

31 August 2011

Kent County Cricket Ground, Beckenham

in the London Borough of Bromley

planning application no. DC/11/02140/OUT

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral (new powers)

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008

The proposal

The proposal is for three detached buildings for use as an indoor cricket training centre/ multi-function sports/leisure facility, health and fitness centre and conference centre. A spectators stand for 2000-3000 people and 48 detached houses. Car parking and all weather/floodlit pitch.

The applicant

The applicant is **Kent County Cricket Club**, and the architect is **Paul Davis and Partners**.

Strategic issues

The main strategic issue is whether '**very special circumstances**' exist to justify the proposed **residential units and indoor sporting/ conference facilities** on **MOL** and the **loss of playing fields**. The design of the proposal and its impact on the openness of the MOL is also a concern.

Further information regarding, inclusive design, biodiversity, climate change and transport is required.

Recommendation

That Bromley Council be advised that the application does not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 94 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 95 of this report could address these deficiencies. The application does not need to be referred back to the Mayor if Bromley Council resolve to refuse permission, but it must be referred back if it resolves to grant permission.

Context

1 On 22 July 2011 the Mayor of London received documents from Bromley Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 1 September 2011 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that

view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor's use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under Category 3C, 3D and 3F of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

- 3C: "*Development which is likely to prejudice the use as a playing field of more than 2 hectares of land which... has at any time in the five years before the making of the application been used as a playing field*"
- 3D: "*Development (a) on land allocated as Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land in the development plan, in proposals for such a plan, or in proposals for the alteration or replacement of such a plan; and (b) which would involve the construction of a building with a floorspace of more than 1,000 square metres or a material change in the use of such a building.*"
- 3F: "*Development for a use, other than residential use, which includes the provision of more than 200 car parking spaces in connection with that use.*"

3 Once Bromley Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision, as to whether to direct refusal; or allow the Council to determine it itself, unless otherwise advised. In this instance if Bromley Council resolves to refuse permission it need not refer the application back to the Mayor.

4 The Mayor of London's statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

5 The 9.6 hectare site is located two kilometres north of Beckenham town centre. The entire site is designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and forms part of a wider expanse of MOL, which extends to the west of the site. The surrounding area is predominately formed of two/four-storey residential development mixed with large open spaces largely used for sports and recreation.

6 To the west of the site is a five-a-side football facility with playing fields; a gym and indoor children's play facility. Crystal Palace Football Club's training ground is directly south of the site. To the east of the site is a band of residential development, beyond which is Beckenham Place Park and Golf Club.

7 The site is irregular in shape and can be divided into three parts. Two cricket pitches and the clubhouse are located on the north part of the site. The second part of the site is occupied by an all weather playing pitch and an astro turf pitch and runs along the eastern boundary. The third part of the site comprises a strip of overgrown scrubland which connects an area of mown grass (the applicant states this is unused but which has been used in the past five years as a playing field and is marked out for football) to Worsley Bridge Road.

8 The site is bounded by Copers Cope Road to the west and Worsley Bridge Road to the north and east. The nearest section of Transport for London Road Network is the A21 Bromley Road which lies about 1.2km to the northeast of the site. The nearest section of the Strategic Road Network is the A2015 Southend Road, located some 220 metres to the east of the site, which joins up with the A21 to the north.

9 Two bus routes are within walking distance of the site. Although New Beckenham Station is 550 metres from the site, the public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of the site is very poor and is estimated as one (on a scale of one to six, where six is excellent).

Details of the proposal

10 The applicant is seeking outline permission for the following development: an all weather playing pitch, 48 two-storey residential houses (20,443 sq.m.), a two-storey indoor cricket facility (2600 sq.m.), a two-storey health centre (2100 sq.m.), a two-storey conference facility (1600 sq.m.) and a spectator's stand for 2000-3000 people (1040 sq.m.).

11 The applicant is also proposing 211 parking spaces for the leisure facilities, 53 spaces for the office element and 96 spaces for the residential units (2 spaces per unit).

12 The proposed number of cycle parking spaces is unclear.

Case history

13 On 6 February 2001 the previous Mayor considered an application for 42 flats (of which eight were key worker units) on the northwest corner of the site and the current cricket pavilion (PDU/0122/01). The residential development replaced existing buildings and was allowed, in part, to enable the site to be bought back into sporting use for Kent County Cricket Club. Bromley Council approved the application and the previous Mayor did not overturn it (PDU/0122/02). Bromley Council granted planning permission on 11 September 2001 and the development has subsequently been built.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

14 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| • MOL | <i>London Plan; PPG2</i> |
| • Playing fields | <i>London Plan; PPG17, draft PPS Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment</i> |
| • Housing | <i>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG; Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG, Housing Strategy; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EIP draft</i> |
| • Affordable housing | <i>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG, Housing Strategy; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EIP draft</i> |
| • Density | <i>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EIP draft</i> |
| • Urban design | <i>London Plan; PPS1</i> |
| • Inclusive design | <i>London Plan; PPS1; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)</i> |
| • Climate change | <i>London Plan; PPS1, PPS1 supplement; PPS3; PPG13; PPS22; draft PPS Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate; the Mayor's Energy Strategy; Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies; Mayor's draft Water Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG</i> |
| • Biodiversity | <i>London Plan; the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy; PPS9; draft PPS Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment</i> |
| • Transport | <i>London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy; PPG13;</i> |

15 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the Bromley 2006 Unitary Development Plan and the 2011 London Plan.

Principle of development

Sports facilities/ playing fields

16 London Plan Policy 3.19 '*Sports facilities*' states that development proposals that increase or enhance the provision of sports and recreation facilities will be supported and the net loss of such facilities, including playing fields, will be resisted. It also supports multi-use facilities where possible. Additionally, the policy supports the use of floodlights where there is an identified need and no demonstrable harm to the local community or biodiversity but indicates that where sports facilities are proposed on existing open space, they will need to be considered carefully in light of policies on Green Belt and protecting open space.

17 The proposed development of an indoor cricket training centre/sports hall, health and leisure club, conference facility and significant parking would be located on the second cricket field, whilst the 48 houses would be partially located on an existing all-weather pitch which would be relocated slightly east of the existing pitch onto a grass playing field. The existing cricket field is 65,630 sq.m. and the proposed area of the cricket pitch to be developed (including parking) is 32,486 sq.m. Therefore, almost half of the cricket field (49.5%) would be lost. Whilst the area of the proposed all weather pitch is stated as 9,904 sq.m., the area of the existing grass and all weather pitch is unclear from the submitted documents and the applicant should clarify this so a comparison can be made.

18 Whilst Policy 3.19 supports refurbishing the existing sports facilities and the provision of new facilities, this must be balanced against the considerable loss of playing fields, the location of the proposal on MOL and the impact on the openness of MOL which is considered in depth below. The loss of the playing fields must be justified in the context of the guidance set out in PPG17.

MOL

19 Bromley Council's 2006 UDP designates the entire site as Metropolitan Open Land. London Plan policy 7.7 '*Metropolitan Open Land*' notes that MOL should be afforded the same level of protection as the Green Belt of which "*there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*"

20 PPG2 '*Green Belts*' states that construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate except for the following purposes: agriculture and forestry; essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation; for cemeteries and other uses of land that preserve the openness of the Green Belt; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings; limited infilling of existing villages; and the limited infilling or redevelopment of major existing development sites identified in the adopted development plan.

21 Essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation is an acceptable use in the Green Belt/MOL. Paragraph 3.5 of PPG2 defines essential facilities as those that are "*genuinely required for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. Possible examples of such facilities include small changing rooms or unobtrusive spectator accommodation for outdoor sport, or small stables for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation.*" Paragraph 30 of PPG17 states "*planning permission should be granted in Green Belts for proposals to establish or to modernise essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation where the openness of the Green Belt is maintained. Development should be the minimum necessary and nonessential facilities (e.g. additional function rooms or indoor leisure) should be treated as inappropriate development. PPG2 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.*"

22 In July 2011 the Government published a 'draft National Planning Policy Framework' (DNPPF) for public consultation, which is intended to replace all existing national planning policy (PPGs and PPSs). The DNPPF maintains that inappropriate development should only be permitted where 'very special circumstances' exist. However, the description of development permitted in the Green Belt has been altered. The main difference relevant to this application is whereas PPG 2 refers to "*essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation*", the DNPPF refers to "*appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation*."

23 In this policy context and giving appropriate weight to the Government's emerging policy direction, the proposed all weather playing surface would be acceptable development in MOL (although its impact on the loss of the grass pitch still needs to be justified). Furthermore, the spectator stand may be acceptable development in MOL, if the applicant can justify the proposed scale of the stand (2000-3000 seats) and provide evidence that this level of seating is genuinely required on a regular basis on this site and is appropriate. The applicant should consider a demountable/temporary stand if it is only likely to be used on a few occasions each year.

24 However, the proposed construction of 48 new residential units, the indoor cricket training centre/sports hall, health and leisure club and conference facility do not meet any of the above criteria and so is by definition inappropriate development for which the applicant must identify 'very special circumstances'. There is no definition of 'very special circumstances' and each planning application must be judged on its own merits. The applicant has sought to demonstrate that the following 'very special circumstances' exist to justify the inappropriate development:

Kent County Cricket Club's presence in Bromley

25 The applicant states that without the proposal going ahead, Kent County Cricket Club's (KCCC) presence on the site would cease. KCCC have been involved in the site for the last ten years. The club's main ground is located in Canterbury but it has held occasional professional matches at the site. The applicant states that the lack of facilities, has limited the number of higher-level games that can be held in Bromley. It states that the cost of providing temporary facilities is prohibitive.

26 The applicant asserts that increasing operating costs has led to the site becoming unviable for KCCC presence to be maintained without additional commercial facilities. It states that maintaining the grounds, wicket and perimeter fencing is very expensive. Furthermore, the existing astro turf pitch requires replacement and the salaries of professional cricketers has increased dramatically in the last eight years. KCCC feels it can no longer sustain losses from the Beckenham ground and the only way to maintain the use of the ground is to increase the income of the site by creating additional and improved facilities.

27 The applicant has not, however, provided any financial information to evidence these claims nor has it indicated whether KCCC would remain at the site indefinitely if the proposed development were permitted, given that it does not own the site but leases it from Leander Sport and Leisure Ltd. and this lease will break shortly. The applicant should provide evidence of the Club's existing financial situation and it's projected financial situation if the application was permitted. Furthermore, the applicant should provide further information regarding the relationship between the site owner and the Club and how the financial benefits of the proposed development will be split between the two.

Improved sporting facilities and community benefit

28 The applicant states that a wide range of local clubs use the ground including: 19 football clubs, a hockey club, two schools, two senior cricket clubs, Kent 2nd X1, Kent ladies and Kent young cricketers, cricket little league, and a combined football and cricket children's summer club.

29 Furthermore, the applicant asserts that KCCC provided/ supported significant sporting and community benefits in the last 12 months including:

- 550 hours of coaching for children;
- 370 children participating in the two Bromley Schools Kwick Cricket Festivals;
- coached five junior Bromley district squads; support 13 and 32 adult cricket clubs through advertising and assistance with funding grant applications;
- organised first aid and child protection courses;
- organised umpire, coaching and scorers courses;
- ran an urban/housing estate cricket course in areas of deprivation in partnership with the local police;
- ran two Cricket Young Leaders Awards courses and obtained funding from the Mayor's Sports Legacy Fund to support a further 160 Young Leaders over the next two years;
- organised two coach education courses in Bromley.

30 The site is well used by various local sporting and community groups in its current form. Furthermore, the extensive sporting and community activities organised and supported by the KCCC are clearly popular and beneficial to the local community. The applicant should provide further, more detailed, information showing how the site is used over the course of the year, for example by providing a timetable of yearly events and weekly bookings to support the general information in the submission documents.

31 However, the applicant has not provided any information on how the proposals will impact on the level of access local groups have to the facilities or whether there is demand for the proposed indoor facilities in the area. Given that the area of the cricket field will be reduced by half, one of the cricket pitches will be lost and the grass football/hockey pitch to the south of the pavilion will also be lost, it appears likely that some of the current users of the site will be displaced. The applicant should provide detailed information on how the proposals are likely to impact on current users of the facilities. The applicant should also provide evidence that there is demand in the local area for the proposed indoor facilities.

32 Furthermore, the applicant states that the field on which the housing element of the scheme is proposed is currently unused but it appears that the site was once marked out as a playing field. The applicant should confirm when the field was last used as a playing field and why it is now not in use, given the extensive sporting activities that take place on the wider site.

Openness of the MOL

33 Further to making a case for special circumstances, the applicant should indicate how the redevelopment will impact on the openness of the MOL. The site is largely open playing fields that have never been developed and therefore, the proposal to build 48 houses and three substantial double-storey buildings with extensive parking will fundamentally change the character of the land. The impact on the openness of the MOL is therefore likely to be very significant.

34 Overall, the area of the current open space is 95,589 sq.m. (not including the footprint of the existing pavilion [288 sq.m.] and groundsman's shed [100sq.m.] but including the existing

fenced all weather pitch). The proposed residential development and the indoor cricket training centre/sports hall, health and fitness centre and conference centre will reduce this by 23,983 sq.m. to 71,606 sq.m. However, whilst the proposed car parking is not built development, its prominence along the entire northeast boundary and north corner of the site will have a significant and adverse visual impact on the character and openness of the current open land. Furthermore, the large area proposed for parking and landscaping on existing playing fields will directly compromise the ability to fulfil the objective of MOL in this location- to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation. The area dedicated to parking and landscaping around the three buildings will reduce the area of open land by a further 27,896 sq.m. to 43,710 sq.m. Therefore, the total area of open space will be reduced by 54.3%.

35 The applicant has not provided any visual materials and therefore the impact of the proposal on views into and out of the site cannot be assessed. However, the impact is likely to be significant. The applicant should provide accurate visual representation of the impact of the proposal on views into and out of the site.

Summary

36 In summary, the refurbished all weather pitch is acceptable development in MOL and the proposed spectators stand may be acceptable if the applicant can demonstrate the scale is appropriate for outdoor activities, which take place on the site. However, whilst London Plan Policy 3.19 supports refurbishing the existing sports facilities and the provision of new facilities in principle, the proposal will result in the considerable loss of existing playing fields which is usually resisted. A PPG17 assessment is required to justify this. Furthermore, the 'very special circumstances' put forward by the applicant to satisfy Policy 7.7 are not sufficient to justify the harm to the openness and character of the MOL caused by the inappropriate development and a significant amount of further information is required if they are to be accepted.

37 The proposed development is likely to have a significantly adverse impact on the openness of the MOL. The total amount of open space on the site will be reduced by 54.3% and the adverse impact of the proposal is made more severe by the sprawling nature of development, car parking and landscaping along the eastern boundary. The impact of the proposal on the openness of the MOL could be significantly mitigated through a more compact and appropriate design. This is discussed in more detail in the urban design section of the report. Further information is required to determine the impact on views into and out of the site.

38 The development of 42 residential units on the Copers Cope Road boundary has already resulted in the loss of MOL at this site, a further substantial loss is of significant concern and requires substantial justification and information to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.19 and 7.7. The applicant should provide the evidence requested regarding: the scale of the spectator stands; the financial status of the club and the relationship with the site owner; the current use and users of the site and how the proposals will impact on this; the demand for the proposed indoor sporting facilities; and the historical use of the unused playing field. The applicant should provide accurate visual representation of the impact of the proposal on views into and out of the site. Furthermore, the applicant should re-design the proposal in a more compact and appropriate way to mitigate the impact on the openness of site and reduce the area of playing fields that will be lost.

Housing

Affordable housing

39 London Plan Policy 3.11 requires borough councils to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mix-use schemes. In doing so, each council should have regard to its own overall target for the amount of affordable housing provision. Policy 3.12 states that such targets should be based on an assessment of regional and local housing need and a realistic assessment of supply, and should take account of the London Plan strategic target that 35% of housing should be social and 15% intermediate provision, and of the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. In addition, Policy 3.12 encourages councils to have regard to the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development, and to the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements.

40 Policy 3.12 is supported by paragraph 3.71, which urges borough councils to take account of economic viability when estimating the appropriate amount of affordable provision. The 'Three Dragons' development control toolkit is recommended for this purpose.

41 Policy H2 of the Council's UDP has set an overall target of 35% of total new residential units, on sites capable of accommodating ten units or more, to be provided as affordable. An Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in March 2008, which expanded on UDP policy H2 and how the Council expects the policy to operate.

42 The applicant has not included any affordable housing provision on the site and has stated that the residential development is required to enable the sporting development and therefore provision of affordable housing is not appropriate or viable. It has not submitted a viability assessment to evidence this position.

43 Notwithstanding the position set out above regarding the principle of the development, if 'very special circumstances' can be demonstrated then the site may not be appropriate for affordable housing, as the minimum amount of viable enabling development would be permitted to reduce the impact on the openness of MOL. However, the applicant is required to submit a full financial appraisal to determine the minimum amount of viable enabling development and Bromley Council should have this independently assessed.

44 Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan affordable housing policy and London Plan Policy 7.7 'Metropolitan Open Land'.

Quality of residential development

45 London Plan Policy 3.5 '*Quality and design of housing developments*' states that all new residential developments should meet the dwelling space standards set out in table 3.3 of the London Plan and have adequately sized rooms with convenient and efficient room layouts.

46 As the application is for outline permission, the applicant has not provided floorplans or a schedule of accommodation and it is therefore not possible to assess whether the proposal complies with Policy 3.5. However, given that all of the residential accommodation proposed are detached 4/5 bedroom house it is likely that applicant will be able to exceed the space standards set out in Table 3.3. The applicant should commit to exceeding the minimum standards set out in Table 3.3.

47 Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.5.

Density

48 London Plan Policy 3.4 '*Optimising housing potential*' states that taking into account of context and character, design, public transport accessibility, developments should optimise housing output for the site in line with density matrix (table 3.2) in the London Plan. The density matrix indicates that an appropriate density for a suburban site with a low PTAL would be 35-50 units per hectare or 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare.

49 From the information provided, the density for the residential element of the scheme is 23.4 units/hectare or between 140-160 habitable rooms/hectare. Both measures are below or at the lower end of the density matrix scale. However, in this instance, it is the context and character of the MOL that should determine the density of the scheme. Therefore, if very special circumstances can be demonstrated, then the absolute minimum amount of development required to enable the sporting development would be appropriate.

Children's playspace

50 London Plan Policy 3.6 sets out that "*The Mayor and appropriate organisations should ensure that all children and young people have safe access to good quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision.*" Using the methodology within the Mayor's supplementary planning guidance 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation' the applicant should calculate the expected child yield and the amount of child playspace required. The guidance sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable child playspace to be provided per child, with under-5 child playspace provided on-site.

Urban design

51 Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan, in particular the objective to create a city of diverse, strong, secure and accessible neighbourhoods to which Londoners feel attached whatever their origin, background, age or status. Policies contained within Chapter 7 set out a series of overarching design principles for development to achieve this by addressing its layout, height and massing and elevations. Policies in Chapter 3 set out requirements for optimising potential, quality and design of new housing developments.

52 The proposed development will have a significant impact on the character of the area which is currently defined by the unobstructed openness of the cricket ground and surrounding playing fields. Streets that previously defined a distinct urban edge will be amalgamated into the suburban fabric and residencies that looked out onto open fields will look on to new development. The extent to which this change in character is acceptable is dependent on the areas land use designation.

53 Notwithstanding the acceptability of the principle of the development discussed above, there are a number of aspects in the proposed development that undermine the potential for it to maximise its positive impact on the surrounding area. These are outlined below.

Layout

Cricket Ground

54 The cricket ground is laid out with a number of buildings enclosing the southern and western edges of the pitch. A linear car park and access road separates the buildings from the street and widens on the corner of Worsley Bridge Road and Copers Cope Road.

55 The linear arrangement of car parking with a secondary access road undermines the potential of the development to provide enclosure and overlooking onto the public realm by forcing buildings to be set back from the street. An alternative layout where car parking spaces can be accessed directly from the street would prevent the need for a separate access road. This would allow the proposed development to be built closer to the footway, creating a stronger building line and better enclosure and overlooking, as well as a more efficient use of land. This needs further consideration.

56 The location of a large car park at the corner of Copers Cope Road and Worsley Bridge Road also undermines the potential to provide enclosure and overlooking onto the public realm. An alternative layout where development is focused on this corner would not only improve the public realm, but could also help preserve the openness that defines the character of the area by keeping a strong separation between the different areas of built fabric. Further consideration of this layout is necessary.

Residential Area

57 The layout of the residential element of the proposal is arranged around a single cul-de-sac accessed from Worsley Bridge Road.

58 London Plan Policy 7.1D sets out the requirement for developments to reinforce or enhance the permeability and legibility of neighbourhoods, so that communities can easily access community infrastructure, commercial services and public transport.

59 The proposed layout undermines any potential of increasing permeability through the area. A layout where the proposed cul-de-sac links to Gainsborough Close would significantly improve permeability and provide improved pedestrian access to the surrounding area and needs consideration.

60 London Plan Policy 7.3B sets out a series of overarching principles to ensure that the design of a development should look to reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour by maximising activity throughout the day and night, clearly articulating public and private spaces, enabling passive surveillance over public spaces and promoting a sense of ownership and respect.

61 The layout of the cul-de-sac limits views into it and creates a space that is secluded from public view and is potentially attractive to criminal behaviour. Further consideration needs to be given to ensure that any cul-de-sacs are short and straight so that direct views into them can provide passive surveillance from people moving along the main thoroughfare.

Scale, height and massing

62 London Plan Policy 7.4B sets out the requirement for buildings to provide a contemporary architectural response to a site whilst having regard to the pattern and grain of development in the wider area.

63 The height and massing of buildings associated with both the cricket ground and the residential aspects of the proposal are in keeping with the surrounding area and there is no concern with regards to their scale, height or massing.

Residential Layout

64 The London Housing Design Guide (LHDG) sets out a number of aspirations that would ensure the design and layout of residential developments will be of the highest quality both in their internal design and the impact they will have on the surrounding area.

65 Whilst the prevailing typology appears to be semi-detached units, further information is required with regards to the location of entrances and internal layout to ensure that they comply with advice given in the LHDG.

Inclusive design

66 Inclusive design principles if embedded into the development and design process from the outset help to ensure that all of us, including older people, disabled and deaf people, children and young people, can use the places and spaces proposed comfortably, safely and with dignity. The aim of London Plan Policy 3.8 'Housing Choice' and 7.2 is to ensure that proposals achieve the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion, not just the minimum. The applicant should therefore seek to design a scheme that is exemplary in terms of inclusive access. The design and access statement submitted with the application should explain the design rationale behind the application and demonstrate how the principles of inclusive design, including the specific access needs of disabled people, have been integrated into the proposed development from the outset and how inclusion will be maintained and managed.

67 Without indicative floorplans it is difficult to assess how accessible the proposal will be. The applicant's commitment to meeting Lifetime Home standards is welcomed. In line with London Plan Policy 3.8 'Housing choice', the applicant should also commit to 10% of the units being designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The applicant should provide a diagram of a typical wheelchair accessible unit showing how it has/ or could be adapted to meet the needs of wheelchair users.

68 Paragraph 3.114 of the London Plan addresses changing attitudes around disabled people's participation in sport and physical activity. It states that development proposals should ensure that inclusive access issues are addressed from the outset. Sport England's revised Design Guidelines for Accessible Sports Facilities (2010) provides guidance on how to design sports facilities to meet the needs of disabled people. Its guidance is particularly useful with regard to the changing facilities, bathrooms and viewing areas.

69 The submitted Design and Access statement does not address the inclusive design of the sporting and conference facilities. As such, it does not comply with London Plan Policy and further information is required to ensure inclusive design has been considered. The applicant should submit indicative floorplans of the sporting/conference facilities.

70 The Design and Access Statement indicates that 5% of car parking spaces will be designated for disabled people. To comply with London Plan Policy 6.13 'Parking,' this should be increased to a minimum of 6%.

71 Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.8 and 7.2.

Biodiversity

72 London Plan Policy 7.19 states that developments should wherever possible make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity. The applicant has not provided any information regarding biodiversity and given the nature of the site, in particular the proposed housing site, the applicant should investigate the biodiversity in the area and seek to enhance and create suitable habitats for local species.

73 Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 7.19.

Climate change

74 The London Plan climate change policies set out in Chapter 5 collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change, and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions. London Plan Policy 5.2 '*minimising carbon dioxide emissions*' sets out an energy hierarchy for assessing applications, London Plan Policy 5.3 '*Sustainable design and construction*' ensures future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction, and London Plan Policies 5.9-5.15 promote and support effective adaptation to climate change. Further detailed policies on climate change mitigation and adaptation are found throughout Chapter 5 and supplementary guidance is also given in the London Plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG.

75 The applicant has stated that the residential development will aim to achieve Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the commercial elements of the scheme will seek to achieve a BREEAM rating of very good.

76 However, the applicant has submitted very little information regarding climate change mitigation or adaptation. Whilst it is acknowledged this is an outline application, the applicant is required to submit an energy strategy in line with London Plan Policy 5.2. Further guidance on how to prepare an appropriate energy strategy can be found on the GLA website.
(<http://www.london.gov.uk/publication/guidance-planning-energy-assessments>)

77 The applicant has stated that water use for the residential units will be a maximum of 105ltr per person per day. Whilst this is welcomed, the applicant should also set out how it intends to prepare the development for climate change, and its approach to the issues of overheating and cooling, living roofs and walls, flood risk management and sustainable drainage.

78 A significant amount of further information is required to determine whether or not the development complies with London Plan Policy regarding climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Transport

79 The submitted Transport Assessment (TA) is not in line with TfL's Transport assessment best practice guidance (April 2010) or London Plan Policy 6.3, and should be revised. Currently there is insufficient information within the TA for TfL to make an informed assessment of the likely impact of the development on either the highway or public transport networks. Depending on the content of the revised transport assessment and given the nature and location of the site, TfL may request financial contributions towards improving public transport capacity and accessibility.

80 To allow an accurate assessment of the impact of the proposal on different modes of transport, TfL requires submission of multi-modal trip generation and details of the TRAVL/TRICS

sites used as part of the trip generation assessment for all the uses proposed on site. Information should also be provided on existing conditions including the quantum of spectators currently accessing the site on a match day and details on how they travel to it.

81 The development proposes a total of 360 car parking spaces divided between uses, in addition to 12 coach parking spaces for the office and leisure elements. Of those, 96 car spaces are proposed for the 48 residential units. This equates to 2 spaces per unit and therefore corresponds to the maximum permitted for 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings under London Plan policy 6.13. TfL strongly encourages the applicant to provide greater justification for this level of provision which seems excessive, and recommends that, car parking is restrained to encourage more sustainable transport modes, facilitate the success of the travel plan and minimise highway impact. Further discussion is welcomed on this matter.

82 Of the remaining 264 spaces, 53 are associated with the office element of the scheme (equating to 1 space per 30 sq.m.). Such provision is unacceptable as it significantly exceeds the standard allowed for non operational parking for employment uses in Outer London and therefore conflicts with London Plan Policy 6.13 '*Parking*'. Parking provision should therefore be reduced to a maximum of 1 space per 100 – 600 sq.m. of gross floorspace, which is equivalent to 16 spaces.

83 The remaining 211 spaces are proposed for the leisure facilities (equating to 1 space per 25 sq.m.). In order for TfL to assess the appropriateness of such a provision, further information is required on how this figure was generated, including details of expected visitors numbers, staff levels, existing parking provision and level of expected demand.

84 In addition, 20% of the proposed employment parking spaces must be provided with electric vehicle charging points with an additional 10% of spaces adapted for passive provision. Likewise, 20% of the proposed residential parking spaces must be provided with electric charging points with an additional 20% passive provision. Designated blue badge holder parking should also be provided at a minimum of 6% of the car parking spaces for the proposed recreation and leisure facilities. As the proposal currently states a minimum of 5% for blue badge holders, this needs to be increased to accord with London Plan Policy 6.13.

85 The predicted number of staff is required in order to ensure that the proposed cycle parking provision is in line with London Plan Policy 6.9 '*Cycling*'. The residential element to the development proposes 1 cycle parking space per unit, however policy 6.9 '*Cycling*' in the London Plan states 2 cycle spaces per 3 plus bed units are required. Therefore the proposed 48 spaces will need to be increased to a minimum of 96 cycle parking spaces.

86 The Transport Assessment does not contain details of the quality of the pedestrian links to the site. The applicant should undertake a PERS audit of the pedestrian links to key amenities and public transport infrastructure and this should be submitted as part of the revised Transport Assessment before commenting further.

87 The applicant should submit a travel plan which follows TfL's guidance '*Travel Planning for New Development in London*' and is capable of passing an ATTribute assessment. This should be secured by condition or through the section 106 agreement.

88 In line with London Plan Policy 6.14 '*Freight*', a delivery and servicing plan should be secured via condition. This should encourage off highway delivery and collection, reduce the numbers of vehicles, and encourage off peak use following the principles of 'silent approach' so that night time deliveries can occur. The plan should examine the potential for out of peak hour deliveries.

89 Similarly, a construction logistics plan should also be prepared, in line with London Plan Policy 6.14 'Freight', in order to manage the impact of the construction period and this should also be secured by condition.

90 Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan transport policy. To comply with London Plan transport policy the applicant should: revise the Transport Assessment; justify the quantum of parking; commit to incorporating electric vehicle charging points into the scheme; increase the level of residential cycle parking; undertake a PERS audit; and submit a travel plan. Furthermore, a delivery and servicing plan and a construction and logistics plan should be prepared and secured by condition.

Local planning authority's position

91 Bromley Council's position is unknown.

Legal considerations

92 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor's statement and comments.

Financial considerations

93 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

94 London Plan policies on MOL and sports facilities, housing, urban design, inclusive design, climate change, biodiversity and transport are relevant to this application. The application complies with some of these policies but not with others, for the following reasons:

- **MOL/ sports facilities:** The refurbished all weather pitch is acceptable development in MOL and the proposed spectators stand may be acceptable if the applicant can demonstrate the scale is appropriate. The proposed construction of 48 new residential units, the indoor cricket training centre/sports hall, health and leisure club and conference facility are inappropriate development for which the applicant must identify 'very special circumstances'. In addition whilst London Plan Policy 3.19 supports refurbishing the existing sports facilities and the provision of new facilities in principle, the proposal will result in the considerable loss of existing playing fields and this is usually resisted. The 'very special circumstances' put forward by the applicant to satisfy Policy 7.7 are not sufficient to justify the harm to the openness and character of the MOL caused by the inappropriate development. A significant amount of information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.19 and 7.7
- **Housing:** A viability assessment is required to determine whether the development complies with London Plan affordable housing policy and London Plan Policy 7.7 'Metropolitan Open Land'.

- **Quality of residential development:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.5.
- **Children's playspace:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.6 '*Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities.*'
- **Urban design:** The application does not comply with London Plan design policy.
- **Inclusive design:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 3.8 and 7.2.
- **Climate change:** A significant amount of further information is required to determine whether or not the development complies with London Plan Policy regarding climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- **Biodiversity:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan Policy 7.19.
- **Transport:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan transport policies.

95 On balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan. The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan:

- **MOL:** The applicant should provide the evidence requested regarding: the scale of the spectator stands; the financial status of the club and the relationship with the site owner; the current use and users of the site and how the proposals will impact on this; the demand for the proposed indoor sporting facilities; and the historical use of the unused playing field. The applicant should provide accurate visual representation of the impact of the proposal on views into and out of the site. Furthermore, the applicant should re-design the proposal in a more compact and appropriate way to mitigate the impact on the openness of site and reduce the area of playing fields that will be lost.
- **Housing:** The applicant is required to submit a full financial appraisal to determine the minimum amount of viable enabling development and Bromley Council should have this independently assessed.
- **Quality of residential development:** The applicant should commit to exceeding the minimum space standards set out in Table 3.3 of the London Plan team.
- **Children's playspace:** The applicant should calculate the expected child yield and the amount of child playspace required.
- **Urban design:** The applicant should reconsider the design of the scheme, in particular, the relationship between the buildings, the public realm and the car park. Furthermore, the applicant should revise the street layout in the residential element of the scheme.
- **Inclusive design:** the applicant should also commit to 10% of the units being designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The applicant should provide a diagram of a typical wheelchair accessible unit showing how it has/ or could be adapted to meet the needs of wheelchair users. The applicant should include a section on the inclusive design of the sporting facilities within the design and

access statement and should submit indicative floorplans of the sporting/conference facilities. The applicant should provide a minimum of 6% of car parking spaces for disabled people.

- **Climate change:** The applicant is required to submit an energy strategy in line with London Plan policy. The applicant should also set out how it intends to prepare the development for climate change, and its approach to the issues of overheating and cooling, living roofs and walls, flood risk management and sustainable drainage.
- **Biodiversity:** the applicant should investigate the biodiversity in the area and seek to enhance and create suitable habitats for local species.
- **Transport:** Further information is required to determine whether the application complies with London Plan transport policy. To comply with London Plan transport policy the applicant should: revise the Transport Assessment; justify the quantum of parking; reduce the level of office parking; commit to incorporating electric vehicle charging points into the scheme; increase the level of residential cycle parking; undertake a PERS audit; and submit a travel plan. Furthermore, a delivery and servicing plan and a construction and logistics plan should be prepared and secured by condition.

for further information, contact Planning Decisions Unit:

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Planning Decisions

020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

020 7983 4895 email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Gemma Kendall, Case Officer

020 7983 6592 email gemma.kendall@london.gov.uk
