

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Environment Workshop  
17<sup>th</sup> November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

## Good Growth - Table 3

### Overall Summary of both sessions:

1. It is all about 'Place Making' – This is the ultimate goal and should be the focus of Planning Frameworks (OAPFs and others) delivering social, environmental and economic benefit to a place and its community. This can then illustrate how individual developments can contribute to this goal and this should be considered and included in planning requirements and expectations.
  - a. Role for environmental and social standards in London especially now the Code for sustainable Homes has been scrapped
  - b. Good practice Case Studies to highlight opportunities and what can be done and how
2. From Policy to Delivery – Policy in London is generally pretty good and actually it is all about how we actually deliver that policy in practical projects and programmes across London that is important.
  - a. GLA to lead the way in their projects both where they own the land or part-funding the project
  - b. Good practice Case Studies to highlight opportunities and what can be done and how
3. GLA must take both a Strategic and Delivery Role in Infrastructure – There is a need for the GLA to be more pro-active in this area if London is to have the 21<sup>st</sup> Century infrastructure it needs to accommodate projected growth levels, maintain its pre-eminence as a world-leading global capital and achieve its zero carbon aspirations by 2050
  - a. Strategic body - GLA to co-ordinate the strategic planning and development of London's infrastructure (including Energy, Water, Waste, Green, Transport and Communications) especially where this is required at a spatial level beyond individual London Boroughs, so at regional or sub-regional level
  - b. Delivery body - Where there are no other players actively delivering strategic level infrastructure in any of the above markets, e.g. district heat networks, then the GLA should look at how it could step in and fill the void in the short to medium-term in order to get that infrastructure delivered, realise the benefits for London and even create long-term income streams that would support this and wider GLA activity.
4. Review of how strategic housing sites are chosen – To re-assess how the strategic development sites, especially for housing, are chosen to see if new or revised criteria should be developed to inform how that process is undertaken and potentially where those sites are in order to make the best use of the limited land that is available in London and ensure growth is good growth.

# Summary of the individual sessions

## Session 1

**Facilitator in bold and facilitator comments in bold**

Respondents in regular text

*These notes are a summary of the conversation*

---

*Session 1, Table 3*

**Facilitator, Simon Wyke, Greater London Authority**

Kelvin Bathie, London Borough of Waltham Forest

Anita Konrad, Groundwork London

Katharina Winbeck, London Councils

David English, Historic England

Katherine Pelton, London Borough of Enfield

Dan Epstein, Director, Useful Projects, OBSC

Julia Lopez Ventura, C40

Jane Carlson, Forest Commission

Stuart King, Croydon Council, Cabinet Member

---

**When we're talking about good growth, we're talking about spatial planning, accommodating for population growth, but also making sure we have good environmental and community credentials. We need to ensure that growth contributes towards the environment and towards the community. We need to go against that trend of the last 50 years where growth hasn't been particularly sustainable. We need to accommodate increasing amounts of people and improve the quality of our city. This is the first consultation for the environment; we're at the early stages of developing our environment strategy. We've got about 50 minutes for this discussion. I've got a few questions that I'll read out now.**

**I've got a definition of 'Good Growth' here: achieving balanced growth that is financially, socially and environmentally sound.**

**How can we ensure that growth is good growth? How do we balance access to homes, green space and transport infrastructure? How do we ensure that new development actively improves London's environments and unpicks what was previously unsustainable development? Is good growth possible given London's housing density growth needs (50,000 units a year is our target). How do we accommodate that demand while creating spaces where people want to live, work and enjoy themselves? And where should we build those homes? How do we develop environmental policy that is fair for all Londoners? How can we address some of the current imbalances?**

**Those are the questions I hoped could get us started, but I'm sure you have many more.**

London is so varied, there's no one-size-fits all approach. We have developers creating space that does nothing. Where in the process of development, from concept to construction and operation, are we making people think of this? Kings Cross doesn't have any kind of waste planning. At what stage of that development should they have thought about that? We have large developments coming forward, thinking only at the last minute about environmental strategies. We need to stop it from feeling like an onerous thing, and make it something worth thinking about from the start. How can we convince people that this greater initial investment is worth it? People shoving in CHP as a way of getting around the carbon tax just isn't appropriate.

**As you say, there's a real importance in making sure developments are aware of what they need to consider right across the range of activities. Rather than just thinking about units and only coming to everything else at the very end.**

That is a really good point. What's in these proposals is very familiar. I'd much rather see Shirley and others learning about the difference between policy and then practice and focussing on practice. On taking the lessons on board and getting stuff done. There's a real problem in planning; you need a policy which is much more flexible, much more integrated, much more based on real evidence. We see all this CHP but it doesn't reduce carbon at all because people never turn it on. I worked on the Olympic committee, whether or not we got it right, we thought about everything in a really integrated way. That's where I'd like to see the next phase of all of this. We spend too much time looking at policy; we're just rewording. Rather than a written document, I'd love to see something more graphic. I'd love to see someone graphically capture how these things all interrelate, in a much more flowing way than a linear narrative.

**I suppose from a planning perspective, we're often dealing with individual planning sites. We don't always have a big regeneration site - we might have 5 or 6 or 10 different developments in an area - but often they don't look beyond their own boundaries. Maybe there's a policy or an approach that could encourage people to look at other on-going developments.**

I don't think we need to go over all the old ground again. It's about reminding people that it's here and what we already know. I have three points to make. My first point is the importance of learning. The GLA should be more hands-on, flagging up good practice, going beyond the usual 5 case studies that we've all heard too many times. Looking at different formats for learning, for exchange, looking at something creative, but maybe with the unusual suspects. That should be well within your remit without you turning into academics. It would be a good way of bringing people together. My second point is about developers creating spaces. I think they need to better understand the functionality of spaces. This astonishes me: we forget that a space is not just a space. I think a lot of misunderstanding arises from that omission. It's partly a technical job, about mapping out the function of spaces. TFL's Healthy Streets is a good comprehensive approach. My third point relates to types of funding. GLA funding tends to be capital-only, the problem is that, in order to bring spaces to life, you need to enable people to participate in all of that. You need an integrated approach. We have £20,000 for Capital Works - there are problems particularly where major new developments meet existing areas. The new development almost stigmatises existing areas, there's nothing that binds them together.

I was going to touch on a similar point in terms of opportunities for leadership. Of the slides we saw earlier, the two photos we saw demonstrating good growth: conveying that idea at a range of scales could be a really clear way of giving that leadership. The historic environment policy is

what I know best - we've looked into them - they're not bad policies. Our concern is about the implementation. Give everyone a vision that they can invest in conceptually, and a vision they can sell.

**Do we think there might be an opportunity to forge stronger relationships between the GLA and boroughs?**

The range of scales is very important. It's easy to think about this stuff in terms of big regeneration projects. But we have a lot of in-filling in my borough; they're not looked at strategically. The range of scales thing is critical.

And the range of scales is where you have a range of developments that aren't working together. Take Eco Park at Edmonton; the air quality in the area is really bad, and all trucks are coming in from different areas, and a lot of them aren't full. If you have developments in close proximity, it shouldn't be at the end you're adding your 'smart cities' credentials, it's at the start.

Here's something that contradicts what you were saying. There are a number of big strategic investments that London needs to make. A consolidated plan that brings rail, water, electric vehicle delivery together. I think that should be a big strategic move, including a proper sustainable drainage system for all of London. We've been talking for so long about district heating. This idea that we do CHP first on the distant hope that it will be used. If we really want to hit the 2050 target for Greater London, it's across circular economy, logistics, water, waste. I think this working from the bottom up isn't going to deliver that transformative change from a systems perspective. Behaviour is the thing we really need to change. The more you require me as an individual - and the 8 or 9 million other people in London - to make it work, the more of a problem you've got. In the short run, it will absolutely cost, but the overall benefit is huge. With the Olympics, there were all kinds of benefits: health benefit, climate benefit. There wasn't straightforward capital benefit; it definitely didn't benefit investors. But there was a wide societal benefit.

But the Olympics had one big advantage; everyone was on the same side. One thing the last Mayor did do was put forward the infrastructure plan looking forward to 2050. Given the current legal framework, it's difficult to translate that into practice, working with utility companies, Thames Water and all that. The Mayor's main levers are at an individual level. He should be encouraging that joined-up thinking at an individual level. We need to encourage behaviour change in developers and utility companies. I'd agree with comments previously that the policy is already there.

**For utilities, some are publicly owned, most are privately owned. Do you think there is a strategic role the Mayor could take on, perhaps providing funding, and perhaps even with private companies too? Would it be a good idea?**

I'm unaware of what the relationship between the GLA and the boroughs is. What should be the GLA's role? One thing I jotted down during the presentation: interdepartmental work is not just a trend, but a necessity. One of the things that caught my attention was that the London strategy will try to bring this all together: air quality, health, the necessity to reduce emissions, the 1.5 degree pathway, London's zero carbon plan by 2050. Should the GLA have more power for co-ordination in all of this? From my perspective it's very hard to imagine that all these different players will voluntarily come together.

There's definitely a dialogue going on between the boroughs and the Mayor, it looks like this Mayor is looking at strengthening that dialogue. Maybe there should be a joint environment strategy between the boroughs and the Mayor. Even a joint London Plan. To encourage that all boroughs are signed up to what it says. But where are all the developers in this? We have planning officers trying to get developers to follow policy, but we need to remember affordability. We need to say that we are only going to work with developers that sign up to our values. That's a powerful message to send out.

I've worked with a lot of developers. They actually have a list where they class local authorities as either A, B or C - from 'easy to work with' to 'impossible to work with'. A lot of developers will only work with 'A'. Their definition of 'cooperation' is sometimes just to do with clarity. The idea for a London Plan that brings together all the boroughs - especially around waste, which is a complete mess at the moment - a plan with real consolidation, I think is an idealistic but very sensible way forward.

**We've partly got it - there has to be conformity through the London Plan. Maybe it's not as strong as we'd like it to be.**

I agree with aligning what boroughs want to do and how they spend money - local implementation plans - with the Mayor's transport plan. We talked a lot about developers - local authorities can look at big developments flagship opportunities - but actually lots of the growth is coming from small developments in our neighbourhoods where there's not much attention given to it. The patch of Croydon that I look after, most of the growth is happening in those places. These developments deliver local changes we tend to talk about less, like changes in the mix of people, but it's what Londoners in my patch tend to pick up on.

That's always been something for planners to get a grip on.

It's also balancing the fact of the need to build houses. Someone coming along and turning a house into flats might help with numbers. But then the carbon emissions coming from buildings: innovation in building industry is not high. We have out-dated building techniques. And this idea that a building should last from 25-30 years. We all know they're going to last longer, and that after a certain point they're no longer efficient.

Isn't having a building there for 200 years more efficient?

Well exactly. So why are we saying that 30 years is fine?

**I suppose we assume buildings last 100+ years. The 25-30 year figure is just for certain calculations.**

From a structural perspective, they're built to last forever. But we build pokey little homes that have only one use, whereas a Victorian home had multiple uses. It's not a structural issue; it's to do with the way that it's configured. They don't have storage; they're not designed to be flexible. We need to create space that is flexible. For various other reasons, too, I think we should be upping our space standards.

Could part of the leadership be about showing examples for smaller buildings? Retrofitting and adapting them; there has been lots of work like this in the suburbs. This type of thing will be necessary to meet the 50,000 new units per year target. Pilot projects might be a good way to show leadership.

This comes back to the point I was making - we need a logical framework of strategy. It's that lack of understanding about how places work - just dividing up family homes into smaller units - you need to look at the housing service and place that is created, not just throwing £33 million at projects and doing presentations about the designs. It's awful, there's no sense of place, no sense that we'll create something new. There is very little consideration for the surrounding areas, no understanding how the new developments and smaller developments can grow together. I see a real role for the GLA, where it doesn't need to worry about being accused of dealing with the small things. They aren't small. We need someone who feels responsible for promoting this stuff.

It's the cumulative effect of small things that makes a difference. That's the challenge for the GLA - how to make strategies work together. Having 1 environment strategy as we do now should be an opportunity.

I think that's what 'City for all Londoners' tries to do quite well: integrate all the strands, integrating the planning.

It's been said before, yes but it's a better step than we've had previously. We now need to see it deliver on the ground. My London boroughs will certainly play their role.

**We've got about 10 minutes left; I'd like to try to come to two main points.**

I think in this document and in the presentation, the division between resource efficiency and spatial environment is a good one. That's a really powerful piece. I think that improving the environment is often about improving the public realm; this idea as a cross-cutting piece with the design community is really profound. The image of the park and the cycles - the integration there - was a really important component to all of this but I found it disturbing that there wasn't a single person in that park!

**The photo was taken before it opened!**

I think of Broadway Market, which has come from a really grotty street to a really interesting street or place, and that's down to entrepreneurs, independents, through activities including opening up the canal, improving the park at the top. A balance between environmental interventions, social interventions and street improvements. It's really transformative.

**Obviously we got the Community Infrastructure Levy which tries to bring in funds, but often there's a limited amount of CIL that comes in, do you see if there's any other opportunities to make them contribute? Should there be an expectation on new developments to integrate far better?**

I think we should borrow. We're looking at infrastructure as a way of looking at the economy. Like how we did in London in the 1990s and 2000s, like the Southbank. That's what the infrastructure replanning work is doing. We should be borrowing to deliver real value, justifying it on the basis of benefit to society. Without increasing the price of homes. You've got to be careful about affordability.

Some of these interventions aren't expensive to do. Can't we encourage developers and some local authorities in how they go forward? one of the big problems that we have is green infrastructure is seen as this separate thing. There should be no green infrastructure silo. That's when developers worry. But it can be quite cheap, and it improves homes and people's lives and contributes to place making.

### **It brings people together, doesn't it?**

One of the big problems is the cost of the maintenance of some of those places. Maybe that's one thing the Mayor has to use. Trusts and endowments are sometimes being used.

Milton Keynes is an example of how a dowry approach can work..

But that's huge. They were set up as a new town from the beginning.

Can I add - it's something Katherine mentioned - one size doesn't fit all. What works in Waltham Forest won't work in Croydon. Even the north and south of my borough are very different. There are common approaches reflected in this strategy, but London's great strength is its diversity.

We would echo that. Part of good growth is local character. It's not one size fits all.

It's not only built environment but its communities too.

There's real change, real revolution going on in smart, circular and sharing. If you look into the business users, they're talking about these things. Regenerative growth. It's a good thing to latch onto good growth, but sometimes it can become distorted and become bad growth. We need to see smart technology as an enabler to sharing and circular economies.

### **Those are the cross-cutting themes we're using to develop the environment strategy.**

They ought to be underpinning the economy work stream rather than the environment work stream.

### **I think we only have a couple of minutes left, if we can try and summarise.**

We think that the policies are generally there. We need to put them into practice

And the Mayor needs to be taking the leadership.

Don't reinvent policy. Focus on delivery.

Six environment strategies being just one, this should be the model for every city plan. Someone I worked with went to the transport workshop before this one, and they said half of it was about the environment. It really is driving transport. The transport hierarchy is driven by environmental policy; these things are so integrated now. These things are embedding themselves all over the place.

Except we're still getting examples in boroughs where it's not.

It's embedded at policy level. I think building this into practice, as something that is second-nature, is really important.

**So: place-making, GLA's role in strategic infrastructure, plugging gaps where there are no players in the market. GLA's leadership and its strategic role. Where there is a utility that isn't delivering, looking at GLA filling that delivery gap.**

**Thank you very much.**

# Good Growth

## Table 3 Session 2

---

*Session 2, Table 3*

### **Facilitator, Simon Wyke, Greater London Authority**

Ewan Coke, London Borough of Redbridge

John Harte, City of London

Victoria Manning, North London Waste Plan and the London Waste Planning Forum

Jenny Preen, Westminster Council

Iain Watson, Green Investment Bank

Samantha Heath, London Sustainability Exchange

Ken Bean, London Borough of Barnet

Patrick Feehily, Greater London Authority

---

### **So, the first question seems to be: how can we ensure that growth is good growth? How can we balance access to homes, green space and transport infrastructure?**

What do we mean by 'balance'?

It means balancing all the negative impacts that come from a dense city: potential loss of infrastructure.

One of the big tensions is the loss of industrial land to housing. And the loss of waste facilities is a worry.

We're trying to plan for population growth and economic growth, generally meaning more infrastructure to support the city, and asking how do we get the right balance while supporting green infrastructure, which makes the city a nice place to live.

In terms of housing and transport, the old ways are the best ways. That's to target growth in centres where there are already good transport hubs.

The answer really is decent planning policy!

At the moment there's a tension between housing and protecting all the other stuff.

The issue is that we've got an unbalance going on, if everyone says let's put a shoebox here and a shoebox here for people to live in and don't think about the consequences, that's bad planning.

Take Crossrail 2, they're going to have stations and intensify development and houses there. But there's a lot of industrial land there, and waste facilities will have to move.

### **I was going to summarise what we did in the first session but I maybe won't do that.**

I'm happy to hear it so we can build on what has been said previously.

**We were talking about good growth, about sustainable development. Regenerative growth as well; we know we've got a lot of growth to accommodate within London, but how can we do that in a more sustainable way? Development that addresses its own environmental and social challenges, but also that addresses things that have happened in the past, where development has degraded the environment. We need to ensure that growth is good now and also address imbalances that have happened historically. So that we have a high-quality city that people want to live, work and spend time in. Not only economic aspects but how that interplays with the wider place, communities, and the environment. I've got four questions I went through beforehand.**

**We've also got a definition of good growth: achieving balanced growth that is socially and environmentally sound. These are the four questions:**

- 1) How can we ensure that growth is good? How do we balance access to homes, green space, transport, jobs?**
- 2) How do we ensure that new developments actively improve London's environments?**
- 3) Is good growth possible with the level of development needed in London? Where should we be building homes?**
- 4) How do we develop environmental policies that are fair to all Londoners?**

Can I just ask a fundamental question - is 'good growth' something that Sadiq has come up with himself or is it from elsewhere?

**He's very keen on sustainable development. So yes, the term itself is not necessarily from him but he's very supportive. It's also termed 'regenerative growth', where growth improves the quality of the area.**

Do you know how it departs from the idea of 'sustainable development'?

It's more accessible to people. Sustainable is about sustaining things. Regenerative growth is about improving things. You can sustain a bad environment, but 'good growth' is making it better. All these concepts are about making them accessible to people.

I think that the phrase 'good practice' comes into question a bit too. London has reached a point where we're quite an extreme city in the context of the UK; we need to think differently about how we go about things. I'm working at Redbridge, we've got our own views about how to make space for housing. We're looking at green belt release, which a lot of people don't like. But it depends on the green belt you're releasing. I don't think we're going to be the only borough reviewing this.

It's creating a lot problems, the green belt being untouchable.

Sadiq doesn't like what we're doing. But other boroughs are fairly silent on what we're doing - I take that as tacit agreement. I think we need to reassess things. Green belt is one of those things; every borough should be looking at land in their own area. The housing targets are ridiculous. Ours is onerous; we've got a lot of green land, not brown land like Barking. We aren't performing particularly well in home building. We don't have the land. If we did have the land we'd have to find more. And our need is double our target; we need 2,023 new homes per year.

**Maybe there's a new discussion we need to have around this, now that people are thinking about green belt. Maybe we could feed that through and see what the GLA's position is.**

Why is it green belt and not just somewhere else?

Could you say to the Mayor: your targets are unachievable and you've got to lobby government for a new town with new railway links? There's a whole range of options. My next question is: when do we start developing the green belt?

And it's really important for it to be a strategic-level thing. Local councillors will only think about votes, they will only do the popular thing.

What we've done is a full green belt review of the whole borough, and we've revised it twice. The areas of land that we felt could be released for alternative uses don't meet the 5 functions of the green belt. We do not want to release the bits of the green belt where it's working, but only 3% of the green belt is in our area.

Previously, I was Epping Forest District Councillor, and then it was 92% green belt. In terms of home building, Epping's proportion was 11%. Inevitably we looked there at intensifying development on existing sites, making higher densities in sustainable locations. We also looked at the green belt, assessing areas against the 5 functions. We proposed a 1% reduction, from 92% to 91% of green belt. Some of the sites in the green belt might be more sustainable than areas that aren't in the green belt.

There's one area in particular, used for sport facilities, that has a tube station. You come out and there's just green. We're proposing to develop this area.

If you were proposing to use that for housing or whatever, would you be looking to replace the green infrastructure elsewhere?

The leisure facilities? Yes. We have an alternative council-owned green belt site where we could move the sporting pitches and so on. From our perspective, by moving the sporting facilities a 10-minute walk down the road, we could move it without any problems in terms of land ownership.

How do we balance all this? You need to set out some principles. You've got to have all the key ingredients: waste, energy, transport infrastructure at the start. We need to set the principles at the start. The density argument is important too. You could then start to make planning decisions.

What I'm saying is: we need to ask what is good practice today.

Rather than making this a surgery about Redbridge, I am trying to make this discussion more widely applicable.

Don't say no to green belt release just because it's green belt. Look strategically at the opportunities, facilities and supporting infrastructure to assess the most sustainable long-term options.

What are the right principles to consider for strategic sites and under which green belt could be considered for release? There are areas of green belt that could be released.

Could I make an observation on that? You said the council owns some green space somewhere else. You'd be losing green space overall?

No, because what we're trying to release isn't meeting its requirement as a greenbelt space.

You could release that space but then re-open somewhere else, so there's no net loss?

Overall, having a really clear framework and specific priorities for identifying and assessing strategic sites is key.

**So: look at best practice development principles when we're looking at best use of land. Even if developing green belt becomes the most appropriate course?**

The Mayor is quite committed to no releasing.

That's a problem as you're asking what is good growth and one example is what I'm trying to do around the green belt.

We're looking in Barnet as to whether we need to do a review of the green belt.

If it's done on a borough-by-borough basis, it creates a problem, because it's then just about votes.

The access to homes point - I'm going to be awfully political here - is that we're building homes that Londoners can't afford to buy and don't buy. Where I live, it's just Chinese investment banks that buy them. You need proper purchasing legislation.

There needs to be more incentive for people who buy and occupy?

Exactly.

If you've lived in London for 3 years, like in Guernsey and Jersey?

This is a problem that's been let go for so long.

London is such a fine and plucky investment.

You used the clichéd term community, but it's about everything around it, to make people live and work there. If people aren't there half the year you lose a lot of that community. Like in Redbridge; your point about developing around transport hubs, you need to make sure you've got the transport to support it. In that case, the Central Line is already jam-packed.

Sadiq is talking about high-rise, etc., but every borough has a saturation point.

I'm not a housing expert. But you do need different rules. We don't want to be encouraging sprawls, just building houses on the edges.

Often boroughs are underused, like Enfield. South London has been neglected in terms of transport links for so long. In Enfield we've got big gardens at the front and back, a lot of it's council-owned.

Camberwell, a very dense area, doesn't even have a tube station.

I think it would be good to think about what environment policies need to reflect this tension. What the biodiversity plan actually needs to say to create these links. For instance, you can't just have a monoculture - where one disease kills all the trees. A lot of the things we're talking about have been covered in other sessions. We should give the team things about what the environment part of the London Plan needs to say. At the moment, looking at this policy, housing policy is ignoring environmental imperatives.

**Let's wrap up on the green belt discussion, which has been very relevant, as it's about strategic sites for new developments: what's the energy infrastructure, waste infrastructure, water infrastructure requirement to make areas as sustainable as possible. But let's also move onto anything else?**

In looking at the quality of housing that we're looking for, after the demise of the Code for Sustainable Homes, will the London Plan be providing new development standards?

Could be something to be addressed in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPG.

**There are environmental elements within the housing Strategy, like the SPG. In previous administrations, we didn't want to create overlap, but with the demise of the Code for Sustainable Homes, maybe there's a demand.**

I think there might be. We're looking at a lot of housing.

**One of the things we spoke about before; what are the environmental requirements for developments, and make that upfront as early as possible.**

Is there a case for London codes?

When we had the SPG, they were largely ignored by the developments. It took a lot of effort to make them adhere to it. We need to make the case that it's economic. It's always economic to do it this way. But pollution wasn't properly included. By and large, most boroughs are ignoring it.

I disagree.

No, a number are ignoring it. I could name the boroughs that are ignoring it. It's maybe having supplementary planning guidance, so that we all discuss it fully. And in the renewables obligations you should take off the biomass element.

There's a whole load of guidance and planning regulation out there, people are losing their way, it's getting lost from a local authority perspective. And you're right: some people do forget to do air quality impact assessments. The policies and process need clearing up.

And training for planners, perhaps.

Perhaps, or clarification.

That's what was good about the code. Things have come tumbling down a bit since then.

You could put the SPG into planning applications, planning briefs; everyone understood it.

You read some of the planning documents. There's all this stuff committed to but they can't implement it.

Some developers could do it but only if there was stronger guidance. With the Olympics, they wanted to have a row of trees that were all the same. Constantly designing homes with nowhere to dry your washing, so everyone has to have a dryer. Constantly designing homes that are single aspect, so that they either boil or freeze. You need to start conversations about design early on.

### **We've got housing design standards, haven't we?**

It's there, and if it doesn't cost them any more money, they should do it.

You need a planning officer to raise it as an issue from the outset. In an era of massive resource deficiency, where everyone has to do such a high volume of work, to layer on complexities is not going to work. We're having a bit of a problem with district heating in Westminster, it's almost impossible to retrofit it in. We have one in Pimlico, we have one in Whitehall, we wanted to join them up and we still haven't got agreement from all parties to do it. It didn't work because there was a lack of resources, they simply are not there to deliver such projects. Each borough is having to try and do it on their own.

### **A seamless link into what we talked about in the previous workshop.**

Does the GLA have a team that supports all the boroughs in developing district heating projects?

That model of providing expert support to boroughs, there's probably something in that. The GLA should provide more support.

One thing on support, there was a classic stupid thing on the Olympic site, I was trying to get waste disposal in the sink, but you couldn't do that because you couldn't take out of the service charge the waste disposal element. Having a team look at reducing costs to developers and/or costs to tenants. Some developers trying to get new materials into a development were having a real nightmare; investors were saying no to new innovative products. You need the muscle of support at a strategic level. Can you attract Pension funds to invest in new technologies and new materials? If the GLA could broker some of those deals, that would be amazing. Having that knowledge that you can always be asking for help is really useful.

### **Focussing on delivery, and moving from policy. There was something in the GLA as a strategic body, where the GLA needs to provide the strategic leadership.**

When it comes to delivery, and climate change targets, the responsibility always seems to fall on local authorities. I'd like to see developers take a bigger role in achieving these targets. You talked about bringing certain environmental issues upfront on a case-by-case basis; it's a lot of pressure on case officers to deal with developers who are trying to get away with as much as possible. They should have their own set of contributions.

Like a good growth scheme.

It's like they're absolved of those targets.

Monitoring emissions from buildings once they are built has completely fallen off the radar.

Just having standard fittings would be an enormous help.

It put the onus on developers, it's like that's not there anymore.

**The interplay between the site boundary and the wider community was another thing we spoke about.**

You know the list 1, 2, 3 of the CIL, but what about a pan-London CIL to fund this kind of 'good growth' thing? So for example could provide support for developers who need a station for electric vehicles?

**We spoke about the use of CIL and role of CIL, but we realise that CIL is already oversubscribed in its current form.**

We have an offset fund if they aren't zero-carbon that will take funds from developers, which will aid carbon reduction programs. We're looking at how to support boroughs to use that more effectively.

It was a political decision to drop the Code for Sustainable Homes.

It was the government.

**Dropped at the same time as zero-carbon homes.**

London wasn't the problem.

Going back to supporting hard-pressed planning officers, it's a human infrastructure we need. It's a CIL that we need. At the GLA, we had an officer that looks at planning and waste. It's really hard to get your head around. There's a social and investment infrastructure that is needed.

We talked a lot about development, but it's not just about housing.

One of the things I raised at the waste table was case studies. You can have infrastructure within your regeneration area, having an AD facility, nobody knows what it really looks like.

Role of electricity storage?.

We haven't talked about broadband. How that's going to look in ten years time? We're talking about the knowns, but it's the unknowns. Trying to build some headspace into the reams.

Make sure there's no obvious gaps in who's doing what. Make sure thinking is more joined-up and transparent. Coherent and cogent GLA support so the public can easily understand how these plans all fit together. It's all about plans on the ground.

One side-point: this is an awful lot of pressure to put on the planning system. There's a lot of operational issues that create emissions; planning doesn't work for that. With CHP, you want to make sure it's actually used and not ripped out immediately, not just put in to meet a planning requirement. No planning case officer is going to look at every single boiler in a major new development. What happens at year 10? At year 20? Who is checking delivery and service plans: are trucks coming in at the right time, do they have access to turning points,

access to EV charging and to any car parking space? These are all asked for, but none is checked. “We have a biomass burner, but we never turned it on, CHP but we never turned it on. We’ve got loads of charging points that nobody uses. Nobody uses car club.” There’s an operation problem. My view is that it’s not a problem of planning, but rather that we’re asking planning to do something it’s not designed for, which is where things should be and what it should be used for. Planning isn’t operating. Back in the days of industrial London, we had regulations for galvanisers in East London, but now we have nothing that covers that as an emission, in environmental health terms, we don’t regulate this. It should go to pollution regulations: the polluter pays a certain annual charge to the local authority, then we go out and check them. Building managers should send in emissions reports on an annual basis.

But who is there to even look at them?

For a waste site, you’d have environmental planning. For a building, you don’t.

There’s a distinction between new build and existing build. How do we improve that and its functionality?

When you’re doing the planning and signing off the building, you check they’ve installed the CHP, but then after that, you need a process where you hand it over to a team that monitors it, and then there are penalties. We have a policy that they have to be green, and if they don’t there’s a default. I’ve handed it over to a team.

We’ve not had state aid. Energy from waste plant, biomass, we fund lot of low-carbon, the problem we’ve got is that apart from where the government have a policy, the business cases aren’t being developed. We were going through on the other table a lot on street lighting. Kent saving £5 million; how many London boroughs have converted to LEDs? The funding infrastructure is so useful for developing the business case.

And the support to do that with your funders. LEP recycling fund, I’ve never seen that penetrate the mainstream stakeholder. I feel like they should have a whole portion of that on recyclers.

**There’s an ever-dwindling amount of grant funding and an ever-increasing amount of investment funding. Sometimes, you need an amount of grant infrastructure to just get it in place. District heating is a good example; once those pipes are in, the amount you save is huge. They are proven to be more cost-effective and carbon-effective in appropriate district/neighbourhoods. There’s a role for grant funding and investment funding that understands the district heating business model and risk profile.**

**Thank you very much for your time.**