

**So**  
**W.** South Bank  
& Waterloo  
Neighbours

# South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan **2017 - 2032**

**MADE  
NEIGHBOURHOOD  
PLAN**

# Foreword following the Examination & Referendum

South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours is pleased to present the final version of the South Bank & Waterloo neighbourhood plan which follows the Examination and Referendum.

We submitted the Draft Neighbourhood Plan to the London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark on 19 June 2018. Both authorities considered the legal compliance of the submitted documents and made a decision to proceed to publication and examination.

Mr Christopher Lockhart-Mummery QC was appointed to undertake the independent examination of the draft South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan. Mr Lockhart-Mummery provided his Examiner's Report to Lambeth and Southwark councils and SoWN on 28 May 2019.

The London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark each made the decision to accept all of the Examiner's recommendations to modify the draft neighbourhood plan as follows in the remainder of this document. It was agreed that subject to these modifications, the draft neighbourhood plan should be sent to two referenda: one for residents and one for businesses.

The referenda were held on 24 October 2019. The plan was approved by a majority of 92% of residents and 91% of businesses that voted in the referenda.

This final version of the plan is being reported for 'making' by the Cabinet of the London Borough of Lambeth on 16 December 2019, and by the Cabinet and the Council Assembly of the London Borough of Southwark on 21 January 2020 and 25 March 2020 respectively.

**John Langley**, Chair  
**Ben Stephenson**, Secretary to August 2018  
**David Clarson**, Secretary from August 2018  
**Giles Goddard**, Treasurer

December 2019

**So**  
**W.**  
**South Bank**  
**& Waterloo**  
**Neighbours**

# Foreword

I am pleased to submit the examination version of the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan, for the use of all those who have a role in ensuring this place remains one of the finest places in the world to live, work and visit.

The plan attempts to address the biggest problems that you said face our area and the solutions were developed by local people too, in a completely open process. The task facing you now is to read the plan and let us know what you think.

Many of those who contributed to this plan have lived or worked in the area for decades. In getting involved they showed a shared commitment to the improvement of their neighbourhood which reflects the area's unique history of local activism, leading to the establishment of Coin Street Community Builders and many other housing co-ops, locally-led regeneration programmes and services. Few central London neighbourhoods have maintained such active community over such a long period.

When the plan is finally adopted by Lambeth and Southwark, the process will have taken four years. This fact underlines the strength of commitment demonstrated by local people to see the plan completed. These timescales are also reflective of the complexities of neighbourhood planning in the city, where boundaries are not obvious, where local authorities are planning in parallel, where there is significant development pressure and where there is a large population.

The plan is the final part of an iterative process to establish in as broad a way as possible the concerns of local people about how the area is developing and their aspirations for its future. Local people are accustomed to change and for many this is the reason they live in the South Bank and Waterloo. Development is understood as inevitable.

However, insofar as a general view can be established among such a disparate group, there is a prevailing determination to ensure that the community should have a stronger say in how development should benefit them, or might be tempered. This is one of the core principles of neighbourhood planning.

As a result, the plan will be as much a message to developers as to local authorities about what local people want. I hope you will support it.

**John Langley**

**SoWN**

**So  
W.** South Bank  
& Waterloo  
Neighbours

# Contents

<b>Foreword following the Examination &amp; Referendum</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Foreword</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Policies</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Neighbourhood plan : Status and Context</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Structure of the plan</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Implementation of the plan</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>South Bank &amp; Waterloo neighbourhood</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>South Bank &amp; Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN)</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Objectives of the South Bank &amp; Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Policies &amp; Guidance</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Projects</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>43</b>

# Acknowledgements

---

## Thanks to

Bishop's and Cathedral's Ward Councillors, present and former Kate Hoey MP Sir Simon Hughes DCLG London Borough of Lambeth London Borough of Southwark Paddington Development Trust Bankside Neighbourhood Forum Softroom Architects Nagan Johnson Architects Ridders&Co Design British Film Institute	Southbank Centre Park Plaza Hotels Waterloo Action Centre Network Rail House of Vans National Theatre Small Back Room Morley College First Protocol Eleanor Bentall photography Eden Caterers Janet Morris Bankside Open Spaces Trust
--	---

Thanks in particular to all the volunteer members of SoWN, the steering group, those that attended the many meetings of thematic groups, ran consultation events, workshops and walks, and the people that gave us their opinions and helped to shape the neighbourhood Plan.

---

## Support from

Planning Aid Locality Community Rights Foundation Eden Project	CLT Network Community Land Use National Association of Local Councils Groundwork UK
---	--

---

## Non-member pro bono professional, support and advice

Arup We Are Pop Up London & Quadrant Braeburn Estates Tony Burton English Heritage Richard Bridge, Community Matters	Jenefer Greenwood OBE BSc FRICS Peabody Pocket Housing Quod Angela Koch, Imagine Places Broadgate Estates Dentons
--	---

---

# 1. Executive summary

## Introduction

Neighbourhood planning allows communities to work together to decide how they would like their area to develop in future, backed by powers in the Localism Act that make sure the policies that local people write for their neighbourhood plan are legally enforceable. These policies will be used by the Local Authority, or in this case, two : Lambeth and Southwark, to regulate development in the area.

The South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan has been developed by a group of volunteers, experts and local stakeholders, who make up the 550 member-strong South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN), the formally designated neighbourhood forum for the area.

A steering group elected annually by SoWN members oversaw the production of the plan. This group has some 30 members, representing residents, tenants and residents associations, employers, community groups and charities, ward councillors, and others. Care is taken to ensure members come from different parts of the neighbourhood area.

Rules made under the Localism Act mean that neighbourhood planning should have regard to government planning policy, contribute the achievement of sustainable development and be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the council's development plans.

Within these restrictions, the plan can lay out detail about the ways in which development can contribute to the area – for instance by improving the streetscape, by asking developers to install green roofs to improve air quality, or by creating certain types of housing.


## Local involvement and consultation

SoWN's membership is open to all who live and work in the area and continuing efforts are made to involve as many people as possible in developing the plan.

The process has included intense engagement with the community as a whole. These have included open consultations on the right boundary for the area, the forum's constitution, the issues that local people wanted to see addressed in the plan, and the plan's projects and policies.

The range of techniques used to gather local views has been extensive and includes public debates, walking tours, street based surveys, social media, school assemblies and social events.

# Area Map



# Policies

The neighbourhood plan includes policies and guidance on seven key themes that reflect the outcome of a general consultation held in 2014. Thematic working groups developed planning policies that aimed to address the issues raised by local people in the consultation. These are summarised below.

## Green infrastructure, open space & air quality

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
There is a lack of green open space in the area and development continues both to reduce this and put pressure on existing spaces.	If developers build on open space they should replace this with new open space elsewhere in the neighbourhood.
Many streets are polluted, noisy and unpleasant to navigate on foot, and back streets can be designed in ways that favour cyclists over pedestrians.	Network of back streets in Waterloo called 'Greenways' has been identified which provide low pollution walking routes through the neighbourhood.
South Bank & Waterloo suffers from a range of environmental problems including poor air quality, lack of open space, localised flooding, loss of trees.	Developers must mitigate these effects e.g. by building green roofs, providing separate outside space for residents and the public and replacing any trees lost.
Development sites can sit empty for years and should be put to use.	Developers should make their sites available to local people for food growing, sports pitches and other temporary uses.

## Housing

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
Delivery of affordable housing.	Where, exceptionally, off-site affordable housing is an option, delivery via a community land trust may be considered.

## Development management

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
Hotels are being built that do not provide benefits to the local community.	If hotels are built, they must show how they are providing jobs for local people, and welcome community groups' use of meeting rooms and facilities.
Graffiti is common and can be difficult to remove from buildings clad in inappropriate materials.	Developers should ensure new buildings are treated with anti-graffiti coatings.

## Retail & work

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
The need for small flexible and temporary shops.	Proposals for small flexible and temporary shops will be supported.
There is a lack of office space in the area and new companies can't set up here.	Developers should provide flexible, affordable workspace and office units.
Lower Marsh Market needs support to grow.	Development on Lower Marsh should contribute to improvements to infrastructure for the market.

## Social infrastructure & culture

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
Certain buildings are used for activity that is important to the community.	Waterloo Action Centre, Living Space, Pineapple Pub and Make Space Studios (among others) should receive Asset of Community Value status.

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
Leake Street is an important route linking South Bank and Waterloo, and it is also a cultural asset and should grow in ways which are sensitive to its existing use	Restaurants and cultural uses of tunnels running off Leake Street are acceptable.

### Streetscape & transport

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
The neighbourhood is confusing and difficult to navigate.	Large developers should implement Legible London signage, to build on current network of street-based maps and encourage consistency.

### Planning gain & mitigation

Local Issue	Summary of Policy
Local people feel removed from the decision making process when determining how proceeds from development should be spent.	A project list will be developed by the neighbourhood forum and evolve over the lifetime of the plan.

### Guidance & Projects

The plan also includes “non-policy” guidance for developers and local authorities, reflecting local aspirations. It also includes a list of projects which are put forward by the community to realise the vision of the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan in the next 15 years.

## 2. Neighbourhood Plan : Status and context

The creation of a neighbourhood plan is a power conferred under the provisions of the Localism Act (2011) allowing communities to apply to their Local Planning Authority for designation as neighbourhood forums with the purpose of producing a neighbourhood development plan, often known as a neighbourhood plan.

As well as being a planning policy document however, the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan reflects a broader local 'vision' setting out how the area should evolve over time. It is also a celebration of the neighbourhood and its people.



The Neighbourhood Plan is formally related to other planning policies as follows:

The policies in the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the policies in the documents above it in the planning hierarchy and an independent assessment has been made to confirm that this is the case.

The key core planning principle guiding its creation is the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development. In the simplest terms this means that the neighbourhood plan cannot be developed in such a way as to prevent development. Instead it must be 'a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives.' The policies in the plan are intended to provide additional details or a distinct local approach to the policies in the Councils' Local Plans. Decision makers should read the Neighbourhood Plan policies alongside the relevant local plan policies. SoWN has developed the Neighbourhood Plan in this spirit.

### 3. Structure of the Plan

The neighbourhood plan is organised according to themes identified in a wide-ranging consultation undertaken during 2014. The themes are :

- Green infrastructure, open space & air quality
- Housing
- Development management
- Retail & work
- Social infrastructure & culture
- Streetscape & transport
- Planning gain & mitigation

Each theme is arranged by :

- Key issues identified by the community through consultation
- Formal policies
- Rationale for policies
- Additional guidance for boroughs and developers

The policies themselves are presented in yellow boxes and only these policies constitute the formal Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, SoWN's aspiration is that the plan in its entirety should act as a blueprint for developers in the South Bank and Waterloo area, since it represents the aspirations of the community directly affected by development.

Neighbourhood plan policies must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of Lambeth's and Southwark's Local Development Plans. As part of the formal process for our Plan an Examiner will determine whether it is 'in general conformity' with the Councils' strategic policies, and which of those policies are strategic.

Our plan has been prepared within the framework of the local plan policies and is considered to be in general conformity with the relevant strategic policies.

Some policies may appear to duplicate those in Lambeth's or Southwark's Local Plans. In most cases, this is where SoWN has sought to apply a common approach across borough boundaries. For instance, Lambeth's definition of open space is more comprehensive than Southwark's and SoWN applies Lambeth's definition and policies to protect open space across the whole plan area, including the Southwark section.

Alongside the guidance and formal policies, the plan also includes projects suggested by the community. These reflect the aspirations of the plan, and the wish of local groups to see them delivered.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, 2012

<sup>2</sup> The list of projects is a target list for the defrayal of the neighbourhood element of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). 25% of all CIL generated in the area must be spent in the area. The projects list where it applies to the Lambeth section of the neighbourhood also forms the Community Led Investment Plan (CLIP) for Bishop's Ward. A memorandum of understanding setting out the issues relating to the defrayal of CIL can be found in Appendix X

## 4. Implementation of the plan

The plan will be in force for fifteen years, alongside the Lambeth and Southwark Local Development Plans. The plan period is 2017 to 2032.

It is intended that for the lifetime of the plan a local body will be established to monitor the application of the plan's policies, working with the local authorities to update them as necessary. Further consultation will take place when the plan is approved concerning any further functions the local body could undertake, such as the making of grants to community groups or implementation of the projects in the plan.

## 5. South Bank & Waterloo neighbourhood

The neighbourhood area is shown in the map opposite. The area is characterised by:

Variety and volume of people	Vital economic drivers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some 10,000 residents</li> <li>55,000 workers</li> <li>28m tourists a year</li> <li>100m commuters a year</li> <li>Large student population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major public companies like Shell, ITV &amp; IBM</li> <li>World renowned cultural hub including National Theatre, Southbank Centre, British Film Institute, Old Vic</li> <li>Major university, teaching hospital and UK's busiest train station</li> <li>Visitor attractions like London Eye &amp; SEALIFE London Aquarium</li> </ul>
Change	Heritage and interest
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declining public investment</li> <li>Projected growth of 1500 extra residential units by 2026</li> <li>Projected growth of jobs by 15,000 by 2026</li> <li>Entire neighbourhood is within London's Central Activity Zone (CAZ) and substantial development is inevitable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>River Thames, river vistas and bridges</li> <li>Open spaces such as Archbishop's Park, Jubilee Gardens, Millennium Green</li> <li>Historic places including Lambeth Palace, County Hall, Royal Festival Hall &amp; Lambeth Estate</li> </ul>

The area's some 10,000 residents, are more similar demographically to the rest of the boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark than might be expected. Although increasingly residential development in the area tends toward 'high end' housing, 40% of the housing stock is social rented or co-op housing, levels far in excess of both borough and national averages.

Established and new communities participate in various ways in the life of the community and there are many opportunities to do so, including consultations, campaigns and community meetings such as the South Bank Forum and Waterloo Community Development Group. The attitudes and concerns of this community are explored further in the consultation section.

The neighbourhood was designated in February 2014. The designated boundary does not precisely correspond to the area applied for, as endorsed by a meeting of the neighbourhood forum in April 2013 – a section of Southwark between the borough boundary on Hatfields and Blackfriars Road was designated as part of the Bankside neighbourhood area earlier in 2014, and therefore was excluded from this neighbourhood plan area.

## 6. South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN)

The designated neighbourhood forum for the area is South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours. The area is designated as a business area under Section 61H of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It was established by local residents, workers and community representatives to develop a 15 year vision for the development of the neighbourhood. It was constituted in April 2013 following evidence of community support for taking forward a neighbourhood plan.

After the establishment of SoWN and its formal designation a year later as the neighbourhood forum for the area, regular communications, events and consultations boosted membership to over 500 people. The membership voted to elect a steering group of 33 people in membership categories as follows:

- Individuals who live in the area
- Individuals who work in the area
- Representatives of tenants and residents associations and housing coops
- Representatives of large public sector organisations
- Representatives of local charities, public and third sector bodies
- Representatives of large businesses
- Representatives of small businesses
- Ward councillors


This constitution reflects the complex community of stakeholders in the neighbourhood area. Reference to the community throughout the Neighbourhood Plan encompasses these groups by definition.

A number of working groups were also formed in order to discuss the outcome of consultations and develop policies for the plan.

[The SoWN structure is shown on the following pages.](#)

The potential future role of SoWN if the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted is not yet fixed but it is likely to act as custodian of the Plan over its fifteen year lifetime in a range of ways, from monitoring its interpretation by the planning authorities to defrayal or delivery of Community Infrastructure monies and projects.

**South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours Structure**



# 7. Objectives of the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan

## 7.1 Vision

SoWN's vision is to produce 'a neighbourhood plan to support and develop the South Bank and Waterloo area's unique position as an affordable, inclusive and authentic place'.

The plan identifies the unique characteristics of the neighbourhood, the long-term aspirations for its development, the barriers to achieving these aspirations and the ways in which the plan can address these barriers.

A combination of spatial planning policies, guidance and projects, the plan aims to provide a blueprint for developers, local authorities and others, setting out the aspirations of the local community over the next fifteen years. These aspirations include encouraging development which:

- I. Celebrates the culture, character and people of the neighbourhood
- II. Incorporates an environmentally sustainable approach
- III. Minimises negative impacts on the surrounding community
- IV. Provides a range of housing to support a diverse community
- V. Allows for the proliferation of diverse economic activity to reflect the locality
- VI. Supports a network of facilities for local people with a variety of needs
- VII. Contributes to a walkable, liveable and functional public realm

## 7.2 Thematic objectives

### Green infrastructure, open space & air quality

- Protecting and creating open space and green infrastructure
- Minimising the impact of construction on open space
- Reductions in air pollution, noise pollution, and other negative environmental effects

### Development management

- Ensuring appropriate mitigation of development on the surrounding community
- Aiming for a mix of development to suit the needs of a range of users
- Respecting heritage and character

### Housing

- Responding to the demand for affordable housing among under-represented groups
- Encouraging innovation in form, design and management of local housing
- Protecting those accommodated in the private rented sector from exploitation

### Retail & work

- Supporting a mix of retail for a range of users including residents
- Encouraging enterprise and start-up businesses
- Resisting further loss of office space

### Social infrastructure & culture

- Supporting a range of facilities for the use of the community
- Seeking revenue to sustain community activity
- Developing local access to culture in all its forms

### Streetscape & transport

- Encouraging sustainable transport and reducing vehicular traffic through the neighbourhood
- Supporting key public realm improvements which contribute to the sense of place
- Reducing the potential for accidents caused by construction traffic

### Planning gain & mitigation

- Securing mitigation of the impacts of development
- Ensuring there is maximum community input into measures to mitigate the impacts of development

## **8. Policies & guidance**

This section follows the themes with :

- a description of the key issues raised in the consultation
- the policies which comprise the statutory part of the plan
- further guidance for the developer and local authority

# 8.1 Green infrastructure, open space & air quality

## Key issues

- Lambeth, Southwark Mayoral and national policy exists on open space but policy has not prevented some erosion of open space.
- Intensification of land use in the neighbourhood, bringing new residents, workers and visitors, inevitably leads to additional stresses on open space.
- Environmental effects – the risk of flooding, poor access to open space, noise and air pollution etc – impact on the health and well-being of the community.
- Public agencies are not adequately joined up and opportunities are missed to embed green infrastructure in developments and public realm schemes, particularly at an early stage.
- Air quality is an increasing concern for residents and businesses in the area and there is support for local approaches to improve it alongside city-wide policy.

## Consultation and Evidence

Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P 1 – P6; Green Infrastructure, open space and air quality is at Appendix 1, Page 43.

## Policies P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6 : Green infrastructure, open space & air quality

No	Policies
P1	Applications which propose any permanent reduction of existing open space (other than open space that is ancillary to, and / or within the curtilage of a building) will not be supported unless : a). New open space of equivalent quantity is created within the Neighbourhood Plan area which replaces open space lost as a result of the development. b). The quality and amenity value of proposed open space both is as good as the lost open space, meets the additional needs arising from the development, and where the space lost was publicly accessible, equivalent public access be provided to the proposed open space.
P2	Major developments (of any land use) which are likely to intensify, to a material degree, pressures on existing publicly accessible open space should contribute - in a manner and to an extent related to the development - to the improvement of such open space or provide additional publicly accessible open space where feasible.
P3	a). Subject to the character of surrounding built form, roofs should be flat where feasible, and be designed to include roof planting. The roof area should be accessible to occupants of the building, subject to safety and amenity considerations. b). Where it can be demonstrated that it is either inappropriate or not feasible to meet the requirement P3a, a range of alternative climate change mitigation approaches must be considered, and implemented where feasible.

P4	<p>All major developments should be encouraged to meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a). Include amenity space designed for the exclusive use of occupants. This should be provided primarily on levels away from the ground floor, for example via green roofs and terraces. Some ground floor private amenity space may be provided for the exclusive use of the building's occupants, but the majority of ground floor open space should be publicly accessible.</li> <li>b). Ensure that the design of publicly accessible open space incorporates public seating and enables ease of pedestrian movement.</li> <li>c). Have regard to guidance for development document in Appendix 9</li> <li>d). Address and mitigate any temporary major loss of amenity in surrounding public open space during construction phases through financial compensation, ring-fenced for green infrastructure projects to be delivered in the neighbourhood area. There may be other infrastructure projects to be delivered in the neighbourhood area. There may be other appropriate measures which could mitigate such major loss of amenity.</li> <li>e). The impact of development on trees is addressed elsewhere in the development plan. Where it is impracticable to identify suitable locations for new trees, alternative forms of replacement or compensation - for example on-street planters, rain gardens and green walls – could be considered acceptable.</li> </ul>
P5	<p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a). Given the high levels of air pollution in the area, development proposals must show how they contribute to the improvement of air quality in South Bank and Waterloo. Such measures include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) of developments incorporating car parking with car free developments and electric vehicle charging points, or such other technology which encourages the take up of sustainable transport.</li> <li>ii) Incorporation of air filtration systems to improve indoor air quality for occupants.</li> <li>iii) Implementation of green infrastructure.</li> <li>iv) The use of low-pollution vehicles during construction.</li> <li>v) Freight consolidation arrangements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b). The Neighbourhood Plan has identified a network of pedestrian routes ('greenways') through the area which are situated away from heavy traffic, air pollution and noise (shown in Appendix 10). The Plan supports developments along these routes which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Create an improved, pedestrian friendly streetscape, encouraging walking as the primary mode, as set out in local and TfL guidance.'</li> <li>ii) Contribute to an improvement in air quality and a reduction in noise levels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c). Measures to encourage cycling will be explored, especially via routes that seek to protect cyclists from heavy traffic, air pollution and noise.</li> <li>d). Development of Waterloo Station should demonstrate that any measures capable of being regulated by development management, to reduce emissions of diesel vehicles, have been investigated.</li> </ul>

P6	The utilisation of vacant development sites with planning consent for temporary activity such as sports pitches and food growing is encouraged. All major proposals must be accompanied by a construction and phasing plan that identifies opportunities for temporary uses, both community and commercial. Where planning permission is required to bring sites into temporary use, this will normally be supported.
----	---

## Rationale for policies

The objective for this theme is increasing the amount and quality of space where evidence indicates pressure on existing space and to protect local people from the damaging effects of air pollution.

**Policy P1** – This in effect supports Lambeth’s Local Plan Policy EN1, and is included with the intention of applying the key ambitions of that policy to the Southwark section of the neighbourhood area.

**Policy P2** – Due to the unique pressure on public open space in this Central London environment, there should be a policy which addresses the effect of major developments (of any land use) can have in exacerbating existing pressure on publicly accessible open space. The policy applies to all developments over 10 residential units or 1,000 m<sup>2</sup>, in the case of non-residential developments. This is the Government’s definition of ‘major development.’

### Rationale for sub-sections :

**P3a.** Intensive green roofs should be designed so as to provide the following benefits:

- amenity uses for the building’s occupants (to relieve pressure on existing open spaces)
- improvement to the neighbourhood’s biodiversity (to encourage wildlife)
- reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> (to reduce the urban heat island effect and global warming)
- improvement of air quality, (to mitigate high levels of air pollution), and
- sustainable urban drainage (to mitigate flood risk)

Roofs which provide a number of simultaneous benefits, including particularly new open space for the enjoyment of residents are to be supported before other forms of climate change mitigating approaches. Local people agreed that intensive green roof gardens for the use of the building’s occupants reduced the pressure on existing open spaces and were therefore preferable to other approaches, such as brown roofs or solar panels. Alongside intensive roofs, other benefits, such as planting to improve the biodiversity of the area should be incorporated into plans for roofs. Plant machinery should where possible be installed inside the building.

**P3b.** An extensive survey of the area was carried out in 2012 for the South Bank and Waterloo Business Improvement Districts by LRS Consultancy, which assessed roofs in the neighbourhood area for their ability to accommodate green infrastructure. An alternative climate change mitigation approach might, subject to all townscape and viability considerations, include the potential for securing additional green roofs on existing buildings in the neighbourhood area.

The Green Infrastructure audit may be accessed here:  
[www.wearewaterloo.co.uk/service/planting-greening](http://www.wearewaterloo.co.uk/service/planting-greening)

P4a. In line with London Plan guidance, all flats above ground floor level should be delivered with private amenity space in the form of balconies or terraces. Again, this reduces the pressure on existing publicly accessible open space in the area. At the ground floor, although developments will need to deliver some private space for residents (e.g. bike racks, refuse areas, ground floor gardens for flats), in the main, as much space as possible – certainly the majority – should be accessible to the public, including indoor winter gardens at ground floor. These principles apply to non-residential developments also.

P4b. It is necessary to design public spaces in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood which are flexible enough to fulfil several functions simultaneously.

Too often, the first resort of landscape architects working on large schemes which deliver a public realm element is to rely on easily maintained, usually hard materials rather than green infrastructure. Schemes often 'design out' resting places and seating to deter rough sleepers, and inevitably any others, from using public spaces. Spaces can do more to help pedestrians reach their destinations, through the use of desire lines and signage. More can be made of the opportunity to use lighting to make spaces safe and attractive. The primary concern of developers in delivering any publicly accessible area should be, simply, to encourage its use.

This could mean:

- Seating and outdoor tables for eating
- Grass, flowers and trees
- Decorative and architectural lighting
- Use of water features
- paths which meet desire lines

Appendix 9 gives examples of landscape design which encourages use.

P4c. Appendix 9 describes how developers should use landscaping and green infrastructure to meet the aspiration that the neighbourhood should represent an exemplar for functional landscape design.

P4d. The neighbourhood forum suggests a simple formula to determine the compensation which would be paid towards green infrastructure projects in the area. Coin Street Community Builders advertises a number of spaces for hire on the Coin Street estate. The cheapest of these by square metre is Doon Street Car Park, which is away from the riverside, which is priced at approximately £1 per square metre per day.

Should construction work be predicted to have an impact severe enough to prevent the reasonable enjoyment of any publicly accessible open space, the developer can be deemed to have taken it out of public use and should in effect lease it at the rate of £1 per square metre per day for the period of the impact. This funding should be used for improvements to green spaces in the neighbourhood area. Lesser impacts or impacts over a smaller area may still trigger compensation at a lower rate, as determined by the planning committee. Impacts are likely to be limited to light pollution, dust and noise created by construction. The above formula is merely a suggestion, and should be not seen as prescriptive. There may be other appropriate measures which could mitigate major losses of amenity in surrounding open space. The impact of construction on the amenity of such open space should be assessed on a case by case basis.

P4e. Given the difficulty in identifying suitable locations for new street trees, other green infrastructure, including trees in on-street planters, rain gardens and green walls would be considered acceptable the policy intention is to retain existing trees in the first instance before providing alternative green infrastructure.

P5a. The Love Lambeth Air project, carried out between November 2016 and April 2017 by Mapping For Change ([www.wearewaterloo.co.uk/services/planting-greening](http://www.wearewaterloo.co.uk/services/planting-greening)), undertook to measure NO<sub>2</sub> with diffusion tubes at 34 sites across Lambeth, including sixteen sites in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood area. None of the sites in the neighbourhood area met European targets of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (microgrammes per cubic metre), with an average of 51 µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the sites. The project also asked local residents whether they felt that air quality was poor in the area, with 82.1% of respondents reporting their perception to be that air quality was often or always very poor. GLA evidence also supports the need for measures to reduce pollution in the area wherever possible and the policy seeks to ensure developers play their part in this.

P5b. The resident and business communities both describe a demanding environment in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood, which is often suffered rather than enjoyed. Air pollution, noise, dirt, a lack of space to walk, and conflict with vehicles and bicycles regularly feature in these descriptions. In the same way as the Mayor of London has developed a network of Cycle Quietways intended for those who are not confident cycling on heavily trafficked main roads, SoWN has developed a network of streets – Greenways – which are designated as zones primarily for walking.

These streets will develop as places where traffic is less prevalent, or altogether absent; they will be quiet, less polluted, feature green pockets in which to rest, and will have wide pavements to encourage walking. Equally, they will be developed so as to provide a grid of streets which run in parallel to key desire lines, allowing pedestrians the choice to take Greenways rather than polluted streets as their walking routes. Evidence collected by SoWN and King's College showed pollution levels at 50 – 60% more than parallel streets which were less heavily trafficked. This evidence forms the basis for the policy which aims to protect a small network of streets from development which could increase pollution, and reduce opportunities for pedestrians to reduce their exposure to health damaging air.

Those who wish to develop on this network of streets will need to meet certain standards. Their developments will assume the minimum of car use and the maximum walking and cycling. Buildings will need to have particular regard to the degree to which they will require servicing from vehicles, taxis etc, will need to mitigate noise to a higher standard, and will need to provide green infrastructure which improves air quality. They will also need to be stepped back from the road.

In addition, developers will need to contribute to the improvement of the streetscape, either via a Section 278 agreement or through a CIL sum which contributes to a larger fund. This will enable the relaying of wider pavements, noise reducing highway surfaces, the implementation of seating and street trees, and the other elements which encourage people to walk through the area, as set out in the guidance. Ground floors should reflect Greenways principles and uses should not detract from the streets' function as peaceful walking routes.

**P5d.** Among the Love Lambeth Air project results, the worst of the measurements was from a diffusion tube measuring an average of 109,20ug/m<sup>3</sup> - 273% over the legal limit – situated in the tunnels beneath Waterloo Station. These tunnels are primarily used by taxis serving Waterloo Station and, although a queuing system has been introduced which restricts the number of taxis that are allowed to join the queue, the system is not enforced and the tunnels, which should be clear of idling taxis, are regularly full. Feedback at pre-submission consultation stage was unequivocal in calling for measures which specifically dealt with this issue and SoWN would hope to engage with Network Rail as landowner and representatives of the LTDA to develop an approach of solving the air pollution caused by diesel taxis.

Further detail is provided in Appendix 10.

**Policy P6** – Local people believe that in an area under such pressure for public spaces of different kinds, no development sites should be left vacant for extended periods of time, and instead should be put to use. Where vacant sites are left undeveloped after they have received - or have been denied - planning permission, developers should be encouraged where feasible to make them available to local charities and community organisations to create temporary allotments, sports pitches or other open spaces, taking advice from the community about what uses of open space are most needed.

### **Green infrastructure, open space & air quality: Other guidance**

1. Green infrastructure projects should be an opportunity for volunteering, apprenticeships and training. Local examples demonstrate the value in involving local people in the implementation and upkeep of green infrastructure – health and well-being, new skills, reduction of deprivation and improving social cohesion.
2. Network Rail should take immediate steps to prevent the ongoing harmful effects of diesel vehicles serving Waterloo Station. Such measures should include:
  - a. Restricting the capacity of taxi ranks
  - b. Monitoring and enforcing against idling taxis and those breaking existing queuing rules

# 8.2 Housing

## Key issues

- Due both to lack of security of tenure and a lack of different types of housing stock, many find it hard to stay in Waterloo if they have to downsize or upgrade due to shifts in the size of the family. This affects those in private and social housing and leads to a variety of problems, including overcrowding and loss of social cohesion.
- Affordable housing delivered through development is unlikely to be affordable for most. There is a need to accommodate those on low to middle incomes who work in local sectors that need employees to live close to where they work.
- The area would benefit from additional residents, but too much residential development is not permanently lived in.

## Consultation and Evidence

Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P7; Housing is at Appendix 2, page 45.

## Policy P7 : Housing

No	Policies
P7	Where, in exceptional circumstances, affordable housing cannot be delivered on site, consideration should be given to making land in the neighbourhood area available to a local designated Community Land Trust to bring forward affordable housing in partnership with a registered housing provider.

## Rationale for policy

**Policy P7** – A wealth of experience in delivering housing is to be found in the neighbourhood area. Coin Street Community Builders and other coops, housing associations and housing trusts are based in the area and able to deliver housing which best meets local need. SoWN believes that the ethos represented by Coin Street Community Builders should be replicated across other projects, giving local people the power to determine where new homes should be developed and where housing need is most critical.

Mixed use schemes which develop employment opportunities for occupants of the homes are particularly encouraged, to reduce the reliance on public transport for people to get to work, and provide a link between the services that are provided locally and the people who live in the neighbourhood. A community run social enterprise laundrette is a particular aspiration of members of the community.

## Housing : Other guidance

1. Residential development should provide high quality homes which are designed to encourage well-maintained permanent use. Housing should not be developed as a liquid asset but to provide mitigation of the UK housing shortage. Housing developments should be marketed to prospective buyers in the UK before they are marketed overseas.
2. SoWN seeks a community solution to the shortage of affordable housing, aiming for a management structure which enables local ownership and oversight of housing. There should be more local control over housing (e.g. co-ops, community land trusts, neighbourhood housing agencies), with the ability to raise additional funding. Developments that create such arrangements will be welcomed by the community.
3. It is essential to encourage innovative new approaches to form, design and management which address local context and local need.
4. Although largely outside the role of the planning system, new approaches are needed to protect tenants in the private rented sector, including both incentives and penalties for landlords. Boroughs should support such measures as set out in the DCLG's Rogue Landlords discussion paper.<sup>4</sup>
5. Following the example of Westminster and Enfield, Lambeth and Southwark should also consider the purchase of properties in the area to house vulnerable people, reducing revenue costs in the long term.
6. A key issue among local people is the extent to which developers are able to meet the targets set by the local authority on affordable housing levels. These are justified on the basis of 'viability assessments' which can assert that development are not viable if they must provide the level of affordable housing the local authority requires. However, if viability assessments underestimate sales values and developments later make a larger profit than estimated, a mechanism should be developed which allows the council to 'claw back' funding retrospectively to deliver more affordable housing. These sums should fund affordable housing in the neighbourhood area where possible. The development proposals of charities and public bodies should be exempt from this obligation.

A number of councils, including Southwark and Lambeth are now producing Viability Assessment SPDs, which seek to address this issue and argue for the clawback mechanism, and that assessments justifying fewer affordable housing units should be open to public scrutiny. The neighbourhood forum supports the objectives of these SPDs.

7. The community believes that early consultation on major developments would enable them to provide helpful advice and reduce the likelihood of objections. To provide a mechanism to strengthen the Councils' commitment to 'front-loading' local consultation, a local 'development review panel' should be established to scrutinise major development plans at pre-planning stage, against their adherence to neighbourhood plan and other matters and make recommendation to the planning committee, including S106 mitigation and CIL spend. This would apply to applications undergoing pre-planning consultation and would be written into planning performance agreements. Plans would be submitted by the Councils to the panel with strict time limits on comments so as not to delay the planning process.

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/450862/Discussion\\_paper\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/450862/Discussion_paper_FINAL.pdf)

# 8.3 Development management

## Key issues

- Developers and local authorities are not always aware of the needs of the local community or how development needs to be mitigated.
- The balance between affordable housing, density and other requirements like public realm improvements is not always appropriate to the development context.
- While it is recognised that the neighbourhood is one of high demand for hotels, the area has exceeded targets for hotel uses to 2026 and the area has lost large office and residential sites to hotel use. The community wishes to ensure that any further hotels play an active part in local regeneration.
- Poor design could undermine the successful integration of a large number of well-designed new buildings with heritage assets and conservation areas.

## Consultation and Evidence

A summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P8 – P9; Development management is at Appendix 3, page 47

## Policies P8, P9 : Development management

No	Policies
P8	<p>Any hotel proposal must mitigate the development's impact on the existing dynamics of the residential, business and social communities. The following objectives will be supported :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide as much retail frontage as possible to a high street, where the units made available only have high street access.</li> <li>2. Provide space that is beneficial and available to the wider community such as 'incubator space', screening room, community meeting and function rooms, fitness suites and swimming pools.</li> <li>3. Where possible any 'in-house' food and beverage offer should be limited (minibars, bars, restaurants and cafes closed to the public) so that hotel guests are encouraged to use local traders.</li> <li>4. Developments should continue to engage with local recruitment mechanisms to ensure local candidates are employed wherever possible.</li> </ol>
P9	<p>Where they front publicly accessible spaces the ground floor (and any relevant upper floor) elevations of new development shall be treated with a permanent anti-graffiti coating which shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.</p>

## Rationale for policy

**Policy P8** – Many local people do not support the further development of hotels in the area, where they are often perceived to intensify the pressure on the area from the visitor economy whilst providing few benefits to the community in the way that housing, office space or retail developments do. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot be used to prevent development of hotels. However it may include guidance to the hospitality industry on best practice examples in the neighbourhood.

Hotels which have been actively supportive of the local community have been welcomed particularly where they provide community benefit, are willing to host community events, recruit from the area and provide facilities for local people to use. SoWn members agree with statements made in the Waterloo SPD, that the development of aparthotels should only be agreed in exceptional circumstances, as there is less potential for the benefits listed above.

**Policy P9** – The South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan area features two well-known sanctioned graffiti areas, in Leake Street and at the Southbank Centre undercrofts. Graffiti elsewhere in the neighbourhood is removed from the facades of buildings and many developments do not make adequate provision to ensure removal is effective, either by using porous materials or inadequately treating facades. Due to the high local cost of graffiti removal, and the sense of blight non-removal or poor removal creates, developers should adequately treat new buildings to ensure removal can be achieved quickly and effectively.

## Development Management: Other guidance

1. Post consent, the panel should be notified of and invited to comment on the discharge of 2 years where a review shows that negative impacts have arisen from the development.
2. The area's heritage is valued and reflects a complex mix of social infrastructure, architectural character and use. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges existing conservation and character areas and supports their significance in ensuring the character of the area is respected. High quality design, related to context, is required of all development proposals.

## 8.4 Retail & work

### Key issues

- The balance of retail is under pressure with smaller independent stores, which are seen as integral to the character of the neighbourhood, being replaced by multiples.
- The high number of separate landlords in the area prevents a curatorial approach to retail in the neighbourhood. Where local people desire a mix of retail to suit different needs, owners are prone to seeking the tenant able to pay the highest rent. This can lead to homogenisation, serving commuters and tourists rather than residents or other kinds of shoppers.
- The neighbourhood lacks anchor stores which draw shoppers to the area and can complement independent shops.
- The success of retail in the area will be linked to the development of Waterloo Station and there is a need to involve Network Rail and LCR in discussion to align the long term ambitions of the station operator and the community.
- There is a shortage of office space in the area, and in particular offices that support the needs of young and small businesses i.e spaces which are affordable and flexible in their tenure and size.
- More could be done to ensure local jobseekers benefit from local job creation, unlocked through development.

### Consultation and Evidence

Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies 10 – 13 ; Retail & work is at Appendix 4, page 48.

## Policies P10, P11, P12, P13 : Retail & work

No	Policy
P10	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan supports development that provides retail units in appropriate locations with the following characteristics :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Interiors fitted out to RIBA category B standard and made available for temporary or pop-up use</li> <li>ii. A range of unit sizes including units with shop floors under 20 sq/ m</li> </ul>
P11	<p>In Lower Marsh, planning applications will be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a ) Retain an appropriate mix of retail units, taking particular note of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Planning applications involving the loss of an A1 unit will not be supported unless the overall percentage of A1 units remains above 50% following its loss.</li> <li>ii) Planning applications involving the loss of an A3 unit will not be supported unless the overall percentage of A3 units remains above 30% following its loss.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b ) Retain and enhance the retail use of the frontages, taking particular note of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) conversion from retail to residential on these streets will not be permitted, and</li> <li>ii) applications to convert ground floor residential units to A1 or A3 use will be supported*</li> </ul> <p>*with the exception of the purpose built housing such as New Cut housing Co-op and Styles House.</p> </li> </ul>
P12	<p>Schemes will be encouraged which provide office or workspace with the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are able to be subdivided to encourage flexible use and co-working and/or</li> <li>ii. Include a range of unit sizes including offices of under 1000 sq/ m and/or</li> <li>iii. Are able to provide accommodation for a range of jobs which are accessible to local people and/or</li> <li>iv. Commit to working with third party employment support providers and local schools to provide work placements, apprenticeships and training support for unemployed people.</li> </ul>

P13	<p>The neighbourhood will support proposals which enable physical infrastructure improvements to support the development and servicing of the street market at Lower Marsh, including :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Electricity points</li> <li>ii. Storage</li> <li>iii. Refuse storage</li> <li>iv. Improved lighting</li> <li>v. Improved seating</li> <li>vi. Green infrastructure</li> </ol>
-----	---

## Rationale for policies

**Policy P10** – The following facilities to enable temporary or pop-up uses will be encouraged.

- Walls painted white or temporary walls installed to cover up any that are damaged
- Simple overhead lighting ideally spot lighting with different controls so tenants can adjust the lighting state as required
- As much glass frontage as possible
- Power sockets throughout
- WiFi, water and electricity connected
- Access to a toilet
- Buildings insurance

These characteristics were advised after consultation with experts We Are Pop Up, who identify temporary retail spaces for small start-ups at low cost. We Are Pop Up also advise that units should be provided which enable smaller retailers to share space – e.g. a room with a ‘shelf-share’ arrangement or a series of kiosk-style spaces with shared services. The local community would encourage such approaches.

**Policy P11** – Lower Marsh – The local community, whilst recognising and welcoming a general shift towards a combination of A3 restaurant uses as well as A1 retail uses, would like to strengthen existing policy to ensure that only a minority of premises are used as services. This preserves the character of the street as a shopping street with daytime as well as evening uses.

**Policy P12** – Flexibility is defined both in terms of physical adaptability and length of tenure. There is a need for office spaces which can be adapted as co-working space, shared between a number of smaller companies who are able to economise through shared services such as cleaning. There is also a shortage of large spaces for more established businesses.

**Policy P13** – Lower Marsh Market is a valued community asset and a locally-owned not-for-profit company which requires particular and continued support to grow, including investment in infrastructure. It requires particular support as it is an asset in public ownership which can be developed to :

1. Create jobs
2. Drive footfall to the street to support local shops
3. Provide opportunities for training and small business incubation, including via links with schools, colleges and universities
4. Rebalance the local retail offer so as to ensure a greater mix, including provision for the local resident population on a range of incomes
5. Form greater strategic links between the market and other developing parts of Waterloo such as Leake Street, Waterloo Station and a newly developed Johanna site
6. Generate a surplus to support the growth of the market, and the wider regeneration of Waterloo

### **Retail & work : Other guidance**

1. SoWN supports the use of CIL or S106 to subsidise affordable office space for start-ups and enterprise activity – the proximity to local universities provides an opportunity to develop local entrepreneurial talent via subsidies granted by a community body.
2. SoWN supports the use of covenants to restrict the proliferation of specific types of uses in close proximity (e.g. supermarkets, betting shops, coffee shops). Covenants must be agreed by the landowner but are an opportunity to prevent changes of use where such changes would be detrimental to the economic health of the street.
3. Consideration should be given to how changes to business rates allowing for local setting of rates levels can be managed to encourage the establishment of businesses which would serve an unmet need in the community.
4. SoWN supports the Planning Authorities' policies to strengthen protections against the loss of office space in the neighbourhood area, and encourage applications for new provision to come forward. A significant loss of office space threatens the balance of the neighbourhood, including the local retail economy. Central London exemptions to government guidance allowing for office to residential conversion without planning consent are being modified and may erode this further.

# 8.5 Social infrastructure & culture

## Key issues

- A number of organisations work to provide services to local people but such organisations aren't always resourced to work together or publicise these services widely. However, rather than centralising all activity, the emphasis should be on supporting groups to liaise effectively and deepen partnership working, perhaps supported by a small paid staff who could help to coordinate community-wide benefits, seek funding, and publicise activity.
- Education providers and employers need to be more closely linked to increase local access to employment. Further work needs to be done to ensure young people are 'job-ready' using local providers. Smaller businesses need compliance assistance to be able to employ apprentices.
- Establishing a new Library is a key priority and the group endorses the Oasis Johanna Primary School and Waterloo Action Centre sites. Revenue funding must be identified to ensure the project is sustainable however.
- Opportunities to both widen access to culture and strengthen cultural links in the neighbourhood should be exploited.

## Consultation and Evidence

Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P14, P15 ; Social infrastructure and culture is at Appendix 5, page 50.

## Policies P14, P15 : Social infrastructure & culture

No	Policy
P14	The Neighbourhood Forum has identified a number of sites or buildings which should be protected for specified community uses or their community significance. Proposals that will result in either the loss of, or in significant harm to, those community assets will not be supported.
P15	The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the contribution to the artistic and cultural distinctiveness of the area made by Leake Street and seeks to maintain and develop this important feature of the neighbourhood. Applications which contribute to and promote the use of units adjoining Leake Street and under Waterloo station for cultural uses will therefore be supported.

## Rationale for policies

**Policy P14** – The Neighbourhood Forum has identified a number of community facilities which should be protected. Any proposals seeking the redevelopment of these sites should include full re-provision of the community use on the same site and providing equal or increased capacity to the original.

Building	Address	Use
Waterloo Action Centre	Baylis Road	Community Centre
Living Space	Waterloo Road	Community Centre
Make Space Studios	Westminster Bridge Road	Affordable artists' studios

**Policy P15** – The cultural and associated uses of Leake Street and Waterloo Station undercrofts should be supported as a vital element in the creation of physical and economic links between the South Bank and Lower Marsh. Culture is an important part of life in Waterloo and local residents, workers and students value the wide variety of culture available.

The relatively recent expansion of the Waterloo Station undercrofts, brought into use from empty spaces to accommodate urban arts, fringe theatre and food pop-ups, has been supported and there is a wish to see a continuation of this expansion in this space. The location of the Waterloo Station undercrofts is sufficiently removed from residential areas as to warrant intensification as a focal point for the increasingly valuable night time economy in Waterloo.

## Social Infrastructure & culture : Other guidance

1. Initiatives which create jobs for local people are to be supported and could include provision of space to improve practical or vocational skills (particularly for older people and school leavers). The community will support schemes which create sustainable ties between education providers and employers to strengthen local pathways into work.
2. SoWN welcomes and encourages culture and tourism as a valuable part of South Bank life. Consideration should be given to the balance between the economic benefits of tourism - and particularly how these benefits can be shared among a greater geographical and socio-economic spread - and the impacts on the resident and business community of increased footfall, noise and disruption to quality of life/business as usual.
3. On culture, planning regulation is not always conducive to the delivery of an animated South Bank and temporary installations should be delivered without unnecessary impediment where they are in appropriate places. SoWN will consider promoting a Neighbourhood Development Order to support the temporary development of cultural or public art installations, incorporating strict guidelines developed in conjunction with neighbours to ensure noise levels, the duration and nature of the installation, and its location are acceptable.

4. There is a perceived gap between an 'affluent' South Bank and a 'deprived' Waterloo. Projects which strengthen ties between communities of different social economic status are to be encouraged.
5. The South Bank is home to a wide range of cultural organisations and artists. Developers should consider supporting local artists and cultural organisations when developing their cultural strategy, implementing public or internal art and procuring creative services.
6. Local people and organisations should be consulted on public art and culture planned as part of development.
7. Temporary outdoor cultural activity which generates revenue should contribute to the maintenance of the public realm in the area immediately around the site. However, it is recognised that some cultural bodies' funding models dictate that revenue-generating cultural activity contributes to core functions. In such cases, this may be considered 'public benefit.'

# 8.6 Streetscape & transport

## Key issues

- There is a tension between different transport modes – buses, cabs, bikes, trains, tourist coaches, cycling and walking and it is difficult to balance these in an area with such limited space. A predicted growth in passenger numbers in Waterloo Station of 40% will exacerbate the situation. The need to balance the 'place' and 'movement' functions of the area is also important.
- Waterloo Station redevelopment is an opportunity to improve public realm and reduce the barriers to movement currently presented by the building.
- Streets are not adequately maintained and too often investment in high quality public realm is wasted through a lack of resource to monitor and maintain schemes.

## Consultation and Evidence

Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policy P16 'Streetscape and transport' is at Appendix 6, page 54.

## Policy P16 : Streetscape & transport

No	Policy
P16	Developments which create new public realm of a scale which requires pedestrian way finding should implement the Legible London way finding system (or replace defunct Legible London signage) in accordance with the Highways Act and relevant Highways Authority guidance

## Rationale for policies

**Policy P16** – The Legible London signage system has been implemented across the neighbourhood area and its effectiveness is ensured only if it becomes the accepted standard. The neighbourhood is a particularly difficult area to navigate and way finding therefore vital for visitors. Bespoke systems may be used in exceptional cultural circumstances but the primary wayfinding standard should be Legible London.

## Streetscape & transport : Other guidance

1. Changes can be made which encourage a better use of existing space. This broadly encompasses :
  - a. Focusing the use of particular streets for particular modes where possible
  - b. Improving investment in streets and their ongoing maintenance
  - c. Rationalising buses and bus stops
  - d. Reducing through traffic
  - e. encourage cycling, and
  - f. Creating new walking routes through the area which separate pedestrians from motorised vehicles and, where possible, cyclists including alongside railway viaducts, under the station and through back streets
2. The community supports the strategic development of the following junctions and thoroughfares with the key objectives of:
  - a. improving the environment for pedestrians
  - b. enabling greater use of the space for events and animation
  - c. increasing the level of green infrastructure and
  - d. reducing the impact of motorised traffic at these locations:
    - Lambeth North junction
    - Waterloo Road / Baylis Road Junction
    - IMAX roundabout and subways
    - Waterloo Rd between Old Vic and IMAX
    - Addington Street Roundabout
    - Westminster Bridge Road
    - Blackfriars Road and St George's Circus
    - South Bank Spine Route (Upper Ground and Belvedere Road)
3. We recommend that transport assessments relating to planning applications should consider the complexity of transport movements in the area and the impact the development may have on the safe movement of pedestrians and traffic, including:
  - a. Uplifts in relation to the visitor economy (i.e. spikes in visitors associated with tourism, including school holidays)
  - b. Major events within the Central Activity Zone
  - c. Differences between weekday and weekend modal/movement patterns
4. The Neighbourhood Plan supports development in railway arches which follows the principles of the 'Low Line' project. The Low Line is an initiative to encourage industry sector clusters in redeveloped railway viaducts between London Bridge, Bankside, Waterloo and Vauxhall. Schemes which enable access to and development of railway arches to benefit the local economy and provide safe, car free walking and cycle routes.

# 8.7 Policy & guidance : Planning gain & mitigation

## Key issues

- Policies and guidance relating to the negotiation, collection and defrayal of Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy do not relate to a specific theme but are cross cutting. They have been developed by a number of the working groups and a separate group established to consider the defrayal of developer contributions.
- One of the key issues relates to a perceived disconnect between the community and negotiations between the council and developers on how to defray S106 and CIL. Local people assert that they should have a much greater say on how the impact of development should be mitigated since the impact is experienced most locally.
- The London Eye S106 agreement presents an example of the successful local defrayal of revenue S106. A local partnership of businesses, residents and the council determine annually how revenue should be spent according to a set of environmental priorities. A community chest grant fund is managed by a local community organisation and voluntary and community groups can apply for amounts up to £10,000 annually for projects which benefit the neighbourhood. SoWN has proposed a similar mechanism for the defrayal of CIL (see Section 9 - Implementation & Delivery).
- The need for further revenue to maintain infrastructure in the area is paramount. A report prepared by Volterra Consultants for South Bank Employers Group in 2013 and updated in 2016 indicates that declining public investment in management and maintenance of the area has the capacity to limit the economic growth of the area. Consultation with other local delivery groups reflects this view and an appropriate balance must be sought between delivering new infrastructure through capital spend and managing existing through revenue.

## Policy P17: Planning gain & mitigation

No	Policy
P17	Subject to requirements and implications of regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations, where developments create an ongoing and significant cost implication for the management and maintenance of the neighbourhood area outside the development's demise, revenue Section 106 funding to mitigate the impacts should be secured from the development.

## Rationale for policy

**Policy P17** – Revenue funding is required to protect and maintain capital investment. The London Eye Revenue S106 model is exemplar of local management of services via ongoing funding and a similar mechanism would be appropriate for other developments which significantly increase footfall (and therefore litter, maintenance requirements and security measures).

Revenue funding could be generated either via a commuted sum, proportion of turnover or proportion of service charges on operators occupying new developments. Alternatively developers could provide a revenue generator to the community or Council, such as a retail unit or land.

## Planning gain & mitigation : Other guidance

Obligations included within S106 agreements should be reported clearly and transparently by the local planning authority within the committee or delegated report. The obligations should reflect mitigating measures on which the local community have been fully consulted.

# 9. Implementation & Delivery

## Delivering the Neighbourhood Plan

Part of the appeal of neighbourhood planning to local people is the increased role of the community through the establishment of neighbourhood fora and a neighbourhood development plan in developing local priorities for investment.

The implementation and delivery of the priorities and projects in this neighbourhood plan will require funding to be secured.

Government guidance on the neighbourhood portion of CIL states:

The Community Infrastructure Levy should support and incentivise new development, particularly by placing control over a meaningful proportion of the funds raised with the neighbourhoods where development takes place.

[National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012](#)

In England, communities that draw up a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order (including a community right to build order), and secure the consent of local people in a referendum, will benefit from 25 per cent of the level revenues arising from the development that takes place in their area.

[Planning Practice Guidance, June 2014](#)

Where a neighbourhood plan has been made, the charging authority and communities should consider how the neighbourhood portion can be used to deliver the infrastructure identified in the neighbourhood plan as required to address the demands of development.

[Planning Practice Guidance, June 2014](#)

Southwark Council's supplementary Planning guidance on Section 106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy (April 2015 and January 2017 addendum) reflects the requirements set out in government guidance as follows:

Southwark Council will spend at least 25% of CIL on projects in the local area, whether there is an adopted neighbourhood Plan or not, using the following sequence of areas to identify relevant projects:

- Areas with an adopted neighbourhood Plan
- Opportunity areas/action areas
- SPD areas (other than individual sites/buildings)
- Community council areas (for those areas which are not covered by any of the above).

Lambeth Council has made similar commitments in relation to neighbourhood CIL expenditure at cabinet level.

**Section 106 agreements** – secure financial and other obligations from developers and are entered into as a condition of planning permission being granted, in order to mitigate the impacts of the development for which planning permission is being sought. Legislation and government guidance requires such obligations to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Other sources of funding are likely to become available from time to time and these will be reviewed regularly by SoWN together with the Councils and other stakeholders.

## SoWN's Role

SoWN is the neighbourhood forum established under the provisions of the Localism Act, and recognised by both Lambeth and Southwark Councils as the designated body to prepare a neighbourhood plan for the designated area which contains parts of both Councils' administrative areas.

SoWN has some 500 members and is administered by an elected Steering Group of 32 including residents, employees, businesses, third sector organisations, public bodies and ward councillors, providing broad representation across the South Bank and Waterloo Community.

One of SoWN's prime objectives is to monitor the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan, providing input into the priorities for S106 agreement obligations to mitigate the immediate impacts of developments.

SoWN's working groups have collaborated to develop a set of projects that are intended to act as targets for the neighbourhood portion of CIL and, where appropriate, S106 developer contributions. These projects are put forward by the local community and represent examples of locally supported projects which fulfil the policy objectives of this plan.

## SoWN's Objectives

In line with the above, SoWN's objectives are more particularly to:

- ensure there is local input into S106 agreements to mitigate the immediate impact of individual developments in the neighbourhood plan area, including where such agreements can support the projects list which forms part of the plan, in line with the plan's objectives, priorities and projects;
- play a leading role with both Councils in facilitating communication between the Councils, the community and relevant local bodies in reaching agreement on the expenditure of S106 funds and other funding to ensure that consensus is secured locally and the Councils have a clear single point of contact and information.

## Implementation and Future Policy Changes

SoWN is aware that projects and programmes will evolve, priorities will change, and costs and the flow of funding will fluctuate, meaning that mechanisms will be required for SoWN to update and reprioritise plan aspirations and secure local consensus to the outcomes of this process on at least a bi-annual basis, including where appropriate securing agreement from other neighbourhood fora in the vicinity.

SoWN will continue to maintain a Planning Gain Group, which will include ward councillors from both Councils to work with those Councils to review the projects list in this neighbourhood plan, as the list is updated and/or listed projects are implemented.

SoWN intends to work actively with the Councils and other bodies in identifying, pursuing and securing all other sources of funding available to secure the implementation and delivery of the Neighbourhood Plans' projects and priorities.

General		Timing		Cost		Who?	How?	Where?			
Project reference	Project	Capital or revenue	Project description	Start	Finish	Overview	Estimated total cost of project over total plan period	CL funding sought	Lead (and other delivery partners)	Delivery mechanism / funding sources	
<b>Green infrastructure, open space &amp; air quality</b>											
P11	Mounding Spaces	Revenue	Management and maintenance of existing green and open spaces including Waterloo Millennium Green, Jubilee Gardens, Herfields Green and Bernie Sporn Gardens	2018	-	-	£500k	£250k p.a.	A range of delivery partners	CL / Grants	See projects description
P12	Green Infrastructure	Capital	Identify and implement opportunities for implementation of green infrastructure, permeable paving, green walls, rain gardens, initiatives to reduce air quality impact from idling motorised vehicles	2018	2019	1 year	200k	100k	SOVNI	CL / GLA / EU / BID levy	Plan area (selected sites)
P13	Air quality improvement	Revenue	Initiatives to reduce air quality impact from idling motorised vehicles	2018	2020	2 years	50k	50k	SOVNI	CL / GLA / EU / BID levy	Plan area (problem sites)
P14	Greenways	Both	Create network of pedestrian routes which receive particular investment to encourage walking	2020	2025	5 years	2m	2m	SOVNI (plus design team, TL, Boroughs and BIDs)	CL / LIP / GLA	Comwall Road / Hercules Road / Herfields / Spine Route / Corliss Lane
<b>Housing &amp; retail</b>											
P15	Affordable housing in high streets	Capital	Use CL to purchase 2 buildings in Lower Marsh, enabling retail environment to be controlled and providing low cost housing above. Buildings managed through Trust	2018	2026	8 years	4m	4m	SOVNI, CIT with housing assoc partner	CL / Investment / Grants	Lower Marsh / Westminster Bridge Road / The Cut / Waterloo Road / Waterloo Road / Lambeth Road
P16	Community Development Trust	Revenue	Community Development Trust to oversee development and management of affordable housing and retail. Self funded in five years	2018	2023	5 years	800k	800k	SOVNI, CIT with housing assoc partner	CL / Investment / Grants	Plan area
P17	Retail improvement loans	Capital	CL to be used as development loan (e.g. for heritage improvements to shopsfronts, expansion of online offer or improvements which benefit the collective offer)	2018	2021	3 years	200k	200k	SOVNI	CL / GLA / EU / BID levy / Grants	Lower Marsh and selected other sites
P18	Cloud based WiFi	Revenue	Free cloud based WiFi in South Bank and Waterloo to draw customers, fibre optic for shops and offices	2018	2020	2 years	100k	100k	BIDs	CL	Lower Marsh / The Cut / Waterloo Road
<b>Social infrastructure</b>											
P19	Waterloo Action Centre Improvements	Capital	Contribution towards Waterloo Action Centre capital scheme	2018	2020	2 years	1m	800k	WAC	CL / Grants	WAC
P110	The Bridge at Waterloo Improvements	Capital	Contribution towards The Bridge at Waterloo capital Scheme	2017	2019	2 years	2m	1m	St Johns	CL / Grants / S106	St Johns Church
P111	Living Space Improvements	Capital	Contribution towards Living Space playground and pitches capital improvements	2018	2020	2 years	300k	200k	London Borough of Lambeth	CL / Grants	Living Space
P112	Community Chest Grants	Revenue	Provide social cooking facilities, amateur performance and rehearsal spaces for use by local people, residents food growing and shopfront improvements	2018	2023	5 years	250k	250k	SOVNI / WdCOCO	CL	Plan area
P113	Health centre	Capital	Provide health centre to cater for catchment population of 12,000, providing 12/14 consulting rooms (to CQC standards) 4 treatment rooms as well as additional waiting room space	2019	2022	3 years	Unknown	Unknown	NHS Trust	CL / Grants	TBC
<b>Streetscape &amp; transport</b>											
P114	Streetscapes design guidance	Capital	Design guidelines setting out how network of streets should be designed for different modes.	2018	2019	1 year	10k	10k	SOVNI (plus design team, TL, Boroughs and BIDs)	CL	Plan area
P115	Street monitoring sensors	Both	Network of sensors generating information which must be used by developers to generate information for planning applications (e.g. traffic, footfall figures, wind, light, air quality etc)	2019	2024	5 years	300k	300k	SOVNI (plus design team, TL, Boroughs and BIDs)	CL / LIP / GLA	Core South Bank
P116	Traffic reduction grants	Revenue	Improve servicing arrangements to professional operations and reduce local traffic (e.g. local freight consolidation centre with distribution from electric vehicles)	2018	2021	3 years	200k	100k	SOVNI	CL	Core South Bank
P117	Monitoring enforcement and maintenance	Revenue	Local management, maintenance and enforcement regime across all themes via a team of monitors and delivery officers	2018	2021	3 years	300k	150k	SOVNI (and BIDs)	CL / BID levy	Core South Bank
P118	Spine Route	Capital	Redesign and provision of new streetscape at Upper Ground and Belvedere Road	2019	2022	3 years	4m	2m	SBEFG	CL / BID Levy / Private Investment / Grant	Core South Bank

# Appendices

# Appendix 1.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for P1 – P6 : Green infrastructure, open space and air quality

According to the consultation, open and green space is highly valued in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood and many people are concerned that development – and particularly high rise development without private gardens or balconies – creates pressure on these amenities. Many thought that more open space was urgently needed.

The neighbourhood does not, by official measures, suffer from a shortage of open space. However, the methodology – square metres per capita of residents – does not take into account the large numbers of commuters, tourists and local workers who create substantial pressure on the area's open spaces. The Lambeth Open Space Strategy 2013 states that in 2011 there was unrestricted open space provision of 1.49 hectares per 1,000 people, although this is spread unevenly and particularly limited in the northern part of the borough, where the Neighbourhood Plan area is located.<sup>5</sup>

The net amount of publicly accessible open space in the area has been reduced through development and though Lambeth and Southwark policy resists its loss, this has not always been effectively enforced via the Planning system. Local people believe that there are limited opportunities to create more green open space in the area, including for example via an extension of Jubilee Gardens.

Greater local autonomy in the management and maintenance of parks and open spaces is both an opportunity and an inevitability as local authority cost savings are made. Local authorities have a responsibility to consider carefully the conditions under which the disposal of these assets into the hands of the community will be undertaken.


The Thames is also recognised locally as a valuable open space asset, with its fringes offering vistas and space which can be used both for relaxation and at different times also for culture and excitement. These uses should be preserved in balance.

The Neighbourhood Plan's definition of Open Space is taken from Lambeth's Local Plan (9.1), which goes further than Southwark's by including publicly accessible spaces such as communal squares, of which there are several in the neighbourhood area, such as the White House Garden, Forum Magnum Square, Emma Cons Garden and King's Plaza. Lambeth's definition specifies open space as:

Metropolitan Open Land, common land, historic parks and gardens, district and local parks, nature conservation areas, play areas and adventure playgrounds, outdoor sports facilities, allotments, cemeteries and burial space, amenity land within housing estates, communal squares and gardens and the River Thames Foreshore and Thames Path in accordance with London Plan policy.

## Air Quality

Parts of the road network of South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood are highly polluted, and levels of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM10s and PM2.5s (key particulates which contribute to air pollution) and their potential to affect the health of local people are exacerbated by unique factors, including the high number of buses, including the bus garage on Cornwall Road, idling taxis in large numbers around Waterloo Station, coaches on the South Bank and dust from construction and elevated railway infrastructure.



The above snapshot is taken from a system developed by King's College London's Air Quality Unit. This models air quality across central London and regularly demonstrates pollution to exceed legal limits.

On 5th October 2015, a team of volunteers from South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours worked with King's College to collect evidence to support policy P20, which seeks special protections for certain back streets in the neighbourhood area, designed to create low pollution walking routes ('Greenways') and provide opportunities for pedestrians to reduce their exposure.

Volunteers measured pollution levels on a range of streets in the neighbourhood area, including those earmarked for designation as 'Greenways.' The experiment supported King's College data demonstrating that in some cases, back streets were 50-60% less polluted than parallel main streets.

Therefore, measures that reduce exposure to pollution are to be introduced alongside those that aim to improve air quality, such as guidance on use of particular materials, installation of green infrastructure, traffic reduction and incentives for behaviour change.

# Appendix 2.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P7 : Housing

South Bank and Waterloo, like the rest of central London, is subject to market forces that are drastically reducing the availability of housing. This was seen as inevitable by many respondents during the consultation and the power of the neighbourhood plan to address these regional issues was accepted as limited. However, local plans and neighbourhood plans are making attempts to develop policy in this area.

South Bank and Waterloo is unusual in comparison with most central London districts because the demographic is enduringly mixed. According to the ONS (2011) Census, 40% of the housing stock remains as social rented:

Tenure	Number
Owned	962
Social rented	1908
Private rented	1549

This includes a prevalence of co-operative and housing association housing in the neighbourhood, including the Coin Street Co-ops, Edward Henry Housing Co-op, New Cut Housing Co-op, Pearman Street Co-op, Peabody, Metropolitan Housing Trust and others. Security of tenure varies but has tended over time toward the less secure. For instance, the sale of Church Commissioners estate to Grainger in 2005/6 resulted in a move away from assured tenancies to assured shorthold tenancies or private sale.

If implemented, the extension of the Right to Buy to housing association tenants and the associated requirement for the disposal of Local Authorities' high value housing to fund the purchase discount is likely to affect Waterloo more deeply than elsewhere in Lambeth and Southwark. This will result in fewer Council or Housing Association homes, but co-op homes will not be affected by the change.

Some affordable housing will be delivered through new development, including at Lollard Street and Leake Street, in association with the Shell/Braeburn and Elizabeth House developments respectively. Extra care housing for the elderly will be provided on the Braeburn site, with a similar scheme earmarked for Gabriel's Wharf.

Sites such as the Guy's and St Thomas' Charity owned Royal Street and the Bourne Capital owned Triangle Site identified in Lambeth's Local Plan are also likely to include a significant housing element, including affordable housing.

In any case, local people, supported by evidence have raised concerns about the likely cost of affordable units where they are let at 80% of market level rents. According to Valuation Office figures cited in an article in **The Guardian** newspaper in February 2014,<sup>6</sup> renting an affordable two bedroom flat in the Elephant and Castle would require a salary of £44,000, 30% higher than the London median average salary of £30,460.<sup>6</sup>

The affordability issue is more pronounced among certain groups that are increasingly under-represented in central London neighbourhoods such as South Bank & Waterloo. These include those who work in retail, hospitality and healthcare locally, where employers are finding recruitment and retention increasingly difficult where staff cannot afford to live within practical reach of their workplace.<sup>7</sup>

Also, the consultation showed that whilst not demographically underrepresented in the area, housing which is specifically designed for older people is needed. As the local population ages, there are few housing schemes which allow the elderly to remain in the community, and though two are planned, evidence suggests that there is likely to be a demand for further such accommodation.<sup>8</sup> For the 'ambulant elderly', smaller flats in which to downsize are to be encouraged which both frees up family sized housing in the area and allows older people to remain connected to their community. Consultation evidence suggests that retirees are increasingly moving back to the city for its proximity to culture and healthcare, and the local economy would benefit from such residents.

The final group local people believe should have access to housing in the area is young professionals. In particular, and continuing the theme of cooperatives, housing which is designed to increase communality, particularly between young professionals and the elderly would be welcomed.

Although the methods for building housing to meet the needs of such groups are limited, the policy approaches below reflect the intentions of the neighbourhood plan in seeing a range of housing delivered. SoWN envisages a local role in the delivery and particularly the management of housing to meet the ambitions of the Plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2014/feb/03/affordable-housing-meaning-rent-social-housing>

<sup>7</sup> 2012 Figures, ONS.

<sup>8</sup> paragraph 4.2.1, page 67 refers to whether lower paid service sector will be sustainable in light of escalating housing costs, and paragraph 8.7 refers to assisting low-middle income households, not limited to key workers

<sup>9</sup> Paragraph 4.1.1, page 62 and paragraph 8.2, page 97

# Appendix 3.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P8, P9 : Development management

The South Bank & Waterloo neighbourhood is a mayoral opportunity area and intensification is Planned both in terms of housing and office space over the next decade. There are also increasing numbers of hotels being built in the area.<sup>10</sup>

Local views on issues relating to development management reflect an understanding both that some development in the area is inevitable, and that neighbourhood Planning cannot be a tool for resisting it. Campaigns catalysed by Waterloo Community Development Group and others have been effective where development is seen as excessive or under-consulted upon.

During the initial consultation, businesses and residents agreed that the impact of development was a key issue. In the next decade quality of life and business as usual will inevitably be affected by a number of major developments and public realm projects.

30% of the respondents to the pre-submission consultation disagreed with the Plan's conditional support for the creation of further hotels in the area and hotels were regularly raised in comments as an area of concern. Perceived negative impacts were thought to be:

- Loss of other uses, such as residential (or office)
- Proliferation encourages local retailers to change their target demographic, reducing shopping amenities for local residents
- The perception that local residents are not benefited by hotels, or that hotels are not welcoming to locals. That they do not provide 'active' street frontage, or contribute to the life of the high street.
- That their proliferation has disproportionate impact on amenities such as walk in centres, or causes additional burden for public services such as street cleaning etc.
- Design tends to reduce the possibility of green open space
- Taxi and coach pick up and drop off exacerbates local pollution

There is anecdotal evidence of a lack of coordination at planning stage which has led to major projects on adjacent sites being consented, and subsequently developed at the same time. This has led to excessive and protracted noise, dust, road closures, diversions and damage to streets. In the South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood it will be particularly necessary to ensure that the above schemes are effectively coordinated to protect the interests of local residents and businesses, with joint strategies dealing with wayfinding, measurement of impact, messaging and information, safety, and access.

The Our South Bank website ([www.oursouthbank.com](http://www.oursouthbank.com)) and Construction Logistics Group are a positive start to dealing with many of these issues, but further resources will be required as development ramps up, and a commitment at planning stage to ensure that developers participate in the process. Construction logistics Plans should furthermore adhere to Transport for London guidance.<sup>11</sup>

A lack of or inconsistency in consultation was viewed as a key issue and although planning policy cannot dictate consultation processes, the guidance for local authorities and developers which reflects local ambitions in this area is included in the plan. A local mechanism to scrutinise major applications as early as possible has been posited. This would enable a consistent dialogue between the community, the developer and the planning authority which should reduce the likelihood of objections. It would also allow local people to have a say in CIL and Section 106 allocations against the list of projects set out in the neighbourhood Plan.

<sup>10</sup> The report "Hotels and Other Visitor Accommodation in Lambeth 2013 (May 2013)", pages 2-5 states that there were 3,711 rooms, and a further 1,666 in the Planning pipeline at the date of the report. Including additional rooms already built, if all of the permissions were built out, there would be 1,100 more hotel rooms than the London Plan target of 2,000 additional rooms between 2007-2026. There have been a range of consented applications in the plan area in recent years which have permitted change of use from either office or residential. These include Partnership House, Waterloo Road; 100-108 Waterloo Road, Park Plaza Westminster Bridge, Park Plaza County Hall and Park Plaza Waterloo, Marlin Apartments Westminster Bridge Road, Holiday Inn Waterloo, Novotel Waterloo and H10 Waterloo.

<sup>11</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/construction-logistics-plan-guidance-for-developers.pdf>

# Appendix 4.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P10, P11, P12, P13 : Retail & work

The problem of retail in the area is closely linked with the change in demographic and lifestyles. The fortunes of Lower Marsh were traditionally linked with residents' use of the market for daily grocery shopping and local office workers taking lunch in its cafes. Such habits are no longer sufficient to sustain high street operations and so local independents are adapting to thrive.

As outlined in national studies of the changing nature of high streets in recent years, the South Bank and Waterloo retail community will need to redefine the offer to move ahead. The Waterloo Retail Study<sup>12</sup> identifies opportunities to create a retail centre with the redevelopment of Waterloo Station and the 'triangle site' opposite. If sufficient supply of modern new units is created to enable multiples to proliferate on Waterloo Road and in the Station itself, the unique but separate shopping environments of Lower Marsh will face less pressure from high rents, which lead to the loss of independents.

Local people support the addition of a supermarket in the right location, and being able to shop locally would help to sustain low car ownership levels in the area.

Planning legislation does not permit councils to dictate the operator of a business, only the nature of the operation, as set out in a list of Use Classes. Banks and estate agents are represented by the same Use Class, as are chain supermarkets and independent clothes shops – for this reason it is not possible through planning policy to prevent a situation which occurred on Waterloo Road in which a Sainsbury's Local, Tesco Metro and M&S Simply Food are situated immediately adjacent to one another.

Additionally, a large majority of the available units are in private ownership and the landlord is the sole determinant of the tenant that leases them. In many cases the landlord will accept the operator who will pay the highest rent. It is only in cases such as Marylebone High Street, where a single landowner – the Howard de Walden Estate – is able to 'curate' the high street offer, choosing a mix of operators to suit a range of needs.

---

<sup>12</sup> Waterloo Retail Study, The Retail Group 2015

Although it is recognised that the forces of supply and demand drive retail, local people hope that the plan can help to create the conditions to encourage both young start-up businesses and which serve the needs of residents.

Approaches to solving this problem are found in the guidance and projects the neighbourhood forum has developed. The first of these is for a local consortium to purchase one or more buildings for the benefit of the community. Run as social enterprises, these operations will:

- a. Meet local need not currently met by the market (e.g. a community owned launderette)
- b. Provide jobs and volunteer opportunities for local people
- c. Provide genuinely affordable housing above retail units<sup>13</sup>

The second of these is to set up a local retail trust which acts as a low cost lettings agency for participating landlords, providing an agreed rental yield and resulting in a more balanced offer for the neighbourhood. A local trust could also contribute to identifying temporary lessees, pop ups and university spin off businesses in unlet new units.<sup>14</sup>

The final issue raised in the retail working group is that of the severe lack of office space.<sup>15</sup> The group advanced policy that committed to supporting the council in its protection of any further losses, particularly of affordable or mid-range office space. In addition, opportunities to create new offices should be taken up, with units in railway arches on Wootton Street providing a good example and where potential exists for more such development.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Paragraph 5.15 of the "London Borough of Lambeth Retail and Town Centre Needs Assessment" states that in some parts of Central London where small shops are in short supply and affordability is a key concern, a policy requiring Planning contributions to provide or support affordable shop units for small or independent retailers may be appropriate

<sup>14</sup> Page 113 of the "London Borough of Lambeth Retail and Town Centre Needs Assessment" reports on the Portas Review, which recommended the provision of low-cost temporary space

<sup>15</sup> Paragraph 4.5 of the "Employment Land Review 2013" states that a number of surveys found "the limited availability of employment land and premises is seen as a key constraint in stimulating new investment." Paragraph 6.38 states that "it will also be important that other parts of the Borough away from the Opportunity Areas provide accommodation that is flexible and affordable and meets the needs of SMEs" – unhelpful as the NP area is an <http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/EmploymentLandReview2013.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Paragraph 2.11 of the Waterloo Area SPD states that "smaller businesses and social enterprises will be encouraged. Many railway arches have already been converted to provide for small business use, and there are still many opportunities, particularly in the south of the SPD area." [http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pl-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013\\_0.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pl-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013_0.pdf)

# Appendix 5.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policies P14, P15 : Social infrastructure & culture

The strong traditions of mutual support, crucial to survival in Waterloo in the poverty stricken 18th and 19th centuries, were carried forward in the 1970s into the development of more formalised community organisations. These resident led initiatives brought enormous improvements including in housing, community facilities and open spaces. They also helped carry forward the sense of community into a changing world. Both the tradition of involvement and the “village” atmosphere generated are much priced aspects of life in Waterloo. An atmosphere we intend to continue through the plan.

Leake Street has been recognised as an area with cultural potential as a designated graffiti area, and which could be enhanced as a pedestrian and cycle route, and to provide new uses within its arches.<sup>17</sup> Although it is necessary to protect the current graffiti use, some local people believe that improvements can be made which allow other uses to proliferate alongside, as long as they are sensitive to the need to protect street art.

Social infrastructure is mapped by SoWN overleaf, contributing to further understanding of the extent of delivery of services. There are a range of community assets - small tenants and residents association meeting spaces, health centres and doctors’ surgeries, churches, sports facilities, public buildings and community centres. In the Waterloo Area SPD the London Borough of Lambeth stated that all communities would benefit from improved social infrastructure.<sup>18</sup>

A strategy will be developed by SoWN which :

- a. Maps the physical assets available for the delivery of social infrastructure and the types of services delivered in each
- b. Identifies gaps in service provision, according to local need
- c. Makes recommendations of how the community groups might rationalise delivery, reducing the need to compete for funding.

---

<sup>17</sup> Waterloo Area SPD (April 2013) paragraph 4.15 and 5.18  
[http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pi-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013\\_0.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pi-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013_0.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Waterloo Area SPD (April 2013) paragraph 1.10  
[http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pi-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013\\_0.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pi-Waterloo%20Area%20SPD%20-%20Adopted%202013_0.pdf)



Colour	Type of Infrastructure
	<b>Places of worship</b>
	(NB Almost all the places of worship have spaces also used for other activities)
	CoE – Parish of Waterloo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St John's Waterloo Road</li> <li>• St Andrew's, Short Street</li> </ul>
	RC – St George's Cathedral, St George's Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Patrick's, Cornwall Road</li> <li>• Friary on Whittlesey Street (associated with St Patrick's)</li> </ul>
	Oasis Church, 1 Kennington Road
	The following churches worship in WAC (Community Centre) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Divine Word of God</li> <li>• Ensemble Pour Christ</li> <li>• Glorious Faith Ministries</li> <li>• Christian Hope Church</li> <li>• International Breakthrough Ministries</li> <li>• Apostolic Evangelical Ministry</li> <li>• Impact Evangelical Ministry</li> <li>• Door of Faith to the Nations Ministries</li> </ul>
	<b>Schools</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• London Nautical School, Stamford Street</li> <li>• Oasis Academy Joanna School, Lower Marsh</li> <li>• Oasis South Bank Academy, 75 Westminster Bridge Road</li> <li>• St George's RC Primary School</li> </ul>
	<b>Colleges / Adult Learning</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morley College, Westminster</li> <li>• Waterloo Campus of Kings College London, Stamford Street &amp; Waterloo Road</li> <li>• EF International Language Centre, 84 Roupell Street</li> <li>• DDL College, 199 Westminster Bridge Road, Independent 6th Form education</li> <li>• BPP Professional Education, 137 Stamford St, Business School</li> </ul>
	<b>Libraries</b>
	Public Library – Lower Marsh to be closed about June 2016 and moved to a temporary site at Oasis Academy, Kennington Rd. then Planned that a new Public Library be built on Joanna Oasis School, Lower Marsh
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feminist Library, 5 Westminster Bridge Road</li> <li>• Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth Palace Road</li> <li>• The Poetry Library, Royal Festival Hall</li> <li>• The BFI Reuben Library, British Film Institute</li> <li>• Centre for Literacy in Primary Education, Webber St Books and other materials to support professionals engaged in teaching reading.</li> </ul>

Colour	Type of Infrastructure
	<b>Community Centres</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterloo Action Centre, Baylis Road</li> <li>• Coin St Neighbourhood Centre and Conference Centre</li> </ul>
	<b>Children and Young People</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Co-operative Child Care Day Nursery, 21 Frazier Street</li> <li>• Day Nursery and other children's activities and family support, Coin St Neighbourhood Centre</li> <li>• St Patrick's Montessori Nursery School, 91 Cornwall Road</li> <li>• Living Space and Play Space, Waterloo Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– activities for children and young people run by Blackfriars Settlement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SEI United. Youth organisation based in Royal Festival Hall</li> <li>• Oasis Hub, Westminster Bridge Rd, activities for children and young people</li> </ul>
	<b>Tenants and Housing Co-op Halls</b>
	<p>The following have small community halls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edward Henry Co-op</li> <li>• The Cut Housing Co-op</li> <li>• Chaplin Close Sheltered Housing</li> <li>• Peabody, Duchy Street</li> <li>• Briant Estate</li> <li>• Dodson Estate</li> <li>• Wellington Mills</li> </ul>
	<b>Waterloo Job Shop, Lower Marsh</b>
	<b>Health Resources (SoWN area)</b>
	<b>Hospitals</b>
	St Thomas' Hospital, Westminster Bridge Rd – Evelina Children's Hospital These are both part of Guys and St Thomas's NHS Trust
	<b>GP Surgeries (NHS)</b> Waterloo Health Centre, Lower Marsh Nearby and used by many residents in SoWN area
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blackfriars Group Practice, Colombo Street</li> <li>• Lambeth Towers Group Practice, Lambeth</li> <li>• Prince's Group Practice, Prince's Street</li> </ul>
	Private Health Walk in – Occupation Health, Lower Marsh
	Ambulance Station, Waterloo Road
	Opticians – Opticalise, 33 Lower Marsh
	<b>Dentists</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tooth Dental Care, 26 Lower Marsh</li> <li>• Waterloo Dental Surgery, 223 Waterloo Road</li> <li>• Smileright, 268 Waterloo Road</li> <li>• SEI Dental Care, 52 Kennington Road</li> <li>• South Bank Dentists Riverside Building, County Hall, Westminster Bridge Road</li> </ul>
	<b>Counselling</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterloo Community Counselling, Barley Mow Clinic, Greet House, Frazier Street</li> </ul>

# Appendix 6.

## Summary of results of consultation and evidence for Policy P16 : Streetscape & transport

The condition and management of the streetscape was the issue most commented on by the public during the consultation. Reflected in the consultation were serious concerns about the neighbourhood's ability to sustain the numbers of people which currently pass through the area using different modes of transport.

Although the neighbourhood faces similar problems to the rest of central London, certain factors ensure that the area is busy for longer intervals than it is in similar locations. Railway infrastructure, 60s elevated walkways and subways, small Victorian streets and large buildings impeding pedestrian movement; the transport interchange contributes to large numbers of buses, taxis, pedestrians and cycles, congesting roads and pavements; and the office, tourist and night time economies attract large numbers of people at different times.

In appropriate parts of the neighbourhood, streets and public spaces of South Bank & Waterloo are an opportunity for animation, for culture and supporting the local retail economy.

# Appendix 7. Area data.

## Residents


The South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood has a resident population of 9,656 which represents 0.12% of the total London resident population of 8,258,993. The resident population is 47.9% female and 52.1% male.

## Age

The mean age of the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood area population is 35 years compared to a mean age of 36 years for residents in the whole of London. The predominant age band in South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood is age 30 to 44 which represents 25.14% of the population.

## Age Structure


Source : Census 2011



### Ethnicity

The largest ethnic group is 'White' representing 59% of the neighbourhood area's population, comparable with London and the rest of the country. The second largest ethnic group is 'Asian/ Asian British' with 18% of the neighbourhood area's population.

The ethnicity split of South Bank and Waterloo's residents is shown as follows;




### Households

South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood area has 4,554 households, which represents 0.14% of London's 3,281,973 households. The household split by tenure is shown below.

The largest number of households lives in 'Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency' accommodation with 30% of the area's households. That compares with 24% for the local authorities of Lambeth and Southwark, 15% for London region and 14% for the whole of England.

The Neighbourhood area has 319 households with dependent children aged 0 to 4, representing 7% of the area's households. 721 or 16% of the households in the Neighbourhood area have 'Dependent children in household' of any age.



## Employment

The following chart provides a breakdown of the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood by socio-economic classification for all residents aged 16 –74.

The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) provides an indication of socio-economic position based on occupation. It is an Office for National Statistics standard classification. To assign a person to a category their occupation title is combined with information about their employment status, whether they are employed or self-employed, and whether or not they supervise other employees.

The largest group is 'Lower managerial, administrative and professional occupations' representing 20.35% of the neighbourhood area's population, and other well represented categories are higher managerial, administrative and professional' and 'not classified'. This latter category includes full time students and economically inactive people.



### Residents by NS-Sec (count)

	NS-Sec: Higher managerial, administrative and professional	<b>1522</b>
	HNS-Sec: Lower managerial, administrative and professional	<b>1965</b>
	NS-Sec: Intermediate	<b>693</b>
	NS-Sec: Small employers and own account workers	<b>474</b>
	NS-Sec: Lower supervisory and technical	<b>344</b>
	NS-Sec: Semi-routine occupations	<b>650</b>
	NS-Sec: Routine occupations	<b>492</b>
	NS-Sec: Never worked and long-term unemployed	<b>468</b>
	NS-Sec: Not classified	<b>1644</b>

### Education

The resident population is much more highly qualified than the England average.

43% of South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood's residents have level 4 qualifications and above compared to 27% in England as a whole. This category comprises qualifications from Certificate of Higher education to Doctorate. At the other extreme, 13% of the area's residents have no qualifications compared to 22% in England.




**Residents by educational qualifications (count)**

No qualifications	1165
Apprenticeship	67
Level 1 qualifications	656
Level 2 qualifications	711
Level 3 qualifications	1159
Level 4 qualifications and above	4153
Other qualifications	667

### Health

South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood has 319 (3.3%) residents that report being in bad health and 112 (1.2%) residents that report being in very bad health.



**Residents by level of health (count)**

Very good health	5160
Good health	3094
Fair health	971
Bad health	319
Very bad health	112

# Appendix 8. Listening Phase Consultation Report.

April - July 2014

## Executive Summary

### Consultation

Between April and June, South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN) undertook the second phase of the process of developing a neighbourhood plan. This 'listening phase' was a wide-ranging consultation to determine the general issues that local residents and employees wanted to see addressed in the plan.

Ideas for the themes for the plan were collected in:

- a. Walking tours of the area
- b. Debates
- c. Local meetings, events and a school assembly
- d. Market stall on Saturdays in Lower Marsh
- e. Online activity

### Themes

The themes which have emerged through engagement are:

- Streetscape and transport
- Development and housing
- Social infrastructure
- Retail
- Green infrastructure and air quality

### Next steps

The SoWN steering group will be asked to consider the outcome of the consultation and ratify the themes for the Plan. Following this, the next steps are:

#### August 2014

Members will be invited to form sub-groups to develop a set of objectives around each theme.

#### September 2014

Once these objectives are agreed, they will be tested to see if the community agrees with them at a series of events around September/October.

#### November 2014

Following this, we will need to start writing formal policy for the plan and this will involve inviting input from planning policy professionals in conjunction with Lambeth and Southwark Councils

The plan will then be further consulted upon, go through an independent examination and then a local referendum will be held.

South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN) are a group of 400 local residents and employees who have been formally designated to develop a neighbourhood Plan under the Localism Act. The South Bank & Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan will describe local aspirations for the development of the area over the next decade and will include a target list of improvements to be funded via developer contributions. Following an independent examination to ensure legal conformity, the Plan will be subject to a referendum of businesses and residents and subject to a positive result, will form part of Lambeth and Southwark's Core Strategy.

Local people have elected to prepare the plan because of the unique pressures the neighbourhood faces. A community of 10,000 resides in an area that hosts 25m visitors a year, the UK's busiest railway station which brings an annual 40m commuters into the local public realm, a hospital, university, cultural institutions and business headquarters. Unprecedented development in the next 20 years will compound the pressure on this part of central London and in a climate of diminishing public resources a locally-tailored approach must be developed to manage both the problems and opportunities.

Many of the issues above are reflected in the wide ranging consultation SoWN ran in early summer 2014, which is the subject of this report.

## 1. Introduction and purpose of the report

This report summarises the South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN) Neighbourhood Plan development process. The purpose of the different phases is set out below in the context of the wider programme:

Timescale	Milestone	Purpose
April 2013 – March 2014	Development of forum and designations of forum and area by Lambeth and Southwark	Establish governance arrangements, build members support and gain legal designation
April 2013 – July 2014	Listening phase	Events and discussions to harvest information about general issues affecting the future of the neighbourhood
July 2013 – Aug 2014	Distilling phase	Distillation of key issues into a set of themes around which sub-groups will form and develop policy
Aug 2014 – Oct 2014	Objectives testing phase	Development of objectives and testing in wider community
Oct 2014 – Dec 2015	Policy writing	

The Listening Phase was agreed in a full forum meeting of the South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours on 9 April 2014. A series of events, walks and other consultations were proposed which are summarised overleaf.

## 'Listening Phase' consultation activity

The SoWN team had direct contact with 989 people during the listening phase engagement (excluding contact via newsletters, email updates and publicity) and this provided an opportunity to understand the key issues concerning those living and working in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood. 405 'burning issues' were collected which are summarised in Section 3.

Engagement activity comprised the following:

- i. Walks and debates – direct engagement
  - 10 May, 2pm - 4pm, **Developments in South Bank & Waterloo: South Bank**, area walk and debate. 28 Participants
  - 13 May, 6pm – 7:30pm, Debate: **Is South Bank and Waterloo changing for the better or worse?** 32 participants
  - 21 May, 6pm – 7:30pm, **Development in South Bank & Waterloo: Blackfriars Road**, area walk and debate. 20 participants
  - 14 June, 2pm – 4pm, **Outer spaces in South Bank and Waterloo: South Bank** area walk and debate. 24 participants
  - 18 June, 5:30 – 7:30pm, **Outer spaces in South Bank and Waterloo: Lambeth Road**, area walk and debate. 19 participants
  - 26 June, 6:00 – 9:00pm, Debate: **The role of arts, culture and heritage in building a community (and closing reception)**. 24 participants

## Total participants 147

- ii. Other events and meetings – direct engagement
  - 10 December, 2013 exercise at Christmas event – engaged with 60 people
  - 23 April Waterloo Sights and Sounds – engaged with 7 people
  - 29 April South Bank Partnership – engaged with 34 people
  - 6 May, Oasis School Assembly – engaged with 50 people
  - 8 May, Waterloo Open Spaces Partnership – engaged with 8 people
  - 10 May, St John's Church Planning group – engaged with 30 people
  - 17 May, Peabody Blackfriars Road fete – engaged with 20 people
  - 19 May South Bank Employers' Group Board – engaged with 16 people
  - 22 May, Waterloo Steering Group – engaged with 15 people
  - 5 June, South Bank Forum – engaged with 124 people
  - 9 June and 23 June, Oasis UK – engaged with 5 people
  - 11 June, Ben Kind, Bishop's Ward Councillor
  - 12 June, Hatch Row and Edward Henry Co-op discussion – engaged with 4 people
  - 13 June, Waterloo Strategic Forum – engaged with 30 people
  - 23 June, Cllr Jennie Mosley, Bishop's Ward Councillor
  - 28 June, St John's Festival – engaged with 30 people
  - 4 July, Waterloo Carnival – engaged with 15 people

## Total participants 450

iii. Lower Marsh Market Stall – direct engagement

- May 17 – engaged with 75 people
- May 31 – engaged with 75 people
- June 7 – engaged with 50 people

### **Total participants 200**

iv. Online activity

- SoWNeighbours website – 6 comments left
- Twitter 192 followers and 433 tweets sent

## **2. Summary of findings**

As can be seen above, information was collected in a variety of ways to ensure many people could contribute. Extensive notes were taken at walks and debates to record the discussion, and a board was provided on which both questions and issues could be written on post-it notes and attached.

The market stall also employed the boards and an electronic schedule of comments was updated after each day. The stall also featured a 'heat map' on which local people were encouraged to record the places they lived, enjoyed and disliked. Responses were recorded and encoded for analysis.

### **' Burning issues '**

The SoWN steering group agreed that in order to ensure the early process of engagement was as accessible as possible, a simple and standardised method should be adopted. It was decided that local people should be asked to name their 'three burning issues' facing the future of the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood. This was also a simple message to deliver and SoWN volunteers were able to ask neighbours, workers their colleagues and tenants and residents associations could discuss the issues they wished to include.




Responses were both general and specific but ranged across a number of subjects. An additional layer of complexity was added where the discussion was more in-depth. Participants were asked:

1. What do you value about South Bank and Waterloo and want to PRESERVE
2. What do you want to CHANGE about South Bank and Waterloo
3. What do you want to ADD to South Bank and Waterloo to improve its future

Over 440 'burning issues' were recorded over the listening phase period, and these are summarised in Appendix 1. An analysis of the themes they addressed was undertaken and these are summarised overleaf.

The responses fitted into the following broad themes: streetscape and transport issues, development and housing, retail, community facilities, social infrastructure, green infrastructure (e.g. open space/ trees) and air quality, and a small number of other issues.

## Burning issues split by theme and ordered by volume of responses



## Summary of 'burning issues' raised during the listening phase

### Streetscape and transport

- Concerns about the way the area is managed and maintained - litter, dog mess, and maintenance around railway tunnels
- Concerns about road safety (particularly among children) with calls for slower traffic
- Concerns about the domination of the car and suggestions that the streetscape should be redesigned with pedestrians and cyclists in mind
- Need for better vehicular access to local streets and better enforced residents parking
- Improvements to the bus network
- Suggestions for the improvement of specific sites (e.g. Westminster Bridge Road, Waterloo Road, IMAX subways, Lambeth North, Blackfriars Road)

### Development and housing

- Concerns about size, height and scale of development in the area
- Particular opposition to development of a large number of hotels – perception that they add little to the community
- Concern about balance of housing provision - too much private and not enough social, affordable or affordable rent, sheltered, coop housing etc

- Concerns about the size of units and particularly the lack of family sized housing
- Concerns about the disruption of construction and need for coordinated management
- Suggestions for the development of specific sites

#### Retail

- Concerns that there is not enough retail of the right mix, balanced between the needs of tourists, commuters, residents and workers
- Concerns that rent rises and gentrification are giving rise to loss of independents in favour of chains
- Demand for specific provision such as a supermarket or launderette

#### Social infrastructure

- Provision should respond to demand from increasing population. In order by volume, the requests were for schools, sport and leisure, play-space, community spaces, a swimming pool, improved library facilities, GP, provision for families and older children and public toilets
- Concerns around the balance of investment, with much being invested in tourism and little in local residents
- More should be done to reduce petty crime, begging, and street drinking/drug taking, but it is important to improve support provision for the homeless
- Care should be taken to preserve the area's diversity and community spirit – Waterloo is seen as special in this regard. Provision should ensure that all ages are catered for to ensure continuity and reduce transience
- Preservation of the area's cultural offering is vital

#### Green infrastructure and air quality

- There is demand for more green open space / pocket parks and those that currently exist should be well maintained
- Some spaces should be designed with residents rather than tourists in mind, aimed at quiet reflection or food growing
- Maintenance and provision of more street trees is important
- Anti social behaviour in parks should be reduced
- Children in particular felt that they were underprovided for
- Taxis queuing around the Station contributed to problems with air quality

#### Other

- Reduce helicopter noise
- Dispense with congestion charge for locals
- Service delivery via local mechanism funded by development
- Community should say how S106 / CIL / empty property tax is spent locally

## Walks and Debates

Conversation and debate covered many of the subjects above, with a focus on upcoming development, demographic and social shift, heritage/culture and open space/public realm. These events also considered specific sections of the neighbourhood, including Blackfriars Road, South Bank, Waterloo Station, Westminster Bridge Road and Lambeth Road.

A summary of the discussions is below, split by theme. Some of the ideas for policies for the neighbourhood Plan that emerged during the discussion are also given. Although these are only suggestions at this point, such policies will eventually make up the formal part of the neighbourhood Plan. Issues and projects which cannot be translated into Planning policy will form part of the non-strategic 'vision' section of the neighbourhood Plan.

### A Streetscape and transport

Key among concerns of local people was the compounded problem of high footfall and a public realm which is difficult to navigate. The conflict between modes (particularly walking, cycling and road traffic) was also raised on a number of occasions.

Concerns were expressed over the pace of the redevelopment of Waterloo Station, since resolving the local problems caused by this building was considered a vital piece in the puzzle. Interim measures would be needed to create physical links between different parts of the neighbourhood currently bisected by the Station, particularly between Lower Marsh and York Road. However, the many who advocated the redistribution of footfall tended to do so in support of struggling businesses south of the Station and not all agreed that such redistribution was desirable. It was hoped by some that Station undercrofts could be opened up allowing for improved movement at ground level, as well as space for retail or other uses.

A connected concern was the impact of rail infrastructure beyond the station such as viaducts and tunnels which discouraged use or impeded navigation. Westminster Bridge Road was used as an example of public realm diminished by rail infrastructure.

Participants also expressed a desire to see high quality public realm brought by new developments which improved the way the area functions: opening up new routes, providing space to dwell and animation including active frontage, retail, street trading, public art and entertainment where appropriate. For this reason, public realm proposals which some perceived to detract from the movement function – principally the Shell site's narrowing of the pavement at York Road and the removal of the podium area – were not well-supported. Management of the public realm during the construction period ahead was considered vitally important for the safety of pedestrians and to ensure the operational continuity of the area.

Commuters exiting the station and using local routes were considered by many to be a daily problem and the design of public realm should recognise and accommodate them. Pedestrian routes such as Sandell Street and Roupell Street were not appropriate for the high numbers of commuters using them and management of litter and maintenance of such streets were not adequate. In contrast, many felt that investment in the public realm was weighted towards the needs of commuters and tourists rather than residents.

Some were concerned that new development was likely to exacerbate the problem, and even created safety concerns – e.g. the impact of new hotels on overcrowding at Lambeth North Station and the immediate environs and additional footfall created by the Garden Bridge.

Some participants advocated greater use of underground space for buses, parking and other functions to reduce congestion at street level. However, others sought more residents parking and vehicular access to local streets. Streetscape design should encourage sustainable transport such as walking or cycling though many raised a conflict between the two, for instance, where cycling occurred on the riverside walkway or on pavements.

Key places to improve include):

- i / IMAX Subways and Roundabout, areas which are seen as unwelcoming and a barrier to navigation. Many recognised the problem of frequent level changes which precluded a 'street level' solution. It was suggested that a proportion of the IMAX advertising revenue might be given over to local improvements.
- ii / Waterloo Road, which was considered to be very congested, with narrow pavements, too many buses and unattractive public realm.
- iii / Blackfriars Road, which is seen as unwelcoming and underused by pedestrians but for which a broadly supported 'Blackfriars Boulevard' scheme is emerging. Concerns remain about a dominance of 'bland' retail and the potential for the Cycle Superhighway to reduce pavement width. Locals are keen to see a more 'people-friendly' St George's Circus.
- v / Westminster Bridge Road, which suffers from very poor public realm, particularly at the railway tunnel and Addington Street. It is traffic dominated and subject to large scale development which will cause pavements to become congested. There is an opportunity to provide a focal point/local identity at Lambeth North junction
- vi / Leake Street, which was generally valued by locals but could be improved both as a passage between York Road and Lower Marsh (by better lighting and cleaning) and as a potential cultural destination in its own right.
- vii / Upper Ground and Belvedere Road, seen as important for cycling and walking and the gateway to the riverside. Maintenance of the streetscape is poor and an opportunity exists to ensure developers coordinate and pool resources to invest in a joint scheme

Management and maintenance of the area was not thought to reflect the level of footfall in the area and a number of participants sought a local mechanism to manage and maintain the public realm. Cleaning, the management or reduction of street drinking and begging, maintenance of parks (particularly the disposal of items related to street drinking and drug taking) and management of litter from large events and the night time economy were all thought to be problem areas. Seating and bins should be increased, well designed and properly maintained. Places where people can linger and meet without needing to buy food or drink should be safeguarded.

It was a generally accepted principle that space should be as democratic and inclusive as possible, with anti social behaviour being managed rather than 'designed out' (e.g. seats designed to stop rough sleeping). There was disagreement on the extent of management required but some areas should be 'zoned' exclusively for specific activity (e.g. street art and skating) if carrying such activity out across the area would have the potential to impinge on others' enjoyment of the space. The South Bank should retain an element of surprise and eccentricity many thought impossible if public space was to be 'over-managed'.

### Policy ideas

- i. Generation of CIL to fund ongoing and locally run management and maintenance of the area, using London Eye S106 model
- ii. Developer contribution towards coordinated and cross borough management of neighbourhood during construction period
- iii. Development of public realm projects list linked to development
- iv. Community-led approach to cultural or public art strategies of large developments

## B Development and housing

Participants recognised that the neighbourhood is to face two decades of development and had varying reactions to this prospect, both positive and negative. Many recognised the opportunity development brought, including the potential to unlock employment opportunities or new pedestrian routes through congested areas. Others anticipated a regenerated public realm, active frontage and animation. Many stressed the need to coordinate construction during this period.

A significant number felt that the area was becoming overdeveloped and/or with the wrong type of development – tenure, type (particularly hotels and student accommodation), and size of developments being the key issues.

The concept of mixed-use development was generally supported. Many were concerned that the housing mix was inappropriately balanced. A significant number called for more social housing to be developed in the area. Affordable housing was not considered truly affordable for local people and where Waterloo was seen as an exemplar of other types of housing, particularly co-ops, debate was needed on alternative models of housing and alternative measures of affordability. Some felt that the lack of affordability contributed to transient communities: young people growing up in the area would not be able to stay and would therefore have no investment in their neighbourhood. Equally, older people are not well provided for with housing and must leave the neighbourhood to access appropriate care later in life.

Many felt that the practice of allowing an off-site affordable housing contribution to be spent on a greater volume of units in southern areas of Lambeth and Southwark, though contrary to policy, was becoming standard practice and threatened the sense of a mixed community which characterised the neighbourhood.

In addition, some were concerned that the affordable housing contribution was the priority for local authorities and seeking to fulfil the 40% target (in Lambeth, 35% in Southwark), could reduce the amount available for other mitigating measures such as better public realm, school places etc, where these were also under increasing pressure from new residents. Local people wanted to be more able to influence the formula for defrayal and a further debate is required on this issue.

Heritage is a key concern but there is a balance to be struck between listing assets and preventing their reuse. Preserving the area's general character can be as important as listing individual buildings. Many disagreed over the need or otherwise to restrict the height of buildings in appropriate places in Waterloo but where buildings are high they should be more sensitively expressed at ground level. The impact on local views is important to local people and the impact of development on the setting of the Westminster World Heritage Site should not eclipse this issue.

Where open space is secured through development, there should be a mechanism to guarantee that the space will remain accessible. Some felt that such assurances had too often been rescinded post-construction. Major developments and even advertisers could compensate local people for their position/impact via a locally defrayed revenue S106 payment.

There was some recognition of the change in the local demographic – a trend towards single occupancy dwellings, new foreign investment in London property market and a greater than ever before wealth gap in the local resident population.

### Policy ideas

- i. Developers' transport Plans must be seven-day rather than five-day
- ii. Modelling of wind and shadow effects on development should be independently carried out (though still paid for by the developer)
- iii. Revenue S106 payment on large developments used by local community to mitigate the impact in perpetuity
- iv. Community consultation on major developments to be carried out early and independently
- v. Make it a condition of advertising consent that advertising hoardings provide revenue stream for local defrayal

### C Retail

Participants raised concerns about the balance in the local retail offer between residents, workers/commuters and tourists. A significant number of both local residents and to a lesser extent workers believed that the retail offer was insufficient for their needs.

Retail was seen by many to be the principal reflection of a neighbourhood's character and the homogenisation of retail as marking a loss of that character. Therefore a key concern was the perceived decline in numbers of small independent shops and the fragility of Lower Marsh in particular.

Some considered that this decline was inevitable, with rising rents exacerbated by recent public realm improvements. Similar changes had been observed on The Cut following improvements in 2009. Others said that Lower Marsh would continue to be characterised by independents and that small floor plates which are unattractive to chains would preclude the changes in lease-holdings seen in The Cut.

Lower Marsh Market was seen to be important for the success of the area, and some reservations were expressed about its future, citing declining numbers of traders and custom, and an apparent shift towards hot food rather than groceries, clothes and kitchenware which was seen as serving worker rather resident demand.

The Lower Marsh economy could be supported with sensitive development and a complementary offer in Leake Street or in Station undercrofts, creating a retail circuit with the South Bank and featuring a shopping destination focusing on independent designer-makers and street food. Brixton Village, Camden Market and the Brooklyn Night Bazaar were mentioned as successful examples of this model.

With retail provision set to increase as mixed-use developments are constructed, a number of local residents expressed a hope that the neighbourhood Plan could influence the occupation of the new units, many of which remained empty for long periods of time post construction. Given that fit-out costs often prevented start-up and temporary pop-up uses, requiring developers to prepare units for such uses could be a Planning condition. In conjunction with the developer and supported by a rolling CIL fund, a local trust could help to run units or manage the temporary letting of limited units to local entrepreneurs.

Due to the likelihood of a substantial amount of new retail coming forward, and fears of further 'blandification', Blackfriars Road was seen as a key location to bring forward policies for diverse retail, in partnership with the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum. The 'curated' use of Network Rail arches to create clusters of businesses around particular sectors was an opportunity being explored elsewhere.

The proliferation of Tesco Metro and Sainsbury's Local stores was seen as a negative development for the area, particularly when they were in close proximity. Such stores were seen as reducing choice for the consumer, diminishing the character of the area and responding to the needs of workers rather than residents. Conversely, many local residents stated a desire for a large supermarket in the area, potentially on the Waterloo International Terminal site.

There were also comments about the demographic shift in the neighbourhood fuelled by rising property prices and the resulting retail aimed at the incoming wealthier residential population or the tourist market. Some local residents reported with concern launderettes and other shops serving local needs being replaced with bars and coffee chains.

There was a division between those who wanted to see more chain stores or anchor retail across the neighbourhood and those who wanted less. Some people thought that the character of the area was reflected in the evening economy, reflecting the area's cultural diversity and providing considerable opportunity for local economic growth. For others, such establishments were a sign of gentrification and the loss of Waterloo's working class character. Launderettes, pubs, cafes and betting shops were seen by different sections of the community as vital social hubs that should be protected.

Diversity of provision was seen as important to ensure that diverse communities were adequately served.

## Policy ideas

- i. Retail Trust made up of local people to:
  - a. Act as link between local entrepreneurs and those testing business ideas and developers/ landlords with empty units
  - b. Defray rolling CIL fund as rent subsidy, business development grant funding for small independents
  - c. Own and manage (eg) community launderette as social enterprise and community hub
- ii. Planning conditions compelling developers to :
  - a. Ensure basic fit out of shop units for pop-ups, entrepreneurs and micro businesses
  - b. Provide a certain number of small/affordable units suitable for above uses

### D Social infrastructure

The diversity of the local population was regularly mentioned as an asset and many raised the problem of inadequate community facilities, particularly a 'whole-life hub' which provided for people of all ages, to serve them. Social inequality between those north and west of the station and those to the south and east was seen as pronounced, with railway tracks acting as a physical and metaphorical barrier to opportunity.

Schools were seen as community anchors, important in a transitory area, but school places were said to be in particularly short supply. A number of participants reported anecdotal evidence that people had left the area as a result of not being able to send their children to school locally and this is supported by the new Oasis South Bank Free School figures which suggest that 450 applications were received for 120 places. New development was seen as likely to exacerbate the problem.

Community spaces and sports and leisure facilities including a swimming pool were also needed, particularly for young people who were underprovided for in the neighbourhood. Because of the lack of open space on which to develop sports pitches, new schools would need to provide play space and sports pitches on roofs.

A new space and improved facilities for the library were also called for and new development would create pressure on GP and dentistry provision in the area, where these were already viewed as stretched. It was seen as the responsibility of developers to provide such facilities on site, and for the use of the whole community.

Participants were concerned that homelessness endured as a problem so many years after the development of the bullring (now the IMAX Cinema), though it was stressed by some that homelessness had reduced a great deal and in their view the problem was street drinking, drug abuse and begging. A combination of management of these behaviours and support for those in need was suggested. Many felt that the street population was simply displaced from one neighbourhood to another.

Work units and training to access jobs created via development (e.g. in the construction phase or in the hotels, offices and shops being built), were viewed as a useful step in reducing unemployment, particularly among local young people. Large employers also had a responsibility to ensure there were employment opportunities for local people.

Drug sales around Waterloo Station and estates to the South and petty crime associated with tourism and were raised as a problem at debates. It was suggested that police numbers were too low for an area with such high footfall. It was also suggested that a unique licensing regime might be developed to manage any issues created as part of the night time economy, whilst recognising the unique part licensed premises (including cultural institutions) had to play in supporting the local economy.

Local people recognised the contribution cultural institutions made to the local community but some felt that more could be done to ensure culture was brought into estates.

## E Green infrastructure and air quality

Open and green space was highly valued in the South Bank and Waterloo neighbourhood and many people were concerned that development – and particularly high rise development without gardens - created pressure on these amenities. Many thought that more open space was urgently needed.

As reflected in discussion around Archbishop's Park, the proportion of space given over to particular types of activity such as sports, play space for different ages, quiet contemplation, cafe, public toilets, food growing, flower beds and events was contentious.

Where the expectation was that development often resulted in a net loss of open space, it was felt that development could either increase or maintain the amount of open space through providing roof gardens, access to new space at ground level, or compensatory space off-site. Roof gardens were seen as a particular opportunity given the success of the South Bank Centre's spaces above the Queen Elizabeth Hall, however concerns were raised over problems gaining access to spaces in developments which were guaranteed at planning stage to be public.

Local residents and workers sought out and valued quiet green space away from visitors to the South Bank and it was hoped that further such sanctuaries could be created.

It was generally recognised that space did not need to be green to be valued and that there was more to greening than open space. The riverside walkway was regularly brought up as a key asset, although one which some locals used less frequently due to increasing footfall. Also, many felt that street trees, green walls and other forms of green infrastructure should be integrated at every opportunity as part of development and public realm improvement.

Although opportunities for creating new accessible space were seen as limited, they do exist. The developable space underneath, or above, Waterloo Station is the size of ten Trafalgar Squares. Organisations like Make Space Studios have taken advantage of seemingly unusable land beside railway tracks to provide over 80 artist studios. Some felt that more could be done with the foreshore of the Thames, including using the beach at low tide or developing a lower walkway similar to that alongside the Seine in Paris but which rose or fell with the tide. The temporary use of development sites for sports pitches could be considered and the reduction of road space, though unlikely to create enough room for a park, could increase the functional space used by pedestrians to sit and rest.

Places of particular debate were:

- I. Hungerford Car Park – many people were aware of its designation as Metropolitan Open Land and repeated the desire to see it developed as an extension to Jubilee Gardens, at least in part
- II. The Garden Bridge – despite the calls for new open space, the Plans for the bridge were received by some with caution. Many argued that the space would attract further footfall (estimated 7m annually) and further erode the opportunities for peaceful riverside promenade. Management of litter on routes between the Garden Bridge and the Station and the impact on views from Waterloo and other bridges were also raised as concerns. It was felt that the area needed more pocket parks and places of sanctuary rather than further tourist attractions, but others celebrated the prospect as a much needed new green open space
- III. Archbishop's Park – Identified as a much-loved Green Flag local space, Plans for its transformation via funds from development caused debate over the proportion of space given over to sports facilities versus the proportion of land for open space, revenue generating or other uses. Each use impacts of different communities in different ways (e.g. the floodlighting and noise of sports pitches has the potential to disturb neighbouring residences, but reduction of sports pitches impacts on access to young people to sport).

In response to the question of community management of space, feelings were mixed as to the sustainability of this model. Local management would require a regular income stream via a mechanism such as the London Eye revenue S106 agreement and the oversight of a trust rather than a loose collection of volunteers. Other potential sources of income including private grants, events, cafes and the renting out of sports pitches could also be used.


The social and educational benefits of the local management of space, food growing and bee-keeping were recognised. Volunteer interventions such as guerrilla gardening, neighbourhood management of pocket parks and estate gardens and arrangements which helped vulnerable local people (such as the putting down roots maintenance of St John's Garden) were popular and seen as of great value to the neighbourhood.

It was generally recognised that air quality was poor in the area and two contributing factors cited in addition to general traffic levels were taxis queuing for Waterloo Station, often from as far as York Road, and the bus garage at Cornwall Road.

## Heat map

Used at the Lower Marsh Market stall and at selected events, the heat map was a way of building a picture of the distribution of participants (black stickers), physical hotspots or areas of concern (red stickers) and areas that people valued (green stickers).

There were 107 responses from those living and working across the area, including a small number of those from immediately outside the neighbourhood. [Appendix 2](#) shows the raw data, but the top responses in each category were:



<b>Green / Positive</b>	
Location	No. of people
Lower Marsh	47
Archbishop's Park	34
Queens Walk / National Theatre	13
Royal Festival Hall	13
St Thomas' Hospital	12
National Theatre	11
The Cut	9
Jubilee Gardens	8
Leake Street Tunnels	8
Lambeth Palace Road / Lambeth Palace	8

<b>Red / Negative</b>	
Location	No. of people
Westminster Bridge Road railway tunnel	17
Queens Walk	7
Leake Street Tunnels	7
Capital Tower footway	6
BFI	5
Westminster Bridge Road roundabout	5
Shell Centre	4
Waterloo Christian Centre	4
Park Plaza Westminster Bridge	3
Waterloo Station parking	3
The Cut at Blackfriars Road	3
Waterloo Road	3

It is not possible to report on the reasons for the respondents choices in every case and these data are not statistically significant. They do however indicate the assets that are valued and of concern in general terms. In the case of the Leake Street tunnels it is interesting to note the even split between those that valued it and those that singled it out as an area of concern. The support for Lower Marsh is significant, although the reasons for people's selection of this area differed. The choice of the Westminster Bridge underpass as an area of concern is unequivocal however.

Given the data above, SoWN should consider the approach to specific areas in the neighbourhood as well as themes.

## APPENDIX 8A: Burning issues raised during listening phase

### Streetscape & transport

Better management / maintenance of streetscape	31
Improve street design for pedestrians and disabled	21
Cyclist-friendly road layouts	7
Improve flows of people and routes	5
Containers for bin bags, more litter bins	4
More or better enforced resident parking	4
Encourage people to dwell in the neighbourhood away from the river	4
Make improvements to IMA/ Waterloo Road area	4
Routes under railway arches need improvement	3
More seating	3
Protect / Open up Leake Street as a key route and potential cycle park	3
Deliver Blackfriars Road 'Boulevard'	2
Faster and more frequent buses	2
Enforcement against those who drop litter or don't pick up dog mess	2
Cash point on Lower Marsh	2
Better access to streets for local traffic	2
Make improvements to Westminster Bridge Road / Addington Street	2
Stop cycling on pavements / encourage cyclists to be more considerate	2
Redesign crossings at the Old Vic	1
No more cars / pedestrianisation where possible	1
Reduce speed limit of St George's Road	1
Make improvements to Lambeth North	1
Privately owned public realm should always be publicly accessible	1
Reduce the impact / number of buses standing	1
Street based animation, street trading, entertainment etc	1
A riverside walkway free of commercial interests	1

**Total**

**111**

## Retail

Preserve independent retail/ no more chain stores	33
Create retail mix or more retail/ fill empty shops	18
More variety for Lower Marsh Market	8
Stop social cleansing/ gentrification of Lower Marsh	5
Launderette/ dry cleaner	5
Supermarket	4
More/better bars, restaurants and nightlife	3
No more estate agents	1
Too many bars and restaurants	1
Too many coffee shops	1
Too many betting shops	1
Balance of retail to cater for residents, tourists and workers	1
Subsidise rents for Lower Marsh shops and stalls	1
More specialist food shops	1
Campaign to encourage new residents to support local business	1
Get rid of 'tacky' Christmas Market	1
Department store	1

---

**Total**

**86**

## Development & housing

Preserve heritage / character	15
More affordable housing for locals	14
Stop the development of further tall / large scale buildings	14
Too many hotels	11
Preserve or increase social housing	10
Active frontage and public realm on all new development	4
Stop further development	4
More affordable rent properties	4
Provide usable green space on the roofs of developments	3
Better management of construction	3
Do more to mitigate environmental impacts - wind, shadow, views	3
More co-op housing	3
Prevent private housing lying empty	3
More family sized housing	2
Less office development	2
Housing policy based on need for local residents	2
Develop housing and open space above Waterloo Station	2
Develop Lambeth North Station	1
Provide more premium residential property	1
Sheltered housing	1

**Total**

**102**

## Social infrastructure

More sports and leisure facilities	23
Less gangs, crime and antisocial behaviour	8
Invest in local schools	7
Reduce rough sleeping and street drinking/drug taking	7
Jobs for local people	5
More play space	5
Reopen Living Space / More community facilities	5
Swimming pool	5
Improve library facilities	5
Look after the homeless better	4
Rediscover the sense of community / less segregation	4
Preserve diversity of people and activity	3
Consider how people of different ages are catered for	3
Doctors surgery	2
Invest in local communities rather than just tourists	2
Stop gentrification	1
Don't get rid of skaters	1
Protect those in greatest need	1
Value and preserve the cultural offer	1
Celebrate local history and architectural landmarks	1
More facilities for families and older children	1
Public toilets	1

---

**Total**

**95**

## Green infrastructure & air quality

More green / open spaces / pocket parks	11
More quiet green and food growing spaces for residents	6
More street trees	5
Improve air quality - prevent queues of taxis	5
Embed green infrastructure	3
Reduce antisocial behaviour in parks	3
More child-friendly spaces	3
Improved / better maintained green spaces	2
Recognise the river as an asset	1
Cafe for Archbishop's Park	1

---

<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>
--------------	-----------

## Other

Reduce petty crime	2
Stop helicopter noise / reduce noise pollution	2
Dispense with congestion charge for locals	1
Service delivery via local mechanism funded by development	1
Community should say how S106 / CIL / empty property tax is spent locally	1

---

<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>
--------------	----------

# Appendix 9. Developer guidelines for the implementation of green infrastructure

## Introduction

SoWN is especially short of open green space, and in the absence of sites which can provide large scale parks, it is especially important that schemes help to provide green infrastructure in meeting our first thematic objective

### Green infrastructure, open space & air quality

- Protecting and creating open space and green infrastructure
- Minimising the impact of construction on open space
- Reductions in air pollution, noise pollution, and other negative environmental effects.

These guidelines can also be used in satisfying our other objectives, particularly

### Streetscape & transport

- Encouraging sustainable transport and reducing vehicular traffic through the neighbourhood
- Supporting key public realm improvements which contribute to the sense of place

The Planting Guidelines in SoWN should be seen as part of the wider GI policy for our neighbourhood and beyond. Countrywide principles for GI in the development of planning policy are well set out in:

Planning for a healthy environment – good practice guidance for green infrastructure and biodiversity Town & Country Planning Association & The Wildlife Trusts (July 2012) <sup>1</sup> and we have included particularly relevant statements for each guideline.

This document describes the context in which our planting guidelines must be read, and is a helpful guide to getting the most out of sites through GI.

The amount of GI that should be provided, along with its character and distribution, ultimately depends on the individual nature of the location and its specific circumstances, the type of development, and the contribution it can make to improving ecological connectivity. In restricted urban areas such as SoWN, GI connectivity, water quality, flood mitigation, etc are amongst a range of high level GI goals that we cannot accomplish, but yet must work towards. A principle of no net loss of GI should be used, rather than the UK general aim that a minimum of 40% (DCLG (2009) of the total land should constitute GI (including private gardens and living roofs, as well as any individual site).

There is also Government Planning Guidance on Green Infrastructure which the SoWN NP follows.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/Green-Infrastructure-Guide-TCPA-TheWildlifeTrusts.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://Planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/green-infrastructure/Green-Infrastructure>  
Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 8-027-2160211

### What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a network of multifunctional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities.

Green infrastructure is not simply an alternative description for conventional open space. As a network it includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, but also street trees, allotments and private gardens. It can also include streams, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and walls.

### Why is green infrastructure important to delivering sustainable development?

Green infrastructure is important to the delivery of high quality sustainable development, alongside other forms of infrastructure such as transport, energy, waste and water. Green infrastructure provides multiple benefits, notably ecosystem services, at a range of scales, derived from natural systems and processes, for the individual, for society, the economy and the environment. To ensure that these benefits are delivered, green infrastructure must be well-planned, designed and maintained. Green infrastructure should, therefore, be a key consideration in both local plans and planning decisions where relevant.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, these guidelines cover the multitude of possibilities raised in delivering Green Infrastructure solutions as part of new development in SoWN. They are supported by photographs and are intended to provide a guide to quality. It is preferred that Developers put forward their own, site specific-solutions in seeking to address the nine main points in the Guidelines to follow.

---

<sup>3</sup> Revision date: 1 21 2160  
Paragraph: 028 Reference ID: 8-028-20160211  
Revision date: 1 21 2160


## The Guidelines

What do we want the guidelines to achieve?

We want to make sure that developers understand their responsibility and commitment to the following issues both when planning their development, and during its lifespan:

- 1 Climate Change, inc SuDS
- 2 Greening: planting in all its forms
- 3 Improved accessibility
- 4 Improved pedestrian realm
- 5 Greater biodiversity
- 6 Improved Air Quality & Healthy landscapes
- 7 A Sense of Place
- 8 Well Maintained Places.

In all cases, we wish these guidelines to encourage developers to use high quality solutions which demonstrate best practice and are offered with evidence to support the chosen methods. The photographs we have provided in this appendix provide a variety of solutions but we also wish to encourage developers to put forward creative and innovative solutions and those which are multi-tasking, tackling the issues holistically (at early concept design and master planning phases).



All the issues come under a wider heading of sustainability, and any planning application coming forward to Lambeth or Southwark will be required to address sustainability challenges, giving solutions which are in the scope of the development. These guidelines are intended to cover the implementation of Green Infrastructure, but developers should note that being sustainable should recognise the inter-relatedness of the 'three pillars of sustainability.'

If the developer is not able to meet obligations on his own site and is seeking to provide or improved alternative public open space elsewhere, these guidelines should still be followed.

## 1. Climate Change including SuDS.

### Meeting the challenge of climate change

Green infrastructure can help urban, rural and coastal communities mitigate the risks associated with climate change and adapt to its impacts by storing carbon; improving drainage (including the use of sustainable drainage systems) and managing flooding and water resources; improving water quality; reducing the urban heat-island effect and; where appropriate, supporting adaptive management in coastal areas. Green infrastructure networks also help species adapt to climate change by providing opportunities for movement.<sup>4</sup>

Managing urban run-off is just one of a number of issues which are increasingly pressing as the demonstrable effects of climate change on our urban environment become more marked.

Schemes need to show that they can be responsive to less predictable weather conditions. For example, by the provision of:

- Water Reducing measures
- Rain Gardens & swales – slowing the amount of time it takes for excessive surface run off to drain away.
- Permeable pavements
- Diverted roof gutters
- Green Roofs (in all their forms, see 5)
- Drainage which is self-cleaning, such open channels as part of streetscape
- Greater planted areas of plant size diversity whose root structure increases the holding capacity of the soil

Schemes should also attempt to mitigate for extremes where possible for example in the provision of:

- Shading/ pergolas which double as rain-cover (planted pergolas and greened bush shelters are good examples of this)
- Wall and roof planting to add a natural temperature control system to buildings (see 5). Planted walls and roofs keep buildings cooler as heat in the city builds up. In the winter they provide additional insulation.
- Allowing some areas to collect excess water to protect more vulnerable spots.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://Planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/green-infrastructure/>  
Revision date: 11 02 2016  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 8-031-2016021

## 2. Greening: Planting in all its forms.

### A / Timing

Before measures can be taken to install planting, the developer must make plans to include planting at such as stage in the project design that the resulting planting is an inevitable part of the development, and that the conditions for such planting are optimised to ensure its long term, health existence. This includes consideration of planting issues at early structural and infrastructural stages to allow substantial root zones & soakaways, and when drainage design favours re-use, irrigation and SuDS.

### B / Infrastructure & Below Ground Services

Cables, pipework (and occasionally other structures) can impede the planting of trees and other plants – this should not be an obstacle to planting and the expectation is that new development, particularly development which disrupts the pavements and roads outside the site boundary, should involve new planting despite the services, perhaps in large scale above ground planters. Manholes and other access points should be detailed and positioned so that services can be accessed whilst allowing the maximum possible planted area or pedestrian zone.

### C / Right Plant Right Place

The key to good maintenance lies in correct plant selection with a commitment to maintenance which is appropriate to the planting situation. Proposals which show planting, but don't accompany it with thoughtful maintenance solutions are unlikely to result in the longevity of the planted scheme. Mature plantings may require less maintenance after establishment, so well designed schemes should allow for the reduction of maintenance efforts after the early establishment of the plantings.

In order to assess that the developer is suggesting a suitable planting layout and species, it is suggested that development proposals are accompanied by a site analysis which acknowledges the micro-climatic conditions of the place, including, when appropriate, wind testing, and designed planting plans and lists of species, alongside their architectural proposals.

Contrary to belief, there are a number of specially selected and grown tree species available especially for urban settings - see 'Traditional Urban Tree Strategies: time for change?' which sets out ideas and practical notions to include, rather than easily exclude trees from urban development. Specialist producers, such as Barchams also provide clear advice on suitable species.

### D / Planting for People

Planting should make spaces more desirable for people (on foot, in vehicles and within buildings). Places with a green aspect are known to induce a sense of calm, and factors such as scent, colour, seasonality and the sheer beauty of massed floral planting should not be underestimated. 'Amenity' planting should be avoided, or should be created with greater thought for people, rather than simply for security. Urban wilderness, when well-constructed, can counterbalance the rigidity and formality of buildings and standard urban rows.

### E / Collaboration

Where possible, a community relationship may be established which not only helps the developer to meet his obligations to Green Infrastructure, but helps to engage the community in the planting and the development. Local Organisations<sup>5</sup> have assisted in the implementation and maintenance of a variety of local schemes.

### 3 Improved Accessibility

Issues to do with the more detailed design of pedestrian areas are covered below. Improved Accessibility means that more people, no matter the state of their mobility, can feel free and are able to venture out in South Bank and Waterloo

#### A / Wider design issues

Developments which seek to show that pedestrian routes on and adjacent to the site have been well considered and put pedestrians first (not just users of the development) are encouraged. Early design can consider pedestrian routes in their wider context, providing clear links to other routes and landmarks near the site.

Crowding should be avoided and where a development is proposed which would generate a high footfall, or be a neighbour to pavements where high footfalls already exist, studies should be provided which present evidence that the proposed design for pavements on the site, an/or the impact on pavements adjacent to the site by the development, have been used to underpin a mitigating solution. TfL provide extensive guidance.<sup>6</sup>

Where pavements are adjacent to roads, designs should consider measures to mitigate the effects of pollution and road noise.

#### B / Permeability

Routes through larger sites are vitally important, and large sites which present barriers to natural movement should be avoided. The creation of more possibilities for people to inhabit and pass through public space is vital.

#### C / Ease of transit

All users, no matter what their level of ability should be able to use and navigate public space in SoW. Less able users should not be forced to take routes which are not part of the mainstream transit options.

#### D / Signage & Lighting

Signage and wayfinding should be well located and legible, and also be imbued with a sense of place; Improving legibility, through better signage and improved identity such as providing navigable landmarks. In this respect, public art may be proposed, and it can be the case that an integrated strategy for art and public realm will allow a number of GI and sustainability topics to be handled as one.

Lighting should be given due thought and appropriate solutions put forward which show the nature of the intended lighting effect on the development, and adjacent area. High beam security lights are to be avoided. Lighting should enhance the experience of the place and make the areas attractive and feel safe without unduly over-lighting the place. In some places the timing of light effects will be crucial and evidence that this has been considered will be sought. Illuminated planting is particularly lovely in urban locations, making planting more desirable in the evenings.

#### E / Encouraging the public to be in the open air ( see 7).

#### F / Accessibility through safety and cleanliness.

Providing public space that is clean, free of litter; Spaces and streets which are regularly cleaned feel safer & more desirable, and the value of the materials and detailing used during construction last longer if there is regular cleaning. Footfall is higher when space is well-cared for (which increases site value through increased footfall).

- G / Providing space that is refuge: safe and relaxing – including the separation of different transport modes and the removal of pedestrians and cyclists from congested and polluted routes, and the separation of cyclists and pedestrians where high speed cyclists are a danger.
- H / Creating Connected space – making WiFi/broadband publically accessible in outdoor spaces. The availability of WiFi technology via hotspots is currently desirable, and in the future there are like to be other technologies which help connect spaces with users, and embed a sense of ownership. Real-time billboards may be appropriate in some places.
- I / Creating public spaces, or improving existing public realm (including smaller paths and spaces) which are well connected to other places and follow the desire lines of users.
- J / GI and Streetscape should be relevant and amenable to people of all ages and backgrounds
- K / Promoted links – development of streetscape should involve strong link with existing local organisations so that new places are quickly embedded in the community – for example – Old Vic performances on Waterloo Millennium Green, or the connecting of similar service types though signage and specialised trails.

#### 4. Improved Pedestrian Realm

Walking is by a long way the most common form of transport, but all too often, pedestrians must divert their route to avoid hoardings, suffer bumpy pavements, become disoriented by poorly signposted routes, struggle with the fumes of traffic jams or compete with cyclists for limited space, to name but a few. With topics of well-planted pavements and walkways covered above, other improvements for the enhancement of space for pedestrians are:

- A / Detailed hardscape
  - Good walking routes are well constructed from high-quality materials.
  - Level changes should be carefully handled and easy to negotiate whether stepped or ramped.
  - There should be places for stopping and resting and walkways should be designed to allow walkers, wheelchair users, buggy users etc to pass without clashing. Creating areas for all ages to linger and sit, and making sure that the seating available is high quality, with a mixture of seat heights, backrests and armrests, and close to (but not right by) bins;
- B / Collaboration – good pavement design will require the careful positioning, or design around streetscape elements such as manholes, signage, lamp columns, parking meters, car charging points etc. High quality proposals will have considered such street furniture early in the life of the design so that comprehensive proposals are put forward for consideration at planning. Ease of movement may be greatly helped by removing pavement clutter/combining signage.
- C / Anti-social Behaviour
  - The pedestrian realm should be design so that anti-social behaviour is appropriately accommodated, and that, having done so, more appropriate behaviours are likely. Activities that are enjoyed by some, and are not illegal, can be found intimidating by other people. This includes skateboarding, drinking, overcrowding, littering, etc.
  - Measures should be taken to deter illegal activities such as urination, rough sleeping, graffiti etc.

#### D / Shared Surfaces

The NP seeks to increase the quantum of green and publically accessible open space in the SoWN area. Where appropriate, the stopping up of streets to traffic or the creation of shared space may be appropriate, particularly if it allows the developer to deliver façade to façade public realm, complete with planting including more substantial trees. This is particularly applicable to Greenways and Quiet Routes.

#### E / Greenways

Routes on which pedestrians are prioritised and can walk separate from and unhindered by other transport modes. They involve the removal of pedestrian routes from faster, noisier, more dangerous and more polluting forms of transport

Greenways may be pedestrian only routes but could be shared surfaces or wide pavements. Greenways, especially in their early stages of development may be aspirational unbroken routes, the delivery of which is piecemeal as funding and opportunity arises. This should not be seen as detrimental or counter to the development of a strong area-wide Greenway strategy, but part of its natural evolution. It allows for the development of green nodes, which users can mentally link to create their own quieter and more interesting routes.

#### F / Streetscape – a holistic approach

The consideration of all elements of the public realm as important areas of responsibility and consideration – pavements, verges, driveways, pull-ins, street furniture, signage and posts, railings, manholes, kerbs, advertising signs and hoardings, and slip roads. Even if elements are out of the direct control of the developer they should be fully considered as part of the proposal in order that the highest quality completed design is delivered.

A balanced streetscape is desirable – one which includes hard and soft landscape elements. Streetscape should be both recognisably part of the neighbourhood, being appropriate and in keeping – but, importantly, must provide local or nodal distinctiveness, moments of joy and excitement as well as simple repetition and understated design for calmness.

Streetscape should be appropriate to the **hierarchy** of the street: – walking transport routes remaining clutter free,

#### G / Active frontages

These are supported, particularly where they also activate networks and link to other desirable active locations. The following should feature: seats, signs, flowers, shade, space for café seating, bike stands located unobtrusively, surveillance cameras and lights positioned to be effective but not dominating, post boxes are frequent, Bins are well located and sized for use with frequent monitoring, WiFi is available; community information boards are visible and free to use, those owning, renting or using street-fronted property are encouraged to take ownership of their space by cleaning and maintaining it.

#### H / Strong design clarity on detailing and use for less frequented streets should be detailed to avoid problems, especially those of overspill from busier streets such as anti-social behaviour, urination, graffiti, rubbish dumping, paucity of cleaning, etc. Off-street parking, delivery and rubbish collection are regular uses but anti-social use can result and proposals should explain how these issues can be avoided.

## 5 Increased Biodiversity

It is generally recognised that levels of biodiversity are now critically low and in SoWN we have made a commitment which recognises the positive impact on this issue that quality development can make. There are high level Government guidelines which set the issues of biodiversity loss in context.<sup>7</sup> Despite the strongly urban nature of SoWN, all developers can make a positive impact on net biodiversity, and there are existing green infrastructure projects to consider, alongside their own which can contribute to an integrated approach. This guideline is to encourage developers to take measure to encourage the proliferation of nature on their sites and to an increase in the number of plant species to be grown on the site or designated replacement site within SoWN;

- A / An increased mix of species types for example increasing the range of plant sizes/ increasing the range of flowering times;
- B / Providing a mix of both deciduous and evergreen species; increasing the range of species which support a diverse insect and bird population;
- C / Increasing the range of species resistant to drought and increasing temperature fluctuations; working with reputable nurseries to provide plant mixes which are suitable to site microclimate; providing a wide range of plant species which allow planned maintenance;
- D / including in the landscape plan a demonstrable strategy to maintain the biodiversity of the site over 5, 10 and 20 year plans, with arrangements to replace species as they die or are succeeded.
- E / Biodiversity must not be reduced as a result of any new development in SoWN

Biodiversity for wildlife – Suitable biodiversity enhancements include additional floral planting, and floral planting that extends the season for flowers to encourage and feed urban bees. Planting charts showing floral seasonality will be required alongside planting Plans and schedules.

---

<sup>7</sup> Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. A key purpose of this duty is to embed consideration of biodiversity as an integral part of policy and decision making throughout the public sector, which should be seeking to make a significant contribution to the achievement of the commitments made by Government in its Biodiversity 2020 strategy.

In considering how development can affect biodiversity, and how biodiversity benefits could be delivered through the Planning system, it is useful to consider:

- the policies and commitments in Biodiversity 2020;
- the contents of any existing biodiversity strategies covering the relevant local or neighbourhood Plan area and any local biodiversity action Plans;
- the potential effects of a development on the habitats or species on the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 section 41 list (in Biodiversity 2020)
- whether an ecological survey is appropriate;
- the factors listed in guidance on local ecological networks that supports National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 117.

The statutory obligations in regard to international and national designated sites of importance for biodiversity must also be considered.

<http://Planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/biodiversity-ecosystems-and-green-infrastructure/>

Measures to increase Bio-diversity include:

- Increasing the amount of planted area on the proposal site
- Green Roofs (see images) primarily a planted roof incorporating a mix of species:  
Include recognised suppliers and systems  
Difference between intensive & extensive (soil depth/species mix/ maintenance and watering etc). Includes Bio-solar roofs.
- Brown roofs (of a much lower planted density and consisting of rubble for bird and insect habitat; only suitable where green roofs would not be suitable eg higher altitudes; must be quiet locations in order to encourage birdlife, esp. Black Redstarts) – should be qualified by a reputable and experienced ecologist– could potentially be acceptable but could be subject to the same scrutiny as green roofs.
- Green Walls - Covering existing or new vertical walls and surfaces with planting. Plants may be self-clinging, climbing/twining and clambering; fixed to cables and wires; rooted in tiered specialist containers. Consideration should be given to appropriateness of location, watering system, sunlight & orientation; Species selection & maintenance; Proprietary systems & suitable suppliers.
- Window boxes and planted balconies
- Making sure above ground planters are used if pavement services are too congested.

## 6 Improving Air Quality & Creating Healthy Places

'All plants are sensitive to the effects of air pollution, to a varying degree. It is not surprising that air pollution poses an important threat to the health of greenspaces within our towns and cities, given that they are generally located close to large potential sources of pollution.

Historically, the major air pollution problem in both urban and industrial areas has been associated with high levels of smoke and sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) arising from the combustion of sulphur-containing fossil fuels for domestic and industrial purposes. Over the past 40 to 50 years, the decline in coal as a fuel source, combined with a series of Clean Air Acts and cleaner fuels/ new burning technologies, has led to a successful reduction in the emission of these pollutants.

The major threat to clean air is now posed by traffic emissions. Both petrol and diesel-engine motor vehicles emit a wide variety of pollutants, principally carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>) all of which can have an increasing impact on urban air quality. In addition, photochemical reactions resulting from the action of sunlight on nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and VOCs from vehicles leads to the formation of ground-level ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), a secondary long-range pollutant.

The EPSRC-funded [Pollutants in the Urban Environment \(PurE\)](#) project has developed a framework for the risk assessment of pollutants in the urban environment with recommendations for planting schemes which work in the tested conditions.<sup>8</sup>

A / Monitoring – BY OTHERS

B / Improving Air Quality

In addition to the measures in other guidelines above which increase the range of plants and their quantity, there is some research which point to species selection that is especially suitable for the more polluted routes through SoWn. Such species are firstly more tolerant to high levels of environmental pollution (and often equally tolerant to drought/flood) and these include London Plane trees. There are other species whose foliage is a more active reducer of pollution, whereby the plant can convert some harmful substances to less noxious chemicals.

The positioning of plants is also important, shrubs and taller perennials placed between pavements/cycleways and the trafficked road can have a marked reducing effect on immediate levels of environmental pollution. The same is true when spaces between openable windows and roads are planted rather than left hardscaped.

#### C / Avoiding Polluted Areas

Measures which help to divert people from more to less polluted routes are to be encouraged. Such routes can be promoted as developments along them promote their healthier locations. See Greenways above.

### Promoting healthy communities

Green infrastructure can improve public health and community wellbeing by improving environmental quality, providing opportunities for recreation and exercise and delivering mental and physical health benefits. Green infrastructure also helps reduce air pollution, noise and the impacts of extreme heat and extreme rainfall events.<sup>9</sup>

#### A / GI for Health

As well as better air quality, developers should strive to create places and add GI to their project in direct acknowledgement that this contributes to the health and wellbeing of their tenants and residents as well as the wider community. Some of these measure are simple – with good planting schemes and adding trees being the major ‘quick wins’. However, we acknowledge that some places in SoWN present problems for tree planting and wider landscape, and all small-scale efforts must be made to add greenery where possible, since even a view of green, rather than buildings can promote well being.

#### B / Play & exercise

Opportunities for promoting more active routes should be encouraged; routes along greenways may be longer, allowing more exercise and such routes can easily include dual-use street furniture (part bench/part balance beam for example).

C / Such equipment makes for teen hang-outs as well as providing exercises for older residents and any measure which encourage a generation mix further contribute to wellbeing. GI and Streetscape should be relevant and amenable to people of all ages and backgrounds.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.forestry.gov.uk/fr/urgc-7eff6x>

<sup>9</sup> Revision date: 11 02 2016  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 8-031-20160211

## 7 Sense of Place

The design of a development should aim to reflect and enhance the area's locally distinctive character. In achieving this, existing biodiversity features of environmental, historical or cultural interest, such as habitats of principal importance, open spaces, and routes long used by local communities, should all be conserved and integrated into the design. Private gardens can also be a key determinant of local distinctiveness. GI can be harnessed as a positive 'place-shaping' tool, and where appropriate can be used to positively transform local character.

### 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

The components of green infrastructure exist within the wider landscape context and should enhance local landscape character and contribute to place-making. High quality networks of multifunctional green infrastructure provide a range of ecosystem services and can make a significant contribution to halting the decline in biodiversity.'<sup>10</sup>

### 'Requiring good design

Well-designed green infrastructure helps create a sense of place by responding to, and enhancing, local landscape character. Green infrastructure can also help create safe and accessible environments in new development and the regeneration of brownfield sites in existing built up areas.'<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Revision date: 11 02 2016  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 8-031-2016021

<sup>11</sup> Revision date: 11 02 2016  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 8-031-2016021

## 8 Well Maintained Places

Reference has been made within the individual guidelines above, to the importance of developed maintenance strategies for GI proposals. Generally, at planning, the maintenance schedule of the landscape proposals are subject to condition. It is the intention of the NP that this commitment to full maintenance of the proposal site, and contributions to surrounding open space and GI, impacted by the development, or frequented by its inhabitants should form a well-conceived element of the proposals at planning.

There are collaborations to be made with local service suppliers for such tasks which would add to the inclusivity and social sustainability of new developments and engender more community minded building.

The quality and depth of pre-planning consultations should be considered with strong links with the local neighbourhood, and an attitude of helpfulness being part of the development proposal from the outset.

'How should green infrastructure be planned for in the long term?

As with other forms of infrastructure, green infrastructure requires sustainable management and maintenance arrangements to be in place if it is to provide benefits and services in the long term. Arrangements for managing green infrastructure, and for funding its management over the long-term, should be identified as early as possible when planning green infrastructure and factored into the way that it is designed and implemented.'<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Revision date: 11 02 2016  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph: 032 Reference ID: 8-032-2160211

# Appendix 10. Greenways: walking routes through the neighbourhood area

## Greenways: Design Guidance

This is a Design Guide which forms a strategy for developing a Green Web in the SoWn area. It describes design intentions in the creation of six Greenways which are conceived as pedestrian friendly, linear parks across the area.

It is envisaged that developers would be involved by sponsorship, Section 106, direct intervention in public realm Greenways close to developments or designing in destinations into their projects.

This Greenways Design Guide is divided into three themes:

- Destinations – points of interest along the way
- Routes – green corridors from one side of the SoWn area to another
- Human Needs – places to recharge.

## A Destinations

### A.1 Destination Points - points of interest along the way

Greenways must offer destination/ node points along the routes in order to encourage walking by offering a sense of arrival, a goal or reward. They will help avoid any tedium at the slower pace of movement on foot. They may be places to pause, to sit, to talk and may be anything from a single seat to a piazza outside the NT.

### A.2 Naming Routes and Signage

Routes and destinations should have names. Perhaps:

A	River Greenway	Lambeth Palace along the river to Blackfriars Bridge
B	Jubilee Greenway	St Thomas' Hospital past Jubilee Gardens and RNT to Oxo
C	Marsh Greenway	ArchBishop's Park along Lower Marsh to Southwark Station
D	Imperial Greenway	Imperial War Museum to Valentine Place (pedestrianised?)
E	Thespian Greenway	RNT past the Pld Vic to the IWM
F	Oxo Greenway	Oxo Tower to Ufford Street Recreation Ground

There is potential to extend the grid and to link more recreational greenways to incorporate other green spaces:

- 1 South end of Greenway B at St Thomas', through Upper Marsh to ArchBishop's Park on Greenway C.
- 2 RFH past Green Room, around Imax through St Johns churchyard to Greenway E at Secker Street.
- 3 From Blackfriars Bridge, end of Greenways A & B, south down Renne Street to Christchurch Gardens, along Roupell Street to link with Greenway E and Link 2.
- 4 Waterloo Station concourse down Spur Road through Millennium Green down Coral and Pearman Streets to Greenway D at Frazier Street.
- 5 From Leake Street Pocket Park, along Leake Street and Chicheley Street to Greenway B at Jubilee Garden.

Signage – See Appendix GI Framework 3d

### A.3 Features and Activities

A destination can be a mix of physical features and activities such as places to eat, benches, views, natural elements and other items of interest. The feature may be a place to rest, a water fountain, shade, or a place for people watching. Some Greenways, such as the River Greenway (A) are so full of features and activities, it may be in need of a place of solace.

### A.4 Local Unique Characteristics

The area is characterised as having paths, edges, nodes and landmarks and districts. Landmarks should be visible and distinct within the landscape.

See Appendix G1 Framework 3k & 7.

### A.5 Few Negative Features

Whilst there will inevitably be some negative elements, social destinations should have none and be kept well maintained. Consideration should be made to the property side of the route. Cars should not be parked in front of gardens, planted areas encouraged in place of gravel, broken walls and fences repaired and wheelie bins found a home.

See Appendix G1 Framework 8.

### A.6 Merging with Adjacent Resources

The SoWN area is fortunate to have many resources which can be merged into the Greenways. Use should be made of space which are often bypassed, such as St Johns churchyard and the landscaped areas in front or within public buildings.

Cafes, pub gardens, museums and theatres can offer courtyards where people from the Greenway can rest. Opportunities are there for commerce which may include coffee shops, cafes and appropriate kiosks (smoothies or health related foods). These may offer bike racks, seats and drinking fountains.

### A.7 Access for All Ages and Abilities

Greenways should be accessible to all ages and abilities and RNIB and Age Concern guidelines should be followed. At interactions with vehicular streets, Braille Trails and Slow Crossings should be considered.

They should appeal to the child as well as the adult and be fully inclusive. Play equipment may be placed at destination points – existing play spaces such as at Ufford Street can be discovered.

See Appendix G1 Framework 3c

## **B Routes**

### B.1 Optimal Distances between Destinations

Some Greenways will need no additional destination points, but those to the south will benefit. The River Greenway is a world class walk, but Greenways E and D which link the important destinations of the National Theatre and the Imperial War Museum need interim destinations along the route. There should be 4-6 destinations on each Greenway.

### B.2 Separation/ Hierarchy of Walkers and Wheeled Travellers

The final destination of those visiting the SoWN area may be the station, the theatre or Lower Marsh and visitors who wish to walk there should be offered an attractive, memorable and safe experience.

In the dense urban environment of the SoWN district, Greenways are inevitably going to be along existing trafficked streets. Traffic volumes and speeds should be low to allow a comfortable, safe and pleasant experience for pedestrians. Speed limits should be 20 mph and on occasion 15 mph.

Some roads, such as Valentine Place, can be kept car free with the exception of emergency vehicles and residents. With the increase in residential use of the area, this would allow the street to be safer and greener.

### B.3 Sense of Flow

Design should aim at continuity for pedestrians with raised pavement crossings to provide a level route along the length of the Greenway. Routes should be 'lines of desire': direct, attractive with minimum of pressure from traffic.

Flow is challenged at crossings. These can be enlivened with designed interventions and signage, but safety must be paramount.

Cyclists should be taken through junctions on clearly defined lanes.

### B.4 Relationship with Arts

Greenways are landscape architecture with direct a tie to the arts. The use of gateways and art and sculpture will encourage an improved sense of public ownership.

### B.5 Repetitive Small Features/ Branding

While destinations are large landmarks with defining features, smaller elements with defining features on a Greenway such as benches, water fountains, rubbish bins or signs could be similar to offer a sense of orientation, order and predictable maintenance to the route. Preferred environments make sense or offer legibility and coherence.

The WeAreWaterloo planters and seats are a local example of this.

### B.6 Avoid Obstacles

Pedestrians should be offered good pavements, free of obstructions. Greenways should be defined as special routes, free from obstructions with signs and meters repositioned in the road space. Where a Greenway runs beside a busy road or by the backs of buildings, shielding devices can be introduced to avoid them being major obstacles to users of the Greenways.

### B.7 Urban Arrangements

Where shared use with vehicular traffic is inevitable, strategies must be found to prioritise pedestrian usage.

These may include:

- Signalised crossings
- Joint use with cyclists on a low flow, low speed, tree-lined street
- Raised pavements indicating priority for pedestrians
- Where pavements are narrow, plant in build-outs
- Cycles and pedestrians cross on raised table
- Widen pavements to take trees and create promenade leaving one-way traffic and counter-flow cycle lane
- Widened footway sufficient for shared use on footway appropriate beside busy road
- Raised zebra crossings on main road for shared use
- Raised table with signals.

In some cases, cyclists should be banned, for instance on routes with a high pedestrian footfall. Alternatively, paving can be arranged so that there is a clear route for cyclists.

#### B.8 Views/ Trees

Long views down Greenways should be of trees and plants rather than cars. There should be a programme of planned maintenance of greening along the routes.

See Appendix GI Framework 2.

## C Human Needs

#### C.1 Restorative Experience

The Greenways can be a restorative experience and spaces along them can be recharging stations. Interventions can be small. Disused areas can be revitalised such as has happened at Lower Marsh with the Leake Street pocket park.

See Appendix GI Framework 6a.

#### C.2 Opportunities for Healthy Activities

Priority should be made for active travel, fitness and health and convivial public places. Along the Greenways, sporting activities can be facilitated whether they be climbing walls, boule pitches, outdoor gyms or athletic arenas. A round Waterloo 5k 'park run' could be instigated for Saturday mornings.

See Appendix GI Framework 6b.

#### C.3 Social Bridges

In most cases, the urban environment does not facilitate interaction between strangers. If social capital is to be increased, and interaction improved between people who know each other and people who do not, environments that might foster positive interaction should be built.

See Appendix GI Framework 6c.

#### C.4 Green Links

Greenways should go through as many green spaces and parks as possible. Every green space in the SoWN area should be linked to a Greenway and sign posted. These are identified in A.2

#### C.5 Corporate responsibility

Businesses can make a contribution to the street scene in the way that they treat their frontages. They can make a real difference by arranging planting through 'give and gain' days. Further, there should be collaboration with local CBOs and NGOs.

See Appendix GI Framework 4g.

#### C6 Air Quality

The Greenways will take people along routes with better air quality.

See Appendix GI Framework.


#### C7 Lighting

The Greenways should be as attractive at night as during the day. Lighting should be key to achieving a welcoming pedestrian experience after sunset.



### Greenways in the South Bank & Waterloo neighbourhood

- A.** River Greenway: Lambeth Palace along the river to Blackfriars Bridge
- B.** Jubilee Greenway: St Thomas' Hospital past Jubilee Gardens and RNT to Oxo
- C.** Marsh Greenway: Archbishop's Park along Lower Marsh to Southwark Station
- D.** Imperial Greenway: Imperial War Museum to Valentine Place
- E.** Theatre Greenway: RNT past the Old Vic to the IWM
- F.** Oxo Greenway: Oxo Tower to Ufford Street Recreation Ground



① - KEY ELEMENTS OF A GREENWAY  
(HOW TO IDENTIFY POSSIBLE ROUTES)

② - ESTABLISHING A GREEN WEB

# Glossary

**NPPF** National Planning Policy Framework

**Green Infrastructure** A strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas with other environmental features designed and managed to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services such as water purification, air quality, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation

**Social Infrastructure** Social infrastructure is the interdependent mix of facilities, places, spaces, programs, projects, services and networks that maintain and improve the standard of living and quality of life in a community

**DCLG** Department for Communities and Local Government.

**Sustainable development** Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs

**Planning gain** Contributions made by developers to mitigate the impact of the development or fund infrastructure (e.g. Section 106 funding or Community Infrastructure Levy)

**Local Plan** Local plans set out the strategic priorities for development of an area and cover housing, commercial, public and private development, including transport infrastructure, along with protection for the local environment. They are developed by Local Planning Authorities at Borough level

**Central Activities Zone / CAZ** Area of central London designated by the Mayor of London as subject to specific planning guidance: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/implementing-london-plan/supplementary-planning-guidance/central-activities-zone>

**SoWN / South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours** The designated Neighbourhood Forum for the South Bank & Waterloo area

**CIL** Community Infrastructure Levy

**Public realm** Space between and within buildings that is publicly accessible, including streets, squares, forecourts, parks and open spaces

**Private rented sector** New housing developments where all the properties are built for rent, not sale

**Social rent / Social Housing** Social housing is let at low rents on a secure basis to those who are most in need or struggling with their housing costs. Normally councils and not-for-profit organisations (such as housing associations) are the ones to provide social housing

**Affordable Housing** Type of tenure - affordable rented homes should cost no more than 80% of the average local market rent

**Family housing** Dwellings with two or more bedrooms

**Start-ups** An entrepreneurial venture which is typically a newly emerged, fast-growing business that aims to meet a marketplace need by developing a viable business model around innovative product, service, process or a platform. Typically a small business

**Sustainable transport** Modes of transport that do not significantly impact on the environment, defined for the purposes of this plan as walking and cycling

**Intensification** Development of an already urbanised area

**Green roofs, intensive** Roofs holding soil depth of 6 inches or more, planted with a variety of green infrastructure including grasses and shrubs

**Green roofs, extensive** Roofs holding soil depth of less than 6 inches, planted with limited varieties such as mosses and lichen

**Brown roofs** Extensively planted roofs designed to encourage biodiversity rather than amenity

**CAVAT** Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees: <https://www.ltoa.org.uk/resources/cavat>

**Major developments** New buildings which provide 10 or more residential units, or over 1000 square metres of non-residential space

**Amenity uses** A positive element or elements that contribute to the overall character or enjoyment of an area. For example, open land, trees, historic buildings and the inter-relationship between them, or less tangible factors such as tranquillity

**Biodiversity** The variety of plant and animal life in the world or in a particular habitat, a high level of which is usually considered to be important and desirable.

**Sustainable urban drainage (SUDS)** The practice of providing drainage systems for development using natural methods and materials.

**CO2** Carbon Dioxide – pollutant from diesel vehicles

**London Plan** The strategic Plan for London, setting out an economic, environmental, transport and social framework for development, produced by the Mayor of London

**Low to middle income** Households in which the total income is less than £60,000

**Social enterprise** Business with a social or environmental mission

**Coop** Co-operative Housing. An arrangement in which an association or corporation owns a group of housing units and the common areas for the use of all the residents

**Community land trust** A non profit company that develops and stewards affordable housing, community gardens, civic buildings, commercial spaces and other community assets on behalf of a community

**Active frontage** Building frontage which contains uses that promote activity on the street.

**Waterloo SPD** Supplementary Planning Guidance covering the Lambeth section of the Waterloo area – produced by Lambeth Council and updated in 2013

**Viability** The process by which developers calculate and demonstrate the viability of a development after costs

**S106** Section 106 – a mechanism which make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, that would not otherwise be acceptable. They are focused on site specific mitigation of the impact of development

**Site allocations** The allocation (by a Planning Authority or Neighbourhood Plan) of specific development sites for specified forms of development

**LPA** Local Planning Authority

**RIBA Category B standard** Royal Institute of British Architects category B fit-out – standard sufficient for immediate occupation

**Co-working** The use of an office or other working environment by people who are self-employed or working for different employers, typically so as to share equipment, ideas, and knowledge

**Affordable lease** Commercial leases let at up to 80% of local market rent levels

**Asset of Community Value / ACV** Land or property of importance to a local community which is subject to additional protection from development under the Localism Act 2011

**Neighbourhood Development Order** Grant planning permission for a particular type of development in a particular area

**Section 278** Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 allows a developer to carry out works to the public highway

#### Use classes

Class 1	=	Shops
Class A2	=	Financial & professional services
Class A3	=	Restaurants and cafes
Class A4	=	Drinking establishments
Class A5	=	Hot food takeaways
Class B1	=	Business
Class B2	=	General industrial
Class B8	=	Storage or distribution
Class C1	=	Hotels
Class C2	=	Residential institutions
Class C2A	=	Secure residential institutions
Class C3	=	Dwelling houses
Class C4	=	Houses in multiple occupation
Class D1	=	Non-residential institutions (including libraries and museums)
Class D2	=	Assembly and leisure (Including cinemas and dance halls)
Sui Generis	=	(Including a range of uses not stated elsewhere)