cath Rose, Reigate & Banstead

Cinar Altun, EELGA

Corrine Swain, Arup

Ian Bailey, Tonbridge & Malling

Cllr Linda Haysey, East Hearts

Nick Woolfenden, SEEC

Richard Hatter, Thurrock

---

Need for investment in public transport - to accompany growth, which should also include employment and not only housing growth.

Make growth work for WSE, including e.g. promotion of re-verse commuting; transport improvements not just serving/benefitting; and beyond transport also consider social infrastructure.

Need for better orbital routes within and beyond London.

Inequality of scale of investment along / between corridors.

Not within all transport corridors there is a desire to accommodate additional growth.

Focussing on volunteers for growth, but some willing partners may be within outer parts of WSE – how does that fit with a coherent corridor strategy, e.g. Peterborough's ambitions have impacts on areas between London and Peterborough?

What comes first - opportunities for growth or transport investment? Where infrastructure is needed, it should come first.

---

Concept of corridors provides policy direction, but it is not exclusively about considering accommodating growth outside London, it is rather an opportunity to consider within these corridors.

Need for transparency about what is needed in and beyond London in terms of housing / employment provision; in particular engaging WSE when we know the gap of future housing need within London; premature to define corridors in advance of clear need.

Evidence data will always change – need to anticipate behavioural change, etc. through scenarios.

Engagement with WSE has to be ongoing; important that Mayor is clear about considering development outside London with volunteers, understanding who we are already talking to and who we are planning to do.

No advance understanding/indication outside London what 'City for All Londoners' consultation was going to be about.

Lack of political leadership and communication/clarity about the direction the Mayor may take in terms of his spatial ambitions.

Where should the spatial consideration of London Plan go – beyond its boundaries?  
Need for spatial 'ground rules' at WSE level, but more tangible collaboration better at sub-regional level.

Need to consider where outside London there is capacity to deliver beyond their own indigenous growth needs.

Also need for consistency of approach re GB within and outside London; local authorities outside London need to consider GB, so London should as well.

How to implement the corridors, in terms of consistent approach to land use?

### **Key conclusions:**

It is important that there is a clear evidence which demonstrates the need for growth, and where this growth needs to happen, before specific corridors are identified.

There needs to be appropriate transparency and active dialogue across the London/WSE boundary, including the need for a clear Mayoral position on accommodating growth within/outside London.

There needs to be a consistent approach taken to planning for growth along corridors, especially in terms of land use, encouraging out-commuting, making orbital connections and keeping up with changing technology and travel patterns.

---

## Development corridors in London and the South East

*Session 2, Table 10*

### **David Jowsey, Greater London Authority (Facilitator)**

Chris Kenneford, Oxfordshire County Council

David Lewis, London Forum

Clr Jayne McCoy, London borough of Sutton

Will McKee, Old Oak & Park Royal Mayoral DC

---

**We'll be talking about development corridors. The London Plan has always linked transport with growth in areas of good public transport activity. You can get higher levels of density in areas of better public transport. TfL and GLA have increasingly been looking at the role of transport in development. Crossrail is less about housing potential. Bakerloo line extension and other structures we've been doing are more about focusing on transport and growth together, particularly in housing delivery. The GLA has been having engagement with the wider South East in the best way to lobby for infrastructure investments to benefit London and the wider South East. Do we think that considering development and growth around development corridors is a good concept?**

Yes. It's difficult to take in this diagram. Are these planned projects, whether or not they're approved?

**This map shows some of the big transport investments. Crossrail 2, Bakerloo extension, improvements to DLR and tram, and how they're linked to growth areas.**

Of all the topics this morning, this one makes the least sense. It has to be developed with the cooperation of the surrounding areas. You're using the same infrastructure. You ought to make that point.

Are the South East authorities buying into this concept?

Some of them are.

well-developed London Stansted corridor with local boroughs.

The wider South East group talks to the surrounding areas.

In terms of the land associated with these transport corridors, that's okay as well, is it?

I have concerns. The expectation is for jobs to be highly concentrated in the centre. TfL is looking at housing. It intensifies the travelling in and out of London. If you use transport to unlock economic development and spread it around, there is less in and out commuting, which

takes the pressure off. It's poorly served, which has a knock-on impact. On employment growth, they need to improve the orbital impact, not just in and out all the time.

I agree it's not just about improving community. It's about spreading more. The outer London boroughs have to be given to more intensive and mixed use developments.

Absolutely. Happy to accommodate growth, but they're not well served at the moment. We have the railway, but no underground and no Overground. Give us the right transport links, and we can work on employment growth.

**What mechanisms can they do to unlock employment growth? Housing makes it a bit easier.**

It's not just talking about where do we improve transport links to improve housing, but looking at employment as well. Where are the growth areas? We have very few in South London. We're losing industrial land that can be provided elsewhere. Rather than thinking narrowly, we need to think of spaces as well, possibly nice places to live.

**A lot of this is quite London focused. What are your thoughts looking beyond London?**

Developing expanded new towns to serve London?

**Possibly. Outcommuting to the wider South East is increasing as well. Reading has a huge in-flow from London.**

This map only shows public transport. It doesn't show major road corridors like the A23 or Wandle Valley. I wonder if this is only half the story, or if there is such a resistance to road-based employment. Is this half a map?

We need more public transport corridors. If we can open up better corridors to key places, it's desirable.

Hackbridge has a station right next to it, but it's dependent on road transport.

Yes.

It's about grasping every opportunity.

**Places like Hackbridge or other stations with industry logistics could be relocated to corridors?**

It needs to be allocated as well as this road policy. They'll always be road based. It doesn't mean every road in outer London needs to be improved, just the ones that strategically serve.

**Jules talked about exporting industrial land to the wider South East with good highway links.**

John has said many times that London is losing industrial land. I wouldn't want to see all the blue collar work disappear somewhere else. Possibly some of it. Life is about more than just providing housing. This plan isn't only about fuelling houses. It's also about employment.

With click and collect, Amazon deliveries, the change in the retail sector, we have more on the road. We want London to be a good place to live and work. The trouble is it's not very pleasant, having come here today on a very packed train. It's too narrow. If you don't have the aspiration, you'll never have a solution. If you have one narrow focus, you'll have one solution.

Benefitting all areas.

Thinking about employment, how your journey can be more pleasant.

This plan is the spokes in the wheel. It's radial stuff, not orbital stuff. TfL demonstrated to us effectively that it doesn't make sense to make a continual orbital route all the way around. The Wimbledon-Croydon Tramlink is a big example. Some of the orbital bits do make sense, if not all of it. That's worth thinking about.

That's public transport? Not road links as well.

**It's primarily public transport, with buses in the mix.**

It's a corridor.

**The tram could have a big investment. Particularly if we start linking it in with our aspirations on rail services in that part of London.**

We look at an existing tram line that goes to Croydon, with potential. Improve the service, give the extension down here and we can deliver £13 billion just by allowing us to unlock that. It's a short link, so it will be expensive to deliver. The Tramlink is very sustainable. Maybe you need to think of a bigger programme, more sustainable. A bigger project makes it more efficient. We look at economic benefits, not the housing benefits. That's what makes it really valuable. All the jobs are in the centre. If you keep fuelling that, that's where it will stay. You have to drive it. It's about having ambitions.

We have a mutual interest with improving corridors in and out of the capital. Whether you're saying that using corridors as points?

**In the last steering group, there was talk of a key diagram that has corridors, and has blocks where growth is acceptable to local authorities.**

A lot of the surrounding counties have, for example, 100,000 new homes in a few years, doubling what's been achieved before. We've got to have new mechanisms if that's going to happen. It's a step change in growth.

**The Mayor wants to accommodate as much growth as possible.**

It makes those conversations with the wider South East a bit more difficult than they can be. It would be easier if the pain in London was more visible. Didcot, Bicester. They have huge

construction programmes already. You have Milton Keynes already mopping up the lion's share of growth in those counties. You want the South East to do something over and above that. Delivery arrangements over and above what we've got. I suspect it won't deliver the kind of growth we're talking about.

If London built on the green belt, Oxford wouldn't be a distinct, separate place. It's about the expansion. You're allowing more creep.

You can have Hertfordshire, Dartford. Sustainable parts of the green belt, public transport.

Our residents are keen to observe that. The more housing you build, the more you need the green space.

I think green belt policy needs to radically change. Even if you stick with what you've got, it's one thing to talk about a longer corridor. It's transport intensive. It's a balance between the green belt and the transport links. It's about making best use of those corridors, where they pass through the green belt. This is a green belt, but it's awful.

The trouble is it's a steady creep. We see erosion. We build on green space to accommodate schools. In the end, it all goes.

Politicians want to protect it but there is intensification.

You have to intensify in the right places. There is a balance to be had. It's a precious commodity in London, which helps with air quality.

If you allowed some settlement inside the green belt in the corridors, you can still create a new green belt outside the corridors, quid pro quo.

That would be much more acceptable. It's about place shaping.

### **What about development around outer London in low density areas?**

It wouldn't be particularly new to do that.

### **There are certain areas, but there are many places with no change of density.**

Why is that the case?

### **I think in the last 10 years, we've been locked in to not changing the character. If the character is suburban, the current planning regime means it will stay as 2-storeys.**

You want to do that and protect the green belt and all the rest of it.

I understand that problem, coming from a suburban borough. It's also about quality of design. People expect ugly high rise buildings. We're trying to show that intensifying doesn't mean tower blocks, it can actually make it look better. If you show people the improvements, creating more space, planning well to make it more beautiful, it will go down better. You have to think carefully. We have a good example in Worcester Park. It's a new development, with

huge pressure on the transport system. People commute to the station and park. It's a nightmare. Hampton development. There is no scope for further development because it's completely congested. It's a great place to encourage more people to use the station, but people commute there. That was MOL. A huge part of it is landscape, very nice, but it doesn't take into context the local area.

Crossrail 2, high density underground system, a lot is happening over here but almost nothing over here. If this doesn't get coupled with improving local accessibility and increasing intensification and density, then it's just a way of taking pressure off services. Rather like the Victoria line, it's just a relief for the rest of the system. It should have a well thought relationship to the stations, where they connect and what they're near to. Is this just a relief or taking a development where you want it to go to?

TfL has calculated development potential. I don't know how much importance has been attached to those decisions. Perhaps not very much. In the Kingston branch, Norbiton has been identified as a key transport location. It must be one of the most difficult areas to intensify.

This was about rebalancing London's economy, not just providing places for people to work in the city. Just generally transport improvements, making Outer London a more rounded, attractive place.

Crossrail 2 is an unfortunate development in that context.

We went to Haringey, and they were talking about local economies, not connected. How do we reinforce those? How do we make them contribute more to the economy of London?

How important are transport links and what kind of transport links?

We concluded it's not just a relief system. We haven't got round to saying, 'Put it here.' We want TfL to be clear on why they're doing it.

People always resist if you try to impose it on them. You can say, 'If we improve transport links, it can help you achieve this.' It makes a huge difference. There might be things you didn't know were there, corridors you couldn't have dreamed of. It's servicing a need.

**Improved transport links has been mentioned several times. In terms of smaller areas, are local improvements to buses enough to support the economy?**

It depends on the area. My area is very car based. You have to talk to them to find out what it is. It's about being aspirational, coming up with an idea you might not have thought of. Poplar Harca were rallying for the DLR. They had to make a case for it. It wasn't on the table as an offer.

What sort of employment were Waltham Forest talking about?

Industrial marketplaces. They were talking about making it attractive. In London we saw a shift of back office functions in places like Maidstone. We need to think of those in thriving London centres. Not everybody wants to spend their life going from Shepperton to Blackfriars.

Businesses move out of central London as well. They want to cycle to work and live in a nice environment. You want greater employment but you don't want to lose that character.

A lot of office employment moved out of central London. It's been decentralised further. Presumably the pull being that was people working where they live.

People moving from Croydon to Gatwick.

To what extent should we be looking at the pool of labour in particular areas of London? What sort of employment would be attractive to them?

We look at what the opportunities are and make sure the residents have skills to take advantage of that.

We can, but what are the opportunities?

We have social health, science. We want to make sure the local residents can take advantage. All the way from cleaners up to researchers and scientists. We have the Institute of Cancer Research. Additional transport links can make that grow. We look at employment and you can take action to make sure locals can access it. We have grammar schools and highly educated people.

What steps are you taking to ensure that?

We work with training providers, schools and businesses. We have a talent mapping strategy, a planning exercise to make sure the training providers know the skills needed and provide enough training. We have further education colleges, Kingston University we're linked with, Job Centre Plus. We bring them together with businesses to deliver the training.

A lot is in highly specialised categories, medical and scientific, subject to immigration regulations.

**What are the 3 key messages? South East is vital in this area.**

There might not be the mechanisms to achieve that.

Political or delivery mechanisms.

**Growth and development is not just housing, it's employment. We need to think not just about radial. The local linkages, how stations interact with the local area is just as important.**

TfL has a cultural problem on road based corridors. TfL never want to talk about road transport. They make sure the industrial potential is recognised and provided for as a corridor as well. The A13 is a corridor, the A23, the A1/10 too.

We don't want to see net green belt sacrificed. Consideration should be given to extending or improving the quality to compensate.

You can't sacrifice everything just to get density of housing.

Wimbledon, Sutton, Kingston is a potential real powerhouse. The Sutton-Kingston link strikes me as really strong.

**It's about how we deliver that. It's one big opportunity area.**

We have the South London partnership.

John was elaborating on the idea of sub-regional planning.

We're looking at devolution. It's a key mechanism to work together.

**We're looking at defining what is good growth. It's easier to define bad growth, what's outside the window. We need to collect tangible examples of good growth in a rounded sense. Physically, socio-economically. The second idea was a holistic measure of what is success, measures of impact and local economy. Some kind of test at a local level, London-wide, borough-wide and an individual development. We talked about delivering growth that works for Londoners. The mechanisms are quite reactive. They could be more proactive.**

**We talked about setting targets. It's difficult for local authorities to feel they're the right targets that have been set. There is a feeling that a lot of this needs to be monitored by having a social impact assessment of what is there already, what's there on the ground sensitively. Monitoring financial and social considerations, including the quality of employment benefits. Challenges around the pipeline. There were good points on how GLA, TfL and commercial properties have the ability to send signals to the market on what good growth is, through setting shared principles. Showcasing more what we mean by that for others to respond to. The other point was transparency in decision making in opportunity areas and scope for those to be more inclusive or locally led.**

**Spatial approach to good growth, being divided around central and outer London. We talked around the distinction of the 3 parts of London, not recognising the specificities of the area. Second point was relating to the good growth discussion, the quality of the space. Whether it's an old zone or a new zone designed from scratch, to recognise diversity in population, recognise affordability so the quality of the place is making the place usable for all Londoners. The third element was the green belt approach, not to be too bold on not touching it. There are opportunities. Some of the green belts don't deliver all the functions.**

**Suburban intensification. Suburbs already see rapid change in population levels and demographic mix. The choice is between planned growth and unplanned growth. The Mayor will have to lead on this through the London Plan. There is too much sensitivity at the local level. Thirdly, rather than being spatially targeted policy, maybe the London Plan should identify particular topologies of housing to give guidance.**

We talked about suburban intensification. Some of the main issues were from local authorities on whether there is enough political will, and how you would manage this. Would it be worth it? Would you get enough units, would it be worthwhile? There is an incentive for households to redevelop. There would have to be piloting and testing to see if issues are resolved. There would need to be community involvement. Bottom up rather than top down. Not a one size fits all solution. There can be opportunities around the garden city model, incorporating good growth principles. Targeting investment where there is local consensus for an area to change. There is a generational issue. People may leave London because they don't get opportunities previously expected. There are concerns on how good growth is defined and tested. We're seeking to achieve planned incrementalism, but you need a clear vision of the end result, or you'll struggle to get political and community to buy in. They can increase their role in housing delivery. A main factor is boroughs need to do a characterisation study. Mixed tenure, local authority delivering housing. That's key to gaining support.

We looked at industrial land. We need to understand and value better the role they play in supporting businesses, supply chains in servicing the needs of the residential population. It's being clear on the accommodation requirements of businesses and developing topologies of industrial activity. They can be mixed between residential and the wider urban environment. Second around developing opportunities and intensification around verticalisation and stacking in the future. Values will rise and there could be a tipping point. Good design through mixed use development and housing. Looking at opportunities to incorporate industry back into master plans and proposals coming forward. Building and planning back in the industrial and support functions the area needs. Thirdly, the interaction with the South East, a coordinated approach. Particularly in terms of constraints. Green belt is an important constraint outside London. The desire to look at higher value industrial uses. There tends to be more willingness to accept distribution sheds further away, in places like Milton Keynes. What would the impact be of some logistics functions moving further away from London? We need to retain sufficient capacity within London. The Mayor could take a lead role in demonstration and guidance, using public land holdings, demonstrating that it can be done.

Future of London's high streets and town centres. The importance of community led regeneration, the opportunities of localism not being met. An appreciation that we need to grow but cater to new people, providing more opportunities in decision making and getting skills and expertise being part of the process. Consensus for skills and capacity building. Not just organisations but local businesses and the councils themselves, making participation meaningful. We need to support diversification in local culture. Venues threaten local culture. The night tube is an opportunity for high streets and town centres. There needs to be more support for local businesses. Thirdly, the importance of high quality design. Make sure new developments are well integrated for ambitious mixes. We talked about venues and cultural institutions. It was agreed the Mayor should define what we mean by high quality design for London. It's important to look at scale and be clear about local character.

There are national policy issues, the impact on erosion of employment space and the need for the Mayor to lobby government about that. Better recognition of policy and high streets. Thinking of how to support and enhance those places, supporting non-residential. Looking at land use classes. It would be good to have more flexibility, maybe a town centre use class. We want to be more creative in uses, industrial. The discrepancy between the language used in policy, but the actual reality of what's being delivered. Policy needs to procure new employment space. Harnessing technological change and supporting town centres as physical centres of exchange.

We won't add too much to that. Only the role of the public sector in managing and curating the mix in town centres. Without that, they may be at risk and leave it outside the planning system.

The definition of opportunity areas, what they are and what they're for. We need to think about topologies, criteria, perhaps there needs to be different grades. We had a long debate on consultation. There needs to be more on the designation of opportunity areas and what happens within them. Perhaps there isn't enough attention to the management of that change. How do you sell the benefits? Can you set out the benefits of good design and be clearer? The stakeholders need to be more involved.

We talked about the CAZ with national and international functions. The GLA facilitates public and private sector partnerships, bringing mutual benefits, enabling change to be unlocked. There needs to be a clear strategy. Recognising flexibility on how things will change. The policy shouldn't be too prescriptive. Then we talked more about the local impact in the second session. The local plan recognises protecting local areas. We talked about special policy areas, unique to cultural and retail facilities. The 24-hour tube and affordable business premises. Holborn is described as mid-town, so could be an area of growth. Localism should be considered. Then the knock-on impact of CAZ areas, the unseen pressures. For example Stratford and Canary Wharf.

Development corridors. The impacts they have on wider South East. Premature discussions on defining them without an understanding of the opportunities for growth inside and outside London, and whether London can accommodate its own growth. We need a strong political steer from the Mayor, laying ground rules on how this can be managed. There is a need for a consistent approach in what these corridors are hoping to achieve. It's about encouraging economy inside and outside London and outcommuting. Thinking about orbital and radial corridors. Some concerns about not addressing the green belt inside London when it is being considered outside London.

---