Nicky Gavron AM: Before I begin my question I would like to say, on behalf of the Planning Committee, how thankful we are for the way that the Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development, Jules Pipe [CBE], and Deputy Mayor for Environment Shirley Rodrigues and Jennifer Peters and her team have engaged with us and our concerns and we are very glad for that.

Also, to say that although we put in numerous submissions and so on, and a great many of them were about our concerns, there also was a significant number that were about how we supported the Plan and in a number of cases how we wanted it to go further. One of those was the Green Belt, which is the subject of my question now. On the Green Belt, we welcome the fact that you have opposed the Inspectors’ recommendation that you undertake a strategic review to look at the capacity for development. Your Plan is very firm and robust in relation to protecting the Green Belt and you also mention its multifunctional nature. Given the climate emergency, given the need for local food production, for doing something about the alarming loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity and the importance of mental and physical wellbeing and the benefits the Green Belt brings we think these roles could be enhanced. I am wondering now, looking at the multifunctional roles, how you are planning to go beyond just the protection to look at enhancement of these and their benefits to Londoners for this century and beyond.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thanks for the question, Chair. Chair Andrew Boff was very generous in his compliments to Nicky Gavron. Can I also put on record our thanks for all the hard work Assembly Member Gavron has done, not just in the recent past but we have been building on some of the work Nicky did in a previous life.

I want to bring Jennifer [Peters] in shortly but you are right, our responsibility is not just to retain what we have but to enhance it and make sure there is improvement. You will have seen the policies around canopy. You will have seen the policies relating to what we believe in relation to biodiversity. You will have seen the other policies we have announced, which are not in the London Plan, in relation to us being a National Park City and the responsibilities that brings.

I will ask Jennifer and Jules [Pipe] to speak now about some of the areas we have put in the Plan and our expectations for there to be improvements, not just keeping what we have.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Certainly the Plan is very much supportive of enhancing the Green Belt because the Plan recognises the multiple benefits for Londoners from improving the environment.

As you know, the planning system itself often cannot do the active encouragement of positive uses and some of the changes we want to see because they simply do not need planning permission, so there are a number of other areas that we take forward under other mayoral initiatives and strategies. The Environmental Stewardship Scheme that provides payments to landowners for environmental incomes,
for example, is governed in part by European Union (EU) rules. Obviously changes that will come about through exiting the EU will mean that any new scheme that we would seek to draw funds from can focus more on environmental stewardship, improvement and activation rather than simply the current regime in which money gets spent mainly on mitigating harm.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I would like to bring in Shirley [Rodrigues] as well because obviously there are other things, before Jennifer comes in.

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): To go further, as Jules [Pipe] said a lot of the enhancements and the work we want to do to uplift the quality of the Green Belt and recognise its multifunctional uses are in the Environment Strategy and a number of the programmes the Mayor has helped fund through the Greener City Fund, for example. One of the things we are doing is working with boroughs to look to plant new woodland in the Green Belt with the Mayor’s subsidy of £1.5 million. We are working with a couple of boroughs on that and hope to be announcing that in due course.

Jules mentioned the Land Management Scheme, the successor to the agricultural subsidies that farmers got to protect or to deliver environmental outcomes. The successor regime is being discussed now and we have been lobbying very hard to make sure that urban areas, and in particular London’s Green Belt, are able to access that. We are hosting a workshop in March [2020] where we are bringing together a number of the actors who have seen this as a huge issue so we can get a concerted lobbying campaign around that.

Finally, we will be developing with the London Plan team the All London Green Grid guidance as well and updating that. Again, it is about how we signal the need to tackle the climate and ecological emergency by recognising those benefits that maybe people do not realise the Green Belt provides.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thank you. There are a number of policies in the Plan that cover those multifunctional areas outlined but not pertaining the Green Belt. You do have levers right here in City Hall that could lead to a more productive environmental future for the Green Belt. You have not just the Environment Team but the Culture Team, the Food Team, the Transport Team and the Health Team, which together could be brought into one team – a virtual team perhaps – to look at how to push forward on this enhancement. Enhancement is mentioned in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Is that something you would consider, bringing together a virtual team?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): I am sure it would be. Obviously it falls outside the scope of the Plan, the creation of it, but it certainly sounds --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Hopefully you have seen over the last three-and-a-half years the removal of silos in relation to working more horizontally than we have in the past and Shirley [Rodrigues] has played a big role in that, but I am more than happy to follow through with that.

Nicky Gavron AM: Good. Just to give you one example, you could have family fares going out to the Green Belt at weekends. You could be marketing the assets there. TfL could do quite a lot in this respect, just taking one example.
I now want to move on. The Inspectors also recommended that you reduce - it has been referred to - your housing target from 66,000 to 52,000. Many of the outer London boroughs at the EiP opposed very strongly the small sites policy on the ground that it was unrealistic, the targets were too high and that is one of the main reasons for the reduction in the housing targets by the Inspectors. However, most of us would agree that there are low-density areas in outer London, not right across outer London but there are areas where there could be more housing, an intensification of housing if the infrastructure is right. I am wondering how you are considering working with the boroughs as you have said you want to go further beyond the targets that have been reduced.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Before Jules comes in I will give you some examples of the potential in relation to small sites in outer London. There are the backland and infill developments on underused or vacant sites, there is redevelopment of things like garages and other small sites, there is infill development, there is increase in density of existing homes that are well connected, there is residential conversion and there is upward extension. They are just some examples of the potential in relation to small sites. We are working with a coalition, on building, of boroughs that want to work with us to meet the needs of Londoners. Jules can give you some examples in the London Plan that address this.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** There are a number of policies that we are taking forward that cover big and small sites to help boroughs bring forward capacity. There is the Building Council Homes for Londoners Scheme launched in 2018; the Homebuilding Capacity Fund which supports Building Council Homes for Londoners, the £10 million of revenue funding to local authorities helping them to identify these sites and bring them forward; the Small Sites Small Builders Programme that seeks to increase the availability of small sites in public ownership, that was £15 million to enable small and medium-sized builders to deliver more homes; the Community-Led Housing Hub and the London Community Housing Fund, which is £38 million of capital grant. We are working ourselves to bring forward public sites within the GLA Group ownership, like through TfL. There is the London Development Panel as well that can be commissioned by public landowners, which obviously aids bringing public land forward and will run at least until 2022. There is the Prism tool as well, which you know about, which helps bring forward modular homes. There is, of course, Public Practice - which I know you are supportive of as well - which is aiding capacity within local authorities and then they can fall back again on some of the other Funds I have mentioned in order to fund those Public Practice placements.

[Note: The meeting was adjourned from 10.37am to 10.38am due to a disturbance in the public gallery.]

**Nicky Gavron AM:** I had one final point to make under this section, which is that the Inspectors asked you - returning to the Green Belt - to do a strategic review. You have said you will look at a strategic appraisal of all spatial development options that can lead to a sustainable outcome when you come to do a new London Plan or prepare for it. That seems to me to make a lot of sense. However, you have no remit to really deal with the wider South East, no proper strategic framework for that and you can only work with willing partners. The Inspectors pointed out how lacking the decision-making framework was between London and the rest of the South East. The Assembly made, and the Inspectors noted it, a suggestion that in fact there should be a technical secretariat that underpinned, did the research and provided the evidence for strategic growth locations and for infrastructure in London and the wider South East, taking London within the wider South East. It seems to me that that would need leadership from yourself for particularly opening up conversations with the stakeholders in the wider South East and, of course, with Government. Is that something you would consider doing?
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am going to bring Jules in because he has spent a lot of time over the last three-and-a-half years speaking to leaders from the wider South East. I have been really impressed by their keenness to work with us. You are right it is voluntary, there is no structure there to require a partnership approach and agreement on all sides. Jules, will you give an update on where you are?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes, thank you. It is early days because as you rightly identify there is no formal mechanism. For a number of years now successive governments have not favoured a regional approach to planning that would get us a long way down the road to addressing the point you made. Meanwhile we have been working closely with London Councils and the representative groupings of authorities across the South East – South East England Councils, East of England Councils and parts of the Local Government Association (LGA) – to identify willing partners who want to work together and identify the infrastructure that will be needed to encourage willing partners to come forward. We are at the beginning of your suggestion, as I say it is informal, about identifying capacity, numbers and the strategic approach that ought to be taken to planning across the South East of England.

You are absolutely right to identify that this cannot be achieved in a piecemeal way, picking away at different bits of outer London.

Nicky Gavron AM: Good. I am going to end there. That is something we should go on discussing.

Siân Berry AM: I, along with Caroline Russell [AM], have fed in our ideas, scrutinised and made suggestions and some of them have been taken up. We have been looking particularly at the housing crisis and the climate emergency in the changes we have tried to put forward.

As we are thanking staff I would like to thank George Raszka [former Research & Support Officer, City Hall Greens] from our team who worked incredibly hard throughout the process on all of this.

I wanted to pick up on one particular thing that stands out in the Plan you have brought forward today that does not fit in with London’s needs in this context; this is on airports. As you know, the Inspectors are asking you to remove the policy on airports. It contains the case against Heathrow, the policy you are putting forward that we are defending today. It is good that we are defending the right to have a policy on aviation and the policy that we have on Heathrow. However, the rest of the policy should be much stronger in the context of a climate emergency. It should be opposing all new airport capacity and it does not. Can I ask why your Plan effectively defines a path for aviation to grow at airports like City, Gatwick, Luton, Stansted and Southend still?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure that is how I would interpret it. You will be aware the Inspectors and I are at odds in relation to this and there could well be a direction from the Government in relation to our policy on Heathrow. We have been quite clear in a number of the other policies we have in relation to the Environment Strategy and others regarding the expectations we have of all those who emit carbon in relation to the various policies we have. I will bring Shirley in, in a second, to give you some examples of how we are addressing the climate emergency in relation to aviation.

Siân Berry AM: It is not a wide question that I am asking, it is very specifically about these other airports in the South East.
**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Right. You are saying why are we not disagreeing more with the Inspectors and going even further than we currently are, which already is in danger of being struck out as a direction by the Secretary of State.

**Siân Berry AM:** The Inspectors’ argument is that we do not have the right to have a policy on airports because there is the National Policy Statement on airports. Your argument in respect of our right to have a policy I agree with. What I am questioning is what is in the policy that you are placing before us today in relation to airports outside of Heathrow.

If I can draw your attention to section 10.8.6, that section seems to very much consider increasing flights from Luton, Stansted, Southend and City airports as inevitable or even desirable. This policy is not in fact against airport expansion on the whole. My question to you is, is that a policy that is rational in the face of a climate emergency?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** We have said that the policy should be reviewed in the context of the climate emergency and updates to the Climate Change Act and reflect the ambition to get to the net zero target. I have also written to the Government in relation to this and made clear my views in relation to City.

**Siân Berry AM:** That policy still, as it stands, seems to allow for further expansion at City. One of the first things you did when you became Mayor was remove the former Mayor’s objection to the increase in flights at City Airport from 70,000 a year to 111,000 a year. I am saying that your policy here - your view throughout this, I will give you, has switched from being in favour of expansion across the South East outside of Heathrow to allowing for it - is still a very, very weak policy in the face of the climate emergency.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** That is not what the Inspectors think. The Inspectors are unhappy with our policy because they think we are too anti-aviation. The Inspectors think we are inconsistent with Government policy. You are saying we should go even further and give the Secretary of State a further reason to direct us to remove this. At best it is the beginning of good. Our policy in the London Plan is a good policy, we stand by it. We have not followed the advice from the Inspectors to change it, the non-binding recommendation.

Jules can come in on the specific point you raise in relation to the policy, which is not consistent. I know you are going to interrupt him because he is answering your question directly, but if you let him answer it he will rebut your point quite easily.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** The Mayor has been publicly unequivocal in his opposition to expansion at Heathrow but that cannot translate directly in those words into the Plan because it would be obviously struck out by the Inspectors and the Mayor would not have a leg to stand on, to use that simple phrase. Instead the Plan rightly sets the bar very, very high. It is still too high as far as the Inspectors are concerned but we want to continue to argue that it is consistent with the NPPF, which it would not be if we said that. It would not be at all in conformity with national policy and any Inspector or Secretary of State would be able to justifiably strike it out with alacrity. At least the way it is written we have a chance of being able to argue with the Secretary of State that it should stay in despite of the Inspectors’ recommendation.
Siân Berry AM: I have to move on as I do not have very much time, as you will see from the [timer] machine in front of you. I do accept your arguments there but what I am questioning is - hopefully you will go back and think about it - why you can not have as strong a policy as you have on Heathrow on the other airports because here is no technical reason why you should not.

OK, I need to move on. I first of all support the comments that were recently made by Assembly Member Gavron on the Green Belt. We are fully aligned with Assembly Member Gavron in terms of the quite urgent need to demonstrate the benefits of the Green Belt in view of the request to hold an early review. We can do some really practical actions, getting out and enhancing but also demonstrating the case for the Green Belt by using it better, by using it for green energy and for flood mitigation. My colleague Caroline Russell [AM] and the Environment Committee have looked at farming in the Green Belt and other aspects. That is quite urgent. Just to reiterate the question, would you be keen to put forward a practical strategy outside of the planning process to do more to help enhance the Green Belt and use it better?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We can read you the list of the things we are doing but then you will complain I have taken up your time. What do you want us to do?

Siân Berry AM: You agreed with Assembly Member Gavron and said, “I am happy to follow through”. I am trying to add some urgency to that request and say will you do that straightaway after the election if you are still here?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Let me read through some of the things we are doing, if that is what you are asking. Under the question of environmental enhancement I have a 15-point list that I will read through.

Siân Berry AM: You may have given most of that in response to Assembly Member Gavron.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No, he only gave seven points but I am in your hands.

Siân Berry AM: Proceed. I am going to run out of time to talk about small sites where you might be interested in what I have to say.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Why don’t I write to you and give you a list of all the enhancements we are doing?

Siân Berry AM: That will be useful. OK, great. The other thing I wanted to bring up was small sites. I know there were questions and issues with some of the interpretations of the policy that was potentially a bit broad and could apply to back gardens. However, the main contention that the Inspectors seemed to have was that they were not convinced by the delivery of this and the detail that had been put in, in terms of what was possible in each borough. I want to ask, should you and your team perhaps not have done more to get that evidence together working with the boroughs? I know some boroughs have done quite detailed work and some have not. The Plan might have survived. Could you, when thinking about it in future, maybe add more specifics to define what is a small site that is suitable for development and what is not?

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): In terms of the evidence for the policy - it was discussed at length at the EiP - we were trying to promote a
step change, so that is difficult to evidence. During the time of doing the policy, and over the last couple of years, places like Croydon, for example, have done lots more work in this regard and are seeing more applications come forward. In terms of next steps, what we want to do is, alongside the supplementary planning guidance on design codes and the other guidance, give some training to boroughs and work with them to understand particularly those issues about viability and deliverability to try to deliver on those small sites and go above those minimum targets.

Siân Berry AM: OK, that is useful. Would you like to add any more, Mr Mayor, or Deputy Mayor?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): No, nicely succinct. Perfectly succinct. Sorry, you were asking to go further; no, that encapsulated it perfectly.

Siân Berry AM: This has real potential. Particularly because of some of the doubts that there are about what intensification means, it is really important that we work with communities. I put forward the idea of doing a peoples’ land commission, for example – as they have done in cities around the world – to find these sites with community involvement because there is suspicion that we mean back gardens and there is suspicion we mean more demolition alongside this policy. I do not think that needs to be the case as long as we put the detail together. That is partly why the policy was eroded as part of the examination.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is a fair point.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes, you have absolutely the right interpretation of what that policy is about. It is not building tower blocks in the middle of Acacia Avenue. It is two or three-storey mansion blocks on garage sites rather than two semi-detached homes with four or five parking spaces outside.

Siân Berry AM: ‘Co-produced’ is the key phrase we are looking for here. Thank you.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, you have set out a blanket policy of no net loss of floor space at strategic industrial locations (SIL). What impact will this have on the ability to build new homes in London?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, good question. We have some concern about the conundrum of retaining and enhancing the industrial space we have but also addressing the needs identified by the SHMA for 66,000 homes a year.

One of the things we have tried to do is, where possible, have co-locations. A crude example is to have a ground-floor industrial workspace and on top of that homes. Typically with light industrial use you can do that, you clearly could not do it with heavy industrial use. We need to make sure though that London is a place where people can live in close proximity to where they work. What we do not want is a situation where all the industrial land, all the jobs, are, for example, an hour and a half or two hours away from where people live. One of the things we are doing is working with councils, particularly with light industrial usage, is to have co-location and there are some examples where that is bearing fruit.
Andrew Boff AM: I get the point about being near your place of work but within London’s housing zones 491 hectares of land is designated as SIL. How can you ensure that these tens of thousands of new homes are delivered if this policy remains in place?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Which policy is that, sorry?

Andrew Boff AM: The policy of no net loss of SIL? You have SIL in housing zones.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure, but you will be aware there is designated and non-designated. As a result of the recommendation from the Inspectors we also have to show how we preserve some of the non-designated. Your question is --

Andrew Boff AM: It is about designated.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Exactly right. As I said, some of it is about co-location, making sure we have housing with industrial. Some of the challenges by the way, you will be aware, is around permitted development (PD) and we are encouraging councils to use article 4 directions where they can.

Jules wants to come in to give you specific examples in relation to what we are doing to address --

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): As you are aware, we are very much concerned about the loss of industrial land. It has run away at three times the rate that the previous Plan suggested it should be released. These are not always the most popular things for people to have in their backyard and it is very easy for people to say, “Would it not be better if it was all swept away and turned into much needed housing”, we need both. For every home built, we need to create a certain amount of distribution space now because people are becoming so reliant on last-mile delivery, shopping from home and so on, as well as the jobs issue. We can not just rely on all these big sheds to be up in Luton and all these white vans to be coming down the A1 and M1, London could not function like that. We need to strike a balance.

You are absolutely right to identify the fact that there is a conflict that has built up over recent years that industrial land, much needed industrial land, has also been zoned for housing. The way we are trying to find our way through that is about intensification, obviously there is the density issue about homes but also there is the intensification of the use of all sorts of industrial land. For anyone to suggest that we were preserving in aspic any of this sort of land is absolutely wrong. Even if it is the most valuable SIL that should stay SIL, we would still like a conversation about intensification. That intensification could then yield edges of SIL being released, could move to locally strategic industrial space which could then also be used for mixed use. It is about taking a Plan-led approach across a wider area and making all that land work more intensively.

Andrew Boff AM: You are saying effectively there is no net loss of SIL if you are going to entertain --

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): We want to increase the amount of SIL but that is not about swapping footprint, it is not about saying that bits of Green Belt or bits of places that are designated for housebuilding will be changed to SIL. It is about actively encouraging SIL owners to start double-decking and treble-decking their land rather than the very low usages that we do see on some sites.
Andrew Boff AM: As you so rightly pointed out, the way in which these industrial uses take place in the United Kingdom (UK) are different from perhaps what they have on the Continent where they are used to things like double-decked warehouses, which is something that is not usual in this country. Surely that means there is a reduced demand for the footprint we currently have for SIL and what we should be doing is perhaps using that SIL for other purposes.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): One of the things in relation to industrial space is looking at what the recent trends in London are. The recent trends are that the type of industrial spaces are datacentres, breweries and smaller craft industries. You will know about the online retailers, parcel delivery, food producers and automated sector. The idea is to master plan and to get co-location where we can without losing the SIL that, as you say, is so important.

Andrew Boff AM: Surely if that policy had been in place at the time would developments such as Docklands or the Olympic Park have been built at all, or indeed my home; would they have been built at all?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): In the 1980s those were being brought forward at a time of depopulation in London so there was space. Docklands was derelict, it was possible to bring that forward for the use of anyone’s choice and it was brought forward for commercial use in the form of Canary Wharf. Now for most of London, wherever you look, industrial land is at a premium and its value is as high, if not higher in west London, than the value of housing land. I am afraid it is a complete myth that there is somehow acres and acres of unused SIL that there are no takers for industrial use, that it is just lying there because of policy and that it could be used for housing.

Andrew Boff AM: You really must come around for a cup of tea sometime to Barking Riverside where there are great swathes of industrial land. In fact, in that particular example you are supporting the plans of Barking which are going towards de-designation of industrial land in the area in order to provide more housing. We are just saying be consistent across London and allow other London boroughs as well to get the benefits you have put on Barking.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Although you say “consistent”, a one-size-fits-all policy is not appropriate. You have named Barking and Dagenham. That is one of the three boroughs where the Plan does identify it for release because in those locations it does identify an overcapacity. I was talking generally across London.

Andrew Boff AM: Sure. Barking is not unique. We have a situation in Enfield where 10,000 homes at Meridian Water are now at risk as a result of this policy. In fact, it has forced Enfield Council into considering releasing Green Belt in order to build the homes that you are asking them to build.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Is it worth me just coming in there? In terms of the strategic housing land availability assessment, we did not assume a loss of industrial land in that. Enfield is not being forced to do that, it is the option it is looking at. What we will be saying – as Jules has already outlined – is that you can retain the capacity by intensifying and that may be able to free up some land for homes.
Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Enfield Council chose to buy industrial land in the hope that they could change it to housing. I am afraid that is --

Andrew Boff AM: That is a challenge that Enfield Council is facing. Those are the decisions that Enfield Council is making as a result of your intransigence on industrial land. Therefore you, yourselves, are putting Green Belt at risk because you will not provide other opportunities for building the homes that London so desperately needs.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): For the sake of accuracy, your timeline is not quite right, is it, Assembly Member Boff? You are attributing to this London Plan policies carried out by Enfield Council before this Plan was in place. On reflection you may want to withdraw that, surely.

Andrew Boff AM: Do you not want to give them a hand? They anticipate that the Plan --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You have made my point for me. We can play party politics --

Andrew Boff AM: I am not playing party politics. I have not mentioned a party, unlike you at the last meeting.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Your timeline is wrong. Is it not incorrect and misleading to suggest as a consequence of this Plan Enfield did certain things, which you know to be patently untrue?

Andrew Boff AM: Enfield is saying certain things at the moment on the basis of what your Plan entails, it is as simple as that. You know the process, some of that Plan starts to feed through the planning process and decisions are being made by people, like in Enfield Council, based on this Plan getting through.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): The way Enfield should take this forward is to masterplan that wider area, taking into account the fact that the long-standing industrial land that I believe they have come into ownership of is actually very well located to be used as industrial land, right up against the North Circular. It is questionable about whether that is the best place to locate homes in the first place. If one is going to look at intensifying and take the opportunity to bring in housing, it would be better to look at multi-storey intensification close up to the edge next to the traffic, and then as you move across towards Meridian Water, the more commercial area and the place more suitable for housing, intensify there and actually grade the nature of the development from strategic industrial close to the road progressing across to more residential and commercial nearer to the heart of Meridian Water.

Andrew Boff AM: Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development, these are decisions that Enfield knows about. All we are asking is that you trust your own local councils a bit more to make those kinds of decisions.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): The Plan does facilitate that. The Plan facilitates that mix.

Andrew Boff AM: I am done.
Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): OK, we got an answer to that comment. Can I call upon Assembly Member Kurten?

David Kurten AM: Mr Mayor, good morning. My question to you is how do you reconcile the need to build thousands of genuinely affordable homes with maintaining green open spaces in London?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure what you mean.

David Kurten AM: For example, policy G4(b)(1) of your London Plan says that you do not want development to result in the loss of protected open space.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes.

David Kurten AM: To give you an example, before the previous election in 2016 Assembly Member Whittle and I went to a place in Sidcup in the Borough of Bexley called Old Farm Park. I know you visited there as well. We both undertook to try to do everything we could to protect that as an open space and spaces like that. Now, just this year, development has started on Old Farm Park in Sidcup. How does your Plan provide protection to those kinds of open spaces?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There is independent work done to work out how many homes London needs over the next period. There is separately work done to see if we can identify the homes that need to be built. Because of the Inspectors’ recommendations there is a difference between the number of homes London needs and the number of homes that we have identified that can be provided without building on protected green land, whether it is MOL or the Green Belt. The bad news is we are nowhere near even that target of 52,000 identified in the London Plan. We think it is possible – Jules used the word “intensification” whether it is brownfield sites, whether it is small sites, whether it is building new council homes - without needing to touch either the Green Belt or MOL.

David Kurten AM: I know this word “intensification” comes up a lot. It is a new word that I have learnt since I have been here on the Assembly. From representations from people, particularly in outer London, they do not want intensification. I have had letters from people from areas such as Chessington to Slade Green and to Edgware, they do not want intensification. They are very happy with their areas as they are, particularly they do not want to see small parks and pocket parks being built on. Does your Plan give protection to those small parks and pocket parks? You do mention small sites and the worry is people listening to that would think there may be lots of development on these very treasured and cherished small green sites around outer London.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Absolutely not green sites. The focus is on the derelict garages at the end of the street and the tarmacked carpark behind the shop, which used to be a bed shop but now is a café and has no use for the 50 car-parking spaces out the back where the lorries used to be. If that is at the end of a residential street behind a high street continue the row of houses but do not continue it with just more semis, how about a three-storey mansion block and instead of having two or four more homes, you have 60 more homes. That is the kind of intensification we are talking about. It is not threatening. It is not tall. It is not on green space.

David Kurten AM: OK. If I can stick with the policy I mentioned before, policy G4, it does not just say you do not want a loss of protected open space, it also says you want to create areas of publicly
accessible open space. I know you want to increase the amount of green open space from 48% to 50%. How are you going to do that when also building 52,000 homes a year?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** It is possible. We have examples with some developments already coming on stream in relation to the register, bringing back green space into use whether it is green walls, whether it is green roofs and other examples of canopy cover. We are seeing an increase in green space in London and we want that to continue, whether it is green space through planting of trees or whether it is other policies we have from the Environment Strategy. The Fund we have set aside, which Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy Shirley Rodrigues referred to, is an example where you can apply for funding to help you get more green space in your area.

**David Kurten AM:** I am not convinced you are talking about green open spaces. You are talking about green roofs and green walls. What people want to see from that is that there will be green open space on the ground-floor level, like parks. How are you going to make sure those are protected and actually increased?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** In terms of the policy green space is protected. What you are talking about is creating new spaces. Through area action plans, and particularly through things like our Opportunity Area Frameworks where we are master planning whole areas, we will make sure that within that there is the green space that the community needs so you put that into your design. You can design things in a way that you make the most of including green space and also make the most of building homes and the building spaces.

**David Kurten AM:** Obviously there will be lots of construction in the Opportunity Areas. Are you also going to increase the amount of land that is green open space as well?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** It would make sure that there is the green open space that is required by the community you are developing. Yes, that will be part of it.

**David Kurten AM:** You are going to increase the green open space so that there is then 50% over Greater London as a whole?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Yes, the whole package of measures in the Plan allows us to do that.

**Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy):** Part of it is about reclaiming, ‘greening’ the grey where you are starting to turn paved open spaces into greener spaces so that it starts to help with flood alleviation, flash flooding and so on. Through the Mayor’s Greener City Fund we have already greened over 275 hectares and so it is starting to move towards over 50% of London’s green cover.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** You can see it in some of the applications that have come through in recent years where pocket parks and larger open green spaces have been created where they are actually within a development as public space we are walking through, not enclosed courtyards but public open space that is green. Even when you have two larger developments side by side. I have seen a number of developments where, because it has been master planned, each different developer has contributed their
bit to their side of the thing and once all their respective developments are built out the green space in the middle as a whole is provided.

David Kurten AM: OK, we shall see what happens. Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I want to look at the implementation of the London Plan because there are some good policies in here and obviously there will be some that I am not so convinced by. However, having the best policies in the world can mean very little if they are not fully implemented. Under policy T6.1 it states in new developments at least 20% of residential parking spaces should have active charging facilities. That policy is already in the current London Plan but it is not fully enforced. Under policy S13 the draft London Plan states in major developments in Heat Network Priority Areas there must be ultralow nitrogen oxide gas boilers. How are we going to enforce that? In relation to tall buildings, policy D9 says you are going to restrict these to specific identified areas. How tough will you be in ensuring your London Plan is accurately implemented across the capital?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Do you mean how we enforce Plan obligations and legal agreements?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Yes, making sure that your Plan is properly delivered.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Understood.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Obviously going forward we are providing a lot of guidance on the Plan and its implementation, covering a myriad of things but one of the biggest ones we are bringing forward is the housing design guidance shortly. There is the referable Plan, so for anything of any size that comes here the Mayor can secure a lot of this. Also we are looking to provide training as well for local authorities because ultimately they will be the boots on the ground that can go in and report back on delivery.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK. I do not want to make sweeping criticisms of developers but there are plenty of examples across London where they have got planning permission and then the conditions of that planning agreement are not fully implemented. Also for some of your policies, like the charging points for residential parking, we have no idea whether those have been put in place. As you say, most responsibility does lie with the boroughs. Do you agree that it is vital for you to have that London-wide role in monitoring the degree of compliance and enforcing where necessary? Will you ensure through easily accessible data that we can assess whether the London Plan’s key policies are actually being implemented in every part of the capital?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes, absolutely. One of the things the Mayor is bringing forward is the automation of the London Development Database. When we have the agreement of sufficient boroughs - we need two-thirds of the boroughs to agree, we are almost there - that will provide us with a wealth of data, much greater than we currently have, in real time that will enable us to monitor more things than we have before and in a real-time way.

It is always going to come back to enforcement though and the GLA does not have enforcement powers. However, having that knowledge, all of us, will help us bring some pressure to bear on those that do
have enforcement powers if they are being reluctant to use them or alerting them if they are keen to use them.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** You raise a really important point because there is a ‘postcode lottery’. You are right to say you do not want to make any generalisation or sweeping comments against developers, but some developers may well be playing the system because they know ‘Authority A’ does not have the resources to follow up on a planning condition. We do not know about it until people tell us and we have very little enforcement rights. However, what Jules [Pipe] is talking about is a game changer because it will be a database available to everyone and we can see what is going on. It will be an unwise developer who is not abiding by conditions in ‘Borough A’ because the other boroughs, and we, will know about it as well.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** As I say, there is a real challenge. I have asked many mayoral questions about the electric charging infrastructure for all these new developments, but we have no idea whether they are meeting the policy in the current London Plan and your one going forward to make sure that infrastructure is in place.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Except you would hope the local authority would check in relation to individual permission given - most do not come to us because they are below the size - that the planning obligations/legal agreements are being done by the developer otherwise they are breaching that. You would think a good local authority would be doing that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** The London Development Database has the potential presumably also to help our scrutiny on the Assembly in terms of working out what is working in your plan, what is not and where perhaps more work needs to be done with boroughs and others.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** Yes, absolutely.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Wonderful. Thank you very much indeed.

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** My question is about planning for new infrastructure. How will the new London Plan ensure that planning applications for building developments have the appropriate social and community infrastructure?

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** This is really important. A lot of work has been done - I will let Jules come in, in a second - in relation to making sure that when a plan comes through that the proposal includes provision for infrastructure, not just hard infrastructure but soft as well. I will let Jules talk about some of the specific examples of social infrastructure.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** Yes, the Plan is really clear about protecting social infrastructure. When a development comes forward it requires no loss of provision unless it can be obviously replaced by something that is better or it is part of a wider service transformation plan such as if the actual development is a social infrastructure in itself, for example a hospital redevelopment. The Plan requires boroughs to undertake a needs assessment and to address those needs that it establishes are required in
their local plans, which obviously have to be taken into consideration by boroughs on any developments that come forward that do not come here.

The Plan is very supportive of co-location, encouraging people to explore co-location of social infrastructure to make it more sustainable in terms of running costs. Any time for a development coming forward it is suggested that the social infrastructure on the site is redundant the Plan requires consideration should be given to that infrastructure being reused as social infrastructure before consideration is given to it being used for anything else.

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** I was reading a report recently by London Councils, which says that borough leaders were concerned about the deteriorating condition of primary care facilities in London. They were saying their research showed that 51% of London general practice surgeries are in need of some refurbishment, whilst 13% were poor, very poor or terrible and should be rebuilt, and further practices were found to be inaccessible for people in wheelchairs. I can see a lot of housebuilding going on, but the National Health Service (NHS) is not keeping in time with the growth of housing.

How is the London Plan going to work to make sure that we deliver this infrastructure on the ground and how will you be monitoring that?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** One of the important things about the Plan is it is trying to make sure that at the local level there is an understanding of those infrastructure requirements and that a local plan is developed in a way that makes sure they are addressed and that, when an application comes forward that is going to put extra burdens on the existing infrastructure, then it is required either through the Community infrastructure Levy or through onsite delivery of the infrastructure that is needed.

That is a key point in our Opportunity Areas work as well, where we have a whole understanding of what is needed in that area and what is needed to be delivered to deliver that growth. Then, also in terms of the design-led approach to capacity, we are understanding, looking at what you can deliver in terms of the physical capacity and weighing that against what the social and physical infrastructure is in the surrounding area. What we are trying to do in this Plan is very much bring those things together.

Then there is also in the Plan the funding challenge that talks about the extra funding that we may need because, for some of this, only so much can come through development funding. Some of it will need to come from Government funding and other sources.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Just to reassure you - and you know this - the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), NHS London, the London Health Board and the Sustainability and Transformation Plans fully understand. You are right to identify some of the real challenges around primary care in London.

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** Of course, space is at a premium in this city, but it is essential for children that government provides green areas and room for them to play. It is equally vital that when such spaces are provided, they are accessible to all residents. How will your London Plan ensure that new developments give families the space they need?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Firstly, I am really proud. This is the first time a London Plan sets a space requirement for play space per child. We should be really proud of that. It also makes it quite
clear in relation to no segregation by tenure. That is really important. There are also, by the way, minimum space standards for internal and external housing as well and there is a big section on public realm and you will have seen the work we are going to be doing around the Public Land Charter. We are cognisant of that. Also, we are quite keen to make sure that when homes are built, they open up into the community. The frontage is really important. We have done a lot of work on this and, hopefully, the Assembly has been reassured by the improvements made during the process.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** Those are really big issues, particularly the one about space standards because, in the previous Plan, it did highlight flexibility on space standards. That was possible, whereas this Plan is much firmer on internal space standards. That is why it is doubling the amount. Whereas before it suggested 5 square metres per child, now it is actually a requirement to have 10 square metres per child.

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** The other area that is of course a particular concern to me in my constituency is, for example, we know we are not going to be building on more Green Belt land and so we will be building on more brownfield land whilst we are developing. Some of this brownfield land is contaminated. For example, there are 24 gasworks sites that are ready for development. In my constituency, we have a gasworks site that is being developed with permission given by the previous Mayor. The monitoring of the air quality around there has fallen between stools. It has fallen between the Environment Agency, the local authority and Public Health [England] and no one seems to hold the baby.

How does the London Plan ensure that the permissions given for contaminated sites are properly monitored? Who takes the responsibility for it? I have named a case already in my constituency where it sits between many stools and it has fallen between the stools.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** I am grateful to the Assembly Member for having highlighted that to me recently. I was aware of the case but you supplied me with lots of helpful detail. We have a practice note, which I wanted to share with you before we distribute it because it does fall slightly outside of the Plan. We will be issuing a guidance note to local authorities encouraging them, when permission is given, to secure funding from the developer for independent monitoring. You have rightly highlighted that often it falls to the developer to directly fund their own monitoring and they are in charge of, effectively, the distribution and the timeliness of that data, whereas we are suggesting to local authorities that a good practice route would be to secure that outside of the funding to supply the capacity for either their own inhouse monitoring or third-party monitoring. Either way, it would be independent and timely.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Chair, this is another example of the collaborative way I hope the Assembly thinks we are working with the Assembly. The case that Assembly Member Dr Sahota referred to has been a longstanding issue. The practice note addresses not just that but other issues as well. I hope this is another example of a lack of adversarial and an iterative process and a collaboration between us and the Assembly.

**Dr Onkar Sahota AM:** Thank you.
Léonie Cooper AM: I want to ask you about embodied carbon. It is something that the Environment Committee has done some work on. It came up at the EiP. As we bear down on operational carbon emissions from vehicles and from buildings, it is becoming an increasingly important area.

Although the London Plan does require developers to calculate the life cycle of carbon in their buildings - and you just did mention about demolition, Mr Mayor, in your introductory remarks - whilst we are looking at that in terms of construction and demolition, developers are not required to offset their carbon in the Plan. Given the pressures to build associated with London’s housing crisis, how else can we reduce the embodied carbon in London’s buildings?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Actually, the London Plan goes further than ever before. Also, no other city in the country is doing what we are doing. The Plan requires net zero carbon for all major developments. It is a really important policy. I want to bring Jules [Pipe] and then Shirley [Rodrigues] in to give you examples and reassurance. I know you have been assiduous in chivving us to make sure we go even further and we have gone further than anybody else ever before.

Léonie Cooper AM: I appreciate we have gone further, but I am just concerned --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, I know. I agree and you have to keep pushing. I agree.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): This was about the embodied carbon in construction? Yes, you are absolutely right to highlight it because it has not been removed at all. The consideration has not been removed from the Plan and its policies. It has been clarified that it is not included in the calculations, though. Instead, now what we have is a much clearer requirement for referable schemes to calculate and reduce whole life cycle carbon, which is much more comprehensive and more far-reaching than only assessing the emissions in construction, which is where we were.

The problem that we had in going as far as we would want to at the time that we brought the Plan forward is that there is just currently a lack of data and a lack of benchmarks and consistency in assessing and then the approach in reducing the whole life cycle carbon costs. However, our requirement for it all to be measured will give us that evidence and those benchmarks to be able to still be in the vanguard of introducing actual reductions and enforceable reductions on developments in the future.

The Plan puts us in a very good position and in advance of elsewhere, but we could not just go straight to the finishing line because of the lack of evidence. The Inspectors would have just knocked out the wider policy had we tried to run before we could walk.

Léonie Cooper AM: We do know that there are some building materials, for example, that are less carbon-intense than others. Could we do more to specify or to work with developers so that they can look at that? What are we going to do about offsetting carbon from construction? I am focusing a bit here on new builds. I do not mind who answers that.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Can I come in on the circular economy point? There is a real link there. We require circular economy statements and also, in the Design chapter of the Plan, we want them to follow the hierarchy of the
circular economy. That should have the influence of reducing the embodied carbon by reusing and recycling.

**Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy):** This is a new area. It was a big feature of the Environment Strategy and we have been working to make sure that it is incorporated into different strategies but including the London Plan. We are really pleased to see how receptive it has been. We pushed as far as we could, but we did not want to lose the policy, as Jules was saying and Jennifer has been saying, because there was quite a push back from some developers.

There are some good leading developers. What we are doing is working with them and with the London Plan Team to come up with some guidance to the circular economy statement, which builds on some of the good practice that they are doing and that they are seeing and so trying to socialise the great reductions in carbon. Some developers are seeing much reduced heavy goods vehicle movements, reducing embodied carbon, and we are going to look at how we encourage people to use more sustainable sources of building materials.

We are working with the London Waste and Recycling Board to look at construction emissions. There is a board meeting today that I am missing, which is looking at a new business plan, which is looking more at those sorts of emissions.

**Léonie Cooper AM:** I know I am pushing you at the edge of the knowledge base because that is what the Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers said during the EiP and also I know that the Building Research Establishment has been working in this area.

I have just been asking you about new builds. Where are we in terms of retrofit? Again, some of the activities in retrofit, if we really want to get to net zero as quickly as possible, we need to be looking at as well.

**Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy):** Yes, I absolutely agree. We have so many homes and buildings in London that are going through refurbishment that need to be retrofitted. We have a number of programmes - we can talk about that separately - about retrofitting for energy efficiency and making sure that we have the new renewables built into them.

The real problem is the Mayor does not really have the powers to enforce that. Most of those emission sources are under Government lead and we have been arguing and lobbying very hard for more powers and funding to support not just this Mayor, the Mayor of London, but other mayors and other local authority leaders to be able to attack that retrofit problem.

**Léonie Cooper AM:** Staying at the cutting edge is where we need to be. Thank you, Chair.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair):** Thank you. Before I call our next speaker, can we just take a moment out and wave hello to Christchurch Primary School from Redbridge. Welcome.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** They have chosen an exciting morning, Chair.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair):** You have brought such joy into this Chamber. Thank you for coming. Assembly Member Shah?
Navin Shah AM: Thank you, Chair. Mr Mayor and the team, I want to pick up issues on policies related to fire safety and resilience and then move on to density and tall buildings.

Starting on fire and resilience, Mr Mayor, your London Plan sets out higher standards than ever before for resilience and fire safety in new developments. How will this keep Londoners safe in spite of the current Wild West of building regulations that we have?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thanks for your question and thanks for your campaigning on this issue over a number of years.

Firstly, this is the first time that the London Plan has a dedicated policy on fire safety and we should be really proud of that, one of the legacies of the awful fire at Grenfell Tower. What this Plan includes is a list of criteria that need to be taken into account in new schemes, including sprinklers, which I know you know all about. There is a need for major developments to submit a fire statement. Also, the Plan contains a policy requirement for developments with lifts to include fire evacuation lifts. Again, you will know the reasons why that is so important.

We are doing what we can. What normally happens is you consider fire issues when it comes to building control. We are saying that at the design stage you should be thinking about how your building can address some of the concerns that we know exist around fire.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor. I fully appreciate what you have just mentioned in terms of how the process works in terms of the status of the London Plan and the building regulations from my work as an architect and also on planning relating matters on the fire authorities.

On the ground, we have a situation where the London Fire Brigade (LFB) has told us, for example, at Fire [Resilience and Emergency Planning] Committee meetings that safety critical improvements they are asking developers to make are not delivered in the way or to the skill required.

Are you absolutely sure that the fire statement that you mentioned, which is required in policy D12, will actually deliver to the fullest satisfaction of the fire authorities and whoever is actually assessing the fire statement the required safety level at the planning level itself?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The honest answer is that we do not know yet because this is ground-breaking stuff. This is pioneering stuff. It is similar to the question raised by Assembly Member Cooper in relation to the policies we have in relation to reducing carbon and the whole life carbon cycle. We are the first to say a fire statement and the first to say fire evacuation lifts and sprinklers.

Actually, the issue is that I would say I am confident about new build but my real concern is the buildings that already exist, not just in relation to the different responsibilities between land owners, managers and users, but whether the LFB and other fire services around the country are being given the information they require.

You will know that in phase one of the Grenfell Inquiry, what was uncovered was in fact that the information was not in one place and the fire service did not know about it. It was not just the fabric of the building; it was things like the doors not being fire doors and stuff.
With the London Plan, we are very confident that the London Plan is going further than anyone else is doing. We are always happy to look at Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) if we need to in the future, but, Jennifer, we have really explored, have we not?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Yes. We are working on some guidance notes at the moment that we are looking to put out quite shortly that will give practical application of those policies to the local authorities so that they can understand how they can implement them. That will look at things like how to make sure that it is taken through to the end of the development.

**Navin Shah AM:** I was and I am concerned about whether the fire statement will be robust enough. Are you saying that, in practice, when the Plan comes into being, if policy D12 and the fire statement are not quite strong enough, would that be coupled with design guidelines or SPGs, as you have just indicated? Is that the plan?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Yes. The plan is to put a guidance note out that will explain about how the approach to fire statements should work and who should be the author of those statements to make sure that they are robust and to make sure that the policy works in practice.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Just to reassure you, a suitably qualified third-party professional must prepare the fire statement, which will document how the development meets the criteria. Then, as Jennifer said, further guidance on this will be published shortly to set out the planning authorities’ specific role on this.

**Navin Shah AM:** Thank you. If I can move on to one other aspect on this, the London Plan, rightly, highlights sprinklers as a lifesaving building feature that should be included wherever possible; yet the Plan cannot make the compulsory. I understand how it works. Also, it can not encourage retrofitting.

Do you agree that it is unjust for only Londoners in new housing to benefit from proper fire safety measures and that the Government’s forthcoming bill on building safety must support sprinkler installations in old residential buildings in terms of retrofitting, etc?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Yes, but it is not just unfair with new build versus those already built but, also, we have managed to secure funding for those tenants but those who are private leaseholders do not have that security. There is lots of unfairness in relation to fire safety and we will carry on lobbying the Government. Thank you for your active lobbying on this issue.

**Navin Shah AM:** Can you reassure us that in terms of the success of your planning policies, you will continue to lobby the Government for the root-and-branch changes that are required to building regulations to make the Plan effective and fire safety effective?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** I can give you that assurance.

**Navin Shah AM:** Thank you very much. If we can move on to the issue about densities and tall buildings, how will the London Plan ensure that new homes built are of sustainable densities as well as typologies, whether they are tall buildings or whatever, and create liveable places across London’s diverse neighbourhoods?
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. I will bring Jules in in a second but you will be aware that the Inspector was supportive of our plans in relation to tall buildings. We are developing a tall buildings guidance. I will let Jules explain to you how we are going to provide you with the reassurance you ask for.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes. As you will have seen, the Plan requires boroughs to use a design-led approach to identify areas where tall buildings would be appropriate in their local plans. That way, boroughs will be able to resist tall buildings where they are inappropriate, if they plan accordingly. The Plan says they have to account of the visual and cumulative impacts of tall buildings and that boroughs have to engage with neighbouring boroughs and local communities that will be affected.

It is really crucial, this issue about defining tall buildings in appropriate locations actually in the local plan stage rather than just doing it application by application to avoid the problems that we see happening today in the absence of the guidance and in the absence of local plans defining these areas. Then you can get them popping up in inappropriate locations.

The forthcoming housing design guidance module on optimising capacity is going to provide more detail and of course applies to tall buildings as much as any other typology. Later this year we are developing characterisation guidance, which will have content that relates to tall building location and definition. After that, we will also be producing some specific tall building guidance covering visual, functional, environmental and cumulative impacts. Plus, we work closely with people who are doing advanced studies like the [City of London] Corporation, which has done wind tunnel effect studies of tall buildings as well. The team is very up to speed on the outputs of that kind of research.

Navin Shah AM: Jules, you know we had a detailed discussion about the change in approach in the new Plan, which puts an extra burden on local planning authorities (LPAs) in terms of densities, tall building definitions, etc.

Can you reassure us that, given the pressures that planning departments are under across London, you will facilitate where required the extra capacity to make sure that they can implement policies effectively for both density-related work and tall buildings?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes. I have mentioned some of the guidance we are bringing forward. We could go into detail on that. We are providing training sessions as well for boroughs. There are various capacity funds we have that they can draw on at least in the short term.

Plus there is Public Practice as well, which has supplied in excess of 80 built environment professionals to local authorities across mainly London, about a dozen or so in the wider South East area, around the fringes of London. Much of their activity has been focused on this issue of local plans, characterisation and the kinds of issues that arise from taking a design-led approach and the capacity requirements that boroughs have for taking a design-led approach is actually taking that issue.

All that said, I would be the first to agree with anyone who suggests that LPAs in London need more capacity.
Navin Shah AM: Very briefly, if I can have an answer yes or no, hopefully yes, to this question. The Plan does not distinguish between residential and commercial tall buildings. With New London Architecture identifying 90% of 541 tall buildings in the pipeline as being residential, would you consider carrying out some detailed work on the impact and quality of these buildings and consider whether specific guidance might be required for high-rise residential developments?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I had better say yes.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Assembly Member Bailey?

Shaun Bailey AM: I am going to focus on overcrowding. Overcrowding is one of the major challenges facing London with over 360,000 children under the age of 16 living in overcrowded accommodation and your removal of any central target for family homes from your Housing Strategy.

Would it be acceptable for 55% of all new homes in London to be one-bedroom flats, as suggested in the main section of your SHMA?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is an independent report, the SHMA. We do not do that. It is the same formula used by the previous Mayor. I am not clear. You are criticising the methodology?

Shaun Bailey AM: Yes, I am because, as far back as 2017, people said it was flawed. A report written here in the London Assembly had a very different outcome to why you provide family housing and so I am saying the SHMA is flawed.

The point is here whether you think it is acceptable for 55% of all new homes to be one-bedroom flats, Mr Mayor?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Could I just check? Has the Assembly Member received the new amended SHMA?

Shaun Bailey AM: Yes, I have.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): That does address this issue and --

Shaun Bailey AM: It is an addendum and it is in the executive summary, but the main body has not been changed.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): It is worth saying that the SHMA used assumptions, as it has to, to come up with the housing numbers and came up with the bedroom size mix. It is just an indicative number across London. At no point in the Plan did we suggest that that should be applied at a borough level or a site-by-site level. We were not promoting that level. That was just part of the information.
There were two scenarios in the SHMA and, as already discussed today, through the discussions at the EiP, we brought forward that third scenario, which we have now put into that addendum to say that that should potentially be the starting point if there is not robust local data available. However, we have always been of the view that the needs of a local areas are best understood at the local level.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** We have always been clear that boroughs should set bedroom size mixes for social and low-cost rented housing.

**Shaun Bailey AM:** How can they do that when your SHMA -- if I am a developer, I will just point to the SHMA and do what I want to do. Even your addendum just makes it confusing. If you do not give an incentive, i.e. have a target so that money follows it, why would local authorities have a different mix?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** We do have a target. The way to address overcrowding in London is to build more affordable homes. What the Plan does is enable them to have a 50% strategic target and a threshold approach and so we are addressing the issue of overcrowding.

It is worth looking at what the Inspector said in relation to this. What the Inspector said was:

> “The significant need for affordable housing is not in dispute, along with the fact that delivery has been significantly lower than identified since at least 2013 [when it was devolved to Boris Johnson (MP, former Mayor of London)]. The approach set out in policies H5 to H8 aims to provide a step change in delivery to address this. It is a new approach and, having operated since 2017, it appears to be bearing fruit.”

**Shaun Bailey AM:** Yes, but that is a step change that delivers 55% one-bedroom flats. We are talking about --

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** It is a step change because I became the Mayor and we had the step change.

**Shaun Bailey AM:** No, we are talking about family homes of three bedrooms and more. There is no target in your housing plans for that to happen and it will only really happen at local authority level if they have some incentive. Unless you set the target, the money does not follow.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** One-size-fits-all would not be appropriate across London, but the Plan is really clear, as I raised when Assembly Member Boff put a very similar question to me. Sorry, perhaps it was Assembly Member Devenish, actually. I was very clear and I read, which I can do now, the part of the Plan that is crystal clear about requiring boroughs to set those targets. It is not letting boroughs off the hook or anyone off the hook. It is saying that boroughs that know their locality should set those targets.

The reference to the SHMA is somewhat misleading because it is a series of scenarios - it was a scenario and now it is a series of scenarios - and a developer cannot pray that in aid of ignoring the Plan when the Plan is very clear.
Shaun Bailey AM: What will local authorities do in the meantime until this Plan comes in?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, let me help the Member, as I tried to do. The policy now states:

“Schemes of all types should generally consist of a range of unit sizes and that to determine the approach of mix of unit sizes, applicants and decision-makers should have regard to robust evidence of local need. For low-cost rent, boroughs should provide guidance on the size of units required by number of bedrooms to ensure affordable housing meets identified needs.”

Shaun Bailey AM: Yes, but while you do not have that target and you still have not allocated any money to it, where is the incentive to build these homes?

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Local authorities will be incentivised because they will be looking at their waiting lists and their overcrowding data to try to meet that need.

Shaun Bailey AM: Which part of your Plan says that they will be supported financially for this? When you have removed the target, the money does not follow.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will give you one example of the support we are giving to councils. We are giving £1 billion to 27 London councils to build record numbers of affordable homes, 14,000, 11,000 of which are going to be council homes. It is not in the London Plan because the London Plan is a planning document.

I can give you another example of the progress that is being made: changing the dodgy definition of what an affordable home means. That is in the Housing Strategy.

The Plan by itself does not set out all we are doing in relation to affordable housing but, last year, we had a record number of council housing starts, the largest in any year since 1984/85, and the London Plan builds on some of the other policies we have.

Shaun Bailey AM: Yes, but that is still not talking about family homes, the thing that we need the most. That is talking about homes in general. That is units, as it were. What are we doing about family homes? Where is the incentive to deliver family homes? It is the part of the market where people suffer the most.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): All right. I am not --

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): I would be at risk of repeating exactly what the Mayor just said. It is so clear in the Plan about the requirement for family homes and the requirement for boroughs to set the targets that are relevant to them. There are 32 different boroughs within London, as you know, and surely it is right -- if the Mayor had a one-size-fits-all target for London, surely the Mayor would stand criticised for taking a one-size-fits-all approach and not allowing boroughs to determine their own needs.
Shaun Bailey AM: That is incorrect because, if you live in one of these boroughs that has that very low number of family houses, you would appreciate the Mayor taking every effort he can to spend some money to change the situation.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, let me talk about money and family homes. The reason why you cannot have a one-size-fits-all approach is this. I will give you just a simple example. In an inner London borough, a three-bedroom home costs on average £1 million and, in outer London, £532,000. In the London Borough of Barking [and Dagenham], for example, a three-bedroom home costs £370,000 on average and, in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, £1.8 million. If you have more market-value three-bedroom homes, the reality is, for those of us who mix with ordinary Londoners, most of them could not afford to buy one of these market-value three-bedroom-plus homes. What we have done is to make sure we have more genuinely affordable three-bedroom homes where possible, through the London Plan and through the grant system.

What is clear is that a large number of family homes do not have children living in them. The figure is a third. Only a third of three-bedroom-plus homes have children living in them. It is really important to make sure we also build one- and two-bedroom homes so that grown children can move into the smaller homes and deal with the issue of overcrowding.

If the Assembly Member is suggesting we lobby the Government for more grant money to build more low-rent sub-market family homes, I am all in favour of that. It would be good to see him joining with us in lobbying this Government to do more for London.

Shaun Bailey AM: What the Assembly Member is suggesting is that you do more and be clearer to local authorities about how you can support them to deliver family homes across London. Thank you, Chair.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): OK. Assembly Member Gavron?

Nicky Gavron AM: I just want to follow on from this because there was a concern across the whole Assembly and it has been there right through the process of the consultation and the EiP on the London Plan. What was being put forward was that London has a very low level of family housing and a very high level of one-bed and studio flats. The Assembly really supported the target of 66,000 and did not want to reduce that in any way, but did not agree with the assumption that nobody in the rented sector, whether public or private, should have a spare room.

We felt that the scenarios, particularly on low-cost social rented housing, which said that only 16% should be family housing and 69% should be one-bed, was unrealistic and in our view would lead to families being forced to live in small flats in the private rented sector. Because there were not going to be enough homes in the social rented sector for families, more and more of them would end up in temporary accommodation and having probably to move out of London.

We are very pleased that now a third scenario has been agreed in which the proportion in the social rented area is now 29% family housing and one-bed has gone down to 44%, which we think is more appropriate, and also the fact that this is going to be the starting point for anyone looking at the SHMA. People do look at that. Of course they look at that and they weigh it up against their local need and so on. Developers look at it.
My question is this. Shaun Bailey [AM] talked about targets, but there is something a bit different from targets. When you call in schemes, when you look, as you do, at many referrals at stage one, will you then use this 29% of family housing as the benchmark against which you look at those schemes? That is what we would like you to consider.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** Yes, we are having a bit of a conversation here because of the issue about the local requirement. Jennifer?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Yes, you would look at it against the borough’s requirement, if it had one, and its data. If it did not, then that could be the starting point for the new third scenario. However, generally, we would hope that local authorities would have the understanding of what they need rather than referring to our London-wide figures, which do not have that nuance in them.

**Nicky Gavron AM:** Yes. We are just concerned that developers may be challenging and so on and that therefore that is a benchmark.

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Yes, it could still be used as that, yes.

**Nicky Gavron AM:** Good. One more point. It came up in a Planning Committee and we brought it up in the EiP that the evidence base for the SHMA relies very heavily on the English Housing Survey. The English Housing Survey has a tiny sample of 2,000 London homes in the survey and, therefore, it is being look at over three years, but it is still a very small sample and does not really reflect what we think a London sample should be like.

Therefore, going back to 2002, nearly 20 years ago, the GLA at the time commissioned its own London Household Survey and that was in order to make sure that we had a proper picture of the development of London, the household types and needs, the stock, the overcrowding levels and the conditions of the private rented sector. That then underpinned the first London Plan.

Now, moving on all this time, what the Assembly would like is for you to commission another of those studies. It may have to be slimmed down in some way or there may have to be samples. We need something that gives us better evidence of what is happening in London. We would like you to consider that.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** I am very happy to engage with the new Deputy Mayor for Housing and with you and with any other Assembly Member who wants to explore that further. I know that Assembly Member Gavron will know the expense that is involved in such a survey and so we would need to explore it outside of this room, but we can certainly commit to exploring it.

**Nicky Gavron AM:** Thank you.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair):** Assembly Member O’Connell?
Steve O’Connell AM: Good morning. Mr Mayor, returning to the Green Belt, if I may, we all agree in this Chamber and with you about the importance of the Green Belt and that its protection is paramount for the good of Londoners. Unfortunately, Mr Mayor, that is not shared by all London boroughs.

Would you not agree that, for example, Croydon’s housing target, which has dropped significantly, has no justification for the release of Green Belt for development?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure about the individual borough, but in general terms --

Steve O’Connell AM: I am talking about the individual borough specifically. I am asking you a question about specifically the individual borough.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not know enough about the numbers in the borough, but I will ask maybe one of the others.

Steve O’Connell AM: Jules probably will.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): The Mayor is clear that we do not support de-designation of Green Belt when proposals to de-designate are brought forward, although occasionally there will be an individual development that proposes an overall improvement in previously developed Green Belt and it results in an overall improvement. Getting outside of Croydon, there was one in Barnet that the Mayor considered and it resulted in a wide expanse of green open space being remediated, cleared of buildings, trees planted and opened to the public in a way that it was not before. Those are rare circumstances and so the generality is that development is resisted and de-designation certainly resisted by the GLA.

However, just to finish, it is not in the Mayor’s gift to decide either way. The Mayor can only make representations to the Inspector and sometimes the Inspector finds against the Mayor.

Steve O’Connell AM: I am not talking about individual applications; I am talking about the preparation of individual boroughs’ local plans. The subject matter here is Croydon’s emerging local plan, to which you have already responded, Mr Mayor.

Mr Mayor, would you agree that by not adopting a lower small sites target, which Croydon has not done, that indeed puts the Green Belt at risk?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure that one follows the other because there are other ways to build homes in relation to the needs of a borough.

Steve O’Connell AM: Your response says that:

“As stated ... Croydon’s housing target has dropped significantly [but not adopted by the borough] and there is no justification for the release of the Green Belt.”

That is your response.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is the point Jules just made. That is just what he said.
Steve O’Connell AM: All right, and so you would agree that Croydon has no justification in releasing Green Belt for development?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): We have made it clear that it is the general case that the Mayor does not support de-designation. We would always encourage boroughs to look at other brownfield approaches in particular and intensification on other sites and not look to the Green Belt.

Steve O’Connell AM: All right. I will try it another way. Mr Mayor, you will be aware that because of the reduction in the small sites target, your targets in the London Plan have reduced. You would agree with that and you would have an expectation that London boroughs would thereby accept those reduced targets, Mr Mayor?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure if they are targets. We still want them to be minimum numbers.

Steve O’Connell AM: Jennifer [Peters], help the Mayor.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): In terms of the numbers, if a local authority wanted to deliver more homes than the target in the Plan, even the reduced target, we would be supportive of that as long as it was consistent with the other policies in the Plan. Therefore, if it required the release of Green Belt, we would not support it.

My understanding is that Croydon consulted on three different options and the other options are more about sustainable intensification and so we would potentially support those approaches if they could meet more of London’s needs.

Steve O’Connell AM: Yes, but do you support Croydon not adopting the new target? That is contrary to the London Plan, surely.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Not if it is higher and the way it is being delivered is consistent with the London Plan in other ways.

Steve O’Connell AM: By basing planning decisions on the increased targets, surely that is not in conformity with the London Plan? Your letter says that.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): In terms of decisions, if we are talking about the development of their local plan, if they want to deliver more and they can justify how they can do that in a way that is consistent with the London Plan, then that would be acceptable.

Steve O’Connell AM: I will finally summarise by saying that your response - this is the GLA’s and the Mayor’s response - to Croydon’s local plan consultation is quite damning and properly so because it criticises Croydon for adopting targets that significantly put at risk Green Belt. I thank you, Mr Mayor and officers, for responding in a critical manner. Thank you, Chair.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member Cooper?
Léonie Cooper AM: Thank you very much, Chair. I am going to try to ask you about three completely separate issues. Biodiversity has been a big theme for me. I did my own personal report on it. It is something we have discussed in the Environment Committee. I was really pleased to see that the Plan moved from the Green Space Factor to the Urban Greening Factor. I am glad to see that you separated industrial and office from retail.

Do we actually think it is going to be high enough and is there anything we can do to really encourage industry towards an Urban Greening Factor being used on industrial sites as well? I see Jules is nodding.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. The Inspector was overall supportive of the policy and our general approach.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Yes. In terms of the slight change we had to make on specific industrial uses, we have kept in an encouragement for those uses to look at what they can do in terms of the Urban Greening Factor and try to go as high as they can. We will be working with the developers that come forward to be able to do that.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): We could not require it on viability grounds, but we did not want to lose the policy completely.

Léonie Cooper AM: I raised at the EiP that Berlin has an Urban Greening Factor - I cannot remember what they call it because it is in German - that is a higher factor than ours in London. Is that something that we can work towards once we get the new London Plan in? The higher the better, really, is it not?

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): Absolutely, the aspiration is there, but we really wanted this to be in the policy. It was at risk if we did not follow the Inspector’s advice. We worked very hard and got a good evidence base for what we can start with, but we need data from the developments as they come through the London Development Database and so on to be able to make the case for that. Outside of that, we know there are very willing developers who want to go further and so we are very happy to work with those progressive developers to go further and build that evidence base for others to do so.

Léonie Cooper AM: I think they call it a Biotope Factor. Matching ourselves with Berlin has to surely be an aspiration.

Can I just ask you about energy-from-waste facilities? The London Plan talks about a carbon intensity floor of 400 grams of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per kilowatt hour and yet my understanding is that National Grid has already reached a lower carbon intensity than this of about 300 grams of CO₂ per kilowatt hour. Surely, we should be trying to meet that level and the Plan should be aiming for 300 grams as an absolute maximum. Surely, we should be going further.

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): We always keep these things under review.
Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes. For the time it takes us to produce a plan, by law, we end up getting leapfrogged in standards.

Léonie Cooper AM: I know.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is a bit like the Seddon Bridge.

Léonie Cooper AM: It is pretty unusual that we are being leapfrogged. In almost everything else we are at the cutting edge. Is this something you are going to be looking at bringing into line with where National Grid is now or even going lower?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): It is easy for me to say that, yes, I would happily incorporate it, but the Plan is the spatial expression of other policies. I am looking --

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): As I said, we will keep it under review, and we will see whether we can upgrade it as appropriate. I am just trying to find the answer in here somewhere, but it is essentially that.

Léonie Cooper AM: Having 400 grams is going to make us an outlier in absolutely the wrong direction. This is yet another area that is really important for us to be bearing down on.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, that is a fair point.

Léonie Cooper AM: We do not have control over the development in terms of whether other things are going to be constructed and so we want any energy-from-waste plants --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is a good point. You are pushing against an open door and, as Shirley and Jules have said, we will review these all the time. I can assure you what our intention is and where we want to be.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): I have to say that this is a really good example of the danger of putting targets in the Plan because SPGs you can update more easily but, once a target is in the Plan, SPGs cannot overrule that and so it is harder to update. That is a good example of that and being too specific.

Léonie Cooper AM: Sure. On to something very specific. We now have this issue, which we touched on earlier, about our opposition to fracking. We have passed resolutions here in the Assembly against fracking. It is clearly far too carbon-intense to be something that we could possibly contemplate in a climate emergency.

Do you agree with me that the Government should be doing all it can to eliminate fracking and fossil fuels from the entire United Kingdom (UK) energy system? What more can we do to be pushing the Government towards where we are so that we are then in compliance with the NPPF because it has banned fracking as well?
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): To be fair to politicians who are currently serving in the Government, during the election campaign it did call a moratorium in relation to new fracking. We are hoping that that will extend to being supportive of our stance in relation to no fracking in London. Again, with the mood music from the Government – you will have seen the Prime Minister announcing yesterday in relation to 2035 versus 2040 – and with the 26th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 26) being in Glasgow, we hope that the Government will continue to move and evolve in its thinking around what is a climate emergency.

Léonie Cooper AM: Perhaps I was being a bit cynical because the moratorium emerged just in the leadup to a general election. I would like to think that you are correct, Mr Mayor, and that it is going to be something that is permanent. It would be great, would it not, to see the UK commit that permanently in the leadup to COP 26 next November [2020].

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): Just to add, the Mayor is really setting a high bar for the Government. Today we have responded to the Government’s consultation on its desire to loosen the standard on zero-carbon homes that has been operating really successfully since the Mayor’s administration started in 2016. We are seeing developers wanting to do this and doing it quite easily and it is seen not just by us but by many developers and green non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and others as a retrograde step. It is those sorts of things that people want to see happen --

Léonie Cooper AM: That is great. It is clarity that developers want.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Agreed.

Léonie Cooper AM: If we set a good context, then we will be pushing at the open door and having those good targets. Thank you very much.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member McCartney?

Joanne McCartney AM: I want to ask about recycling rates, if I may. London’s recycling rate has remained stubbornly low. It is around 33%. In part, that high number of flats that we have in the city makes it very difficult, but the Mayor has set ambitious targets for recycling. Will the provision for storage and collection of recyclable materials in new developments help to increase that level?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It will do, yes. We have a specific policy in relation to this. I do not have the exact number here. It is in the D section. We definitely have a policy in relation to just that point.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): Yes, it is in the housing standards policy.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is D6, yes.

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): If I could add to that, we published some guidance the other day, working with the London Waste and Recycling Board and with our borough colleagues, on recycling for existing flats. New flats are absolutely important but we have so many flats in London already and we need to move on that, too.
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Just to reassure you, Joanne [McCartney AM], what it says is that housing

“... should be designed with adequate and easily accessible storage space that supports the separate collection of dry recyclables (for at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food waste, as well as residual waste.”

Joanne McCartney AM: Thank you. This is one of the areas where you rely on the local boroughs to implement the policies. You have given waste apportionment figures to each borough. Will that put London on track to meet your target of being waste self-sufficient by 2026?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It does reflect that.

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): Yes.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Yes, domestic, commercial and industrial, 100% by 2026.

Joanne McCartney AM: Fine. You also set a target for all boroughs to submit a reduction and recycling plan by the end of last year. Some have not and so I just want to know. Could you update me on the numbers? What are you doing to encourage those that have not submitted a plan to do so?

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): Yes. We have had them all in. Some are complete and some are drafts, but the officers are just working through them now and assessing them and reviewing them in order for the Mayor to make a judgement about whether they in general conformity with his Environment Strategy.

I would say that we are really pleased with the process and the engagement that boroughs have had with us. We have been using the London Waste and Recycling Board, which is, as I have said, a partnership between the GLA and the boroughs, to also help provide some technical advice on what is feasible.

Part of that is making sure that rather than setting top-down targets for boroughs through the Environment Strategy, we have agreed that each borough would set their own, but the process that we go through is a really hard challenge to make sure they are setting the most they can achieve within the very difficult circumstances they have. Comparing Bromley to Tower Hamlets, they will have different green waste and so on.

It is looking very good. We hope to be signing them all off within the next month and that should make an appreciable difference if all are committed. However, there is a big problem in that the ability for local authorities to do more on recycling - and we are the worst region in the country - is reliant on the Government giving us more support and funding for boosting activities on the sector economy, which is waste reduction, in the first place and recycling. The Mayor and the boroughs have been lobbying very hard for that. I know the Government is bringing forward some policies, but we are looking for more support.
Joanne McCartney AM: You have anticipated my final question. The Government has recently published its Resources and Waste Strategy. Is that actually good enough for London? You have talked about extra support. What extra support is it that you and the boroughs are lobbying for?

Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy): We are really pleased that that Strategy recognised the policy that the Mayor implemented, which was about separate food waste collection. That is something that we have been pushing boroughs to understand and to take forward within the contractual regime that they have as fast as possible because that food waste contributes to greenhouse gas emissions and is just bad, generally.

The big problem in moving to faster recycling rates is that not all boroughs have the same sort of infrastructure. It has not kept up with what Londoners and London boroughs want to do and what the Mayor wants to do. We have been arguing for devolution of the landfill tax that exists at the moment. We do not have access to that and so we want a fair share of that and some more funding for putting in new recycling infrastructure, which would help to retrofit some of the infrastructure that the London Plan is now talking about for the existing flats and estates that there are at the moment.

It could go further. There are lots of things that they are doing about deposit return schemes and so on. We would argue that to go further and faster is what Londoners and generally the public want.

Joanne McCartney AM: Thank you.

Tony Devenish AM: Would you agree, Mr Mayor, that big developers are happier with your London Plan than community groups?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure about that. We have tried to address some of the concerns raised by developers, community groups and others. One of the biggest concerns raised by communities is getting involved in the process. Siân Berry [AM] referred to this earlier on. We have tried to do that and some of the changes we have made have addressed some of those. I would hope that there is a general consensus by and large that it is a good London Plan.

Tony Devenish AM: If I can go back to something that Assembly Member Shah did cover in terms of tall buildings, then, please, as a specific, Historic England told the London Assembly Planning Committee that it was concerned about the potential for tall buildings to damage the setting for World Heritage Sites. Have you listened?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I draw your intention to what the Inspector said in relation to us listening. The Inspector was complimentary about our approach to consultation and was complimentary about our approach to talk buildings. In just one line that I would pay attention to: “The Plan’s policies would effectively assist in delivering tall building development in the right place at the right height so as to positively contribute to London’s rich character.”

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): I have to say that it is not the Mayor who is the issue here. When you have Westferry Circus and the damage to the heritage view of Tower Bridge that was recently taken by the Secretary of State [for Housing, Communities and Local Government] and the fact that they have now called in the Mayor’s refusal of the Tulip, again quite damaging to the World Heritage Site of the Tower of London, that is probably better where those questions are laid.
Tony Devenish AM: Thank you, Deputy Mayor.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): He means the Government, by the way.

Tony Devenish AM: Your London Plan encourages boroughs to set height limits for tall buildings in different areas on specific sites. Yet where boroughs have already done this, such as Richmond [upon Thames], Harrow and Kensington [and Chelsea], you have then attempted to enforce these limits, your so-called called in application. How is this policy, therefore, worth the paper it is written on?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are the strategic planning authority and sometimes there may be occasions when we disagree with the local planning authority. That is not unusual.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): It is also about a bit of a process point here. The plans that exist at the moment were developed in the context of the old London Plan, the old housing targets and the old approach to density and identifying tall buildings. The local authorities need to go through the process of doing what this Plan requires and come to us for general conformity comments and then at that point those plans becomes agreed, if you like, whereas we are working on older plans in the local authorities that do not necessarily reflect the draft Plan we are talking about now.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The two examples Jules gave were ones where we agree with the borough and the Government disagrees.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): The two sites that I can think of in Kensington and Chelsea in various iterations at similar heights have been supported by the borough at various times. I know that certain iterations have and have not at various times.

However, I am not really sure that the height is the issue, particularly with the Kensington Forum hotel, for example, because that was proposed by Kensington and Chelsea officers for approval.

Tony Devenish AM: Deputy Mayor, I can assure you that heights, for many Members and real people in our boroughs, is a big issue.

Mr Mayor, do you accept that by 2024, should you be re-elected, London heights will be specifically higher on average than they are at the moment?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure that that is right.

Tony Devenish AM: Do you think they will be or do you not think they will be?

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): What, the average height of a building in London?

Tony Devenish AM: The average height in areas where at the moment there are not tall buildings over 20 storeys.
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Using your definition of 20 storeys, I am not sure. It depends what the pipeline is. I do not know.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): Also, the Plan is clear in expecting boroughs to decide what is tall and what is appropriate in their areas. The definition of ‘tall’ would vary borough by borough.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, and the Plan is quite clear that there should be a plan-led approach and so that underscores Jules’s point. It is a plan-led approach to tall buildings.

Tony Devenish AM: OK. Mr Mayor, finally, would you be happy to be known as a pro-skyscraper Mayor? You have put through a dozen decisions in four years overruling democratically elected councils.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is a question to ask the Secretary of State. The two examples in relation to the Tulip and the Westferry example are ones that are best prayed in aid for those arguing that the Secretary of State may be somebody who will be known as a tall building politician.

Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development): I do not want to waste your time going through each one of those call-ins, but for a number of them it is stretching a point to even call them tall buildings, let alone skyscrapers.

Tony Devenish AM: I will leave it there. Thank you.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Any other Members? Assembly Member Boff?

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, you very helpfully earlier read through the policies on the provisions of Policy H10 in trying to persuade Assembly Member Bailey that the SHMA did not really matter that much and that --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is not quite what I said.

Andrew Boff AM: Well, you know. However, reading through that, you seem to have omitted the very first provision of that policy. On number 1 it says:

“Robust local evidence of need should be provided as evidence where available or, where this is not available, the range of housing need and demand identified by the 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment should be used as a guide.”

The SHMA is being used as a template for the boroughs to produce 55% one-bedroom flats. Is that not the case?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not have policy H here.

Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority): I can respond. Then we have updated the supporting text as part of the EiP process. That mentions the addendum that we have already talked about and those three scenarios. It talks about taking account of
the three scenarios and we have now updated the addendum to say that the third scenario, if you like, is the starting point.

**Andrew Boff AM:** In providing scenarios, of course you are providing choice, not certainty. You are providing all sorts of options when, as has been referred to earlier, what developers actually want is some certainty. With three options, developers surely will choose the one that benefits them the most and benefits children in overcrowded conditions the least.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** You mean that the borough will choose, not the developer.

**Andrew Boff AM:** The boroughs will be told to use the SHMA and the SHMA will guide the developments coming forward. This is not new.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** The developer does not decide. The decision-maker and locally elected politicians --

**Andrew Boff AM:** The borough decides, but developers are going to develop applications that they think will get past the London Plan, will they not?

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** Most local authorities do have policies currently or are working on policies that have some kind of indicative size mix and so they do have robust local data.

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** Where they do not, it suggests that the third scenario is the starting point. Is there a problem with that?

**Andrew Boff AM:** There is a problem because those are appendices. They are not in the Plan.

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** There are no numbers in the Plan on that issue.

**Andrew Boff AM:** There are numbers in the plan.

**Jennifer Peters (Head of London Plan and Growth Strategies, Greater London Authority):** There are no housing size mix numbers in the plan.

**Andrew Boff AM:** Consequently, all those appendices that are being used - which are now variable and difficult to understand, may I say, as a result of three options - can be used to contribute to the muddle, not the certainty, that is currently guiding developments from the boroughs. Will it not be the case that it will provide no more certainty than there is at the moment as to what is acceptable?

**Jules Pipe CBE (Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills and Housing and Residential Development):** As I have said before, the Plan is clear in expecting boroughs to provide that certainty and to come up with their figures that are fit for their purposes locally and are consistent with the Plan.
Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Again, you are attributing this London Plan with the overcrowding caused as a consequence of previous policies, which we seek to address not my necessarily market-value family homes but in particular submarket family homes.

Andrew Boff AM: What confidence can the boroughs have that their plans will be observed when you call in applications, as was referred to earlier by Assembly Member Devenish, and you turn tall buildings into skyscrapers, as we are seeing at the Homebase development in Richmond? You are actually increasing the height of buildings. You are overturning decisions that are respecting local conditions and local aspirations by local authorities. What value really is this London Plan if all you are going to do is overturn the wishes of the boroughs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is not quite right, is it, Chair? What has happened is, since I have become Mayor, the numbers of genuinely affordable homes given permission by City Hall has increased hugely. One of the reasons is because of the draft London Plan and the policies we have published like the SPGs. Another is because of the referrals that have been called in by us. I am not sure it is right to suggest that as a result of calling in, there are fewer affordable homes. You will now that one of the main ways of addressing overcrowding in London is more affordable homes, which we are giving permission to be built.

Andrew Boff AM: The best way of attending to overcrowded homes in London is to build larger homes, Mr Mayor.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is not true. You see, that is the classic argument for a Conservative: build more market-value family homes to address overcrowding. We disagree on this side. We think the way to address overcrowding in London is more genuinely affordable homes of all sizes.

Andrew Boff AM: That is curious, Mr Mayor, because that is not what I said. I know you think that is what you wanted me to say --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am cleaning up your mess --

Andrew Boff AM: I did not say that, did I? We need more homes --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): -- and Londoners are suffering.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): OK. Assembly Member Boff --

Andrew Boff AM: Do you not think, Mr Mayor, you should be giving a damn about the 360,000 kids who are being brought up in overcrowded conditions rather than forcing through tiny homes --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, this is a really good example of the amnesia the Conservatives have. Where does he think these overcrowded people came from?

Andrew Boff AM: -- and prolonging the agony that these young people have to go through?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Sorry, gentlemen. We cannot hear anything. A final question from you, Mr Boff, or is that it?
Andrew Boff AM: Finally, Mr Mayor, combined with your encouragement of tall buildings, your lack of respect for the problems of overcrowding, your general encouragement to build on back gardens and your lack of respect for the kind of parking standards that are required in outer London boroughs, does this plan not amount to little more than a war on the suburbs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, I have two minutes to answer that question and so I will give it the justice it deserves. No, and I do not accept some of the premises made in the question. That is the sort of speech I would expect to hear at a hustings. It is a shame he is not the candidate chosen by the Conservatives to be their candidate over the next 90 days.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Disgraceful. He says you are behaving as though it is a hustings. Tell him you are not.

Andrew Boff AM: Was that an answer?

Tony Devenish AM: That was his answer.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): His answer was that you are treating this as a hustings.

Andrew Boff AM: You are not denying that it is a war on the suburbs? You are just saying that this is a hustings? Is that your reply? Are you confirming my assertion that this London Plan is about declaring war on the suburbs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, I am sorry he lost the selection. What I am saying is that I do not accept --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): No, no.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Disgraceful.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): What I am saying is --

Andrew Boff AM: Let me carry on. Do you realise that Londoners are seeing you not answering the question?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Mr Boff, Mr Boff, just a minute. There was a clear --


Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): No, there was a clear question.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): He is very angry, Chair. He needs to calm down.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): No, it is because it is a shame. We are just at the end now. There was a clear question from Assembly Member Boff --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Which I answered.
Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Then you can make the interpretation that you need to, Assembly Member Boff, because the Mayor has said he has answered your question.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, if that is what you think is an answer to a question, then it makes you realise why we have this poor-quality London Plan that threatens the character of this city in front of us. Do you not think --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chair, can I just say? I can answer that, Chair.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): No, he is coming with a question.

Andrew Boff AM: Is that your motivation, Mayor, because you are so unwilling to answer questions from Londoners?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Here we go. Chair, let me deal with that. This is a classic example of party politics taking over common sense because two hours ago, he made a very different speech from exactly where he is sitting, but he was standing and in that position he welcomed our London Plan and for five minutes was complimentary. Because he wants the knockabout stuff, he is now saying it is a rubbish London Plan. I ask him to reflect on the way he conducts himself and addresses the Assembly because we have had a good process over the last year and a half or two years and the fruits are a really good London Plan. We have talked during this discussion this morning about the iterative process and the collaborative approach, rather than an adversarial process, but because he cannot help himself --

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): No, you cannot help yourself.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): -- he wants to use the last few minutes of this very good hearing up until now with the knockabout stuff. I would say this in response. One of the reasons why we need this bold plan is to fix the mess created by his Government and by his Mayor. I am pleased to have done that and I am really sorry he has run out of time this morning.

Andrew Boff AM: No sympathy for kids living in overcrowded conditions here, is there? No sympathy for children living in overcrowded conditions. That is the Mayor we have.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): OK. We have used up all the time that was allocated. I have to say that if I had in my power I would strike off the last three minutes, but I do not have that power. All I can do is to thank the Mayor --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You give a great hustings, Andrew. Shame you lost.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): -- thank Deputy Mayor Jules Pipe and Deputy Mayor Shirley Rodrigues and to say thank you very much, Jennifer [Peters] and all the very best. Wow, you did a fabulous job.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You did, indeed. Chair, could I just use this opportunity to thank all the staff who have been here watching the session and who have worked incredibly hard over the last two years. They have been a credit to the GLA and to our city.

(Applause)
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