

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Housing Workshop  
21st November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

## Suburban Intensification Table 9 Session 1

**Facilitator in bold facilitator – comments in bold**

Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

---

*Session 1, Table 9*

**Facilitator, James Gleeson, Greater London Authority**

Simon Chatfield, Be:here Ltd

Tony Mulhall, RICS

Nick Lynch, London Borough of Barnet

Robin Brown, Hayes Community Forum/ Just Space

Corinne Swain, Arup

John Hughes, Notting Hill Housing

Gudrun Andrews, London Legacy Development Corporation

Julia Park, Levitt Bernstein

---

### **How can the London plan enable intensification of some suburban areas in a sustainable manner?**

Over the past ten years we have seen significant changes. I think a lot of those changes have been beneficial. For me, the real opportunities are on the town centres. Lot of fast food, buying shops etc, these are a large setting. Encourage local communities a better housing offer. There are a lot of benefits. But for lots of reasons we have not come to this.

What comes first, having priority of getting the housing in? We need to be economically active, getting young people in the community. Local communicates to ace.

Suburban, unless they get the right pressure I cannot see how it will work. The encouragement, semi-detached house-redeveloping those houses would be helpful.

I think, suburb, low density housing is attraction. Suburban residential is flats and affordable housing. Lots of powerful people live in the area. There is a lot of resistance.

Suburban are protected, the greenbelt, the suburban growth.

I find it difficult where the motivation comes from – to want to realise their assets accept the disruption of moving house, having new buildings-, for the sake of London, you've got to be realistic; I think I find it slightly unrealistic. Sceptical, intensives spoken about-, restructuring, with strong role for local authorities on choosing. From looking at the competition from multi-channel retail there seemed to be a struggle on having future space. A role for GLA to partner with local authorities and have power.

Provide characterised and vibrancy with quite a lower offer. There is no food retail. Local authorities, young coming in, you expect to see coffee shops. But there is no Costa, coffee shops. That needs to be quite radical. There is no reason why towns can't do this. We have to also think about the transport in the area.

I have got three words, space, density, transportation and energy. They interconnect. There is huge split, as huge professionals, we want more space. One of the scheme, they said what kind of buildings will build a house without back gardens, shared space rather than private open houses. You begin to have confusion of transport. Private transport- high density develop with the expectation- use of car- mistaken, culturally, they failed to achieve suing private car, if they cannot save energy with drivable location, we have independent transport from the green. If you are driving anywhere, eco private vehicle-is that a problem or not? We have plenty of building- creative energy.

On the matters discussed so far, accommodation growth jobs-, located on the highstreets. Done some research with students from UCL-ethnic traders- they provide good cohesion they are important location. They are on stop shops not only for retail. Town centre can be viewed as fragile creature. Redevelopment –valuable local services. Metro land-, Borough of Hillingdon.

Problem of bringing forward is what did community actually do? They could put new transport and make people be more attracted.

Under occupied housing- there could be an incentive, if there could be new housing for older people and move into larger unit.

**The one of the ways could be forward for older people- personally my mum was searching for a new housing in Dublin and there was a problem. In some cities around the world, you get small amount of home owners who buys five or six house in once. Are there barriers?**

As a suburban dweller- it is not just housing and benefits it's about all the services. Maybe the young people could have children. Those could become a barrier. What is lacking-strategic housing- they gradually lost the abilities of controlling. Bit opportunistic, you will never solve a problem of strategic by being opportunistic. Genuine problem of car, space, I still need car to see my kids and do my shopping.

Incentive- now we are hopefully coming out recession. - They have invested in their housing. The number of basements roof space, there is hardly a house having some of investment. You wouldn't want to do clubbing with neighbours, making a flat and move out.

**Even though you get the right pricing?**

If you have created a right sort of space why would you not?

The value of property has increased.

Town centres have to be the answer. Town centres have to provide the answer to the problem. If you can come up with an offer the mass suburban area, let's get 3000 people in the town centre. I don't see a massive difference in residential difficulties and large residential jobs difficulties. It is easier to pull together than having people in detached houses.

Have to be careful about writing the policy.

Absolutely, totally agree.

London plan offers, guidance and advice.

You don't get much pushback in local authorities. Big is height, guidance can be pushed through. What's acceptable, you can go back. There is opportunity there.

It's going to upset people, but it has to be gone through. That was always going to happen.

Tall building, they are very contentious.

Taller,

More case studies, the funding mechanisms

London planner can offer and create additional value which encourages people. Problem is you've said it but you've got no control. You've got to be strong and control those identities. Enforcing CPO's if necessary. If the local authorities does choose to bring local authorities, - setting out what can change and what can't change and retaining the character. Barnet can bring it, so why can't local authorities do that? Why can't more pressure be put on other local authorities? Carry the burden of putting the power.

**That's an interesting point, of putting control. Local authorities to design a code, we will allow this- some suburban area do. We think it is too difficult for agreement, may be you need to grow hinterland.**

Are you more likely to get more money, if you allow this and this and make people choosing?

Priorities on what they can choose? E.g. The side that people choose more.

This is a big issue. People do not trust Local authorities to do the things, designing the codes. We need to remove people's fears, on that they want to do this but authorities are doing something else.

We haven't given this distrust. GP Surgeries are already in under pressure. Developers are acquiring nestle site. In the west city, in 2004, the London plan growth went up to 30,000. I don't think local people realise the significant in changes of growth. When you are local, I am hearing we need more.

If you think about the last several adventures- code thing is good. There is some kind of low housing building with high tall building. Whatever you do is done, well then it's fine.

The local community will support something higher. Huge issue of housing for younger people, 22 to 27 years olds desperately find housing. I wonder if you want provide more housing for

them? Aimed through design or housing interior, so young people can live in those suburban areas.

Prioritise those housing for young people and old people. Flats are listed good for families. We've got to be more intelligent about who lives in what house. There has to be the right financial asset to the right people and be more adequate.

**Something you see today is population growth in uncontrolled manner.**

Use the mechanisms to create opportunities, for older and younger people.

What I'm suggesting is we do more for people to choose for their need. Not force them but giving more accessible buildings.

We need to break down older people-; 13 years ago it was extremely difficult to get a house.

Roof terraces, they are the places you'd want to go to. We have to be smart about the design. Much nicer bathroom, we need all that.

Densification, using high level of building, it is about good detail of design for residence- Also providing school. If you are the local authorities, would you move out?

One single ownership, that's why we need intensification.

Densification, if CPO lands, would you need to decide that is not a good idea? I want to test out how urgent this is.

(Overlapping)

We need to do it and do it so that it is not destroying the local area. We take London as far as we can go.

Conservation area in suburban area, we do look at characters, low density, it is opportunity missed.

The economy factors are important, let big economy driver to do intensification, they've got to look at local and have it economically beneficial for them. You've got multiple ownership, it will not value for local community authorities. To drive the economy drivers, local authorities has to encourage them.

**First of all, we need to recognise why people remove to suburban. Secondly, town centre could be better to live, but needs to be done sensitively. Thirdly, design code led by, for your benefits, for local people, e.g. for letting them choose.**

Lot of suburban areas are not that nicely designed codes.

Most local authorities have their own characters don't they?

It has to be about creating development, I don't think designing is creating code. If you provide opportunities for elders they would ask, can your grandchildren come as well? Message there for people to get more attracted there.



# Suburban Intensification

## Table 9 Session 2

**Facilitator in bold facilitator – comments in bold**  
**Respondents in regular text**

---

*Session 2, Table 9*

**Facilitator, Andrew Russell, Greater London Authority**

Jane Clossick, London Metropolitan University

Peter Eversden, London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

Robert Rummey, Rummey Design

Greg Bobbins, London Tenants' Federation

Katherine Fletcher, Historic England

Steven Boxall, Regeneration X

Mary Manuel, London Borough of Bromley

---

**How can the London plan enable intensification of some suburban area in a sustainable manner?**

Shopping private, there might be one stop above the other shop, providing much intensification.

Are we talking about real suburban areas? Very large garden in buildings or tree?

Suburbia, if you could persuade two or three house holders.

**We are looking at all of the opportunities.**

It's important not to suburbanise. I.e. you need to retain local needs.

When we intensify, not to make it to suburban, but they are suburban in the end.

When houses are turned into shops they will not turn back into houses anymore.

**You would perceivably need more jobs.**

London has different characters. You have to lose this and that.

Everybody lives suburban area and work in central London.

We've got to look at the fact that London are expanding. It is not sustainable, too many people pushing too many people out. Different areas have different suburban characters so protect their characters. You need to write down, in 30 years they will stay the same as it is. Using up a countryside, which is unsustainable.

Double the density,

### **Seeing lots of things contributing.**

Medium to high density, at least double that density and improve and serve more services. Avoid community in London.

If you bring extra accommodation, bring extra work.

Encourage people to build gardens.

I'm going to be a developer now.

(Laughter)

Issues about kids, jobs, etc.

There needs to be something, process it's possible for ten or twenty or more.

It's then not ownership.

Developers go and say we will share the profit, people will say no to that.

### **More credential, it could happen plot by plot bases.**

Much more planned, planners know that there are areas you can do investment and planned.

People value their properties. They bought because they want to live there. There is problem there.

If you build something for those people, we could build bed shed.

What planning does, it gives opportunity for things to happen.

### **What are the barriers to prevent this to happen? E.g. it's about looking at planning policy.**

Make gardens very long and put two families in one.

Political barriers, when you speak to elected members they want to get elected again and does not want to do something that upsets people.

Most people don't know about that we are talking about intensive suburbs, when are we going to tell them?

Get tall flats and get them in city centre.

### **Getting the products right, not squeezing.**

It has to be well planned schemes. People having shared building, nursing, they never have to leave that district, which is a bigger scheme.

Some areas have the poor accessibility; make it the same according to the characters in that area.

Transport is so significant, fast buses; we are facing families who will not own two cars, if you run out of oil. Accessible job opportunities on suburban areas.

Leave the company cars for wife. We do have to move, not every location has the facilities.

Some people are not economically active; they have to look after kids and all that.

They are struggling in and outer London. Where is the housing to justify that?

CIL?

Everything is done clemently, in 50s 60s they would plan information and then selling the planning information. If it is going to be done in planned way, we need to have the control of how they can come into housing. Land banking is the enemy. Keep the character and make the needs of density.

All the out of town centre, if you redevelop, where it is affective, have better design,

Retail to dwelling, one in three having critical windows, parade, we are going to give you the opportunities to come back.

Incremental loss is happening which is not good. In suburbs, we don't know what's going to happen in those local areas. What does that say for local economy?

### **Can you replace that type of activity?**

How you access what value they bring from economy

It is facing the unknown.

Lot of business thinks there could be more building in the areas.

We are losing lands, it has happened without being planned. If they are serving one area; you cannot say go somewhere else.

We don't want to touch the nice refurbished buildings.

They are much more fragile. Just to continue being in town centre, designing is problem, how you accommodate residential where suburban people need e.g. ASDA. Seeking intensification, need to have diagrammatic structure.

The institution does not want it, not because it can't be, it is confusion structure. They've already got the high street.

It is more equivalent for in London than outer London. Kingston Town centre is an example of what I'm trying to say.

People in suburban will fit for; there are very big political IFs,



There are some unrelated areas, some of them have got enormous garden,

### **Plant some trees**

Where they have widened it has been inevitable.

Can't be done on individual basis.

### **How should the London plan try to enable for this plan to be done. Give a clear frame, guide local, and specifically identify the location.**

Mayor buys the land if many people agree it. Then sell for the developers to do the planning. There needs to be some process on that otherwise it won't happen.

I agree on that, develop some areas for some elderly people.

### **You need that locally, otherwise it won't happen.**

Incredibly sensitive issue, in terms of mix of units who are unoccupied but planning to move out, large two beds, tree bed, it's more flats.

### **Town centres are small areas where, saying stuff that is not happening at the moment.**

Get older people, younger, young generation follow the other, their parents might follow them.

### **Things like that is not different to moving in yours.**

Children outer London, intensification

### **Vicious circle.**

What is the best way to do it in your area?

Depends what you compare with, can we have someone cabin please.

No architect would want to design something that has been designed 300 years ago.

10 things in London

### **What are the design challenges that stop this happening?**

Architectural design, make high density beautiful is moved aside. If you make people feel what is built is going to be beautiful and of a high quality. Otherwise people will say they don't want to have something that is ugly again.

### **Design height, more design criteria?**

Design should be thought of something little aesthetic, I think that people like Victoria street, it's the way things look and represents what it is. People are obsessed as what is it. It could be beautiful as it is, people love that.

Mayor should do where things are done, economic case. Mechanism of how this can be done in group, not done in their individual way.

**High standards, what type of street do you want, how you can do back garden, you'd illustrate what you could do as a house holder would have to do locally. There is no way London authority could do that. What cost and what the rules are?**

We are moving in to the different era, if we could acquire more land to go with it, then you could assist the barriers and ring greater delivery.

**There is an issue on pricing, affordability of housing.**

Did people work out how many people get on to transportation?

Where are we going to hear more about land commission?

I like to see Mayor get involved; assist housing Borough, holding the values down could be included and make sure there is opportunity for more people to collaborate.

Charter issue, how you select the area, sensitive about town centre –character being protected.

Focussing more moving in or out of town centre, suburban areas people are only talking about cars. Lots of back gardens, environmental argument and versatile arguments. What you might end up, people moving outer London and talking about London.

Higher density in smaller units, our town centres have character and lot of opportunity. It is about lot of opportunity and sustainability not just green, how people get around, fitting in high density. Terrace houses are not alien to suburban areas.

Urbanisation, what we need to have is selling, schools, transport, fitting local culture. Including that area with community with what is going to happen for their future area. The bits are really making people feel that area is their home. Aimed to have higher density.

I think we should leave the suburban alone. How is London not big enough?

If we don't build more building, we are going to have more people using the same services.

We can't stop people coming in to London,

**National strategies.**

We don't know what is coming, so we need to build the adaptability. We need to think about residential and economically consider, large format building, e.g. supermarket. Town centre or not town centre, need more design guidance, characterisation is also mix of culturisation.

Economic as well to transport.

Adaptable for car being adaptable.

Outer London intensive opportunities.