

Draft London Plan December 2017 Consultation LB Brent Recommended Response

Consultation responses and proposed changes to the document are set out below. Additions to text are underlined whilst with deletions are highlighted with ~~strikethrough~~.

Introduction to Brent Response

Brent Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on and assist in shaping the London Plan as it moves forward for adoption. The Council welcomes the Mayor's focus on 'good growth' and providing a greater/ more obvious link between new development and outputs from it that are socially and economically inclusive and environmentally sustainable. In this regard the Council's and the Mayor's ambitions are aligned. The majority of the Plan's contents the Council supports and will endeavour to deliver.

The Council does have some fundamental concerns with parts of the Plan. In particular the housing target that has been set and the assumptions based on small site delivery. There has been some good engagement between the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Council in parts of the plan making process. Initial work on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which informs the housing target is an example this, where the Council considered that it had moved towards a mutually agreed capacity for the Borough's housing target.

The Council is extremely disappointed with the GLA's subsequent unilateral decision to substantially alter capacity assumptions without discussion and for these to be incorporated into the draft Plan. Such an approach is considered to not be in the spirit of promoting co-operative working which is required between the Mayor and London Boroughs to support London's continued success. The Council would like to re-establish the level of dialogue and agreement around methodology and numbers in relation to this issue in particular. Ideally this will enable the Council and the GLA to come to a consensus position on an achievable housing target prior to the Examination.

Introduction to the Plan

Paragraph 0.0.14

The sentence "Other elements of the Plan will need to be updated over time through Supplementary Planning Guidance as part of the 'plan, monitor, manage' approach" needs further clarification. Although it is subject to different regulations to other Local Planning Authorities, the GLA should not seek to circumvent Development Plan regulations and introduce policy 'by the back door'. All policy changes should be subject to consultation and independent review through the Plan adoption process. The GLA should abide by the principle that it has to work within the boundaries of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)

Introduction to the Plan

(England) Regulations 2012. In particular it should abide by regulations 5 and 6, about what is considered supplementary and what should be included in a Development Plan Document.

Amend text to:

“Other non-policy elements of the Plan will need to be updated over time through Supplementary Planning Guidance as part of the ‘plan, monitor, manage’ approach.”

Chapter 1 Planning London’s Future (Good Growth Policies)

Policy GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities

The Council supports this policy and the recognition that spatial development can have significant impacts on social outcomes. The Mayor’s aspirations are supported and are consistent with the Council’s, of reducing social inequality and improving life prospects for all.

Given later reference to the importance of open space and other green infrastructure initiatives and their impact on Londoners’ lives there could perhaps be greater reference to this issue in paragraph 1.0.8.

Amend text to:

Paragraph 1.0.8 – “...a better place to live. Health could also be improved by seeking to enhance the quality and quantity of green infrastructure. Planning for a”

Policy GG2 Making the best use of land

Whilst supporting the principle of making the best use of land the Council does not agree with some aspects of the wording in this policy.

First line of policy.

There is no need to identify high-density as a specific output. The policy should focus on what are the results typically associated with the best use of land and creating positive places that will endure. This might well lend itself to and result in high density development, but this should not be the driver. A better way of bringing this out might well be through identifying that there would be such sufficient local population to support viable local services, vitality and viability and a place with the characteristics that will show that it will endure in the future.

Amend text to:

Chapter 1 Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)

“To create ~~high-density~~, successful mixed-use places that make the best use of land and prosper for the long term, those involved in planning and development must:.....”

Criterion a)

This might as well focus on brownfield land, as the rest of the policy essentially points to land that is already in use. There is no need to separately identify small sites, as within the policy H2 it makes specific reference to these sites being well-connected by existing or planned Tube and rail stations, and sites within and on the edge of town centres.

Amend text to:

- a) Prioritise the development of brownfield sites in Opportunity Areas, ~~brownfield land, surplus public sector land, sites which are~~ and those well-connected by existing or planned Tube and rail stations, and ~~sites within and on the edge of town centres and small sites.~~

Criterion c)

The principle of high-density and criterion b) is potentially inconsistent with criterion c) and also the design policies which point to a character based assessment of an area to identify what is appropriate development taking account of surrounding character and context. If the existing low density character is something that is valued, then this needs to be taken account of and recognised in any proposed development solutions.

Amend text to:

- c) “Understand what is valued about existing places and use this as a catalyst for ~~growth~~ and place-making, strengthening London’s distinct and varied character..”

Criterion d)

Whilst the identification of specific open spaces might seem helpful, it potentially leads to the perception and potential justification that those spaces that are not identified are less important and can be lost, e.g. non-designated open spaces. There could also be a more positive reference to encouraging retention of trees outside open spaces recognising the Mayor’s desire for London to be a National Park City and the benefits that trees have for environmental resilience and human health.

Amend text to:

Chapter 1 Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)

d) “Protect London’s open spaces, including the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, designated nature conservation sites and ~~local~~ and non-designated open spaces, and trees and promote the creation of new green infrastructure, street trees and urban greening.”

Criterion e)

There needs to be a more obvious link with demand control measures in relation to private vehicle use and how this relates to places and spaces. The 80% target is extremely challenging and will not be achieved by planning ‘connections’. Active priority over cars and policies to actively reduce/restrict vehicular use are essential. This could include Homezones, shared space, car-free developments, restricted or more expensive parking, etc.

Amend text to:

e) “Plan for ~~good local~~ the highest standard of links, facilities and environments for walking, cycling and public transport connections and for actively reducing car ownership, space for private car parking and vehicle use to support a strategic target of 80 per cent of all journeys using sustainable travel, enabling car-free lifestyles that allow an efficient use of land, as well as using new and enhanced public transport links to unlock growth.”

Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city

The policy is supported.

To reduce duplication and workload it might well be better to promote including the (non statutory) HIA with the (statutory) Equalities Impact Assessment and the (statutory) Sustainability Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment. This could also give the health aspects more weight.

Amend text to:

D assess the potential impacts of development proposals on the health and wellbeing of communities, in order to mitigate any potential negative impacts and help reduce health inequalities, for example through the use of a timely integrated impact assessment including key aspects of a Health Impact Assessment

There is perhaps the potential to enhance it by making specific reference to the provision of play and sports facilities in new development, which might not necessarily be captured through criterion e)

Chapter 1 Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)

Amend text to:

e) "Plan for improved access to play and sports facilities, green spaces and the provision of new green infrastructure."

Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need

The broad objectives of the policy approach are supported. The Council supports the Mayor's desire to increase housing numbers. It has worked hard to increase delivery in Brent and will continue to deliver one of the highest rates of housing completions and affordable housing rates in London. The clear message around providing more truly affordable homes and the reintroduction of an affordable housing target within the Plan is supported. It will nevertheless be a significant challenge to achieve the 35% and 50% targets on many sites in Brent in the short to medium term. The Council welcomes the impact that strong and clear policies will provide in reducing landowner/developer land value aspirations and the associated likely increase in affordable housing provision.

It is questionable whether the draft Plan or the draft Housing Strategy have an adequate definition of what "genuinely affordable" means. It is accepted that the available subsidy is not sufficient to deliver enough homes at the lower end of the affordability spectrum and that there is a need for a mix of products that includes Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO), Discounted Market Rent (DMR) and other options but whether these could be categorised as genuinely affordable for those in need is doubtful and current delivery is geared towards these products rather than, say, London Affordable Rent or social rent. The Council's evidence suggests that these are the products most needed locally. The gap between affordable housing needs and what can be subsidised through development is significant. As such the Council will support the Mayor in his attempts to gain additional funding required to support enhanced delivery. The Council does however, as already highlighted, have significant concerns over the ten year target that has been identified for it.

Policy GG5 Growing a good economy

In broad terms the policy approach is supported. The Council wants to ensure that Brent's economy flourishes to support jobs for the growth in its population and to help London in its role as a leading world city. Good public transport and orbital links in outer London will be essential to supporting a good economy across London, not just in inner or central London.

Policy GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience

Chapter 1 Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)

In broad terms the policy approach is supported. The Council wants to see its residents and visitors protected from the potential harm caused to health, well-being and safety.

Chapter 2 Spatial Development Patterns

Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas

Paragraph 2.1.55: The Council supports the mention of the West London Orbital Line which could run through the borough and improve accessibility for many residents and businesses. However, the London Plan should go further than this given that the recent benefits/ cost ratio study indicates a strong case for the provision of the line. The Plan should provide a commitment from the Mayor of London and Transport for London to work with the Council in prioritising the funding and delivery of the line.

Notwithstanding the draft plan's policies on seeking to protect existing Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) within Brent, the Council would like further dialogue with the GLA on the potential for additional Opportunity Area designations within Brent related to the provision of additional public transportation infrastructure. For the Brent Cross Thameslink station and in particular land at Staples Corner and also existing designated industrial sites along West London Orbital Route connecting Old Oak to Thameslink. Such sites are considered to have the potential to provide substantial new mixed use communities that overall would provide better outcomes for both Brent and London in relation to housing, jobs and environmental outputs than retaining their continued existence solely for employment purposes.

Policy SD2 Collaboration in the Wider South East

The Council welcomes the recognition in the Plan of this wider collaboration which is currently missing from the Mayor's draft Housing Strategy. It is understood that the Mayor wants London to meet its own housing needs, but this is a very high risk strategy and does not take into account how the wider South East has historically supported London's growth. The targets set for individual boroughs, particularly those in outer London are likely to be unachievable for a variety of reasons, including unrealistic small sites capacity, market saturation, lack of affordable housing funding, skills/capacity shortages and lack of funding for associated infrastructure. In addition the draft London Plan places additional constraints where they are not needed and where local areas should have more discretion taking account of local evidence base work and national policies. These will further limit potential which might otherwise have existed, e.g. review of green belt boundaries and SIL/LSIS for more than purely employment uses.

As such the Mayor should be as pro-active and vocal about London's housing needs being addressed in the wider South East as he is about the need for affordable housing and the associated mechanisms to deliver. Currently the Mayor's commitment is

Chapter 2 Spatial Development Patterns

weak in terms of providing clarity on how needs will be met. In the current context of no regional planning and very little appetite to explicitly encourage South East councils to meet London's housing target, it is difficult to see much changing. Greater emphasis should also be placed on ensuring edge of London councils are explicitly considered as part of London's housing market for the purposes of Housing Market Area assessments to identify local housing targets and actively take account of meeting the needs generated within this area as a requirement of the duty to co-operate.

Policy SD3 Growth locations in the Wider South East and beyond

This can be seen as a pragmatic response given the lack of wider regional planning. Nevertheless, it is not necessarily guiding development to locations that make sense from a planning perspective and also there is no guarantee that impacts on London will be direct. As such the Council urges a more robust response to the wider South East issue as set out in its response to SD2.

Policy SD4 The Central Activities Zone (CAZ)

No comment

Policy SD5 Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ

No comment

Policy SD6 Town centres

The Council places a significant importance on the role that Brent town centres have in supporting the character, sense of place and functioning of meeting residents', businesses and visitor needs. As such it supports the majority of this policy and clear importance and priority that it places on town centres as an essential part of the effectiveness of London. It does however have concerns about criterion C and the reference to 'higher-density'. It begs the question of higher than what and experience to date indicates that often it promotes developers to pursue tall buildings in these locations that are often out of context with the existing character of the area. The Council would prefer reference to making best use of land taking account of the factors identified in the rest of the policy and that of policy D1 related to properly understanding and responding to existing character and context.

In addition the Council would like to see greater flexibility with regards to secondary frontage particularly where planned or market contraction of the centre is occurring to ensure that unviable ground floor non-residential space which will potentially be subject to long periods of vacancy is not required/provided.

Amend text to:

Chapter 2 Spatial Development Patterns

- c) “The potential for new housing within and on the edges of town centres should be realised through higher-density mixed-use or residential development that makes the best use of land, capitalising on the availability of services within walking and cycling distance, and their current and future accessibility by public transport. (see Policy D1 London’s Form and Characteristics). Residential-only schemes in town centres may be appropriate outside of primary and secondary shopping frontages, or within peripheral areas of secondary frontage where it can be demonstrated that they would not undermine local character and the diverse range of uses required to make a town centre vibrant and viable.....”

Policy SD7 Town centre network

The Council is disappointed that there has not been any discussion between the GLA and it about the status of Wembley as a potential Metropolitan Centre. The GLA will be aware that the Council with the proposed expansion of retail/ leisure floorspace incorporated into the Wembley Park development and wider Wembley Opportunity Area, was seeking a change in status to at least potential Metropolitan centre. The Council has contacted the GLA with regards to its town centre health check evidence base as it considers it is not robust. In particular it appears to have missed out the London Designer Outlet floorspace. Inclusion of this would provide a very different picture of its potential status as having more than local significance as a centre. The Council has commissioned its own town centre and retail study which will provide further evidence on this matter in the coming months. There are some positive signs of Wembley’s potential increasing prominence at a London level related to existing and proposed development at Wembley Park. The London Designer Outlet is starting to gain larger levels of footfall and an improved tenant mix that is making it more attractive to visitors from further afield. It currently attracts 6 million visitors a year. In addition the planned provision of a Boxpark, together with the London Plan’s recognition of the SSE Arena as a regional cultural facility, improvements to public realm/retailing/cultural activities along Olympic Way and the land/ space for potential additional A1-A5/B1a/C1/D1/D2 uses provide sufficient potential to raise the role of the centre.

Taking account of this apparent omission in the evidence and changing market sentiment the Council would not want to see the continued omission of Wembley’s status as a potential Metropolitan Centre. This is particularly so if this would undermine the ability of this centre to expand its range of main town centre uses in the medium to long term if as expected it becomes increasingly successful. On the face of it, the identification of Wembley within Annex 1 Table A1.1 as a ‘High Growth’ centre (the highest designation) for uses falling within the A, B, D and SG Use Classes indicates support for its continuing growth and should not be an inhibitor of the scale of growth currently envisaged for the centre. The identification within the London Plan for Wembley as a potential Metropolitan Centre would however clarify this position and not potentially put a brake on its expansion should this be what the market wants to support.

Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents

Chapter 2 Spatial Development Patterns
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SD9 Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SD10 Strategic and local regeneration
The Council supports this policy. The boundaries of this area also coincide with the suggested areas for potential future growth areas which the Council would like to discuss with the GLA related to Staples Corner/Thameslink Brent Cross and Neasden/Dudding Hill Line.

Chapter 3 Design
Policy D1 London's form and characteristics
<p>This policy is supported in principle, but this character based approach in criterion B 1) is somewhat at odds with the London Plan's assumptions on small site capacity and the statement in policy H2 Small Sites criterion b) that boroughs should: "recognise in their Development Plans and planning decisions that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing provision and increases in residential density through small housing developments." The emphasis on Figure 3.1 circular economy of hierarchy for building approaches which favours 'retain' or 'retro-fit' is also somewhat at odds with these policy criteria. The density assumptions for suburban areas in the SHMA including the small sites work primarily ignore these elements of policy. Either existing high quality character which is appreciated by the community is important to a place and should be enhanced/maintained, or if it isn't policy D1 should not be the principal element on which the building blocks of new development should be founded. There should be some clarity in either the policy justification for this or the H2 policy.</p> <p>Part A 3) could be strengthened by specifically mentioning perimeter blocks as the development type which results in the desired street-based development that also addresses the other requirements.</p> <p>Part B 1) could clarify the importance of roof form by mentioning it specifically.</p> <p>Additionally, in relation to housing sites and residential-led developments the 12 principles of '<u>Building for Life 12</u>' (government endorsed) should be expected to be followed, even if accreditation is not a requirement.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.5 Design out crime – should reference the website interactive.securedbydesign.com</p>

Chapter 3 Design

Amend text to:

A 3) “be street-based in the form of perimeter blocks wherever possible, with clearly defined public and private environments”

B 1) “respond to local context by delivering buildings and spaces that are positioned and of a scale, appearance and shape that responds successfully to the identity and character of the locality, including to existing and emerging street hierarchy, roofscapes, building types, forms and proportions”

Add new criterion B 7) “positively address all headline questions of the latest edition of Building for Life 12”

Policy D2 Delivering good design

Whilst this policy is supported in principle in the context of challenges to Boroughs’ planning departments in terms of capacity, this level of assessment will be challenging. Apart from conservation areas, many local authorities will not have detailed assessments of their areas. It could be argued that Capacity for Growth (Part B) is largely unrelated to many of the items described in part A. Most relevant are items 3 and 9. Items 1, 2, 7 (except where there are heritage assets) and 8 are hardly required to determine the capacity for growth. They would require an enormous amount of resource (time and money) to create data that is not needed for high-level masterplanning purposes or to achieve good design. In addition the reference in B to “taken in association with other policies in this plan” again as with D1 gives an uncertainty on weight that can be attached to A 3) and how this informs capacity in relation for example to policy H2 Small Sites Criterion b).

In relation to paragraph 3.2.2 it might be helpful to reference GLA’s Character & Context SPG.

In relation to paragraph 3.2.8 for Design and Access Statements there should also be reference to policy D2 as this is in this policy’s justification.

Amend text to:

B “The findings of the above evaluation (all aspects of part A or as a minimum criterion A 3 and A 9), taken together with the other policies in this Plan should inform sustainable options for growth and be used to establish the most appropriate form of development for an area in terms of scale, height, density, layout and land uses.”

Chapter 3 Design

Paragraph 3.2.2 add last sentence "The GLA's Character & Context SPD provides good advice on how to consider these matters."

Paragraph 3.2.8 "The design and access statement should explain the approach taken to these design issues and be used to consider if a scheme meets the requirements of Policy D1 London's form and characteristics and Policy D2 Delivering Good Design (see also requirements of Policy D3 Inclusive design)."

Policy D3 Inclusive design

The principle of inclusive design is supported. The need to provide additional reassurance post Grenfell Tower is understandable, particularly as it is likely that the plan will essentially require taller buildings to meet development capacity needs. There however needs to be clarity on what the role of planning is and what is covered by other legislation, e.g. building regulations. Some of these elements, in association with policy D10 Safety, Security and Resilience to Emergency, currently unacceptably blur lines and increase expectations on planning. This risks causing the potential for delay to or judicial review of decision making which might stray into other areas that are subject to other legislation outside planning. The London Plan will need to reflect the conclusions and Government response to the Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety expected from Spring 2018.

Policy D4 Housing quality and standards

The policy is supported in ensuring minimum design standards are met and providing flexibility on some issues, such as dual aspect where the case for alternatives can be shown to be necessary. The text on single aspect could however be strengthened to ensure that these are the exception rather than frequent occurrences. In relation to minimum private outdoor space the sizes, particularly in a suburban context are not that generous and it is the Council's experience that despite a standard being set in the Brent Local Plan, developers often assume that the London Plan target is the standard that should be applied. Things such as the minimum width and depth of all other private external spaces can be undermined by the opening space required by doors or the need for planting/privacy strips which eat into the useable space. As such it would either be useful for the policy to be rephrased to indicate that wherever possible the amount of private outdoor amenity space should be maximised, with developers seeking to provide more than the minimum standards and reference to the fact that local authorities can adopt their own local standards where justifiable. It would also be helpful if the policy made reference to the need to take account of useable space related to size and elements such as comfort taking account of impacts of exposure to noise, overlooking and wind.

Amend text to:

Chapter 3 Design

9) “The amount of private outdoor space should be maximised, taking account of the locational context and likely occupiers of the proposed development. Local authorities may adopt local minimum standards where they can be justified. Where no local standards apply, as a minimum of 5 sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1 sqm should be provided for each additional occupant. This does not count towards the minimum Gross Internal Area space standards required in Table 3.1.....

11) Usability should be maximised by seeking to avoid potential limitations of adverse impacts on comfort related to overlooking, noise, air quality, overshadowing and obstructions limiting circulation space.....

E Residential development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings, ~~and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings.~~ Single aspect dwellings should only be provided in exceptional circumstances where it is considered demonstrated to be a more appropriate design solution to meet the requirements of Policy D1 London’s form and characteristics than a dual aspect dwelling and it can be that it they will have adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy, and avoid overheating.

F The design of development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst avoiding overheating, and minimising overshadowing ~~and maximising the usability of outside amenity space.”~~

Policy D5 Accessible housing

This policy is supported. The supporting text could provide greater clarity on the extent to which it applies to new dwellings. The policy states its application to “residential development”. The policy justification however refers to its application to “all new build dwellings” which provides ambiguity over development such as changes of use to residential and conversion, which must be clarified.

Policy D6 Optimising housing density

The policy is supported. To give greater certainty over what the design led approach to determine the capacity of a site is, reference should be made to policies D1 and D2 which already address this matter.

Amend text to:

Chapter 3 Design

A “.....The optimum density of a development should result from a design-led approach to determine the capacity of the site, taking account of factors set out in Policies D1 and D2.....”

Policy D7 Public realm

The policy is supported. There does however need to be a recognition of the pressures on public finances to maintain the quality of spaces in the longer term, which is sometimes harder to achieve than the initial capital sum of installation. There could also be a greater emphasis specified around relationship between ‘cleaner, greener, safer’ theory. This is that a cleaner and greener location creates increased feelings of safety. So design from the outset should be around ensuring increased cleanliness and greenery is important. This also relates to street furniture and ‘seating’ as this can also create an area for anti-social behavior and enviro crime. Areas for community members to meet is also essential, it needs to be designed in the right way and area to ensure a reduction of anti-social behavior opportunities. Lighting is also a critical element of this.

It is recognised that the policy applies to a variety of areas of public realm as opposed to merely focussing on streets. Perhaps more could be done in the policy emphasis to promote active change of streets as places of public realm that can create a sense of place, with a rebalance to reduce vehicle dominance, e.g. specific mention of shared space/Homezones. Criterion L would benefit from greater emphasis on street trees as well as the generic term green infrastructure and crossings being direct and unenclosed.

Amend text to:

A “Ensure the public realm is safe, accessible, inclusive, attractive, well connected, easy to understand and maintain, and that it relates to the local and historic context, and incorporates the highest quality design, landscaping, planting, lighting, street furniture and surfaces that will endure for the longer term and achieves the ‘cleaner, greener, safer’ objective.”

B “Recognise the need to deliver the Plan’s modal shift target by 2041 by prioritising existing and new streets and other public realm to maximise the its contribution ~~that the public realm makes~~ to encouraging active travel and ensure its design discourages travel by car and excessive on-street parking, which can obstruct people’s safe enjoyment of the space.....”

D “.... The priority modes of travel for the area should be identified and catered for and creation of ‘shared space’ and Homezones should be considered as appropriate. Desire lines for people walking and cycling should be a particular focus, including the placement of street crossings.”

Chapter 3 Design

L “Ensure that on-street parking is designed so that it is not dominant or continuous, and that there is space for street trees and green infrastructure as well as cycle parking in the carriageway. Pedestrian crossings should be straight, regular at convenient intervals, accessible, direct and guard rail free.”

Policy D8 Tall buildings

The principle of the policy is supported. There does however need to be a greater emphasis on a plan led approach to the provision of tall buildings and the London Plan should give this greater prominence. The planning application process should not be the way in which the identification of location of these buildings is pursued. At the moment there is an ad-hoc approach to tall buildings as if they can be justified in almost any location. In outer London areas there appears to be little support from the GLA in supporting local planning authorities in relation to their concerns over building heights on referable applications where such buildings are proposed outside areas that have been specifically identified by Councils.

Tall buildings historically have created communities where there is little opportunity for social interaction, or feeling of community. It would be beneficial if there was reference to the need to promote incorporating opportunities for social interaction into the design of the building.

C 3 a) The policy should specifically identify the tests – e.g. Lawson’s criteria with graphical representations for wind comfort, as well as daylight and sunlight graphical representations in public realm areas and shared spaces within developments. These should be provided at the earliest opportunity in the pre-application process as the design of the building can determine how it affects public realm and private amenity. It is harder to make significant changes to the building later on if there are problems with daylight/ sunlight/ wind in these areas. The approach should be about maximising sunlight and daylight into these areas and minimising the negative aspects such as wind from the very start.

3.8.4 The text should mention architectural treatments that can be used on the top of a building to help “finish” it, give it a more recessive quality and in doing so reduce the bulk and mass.

3.8.7 The text should mention that it is also important to know what a tall building will look like at night. Lighting design can provide an important feature in a neighbourhood. Poorly done it can give a utilitarian impression that is of detriment to the neighbourhood.

Chapter 3 Design

Amend text to:

First part of policy: “.....To ensure tall buildings are sustainably developed in appropriate locations, ~~and are of the required design quality,~~ Development Plans should be the principal mechanism for identifying suitable locations taking account of the factors set out in A, B, C and D. Proposals outside specifically identified locations should be wholly exceptional and only considered where for instance there is an absence of a Local Plan having positively considered appropriate locations or where a change in circumstances is so great that existing identified preferred locations can be shown to be no longer appropriate. ~~and development proposals must undertake the following:~~

1a ii) “Mid-range views from the surrounding neighbourhood - particular attention should be paid to the form and proportions of the building. Buildings should fit in with the local townscape in terms of legibility, height, proportions and materiality.”

C 2g) “Buildings, including their construction, should not interfere with aviation, navigation or telecommunication, and should avoid a significant detrimental effect on solar energy generation on adjoining buildings and the highway network”

Add: “C3 h) The design and layout of the building must positively address the need to support community cohesion and well-being through incorporation of appropriate facilities and places to meet and interact with other occupants of the building.”

Policy D9 Basement development

The paragraph 3.9.5 mentions structural stability which is not a planning matter.

The term Construction Method and Management Plans in para 3.9.4 to be amended to Construction Logistics Implementation Plan. Consistency in terminology used across boroughs and TfL will ensure these plans are able to be consistently scrutinised in accordance with industry best practice and TfL best practice.

Policy D10 Safety, security and resilience to emergency

The emphasis should be on application in perceived higher risk locations / buildings only where impacts could be significant. It is not clear what detection means, implying longer term intelligence/monitoring rather than attributes associated with promoting natural surveillance. In relation to planning matters, rather than those covered by for instance building control, more emphasis could be placed on the importance of designing egress and ingress routes relating to emergency and evacuation plans. Emergency exits are not necessarily the same as this, as general main egress and ingress routes for buildings/areas with potential for large crowds need higher consideration.

Chapter 3 Design

Amend text to:

B “Development proposals should maximise the resilience of buildings resilience and places and minimise potential physical risks, including those arising as a result of fire, flood and related hazards. Development with potential perceived higher risk/significant adverse outcomes should include physical measures to design out crime that – in proportion to the risk – deter terrorism and help mitigate its effects. In addition consideration should be given to importance of designing egress and ingress routes relating to emergency and evacuation plans, particularly where this relates to large volumes of people. These measures should be considered at the start of the design process to ensure they are inclusive and aesthetically integrated into the development and the wider area.”

Policy D11 Fire safety

This policy is closely related to policy D3 and the Council has similar concerns about unrealistic expectations/burdens on the planning system and the relationship with matters not necessarily covered by planning but subject to other legislation. The Council feels that the London Plan needs to provide greater clarity on these issues and restrict its proposed policies to fire safety to avoid duplication of responsibilities.

Policy D12 Agent of Change

The Council supports this policy in principle but feels that it needs to be proportionate and have some flexibility, taking account of the desirability of maintaining the existing noise generating uses in the area, or the realism of its long term future. This could otherwise place additional burdens on development that are unnecessary.

Amend words to:

A “The Agent of Change principle places the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise-generating activities or uses, the continued operation of which are considered desirable to support positive outcomes in relation to other policies in this plan, on the proposed new noise-sensitive development.”

Policy D13 Noise

The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 4 Housing

Policy H1 Increasing housing supply

The Council has significant concerns about the 29,150 target set for 2019/20-2028/29. It does not consider that it is evidence based, justifiable, effective or deliverable. This is in relation to:

- a) the overall objectively assessed housing need related to London;
- b) the capacity identified to deliver that target through the SHLAA and assumed windfall allowance related to the small sites; and
- c) other factors related to deliverability, such as funding for affordable housing and infrastructure capacity, market capacity to absorb assumed owner-occupier build out rates, skills shortages and construction sector capacity .

Inner London boroughs' housing targets are proposed to be increased from the previous London Plan by only 4% on average (around half have had their targets reduced), which compares to a 91% increase for Brent, which has similar characteristics.

London's overall objectively assessed housing needs. Whilst the Council considers that in numerous respects the GLA population projections are more realistic than those which would be generated by the ONS, it does not consider that the resultant household projections to be as robust. The GLA's household formation rates are based on very long term household size trends which include the period of the early 1970s. Within that period there has been a significant amount of in-migration of BME groups who have very different population fertility rates and are also more likely to seek multi-generation living in a single household. This, along with other housing pressures related to London's increasing economic attractiveness but limited housing supply, has increased household sizes. Taking account of medium term trend based data for household sizes which have been upward, it is difficult to see how the GLA's generous assumptions about reductions in household size can be justified. In the short term this trend based data could be argued to support continued increases in household sizes, whilst potential reductions in size should be more measured. In addition the Council is also aware that ONS will be taking over responsibility for identifying household projections. The ONS has identified a change in methodology to inform the new household projections which will use shorter trend based data than that currently used by the GLA. On this basis the GLA should reconsider its household sizes so that they reflect the shorter term trend and the likely national change in methodology. This should result in a significant reduction in London's objectively assessed housing needs.

SHLAA and Windfall Sites. The Council initially worked closely with the GLA on the SHLAA in early 2017 and was generally comfortable with the methodology applied. After a period of checking and challenge by the GLA towards May 2017, whilst the capacity targets being produced by the SHLAA were challenging compared to historic delivery rates, the Council considered that methodology was relatively robust. The Council considered at this time it could support the likely GLA target which was roughly

Chapter 4 Housing

in line with its own recently produced SHMA. Subsequent to that time, the GLA has not only changed its assumptions in relation to the likely availability of employment sites (reducing the likelihood of these sites coming forward and their capacity), but has also pursued a highly speculative approach to the capacity identified on small sites which does not fit with historical evidence of delivery. The Council is particularly perturbed by the GLA's lack of discussion with it on this change in methodology and the significant rise in target. The Council considers that this is not a suitable way for the GLA to conduct itself when the Plan should be a partnership based document supported by Boroughs based on shared ambitions that have a high likelihood of delivery.

The small sites figure for Brent has increased from 258 dwellings per annum on average delivered to a new assumed GLA figure of 1023. The GLA's reliance on changes to policy identified in policy H2 Small Sites simply will not increase delivery to the extent identified in the SHLAA. There is already a presumption in favour of development in the NPPF and this is the starting point for the Council in its determination of all applications. The Council has permissive policies in relation to changes of use of many forms of non-residential uses within the areas identified in policy H2 such as changes above shops to residential, or the subdivision of existing family sized dwellings, it has flexibility on upwards, rear extensions and additional dwellings within plots, whether through retention of existing homes, or through demolition and replacement with flats.

An assumed four-fold increase in delivery from this source, particularly in the context of other policies in the London Plan related to taking account of the existing character to areas is not credible in any shape or form. It does not take account of the housing needs of Brent's population which point to current overcrowding and a SHMA requirement for 65% of all new homes to be 3+ bed (market 75%, and affordable 60%). The draft London Plan's requirement for boroughs not to set out policies that seek to provide family housing if taken forward will reduce the supply of new family sized homes. Against this background, it is not clear to see what would be the drivers that would encourage existing family sized home owners to sell up to realise these potential development sites if there was no realistic prospect of them finding a family sized home elsewhere.

Other factors related to delivery. The numerous barriers to delivery issues have been identified in the Housing White Paper and as yet there have not been any significant changes at a national level which point to a significant advancement in overcoming these issues. Whilst housing delivery in Brent is at high levels, it is unclear how long this can be sustained for. The housing market is cyclical and looks to be coming to the end of a boom period in London which could affect buyer appetite and therefore housing developer activity. Whilst this could be compensated for by affordable housing providers, funding levels for this sector are still comparatively low and the role/build out rates for institutional private sector rented accommodation are uncertain. The skills shortage and uncertainty caused by Brexit provides no assurance that there will be the capacity within the construction sector to provide for the level of additional homes required across London. In this context even if capacity were available it is

Chapter 4 Housing

difficult to see how an effective doubling of the Council's target could be achieved within the timescale envisaged. The lead in times for development effectively means that delivery for some years of the ten year period would have to be a lot more than the current doubling of delivery which again further undermines its credibility.

The Council is very much in favour of creating additional homes, it is a corporate priority, which reflects the fact it is a priority of its population. Brent has been one of the largest deliverers of homes and affordable homes over the last 5 years in London. The Council welcomes challenging targets and would have no problem with an ambitious but attainable target. An aspirational target with no realistic prospect of delivery in the context of national planning policy and the five year housing delivery test however, provides significant risks to the effective planning of the Borough and the Council could be unfairly penalised. Inability to achieve these unrealistic targets is likely to undermine the plan led system resulting in ad-hoc development to the detriment of Brent. Therefore, the Council objects to the targets set.

Policy H2 Small sites

For the reasons set out in response to H1 the Council does not consider that the small sites policy will deliver the windfall amount of housing development set out in the policy. The policy also has the potential to effectively undermine the opportunity for longer term properly considered wholesale redevelopment/regeneration of areas that would provide better communities and infrastructure solutions, ensuring the most effective use of land, rather than an ad-hoc approach which does the opposite. The policy has the potential to increase the complication of existing site land ownerships by creating an additional layer of small-scale owners/leaseholders who will at the very least slow down wider significant change and could potentially undermine it. The Council has had experience of this scenario occurring through small scale landowners/developers taking up the revised permitted development rights in relation to offices and industrial units. This has led to wider site allocations now having to be brought forward in a much more piecemeal way with much less effective use of land, or the alternative of having to buy out significantly more interests than was the case when the allocation was made; this increases time and risk and reduces viability which either impacts on developer appetite or affordable housing delivery.

A better policy solution would be for the GLA to set targets related to these 'areas of search' within local planning authorities and give them the potential to consider the most locally accepted appropriate way of meeting these targets. It would then be for the Council to decide whether that be through the GLA's small sites approach or a process where they potentially consider that some areas should be subject to wholesale regeneration/site allocations, whilst others, which Councils consider have significant character, are subject to less radical change. The lack of detailed character assessment to support the GLA work, plus the sweeping statement that "local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate

Chapter 4 Housing

additional housing provision and increases in residential density through small housing developments” shows a lack of regard for the character of some parts of suburban London. It is a disingenuous statement that effectively appears to regard outer London’s existing character as dispensable whilst poor areas of Green Belt are regarded as beyond consideration for development.

In relation to Part H, notwithstanding the national Practice Guidance advice related to on-site affordable housing contributions not being sought from developments of 10 or fewer dwellings, the Council successfully adopted development plan policy that seeks to apply on site contributions from 10 or more dwellings. As such there would appear to be the potential to apply a similar threshold in the London Plan.

The Council considers that for the most part the policy should be deleted. On a without prejudice basis however, it will suggest changes to wording that relate to a retained policy.

B Boroughs should:

- 1) ~~recognise in their Development Plans and planning decisions that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing provision and increases in residential density through small housing developments~~
- 2) prepare area-wide design codes to promote good design and to proactively encourage increased housing provision and ~~higher residential densities on small housing developments~~. Design codes should provide clear guidelines and parameters ~~for small housing developments~~ and show how additional housing provision can be accommodated in different locations, drawing on the principles set out in this policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance provided by the GLA.

C Boroughs should increase planning certainty on small sites by:

- 1) identifying and allocating appropriate ~~small sites~~ for residential development that can support delivery consistent with Part A of this policy
- 2) ~~listing these sites on their brownfield registers~~
- 3) granting permission in principle on specific sites or preparing local development orders.

D To deliver the small sites (between one and 25 homes) targets in Table 4.2, boroughs should consider the role that apply a presumption in favour of the following types of small housing development opportunities which provide between one and 25 homes can play:

- 1) infill development on vacant or underused sites

Chapter 4 Housing

2) proposals to increase the density of existing residential homes within PTALs 3-6 or within 800m of a Tube station, rail station or town centre boundary through:

- a) residential conversions
- b) residential extensions
- c) the demolition and redevelopment of existing buildings
- d) infill development within the curtilage of a house

3) the redevelopment or upward extension of flats and non-residential buildings to provide additional housing.

~~E — For the purposes of part D, the presumption in favour of small housing developments means approving small housing developments which are in accordance with a design code developed in accordance with part B. Where there is no such design code, the presumption means approving small housing development unless it can be demonstrated that the development would give rise to an unacceptable level of harm to residential privacy, designated heritage assets, biodiversity or a safeguarded land use that outweighs the benefits of additional housing provision.~~

~~F — The presumption in favour of small housing developments should not be applied to:~~

- ~~1) statutory listed buildings~~
- ~~2) developments providing more than 25 homes~~
- ~~3) proposals that do not provide net additional housing~~
- ~~4) sites of more than 0.25 hectares in size~~
- ~~5) non-self contained housing schemes~~
- ~~6) mixed-use proposals within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ)~~
- ~~7) estate regeneration schemes~~

H “Boroughs wishing to apply affordable housing requirements to sites capable of delivering fewer than ten units or fewer and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000 sqm should only require this through a tariff approach to off-site contributions rather than seeking on-site contributions....”

Policy H3 Monitoring housing targets

The policy is supported, subject to reconsideration of the small sites target.

Policy H4 Meanwhile use

The policy is supported.

Policy H5 Delivering affordable housing

The policy is supported.

Chapter 4 Housing
Policy H6 Threshold approach to applications
<p>The policy overall is supported. Notwithstanding the support for the 35% fast track approach, the Council welcomes the Mayor's desire to see such developments contribute potentially more affordable housing through encouraging the availability and use of subsidy towards meeting the 50% target. The Council considers in relation to Brent's particular needs that where the 35% fast track viability approach applies, it would benefit from greater flexibility where more than 25% of the total number of dwellings/habitable rooms is being provided as the London Affordable Rent product. This will provide greater emphasis/delivery of homes that are genuinely affordable, rather than Low Cost Home Ownership products which generally are provided to those who have the potential ability to meet their needs within the market.</p> <p>The reference to the 35% target being updated in Supplementary Planning Guidance needs to consider whether this is possible/likely to survive legal challenge as it would appear to be inconsistent with statute which identifies Supplementary Planning Guidance cannot be used to amend policy.</p>
Policy H7 Affordable housing tenure
<p>The policy is supported. The reference to the tenure mix being updated in Supplementary Planning Guidance needs to consider whether this is possible/likely to survive legal challenge as it would appear to be inconsistent with statute which identifies Supplementary Planning Guidance cannot be used to amend policy.</p>
Policy H8 Monitoring of affordable housing
<p>The policy is supported.</p>
Policy H9 Vacant building credit
<p>The policy is supported.</p>
Policy H10 Redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration
<p>The policy is supported. The Council supports the need to protect existing affordable housing occupiers' ability to be accommodated on site in any proposed estate regeneration scheme taking account of their existing tenure (including social rent occupiers), the size of dwellings required in relation to their affordable housing needs and the need for a balanced housing mix overall. The policy does appear to take account of the need for flexibility being required in relation to local circumstances, e.g. in particular housing size if equivalent affordable floorspace is provided. Estate regeneration often is a very complicated process balancing up a wider range of drivers/ issues than purely a focus on the affordable housing provision element.</p>
Policy H11 Ensuring the best use of stock
<p>Supported as will reduce pressure to provide additional homes for London, but not really a significant Brent issue currently.</p>
Policy H12 Housing size mix

Chapter 4 Housing

The Council supports this policy with the exception of Part C. In relation to C it depends on what the Plan considers prescriptive. The mix in relation to London's wider needs with its emphasis on 1 and 2 bed properties is understood. Nevertheless, Brent's current housing needs are predominantly for 3 bedroom or larger properties (65%). The Brent local plan currently sets a minimum target of 25% of 3 or more bed properties which it generally achieves. The incorporation of larger family dwellings is part of creating balanced and mixed communities. Brent is mindful of its likely increase in housing target but does not consider that this level of provision will undermine total delivery and the policy is not prescriptive in a finer grain sense, it merely sets a minimum (relatively low target) which currently taking account of all developments it is just about achieving. If Boroughs set higher family sized homes targets they will have to find more sites to achieve their overall housing numbers, so it is unlikely that they will set high targets. The GLA has to be aware that in order to keep London attractive to a balanced population that it also has to provide family sized homes in a suburban context, this is what the population also expects.

Amend words to:

C ~~“Boroughs should not set prescriptive dlf setting dwelling size mix requirements (in terms of number of bedrooms) for market and intermediate homes, these should apply at the Borough level and there should be sufficient flexibility to allow on a scheme by scheme basis viable delivery taking account of part A.”~~

Policy H13 Build to Rent

The Council supports the principle of the policy but considers that better evidence is required and regular review is required on certain aspects. Whilst there is the potential for PRS to accelerate supply, this might be at the expense of traditional affordable housing. For example at Wembley Park where the majority of new homes from now on will be PRS there has been a significant shift in likely affordable housing delivery rates related to the different viability modelling aspects of the scheme. These initially at least seem to show much lower delivery than that which will be achieved compared to normal market housing.

There should also be consideration given to whether the current threshold for a PRS scheme should be 50 units. Evidence so far tends to suggest that institutional investors are focused on significantly larger schemes.

Policy H14 Supported and specialised accommodation

The policy is supported.

Policy H15 Specialist older persons housing

Chapter 4 Housing

The policy is supported. It is not clear why there is a specific reference to sites, as this potentially undermines a greater range of policy levers in Borough plans to meet these needs at a local level, for example seeking incorporation of such provision as part of large scale windfall developments. It would assist if there was greater flexibility in the policy which provided opportunities for such specialist accommodation to arise.

Amend words to:

A “Boroughs should work positively and collaboratively with providers to identify ~~sites which may be suitable~~ opportunities for ensuring delivery of specialist older persons housing taking account of:.....”

Policy H16 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation

The Borough supports the policy. It understands that the definition of Gypsies and Travellers is wider than Government’s in terms of planning to meet needs. As such early clarification following representations received from MHCLG of which methodology for meeting needs should be used for planning purposes would be appreciated to allow certainty of numbers for the purposes of site identification.

Policy H17 Purpose-built student accommodation

The Borough supports the policy. Whilst the previous London Plan had some commentary about ensuring that provision of student accommodation did not undermine conventional housing supply, the Council considers that Point A 1) provides sufficient means by which to ensure that displacement of conventional housing opportunities is not excessive. The 3 for 1 bedrooms to dwelling for the purposes of monitoring ensures that sites that do come forward for student accommodation do not place additional burdens on the Council in identifying further sites for housing.

Policy H18 Large-scale purpose-built shared living

The Borough supports the policy in principle. The emphasis on “where of good quality and design” is key to its success or not.

Chapter 5 Social Infrastructure

Policy S1 Developing London’s social infrastructure

The policy is supported.

Policy S2 Health and social care facilities

Chapter 5 Social Infrastructure

The policy is supported.

Policy S3 Education and childcare facilities

The policy is supported. There does however perhaps need to be a greater focus on ensuring genuine availability by community groups to the facilities provided in educational establishments as heads / institutions have different approaches and S106s on ensuring accessibility have not always been followed willingly. Often whilst open in principle, other methods such as limited time slots and pricing mechanisms can be used by the institutions to make genuine public accessibility more difficult than it needs to be/ result in no community use.

Amend wording to:

B 5) maximise the extended or multiple use of educational facilities, including sports facilities associated with educational establishments, for community or recreational use, through appropriate design measures

Policy S4 Play and informal recreation

The policy is supported. It could however benefit from the potential to increase better social cohesion and understanding throughout the generations through incorporating opportunities for increased interaction through for example the development of intergenerational spaces including play spaces.

Amend wording to:

2 e) promotes opportunities for intergenerational interaction

In addition taking account of the need to promote greater walking/ cycling and accessibility to play facilities, it would be helpful to identify the role that play streets could play in ensuring that wider connections to other facilities can be enhanced.

Amend wording to:

3) incorporate play streets and other accessible routes for children and young people to existing play provision, schools and youth centres, within the local area,

Policy S5 Sports and recreation facilities

Chapter 5 Social Infrastructure

The policy is supported. There are however fundamental challenges on this matter related to public sector funding/ increased pressure due to population rises/ opportunities for land for extensive new facilities which will place a greater reliance on provision on multi-functional artificial pitches. There may also be current restrictions on some facilities related to hours where additional lighting is not required. The policy could be amended to allow greater flexibility to assist in increasing capacity of facilities.

Amend wording to:

B 3) “support extended opening hours and the provision of sports lighting within reasonable hours where meeting there is an identified need for sports facilities and lighting is required to increase their potential usage, unless the lighting gives rise to causing demonstrable additional capacity and there is no unacceptable harm to the local community or biodiversity”

Policy S6 Public toilets

The policy is supported.

Policy S7 Burial space

The policy is supported, although given existed capacity issues and pressure to accommodate additional growth, new significant areas for additional capacity are unlikely to be available in Brent. This is perhaps something that the London Plan needs to address at a strategic level, taking account of the potential offered by the Green Belt for traditional (for different faith/ethnic groups) and green burials.

Chapter 6 Economy

Policy E1 Offices

The policy is supported. The Council has sought to introduce an Article 4 to better control loss of office space in growth and SIL/LSIS. Market appetite is the big issue for B1 offices historically and currently, whilst the evidence of the London Plan appears to support greater provision in outer London in limited locations, experience within Brent suggests that rents achieved will not support extensive building of new office space. Current Council policy seeks to protect/replace unless evidence suggests case from a needs/viability perspective is weak.

Policy E2 Low-cost business space

The policy is supported, but needs greater clarity on the re-provision of low cost space, if this is deemed to be a different product to affordable workspace. The policy does not require re-provided employment space to be low-cost or seek to define what constitutes low-cost. This could be included in either B 2) or 3) given that the narrative indicates that some businesses can be affected by even small increases in costs. There also needs to be greater reference to evidence that the space will meet requirements of the businesses identified in the policy. With this regard there perhaps needs to be greater reference to a business or workspace provider being signed up from outset.

Chapter 6 Economy

There could also be greater clarity on what tests should define how premises can be identified to be unviable/there is no identified need for its retention. This for example could make reference in the policy justification to provide evidence of vacancy and marketing should be 24 months. This is the period adopted by most boroughs to allow for robust marketing, and also to account for any changes in local market conditions.

Amend working to:

B 2) “ensure that an equivalent amount of B1 space is re-provided in the proposal (which is appropriate in terms of provider expertise, type, cost, specification, use and size), incorporating existing businesses where possible, or

3) demonstrate that suitable alternative accommodation (in terms of provider expertise, type, cost, specification, use and size) ...”

Policy E3 Affordable workspace

The policy is supported but would benefit from encouraging developers to liaise with workspace providers as early as possible in the planning process, with a view to having a named provider in the S106. This would help ensure space is designed with the end users requirements in mind. The Council is supportive of requiring affordable workspace being operational prior to occupation of residential. This, combined with early input from the affordable workspace provider, would help avoid units sitting empty for long periods once the development has been completed. In order to secure long-term affordability and supply, it would be helpful if the London Plan made reference to affordable workspace being granted on a long lease or secured in perpetuity.

D Affordable workspace policies defined in Development Plans and Section 106 agreements should include ways of monitoring that the objectives in part A above are being met, including evidence in the S106 that they will be managed by a named workspace provider with a long-term commitment (in perpetuity, through freehold or a long lease) to maintaining the agreed or intended social, cultural or economic impact. Applicants are encouraged to engage with workspace providers at an early pre-application stage to ensure that the space is configured and managed efficiently.

Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support London’s economic function

The Council supports the principle of the policy, but objects to its identified status of ‘provide capacity’ in Table 6.2. It does not regard its status to be realistic when considered against market factors and other pressures to accommodate uses related to its projected growth in population/housing target. It is neither convinced by the assumptions within the GLA’s evidence base related to warehousing, of the need for London to amend previous trends which have resulted in exports of B8 warehousing floorspace

Chapter 6 Economy

out of London (which is a policy decision), nor the overall prospect of intensification (on a purely employment use basis within SIL/LSIS) being viable – certainly in the short to medium term. If it is eventually viable it will only be in limited locations which have a market premium (such as Park Royal within OPDC). The Council does not dispute that some B8 operations create significant development/ land values which provide a stimulus to reuse employment sites, perhaps potentially consolidating smaller fragmented uses/land owners, but the evidence of this happening on the ground in the UK is extremely limited, if it exists at all.

The SEGRO Park Royal example highlighted in the evidence was provided on a very large scale site historically within a single ownership and relates to large volume strategic warehousing which is a niche market. The reality is that in Brent such sites are rare and apart from this particular warehousing development, other provision of brand new employment space in Brent (and on brownfield sites across the country as opposed to greenfield) has been very limited. The requirements of warehousing in particular related to servicing provide lower plot ratios than traditional space, which creates a downward pressure on space provision. In the short to medium term at least, redevelopment to provide this space on existing employment sites (if viable) will generate lower densities of space than currently exist. Against this background the ‘provide capacity’ designation is unrealistic.

At the very most the Council considers that the ‘Retain capacity’ should apply. This takes account of other opportunities that exist in relation to SIL and LSIS to meet Council and local population aspirations to improve Brent. These improvements are from a place-making perspective and also to meet local needs (including better employment base/ improved skilled/ higher paid jobs) related to likely increases in population. In relation to the policies E5, E6 and in particular E7, the Council hopes that the GLA takes a proportionate approach. There needs to be a recognition that without more valuable uses subsidising employment space (also taking account of new requirements in policy around low cost/affordable workspace) that improvement of the existing employment stock or increases in space provision could well be compromised by limited developer interest / viability.

There also needs to be greater clarity about what this policy means in relation to spatial choices/priority locations related to the Mayor’s London Transport Strategy desire to see consolidation centres within 30 minutes of the areas identified.

Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL)

The Council supports the principle of this policy, subject to the GLA with regards to Part D having a proportionate and pragmatic approach to considering the opportunities provided by some of the SIL in Brent for wider benefits consistent with the Good Growth Principles of the London Plan. In particular the Council as the GLA is aware would like to progress a wider range of uses/ intensified redevelopment (including at least a replacement of existing employment space/jobs) at Gateway locations taking account of existing Opportunity Areas and proposed improvements to public transport infrastructure, e.g. Wembley Park

Chapter 6 Economy
(Wembley SIL), Neasden (Wembley SIL) and Staples Corner (SIL - related to Thameslink station). This will take account of the need to provide space to satisfactorily accommodate employment uses that might not be conducive to a high quality residential/ social infrastructure/ employment premises environment, such as waste or B2 uses. There is a recognition that such uses will still need to be accommodated within the borough and that notwithstanding the policy D12 'Agent of Change', extensive areas will need to be provided for these types of uses.
Policy E6 Locally Significant Industrial Sites
The Council supports the principle of this policy, subject to the GLA with regards to Part A having a proportionate and pragmatic approach to considering the opportunities provided by some of the LSIS in Brent for wider benefits consistent with the Good Growth Principles of the London Plan. These could seek a wider range of uses/intensified redevelopment (including at least a replacement of existing employment space/jobs) in some areas of LSIS.
Policy E7 Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function
The Council has objected to Brent's identification in Table 6.2 of 'provide capacity'. Notwithstanding this, even if its status was changed to retaining capacity, the Council is currently not convinced that the GLA will provide sufficient flexibility in its approach on this policy. Subject to the GLA having a proportionate and pragmatic approach to considering the opportunities provided by some of the SIL and LSIS in Brent for wider benefits consistent with the Good Growth Principles of the London Plan, the Council supports this policy. The Council considers that such a flexible approach will result in better employment/economic growth outcomes for London and Brent as it will encourage investment in employment floorspace which otherwise, on the basis of past trends, is unlikely to otherwise come forward.
Many employment sites are owned by institutional investors such as pension funds. These owners have many assets including designated greenfield sites elsewhere in the country which are easier to develop and provide lower risk in terms of policy compliance and cost. They have a very long term view of their assets and will be willing to see out a development plan policy period if they consider that in the long term the site would provide better prospects for appreciation in value if it can become available for other purposes in the future. This may well lead to stagnation of employment assets, perpetuating under investment which seems prevalent in much of the stock. As such an incentive may well be required to promote investment, plus added wider benefits consistent with the London Plan, through a pragmatic approach.
Policy E8 Sector growth opportunities and clusters
The Council supports the policy.
Policy E9 Retail, markets and hot food takeaways

Chapter 6 Economy

The Council supports the policy. Part C could provide greater clarity by being specific about it being 400 metres from the entrances of schools.

Amend wording to:

C Development proposals containing A5 hot food takeaway uses should not be permitted where these are within 400 metres walking distance of perimeter gates of an existing or proposed primary or secondary school.

Policy E10 Visitor infrastructure

The Council supports the policy, but requests that clarity is provided on whether there is still a need to provide Accessibility Management Plans for hotels.

Policy E11 Skills and opportunities for all

The Council supports the policy.

Chapter 7 Heritage and Culture**Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth**

The Council supports this policy.

In particular, the Council welcomes the statement in HC1C which states “The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings, should also be actively managed”.

Policy HC2 World Heritage Sites

No comment.

Policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views

The Council supports this policy.

Policy HC4 London View Management Framework

The Council supports this policy.

Policy HC5 Supporting London’s culture and creative industries

The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 7 Heritage and Culture

In particular, the Council welcomes the protection and promotion of cultural institutions such as Wembley Stadium and Wembley Arena in paragraph 7.5.11.

Policy HC6 Supporting the night-time economy

The Council supports this policy.

In particular, the Council supports the night-time economy in the identified areas of Wembley (NT1 International/National) and Kilburn (NT3 More than local). The Council is proposing a revision of its current Statement of Licensing Policy by limiting the number of off-licenses and encouraging more well managed and problem free on-licenses such as restaurants and music venues etc.

Policy HC7 Protecting public houses

The Council supports this policy. There does however have to be a recognition that some areas with a high concentration of drinking establishments also create characteristics that can have a potential adverse impact on the perception of town centres and how welcoming they are for parts of communities, as well as also having health impacts. As such support for additional pubs is on the basis that such establishments are well considered and take account of the existing and potential context within which they sit.

Amend text to:

A 2) support well considered proposals for new public houses to stimulate town centre regeneration, cultural quarters, the night-time economy and mixed-use development, where appropriate taking account of potential cumulative impacts associated with their concentration

Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment

Policy G1 Green infrastructure

The Council supports this policy.

Policy G2 London's Green Belt

Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment

Whilst the Council generally supports the national policy approach to the Green Belt, which allows Councils to review Green Belt boundaries through Local Plan reviews as appropriate, the Council does not agree with this London Plan policy approach which seems to rule out the possibility of local determination. The Council agrees with the statement in paragraph 8.2.2 that “some parts of the Green Belt do not provide significant benefits to Londoners as they have become derelict and unsightly”.

In considering approaches to the location of new housing across London, the Mayor should properly balance the character of suburbs with the national policy objectives of the Green Belt.

Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land

The Council supports this policy.

In particular, the Council supports the statement in Policy G3A2) that “the quality and range of uses of MOL” should be enhanced. The Council also supports the statement in paragraph 8.33 that “Proposals to enhance access to MOL and to improve poor quality areas such that they provide a wider range of benefits for Londoners will be encouraged. Examples include improved public access for all, inclusive design, recreation facilities, habitat creation, landscaping improvement and flood storage”.

Policy G4 Local green and open space

The Council supports this policy.

The policy should also ensure that satisfactory arrangements are in place for local green and open space to be managed and maintained to ensure the benefits are sustainable.

Policy G5 Urban greening

The Council supports this policy.

The Urban Greening Factors provided in Table 8.2 give equal weight to trees and green roofs, but trees should be given greater weight. Green roofs, whilst welcome, do not provide the same benefits as trees because they are invisible from street level and have less benefit in countering pollution, wind and the heat island effect.

Amend Policy G5A to:

Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment
“Major development proposals should contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of site and building design, and by incorporating measures such as high-quality landscaping (including trees), green roofs, green walls and nature-based sustainable drainage. <u>New streets and spaces should include suitable trees.</u> ”
Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
The Council supports this policy.
However, clarity should be provided on what is meant by “protected”, “greatest protection” and “most significant sites” in Policy G6A.
Policy G7 Trees and woodlands
The Council supports this policy.
The policy should also consider seeking equivalent canopy cover in replacement trees, regardless of tree quality or a mechanism to use CAVAT for calculating the financial value to secure offset payments (e.g. by S106) for off-site replacement of trees.
Policy G8 Food growing
The Council supports this policy.
Amend Policy G8A2 to: “ identify <u>consider</u> potential sites that could be used for commercial food production <u>where appropriate</u> ”.
Policy G9 Geodiversity
No comment.

Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure
Policy SI1 Improving air quality
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SI2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure

Amend Policy SI2C to state “development should aim to achieve...” in both instances as this is clearer and more likely to be effective.

In order to prove construction is as design stage, post construction testing should be required such as thermographic surveys and pressure tests. There should be a minimum number for pressure tests and these should be independently verified.

For refurbishment projects, paragraph 9.2.1 requires the same standards as new builds and that this proved with an energy model, but refurbishments do not always need to undertake a full energy model in order to comply with Part L and this may be too onerous a requirement for some developments.

Policy SI3 Energy infrastructure

The Council supports this policy.

The GLA should consider introducing supporting text to require the use of planning conditions to ensure combined heat and power (CHP) or other connections are implemented within a certain period of time e.g. 5 years. Further Energy Planning Guidance could be produced to set out good practice approaches and also address the locational / land requirements for energy centres and sub stations e.g. whether sub stations are appropriate underneath residential properties.

Policy SI4 Managing heat risk

The Council supports the policy but considers that it would be better if it identified the need to reduce overheating in properties through avoiding single aspect occupants (business, residential or other) where possible
Amend Policy SI4A to:

“Development proposals should minimise internal heat gain and the impacts of the urban heat island through design, layout, orientation, ~~and materials~~ and by avoiding single-aspect uses wherever possible.”

Policy SI5 Water infrastructure

The Council supports this policy.

Policy SI6 Digital connectivity infrastructure

Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure

The Council supports this policy.

Policy SI7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

The Council supports this policy.

In particular, this closely aligns with the Council's digital strategy, including ambitions to futureproof our digital infrastructure to ensure connectivity and supporting greater use of smart technologies.

Policy SI8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency

The Council supports the principle of this policy, except the proposed increased apportionment target for Brent which it objects to.

The Council is concerned about the increased waste apportionment being identified for Brent. Table 9.2 shows that Brent is expected to manage 5% of London's total Household and Commercial & Industrial waste (increased from 3.5% in the existing London Plan), the joint 5th highest proportion of all the London boroughs after Ealing (6.6%), Barking & Dagenham (6.1%), Hillingdon (5.1%), Bexley (5.6%) and Hounslow (5%). The apportionment to 2021 is increased from 225,000 tonnes per annum in the existing London Plan (Table 5.3) to 412,000 tonnes per annum in this new draft London Plan, representing an increase of 83%.

Whilst the Council accepts its role in supporting London to be net self-sufficient in terms of waste management by 2026, it objects to the high apportionment given to it in Table 9.2 in light of the high housing target set for the borough (see Policy H1) and the requirement to 'provide' other industrial capacity (see Policy E4) simultaneously. Seen together, these policies are neither justified, effective nor deliverable. The apportionment methodology should have a greater basis in tested opportunities for supply/capacity, taking account of elements such as realistic accessibility to rail and water based transportation opportunities.

The Council is also concerned that Table 9.2 does not identify an apportionment for the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC), which contains a substantial amount of SIL that was formerly within the Brent Local Planning Authority boundary and includes some existing waste sites. Instead, paragraph 9.8.7 simply states "Mayoral Development Corporations should cooperate with boroughs to ensure that the boroughs' apportionment requirements are met". This arrangement is not effective and is not conducive to proper strategic planning and accountability. This should be corrected and the OPDC given its own apportionment in Table 9.2.

Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure

These concerns should be seen in the context of the adopted West London Waste Plan (WLWP, July 2015) which covers the boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Richmond-upon-Thames and part of the OPDC. The combined total Household and Commercial & Industrial waste apportionments for these West London boroughs in the existing London Plan represents 19% of all London boroughs, and the new draft London Plan proposes to increase this to 25% (a quarter). The combined West London apportionment to 2021 is proposed to increase by 62% from the existing London Plan.

The Council also requests an amendment to Policy SI8B3) to:

“identify the following as suitable locations to manage borough waste apportionments... c) safeguarded wharves and rail sidings with an existing or future potential for waste and secondary material management”.

Policy SI9 Safeguarded waste sites

The Council supports this policy.

However, some of the wording is not entirely clear or effective. Amend Policy SI9C to:

“~~Waste plans should be adopted before considering the loss of waste sites.~~ The proposed loss of an existing waste site will only be supported where appropriate compensatory capacity is made within London that must at least meet, and should exceed, the maximum achievable throughput of the site proposed to be lost”.

It should also be clarified whether the London Plan would support more mixed-uses on waste sites, where the waste capacity can be maintained or exceeded.

Policy SI10 Aggregates

The Council supports this policy.

Policy SI11 Hydraulic fracturing (Fracking)

The Council supports this policy and is in agreement that development proposals for exploration, appraisal or production of shale gas via hydraulic fracturing in London (including Brent) should be refused.

Policy SI12 Flood risk management

The Council supports this policy.

Policy SI13 Sustainable drainage

Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure
The Council supports this policy.
The policy and/ or supporting text should support the inclusion of trees in development proposals as a natural way of securing sustainable drainage.
Policy SI14 Waterways – strategic role
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SI15 Water transport
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SI16 Waterways – use and enjoyment
The Council supports this policy.
Policy SI17 Protecting London’s waterways
The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 10 Transport
Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport
The Council supports this policy.
Clarity is sought on the spatial implications of this policy as it is understood that this target is already exceeded in some inner London / boroughs / the Central Activities Zone (CAZ).
Policy T2 Healthy Streets
The Council supports this policy. From a health perspective an environment that allows for and promotes a better physical and mental well-being also needs consideration to be given to limiting the presence of advertising space in street furniture. As well as decluttering streets, this would also reduce the role that it currently plays in subliminally for the most part encouraging people to make unhealthy lifestyle choices.
Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 10 Transport

Amend Table 10.1 to include:

- The Elizabeth Line spur stopping at Wembley Central (subject to further assessment);
- The reinstatement of West Coast Main Line platforms at Willesden Junction (subject to further assessment);
- The West London Orbital / Dudding Hill Line railway (subject to further assessment);
- Greater urgency for inclusive step-free access to stations; and
- Road pricing for particular roads to help fund public transport investment, particularly to halt the decline in passenger km on the bus network.

Amend paragraph 10.3.2 to mention the need to provide better orbital routes that would negate the need to travel into central London only to travel back out again. This would assist in reducing capacity pressure on the central stations (both rail and underground).

Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts

The Council supports this policy.

Amend paragraph 10.4.2 to state:

“For developments of strategic importance... applicants are strongly advised to engage early with Transport for London and boroughs through the pre-application process...”.

Policy T5 Cycling

The Council supports this policy.

In particular, the Council welcomes Wembley being identified as an area where higher (double) minimum cycle parking standards apply (Figure 10.2). This figure should also show Brent Cross and the A5 corridor to reflect identified potential for cycling in these areas.

Policy T6 Car parking

The Council supports this policy.

Amend Policy T6B to:

Chapter 10 Transport

“Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or planned to be) well-connected by public transport and have parking management (on and off street, on street being a Controlled Parking Zone), with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking (‘car-lite’).”

Amend Policy T6H to:

Boroughs wishing to adopt borough-wide or other area-based car free policies will be supported. Outer London boroughs wishing to adopt minimum residential parking standards through a Development Plan Document (within the maximum standards set out in Policy T6.1 Residential parking) must only do so for parts of London that are PTAL 0-4 2.

Policy T6.1 Residential parking

The Council supports this policy.

However, the Council seeks clarity on how the policy T6.1G on disabled parking relates to car-free development. The policy should also recognise that it is not always appropriate to provide on-street disabled parking bays via commuted sums where, for example, there is a high demand for kerb space or where in close proximity to junctions. The policy should ensure more flexibility on this topic to avoid unintended consequences.

Amend Table 10.3 Maximum residential parking standards:

- So that for “All areas of PTAL 5-6” and “Inner London PTAL 4”, the maximum parking provision is “Car-free, subject to there being a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) being in place”.
- “Outer London PTAL 4 – 6” requires “Up to 0.5 spaces per unit” with a footnote of “provision of a commuted sum is required to implement on-street parking management in the future”.

It may be simpler to split the table into groups of PTAL 0-3 and 4-6 and link parking standards to unit sizes for the group 0-3.

Policy T6.2 Office parking

The Council supports this policy.

Policy T6.3 Retail parking

The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 10 Transport
Amend Policy T6.3D to: “If on-site parking is justified it should be publicly-available <u>and in accordance with local parking charges</u> ”.
Policy T6.4 Hotel and leisure uses parking
The Council supports this policy.
Policy T6.5 Non-residential disabled persons parking
The Council supports this policy.
Policy T7 Freight and servicing
Amend Policy and/or supporting text to mention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) as well as the Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) tool (paragraph 10.7.6) as complementary schemes. • Lorry and coach parking facilities, including the provision of welfare and break facilities to ensure that nuisance from noise and refrigeration units is not experienced.
Policy T8 Aviation
The Council supports this policy, but does consider that Heathrow is the best location for expanded provision.
Policy T9 Funding transport infrastructure through planning
The Council supports this policy. In particular, the Mayor should consider supporting funding for the following strategic transport infrastructure projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Elizabeth Line spur stopping at Wembley Central (subject to further assessment); • The reinstatement of West Coast Main Line platforms at Willesden Junction (subject to further assessment); and • The West London Orbital / Dudding Hill Line railway (subject to further assessment). <p>The Council does have some concerns for the proposed Mayor of London’s Community Infrastructure Levy 2 Draft Charging Schedule (MCIL2 DCS) regarding the impact on housing and affordable housing delivery, local infrastructure, Opportunity Areas</p>

Chapter 10 Transport

and Housing Zones, community and employment/industrial land uses. These concerns are set out in more detail in the Council's formal response to the MCIL2 DCS (February 2018).

Chapter 11 Funding the London Plan

Policy DF1 Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations

The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 12 Monitoring

Policy M1 Monitoring

The Council supports this policy.

However, the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for the "Supply of affordable homes" should also consider the different tenures of affordable housing as some meet local needs better than others. The Council has a target of 70% social/affordable rent and 30% intermediate housing. If a high % of affordable housing but all of that being at intermediate levels, that would not fully meet local needs and would be an inappropriate measure of success.

In relation to a KPI for active travel, it would be helpful if there was a measure setting a target of "All working age Londoners undertaking at least two ten minutes periods of active travel a day"

Annexes**Annex 1 Town Centre Network**

No comment

Annex 2 Inner and Outer London Boroughs

Brent is the densest Outer London borough¹ by population and should be re-designated as an Inner London borough.

¹ <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/land-area-and-population-density-ward-and-borough>

Annexes
Annex 3 Glossary
No comment