

London Borough of Southwark Response

Examination of the New Southwark Plan

Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 8 – Design and Heritage

Issue 1

Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to design, heritage and tall buildings.

Relevant Policies – P18, P22, P23, P24, P25

Policy P18 – Listed Buildings and Structures

Question 8.1

Is part 2 of the policy consistent with national policy at NPPF paragraphs 193-196 in relation to considering potential impacts of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset in respect of circumstances of substantial harm or loss and those of less than substantial harm?

1. Yes. The approach of Part 2 of P18 Listed Buildings and Structures is justified, effective and consistent with the approach to the justification needed, as set out in Framework at Paragraphs 193-194. These, states:

193. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks, or gardens, should be exceptional;

b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional⁶³*

2. *This is set out in Policy P20 – Conservation of the historic environment and natural heritage.*

Question 8.2

Is part 3 of the policy consistent with national policy at NPPF paragraphs 193-196 in relation to considering potential impacts of a proposed development on the significance

of a designated heritage asset: in respect of circumstances of substantial harm or loss and those of less than substantial harm?

3. Yes, part 3 of P20 Conservation of the historic environment is consistent Paragraphs 193-196 of the Framework in terms of justification in respect of substantial harm or loss and those of less than substantial harm to the significance of the asset. P20 Conservation of the historic environment and natural heritage forms part of a suite of heritage policies that will successfully conserve and manage the borough's heritage assets.

Policy P22 - Archaeology

Question 8.3

Is the policy approach justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan? Is the amended approach of reducing 11 Archaeology Priority Areas to 6 and the tiered approach justified?

1. Yes. The policy approach in P22 Archeology is justified and consistent with National Policy and the Publication London Plan (2020). Paragraph 187 of the Framework states that local planning authorities should maintain or have access to a historic environment record. This should contain up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and be used to:

...

(b) predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future.

2. The six proposed Archaeology Priority Areas (APAs) are based on the sound evidence base of the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER). The proposed tiered approach in P22 Archeology is consistent with Historic England's tiered approach for Greater London Archaeological Priority Areas that assigns all land to one of four tiers denoting different levels of sensitivity to development indicated by an archaeological risk model. Section 8 of the Draft Heritage SPD (EIP55) set out further detail.

Policy P23 – World Heritage Sites

Question 8.4

As one of the assets of highest significance, does the policy provide sufficient clarity on how development proposals likely to effect the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the three central London World Heritage Sites relevant to the Borough would be evaluated, in particular the relevant management plan concerned?

1. Yes. P23 World Heritage Sites provides sufficient clarity by defining a clear policy objective. The Policy does not duplicate the detailed guidance on how the three World Heritage Sites should protected and managed, as this is set out in Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, Management Plans and Local Settings Studies prepared for the World Heritage Sites as required by UNESCO. These documents are sign-posted in

P23 World Heritage Sites reasons at paragraph 2. P23 should also be read in conjunction with the suite of design and heritage policies in the New Southwark Plan and alongside London Plan (2016) Policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites, Policy 7.11 London View Management Framework and Policy 7.12 Implementing the London View Management Framework, the GLA's London's World Heritage Sites SPG, and national guidance. In combination, this significant and comprehensive policy framework carefully manages development that may impact the significance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Sites.

Question 8.5

Are there identified views, vistas or buffer zones for the World Heritage Sites where a proposal is likely to impact on elements that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value?

1. Yes. Each World Heritage Site Management Plan and Local Setting Study defines buffer zones and identified view in, out and through the Sites. The three Sites listed in P23 do not fall within the borough of Southwark. However, certain types of new development within the settings of these Sites could potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value. As such any new development proposals must have regard to the Management Plans and Local Setting Studys, alongside this significant and comprehensive policy framework.

Question 8.6

Do Policies P23 and P16 in combination provide a justified and effective approach for managing proposals for tall buildings relative to World Heritage Sites?

1. Yes. Policies P16 - Tall Buildings and P23 read in conjunction with the suite of design and heritage policies in the New Southwark Plan and alongside London Plan (2016) Policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites, Policy 7.11 London View Management Framework and Policy 7.12 Implementing the London View Management Framework, the GLA's London's World Heritage Sites SPG and London Views Management Framework SPD, national guidance, and the World Heritage Sites' Management Plans and Local Setting Studies provide comprehensive guidance and an effective approach for the current and future management of proposals for tall buildings relative to World Heritage Sites and the settings.

Policy P24 River Thames

Question 8.7

Does the policy appropriately reflect and align with the Thames Estuary Plan 2100 in its approach to managing flood risk?

1. Yes. The policy does appropriately reflect and align with the Thames Estuary Plan 2100 in its approach to managing tidal flood risk as result of climate change, ageing flood defenses and population growth.
2. The Thames Estuary Plan 2100 aims to:
 - manage the risk of flooding to people, property and the environment
 - adapt to the challenges of climate change

- ensure sustainable and resilient development in the floodplain
 - protect the social, cultural and commercial value of the tidal Thames, tributaries and floodplain
 - enhance and restore ecosystems and maximise benefits of natural floods
3. Policy P67 its reasons, and the evidence base - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report (SFRA) Level I (2017) (EIP15A), Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report (SFRA) Level I: technical summary (2017) (EIP15B), Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report (SFRA) Level I: appendices A-I (2017) (EIP15C) and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report (SFRA) Level II: sequential test of site allocations (updated July 2020) (EIP15D) - sets out how development in Southwark should address the issue of flood risk in relation to the River Thames. Policy P67 sets out how developments can avoid adding to an increased flood risk, in particular paragraph 2 states:

Development located on sites on or adjacent to the River Thames frontage should be set back from the River defence wall by 10m. This space should be designed and delivered for dual purposes by incorporating the required flood defence measures and providing an enhanced public amenity and environmental benefit.

Question 8.8

Are any modifications required for plan soundness to reflect the interrelationship between the territorial planning jurisdiction of the London Borough of Southwark and the marine planning jurisdiction of the Marine Management Organisation?

1. No modifications are required.
2. The River Thames falls within the South East Marine Plan Area. The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.24 Blue Ribbon Network requires regard to be given to the emerging marine planning regime, which includes the draft South East Marine Plan (January 2020), and also the extant UK Marine Policy Statement that provides guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of tidal river. The Publication London Plan (2020) Policy SI 14 requires Marine Spatial Plans to be taken into account.
3. This Publication London Plan (2020) requirement forms part of the Council's Development Plan, with the draft Marine Plan and Policy Statement being a material consideration for decision makers. Duplication with the Publication London Plan (2020) is not necessary.

Policy P25 – Local List

Question 8.9

Does the policy offer appropriate protection for non-designated heritage assets in the Borough consistent with paragraph 197 of the NPPF?

Has there been progress on preparing a Local List in Southwark and how does this relate to the Heritage SPD?

LBS Response

1. Yes, P25 Local List provides appropriate protection and is consistent with the paragraph 197 of the NPPF in providing the appropriate protection for non-designated heritage assets in the Borough. Further guidance is given in our draft Heritage SPD (EIP55). In this SPD further emphasis is placed on our regard for the non-listed heritage asset across the borough. The Heritage SPD provides information on the borough's Local List and how to nominate a building, structure or open space to the local list in chapter 7 at paragraph 7.2.

Issue 2

Whether the plan is justified and effective in its approach to managing tall buildings and protecting important views

Relevant Policies – P16, P21

Policy P16 – Tall Buildings

Question 8.10

Do the proposed changes provide appropriate clarity on what is meant by tall building in a Southwark context?

1. Yes. The proposed changes to P16 provide the appropriate clarity and are in general conformity with the Publication London Plan (2020) Policy D9 Tall Buildings (page 148).
2. The Publication London Plan (2020) in Policy D9 Tall Buildings sets out in paragraph A the definition of what a tall building is. Paragraph 1.4 (page 3) of the Tall Buildings Background Paper (EIP54) and the fact box (page 103) of the New Southwark Plan (EIP27A) defines what a tall building is, which conforms to that of the Publication London Plan (2020).
3. Paragraph B of Policy D9 of the Publication London Plan, sets out where tall buildings are to be located, this is at the borough discretion. Criterion 1 of P16 Tall buildings, set out Southwark's intentions to the possible locations for proposed tall buildings. Further detail is provided in chapter 4, paragraph 4.1 (page 12) of the Tall Buildings Background Paper (EIP54) on criterion 1 of policy P16.
4. Paragraph C of Policy D9 of the Publication London Plan, sets out the impact the tall building will have, and the considerations that are needed and Paragraph D of Policy D9 ensures proposed new tall buildings are publicly accessible. Policy P16 Tall Buildings criteria 2 and 3, addresses the points made at paragraphs C and D of the Public London Plan, listing specifications to help manage proposed tall buildings, to ensure they are sympathetic to Southwark's character and urban grain as well as setting out Southwark's expectation of where proposed new buildings will be located. P16 Tall Buildings sits within a suite of proposed and adopted design and heritage policies in the Development Plan that will continue to manage the character and urban grain of the borough.

Question 8.11

Are the areas identified as being suitable for tall buildings consistent with the evidence, including the 2020 Tall Buildings Background Paper [EIP20], including the need to protect strategic and local views? Are they sufficiently clear?

1. Yes. The areas identified as being suitable for tall buildings are consistent with the evidence base and the Publication London Plan (2020) Plan and are suitably clear. The Tall Buildings Background Paper (EIP54) sets out why the identified locations are suitable for tall buildings based on their spatial characteristics and the opportunities that they provide. The areas identified as suitable for tall buildings have been established through existing development plan documents, the granting of consented schemes and the construction of tall buildings in accordance with our current plan led approach to tall buildings.

Question 8.12

Is there specific evidence to justify tall buildings on allocated sites outside of the identified areas for tall buildings in Figure 4 of the Plan?

Are the area visions and relevant site-specific allocations sufficiently clear on those locations not identified in Figure 4 where tall buildings may be considered appropriate in principle, subject to detailed matters of design and heritage impact?

1. Yes. The Tall Buildings Background Paper (EIP54) sets out evidence to justify the locations that are appropriate for tall buildings. The allocated sites are of strategic significance and will deliver key planning and regeneration objectives of new homes, jobs and public spaces, as they come forward. The area visions and relevant site-specific allocations provide sufficient clarity by explicitly setting out which allocated sites are considered appropriate for tall buildings, subject to detailed matters of design and heritage impact.

Question 8.13

Will the policy be effective in managing tall buildings in a way which is sympathetic to the character and urban grain of the Borough?

1. Yes. P16 will be effective in managing tall buildings to ensure they are sympathetic to Southwark's character and urban grain. It sets out Southwark's expectation of where proposed new buildings will be located, and also sets out criteria for new proposed tall buildings. P16 sits within a suite of proposed and adopted design and heritage policies in the Development Plan that will continue to manage the character and urban grain of the borough. The evidence for P16 is set out in the Tall Buildings background paper (EIP54). Paragraph 3.1 (page 8) of the Tall Building Background Paper that sets out detail on the tall buildings that already exist in the borough, as well as information on newly consented tall buildings. Furthermore, Chapter 4, paragraph 4.1 (page 12) of the Tall Buildings Background Paper (EIP54) provides more detail on part 1 of policy P16.

Question 8.14

Are there any implications on the realisation of the growth targets for Old Kent Road arising from the Borough Views from Nunhead Cemetery and One Tree Hill, whose landmark viewing corridors to St Paul’s Cathedral cut across part of the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area core?

1. No. The proposed views will not impact on growth targets for the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area. The Old Kent Road Area Action Plan has been fully prepared with regard to the two proposed views and their viewing planes and view geometries. The Old Kent Road Area Action Plan’s masterplans fully take into account the views and illustrate how the growth targets are met without blocking them. Furthermore, the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan Policy AAP 8 requires new development to ‘*preserve and where possible enhance protected borough views from One Tree Hill and Nunhead Cemetery, and the London View Management Framework (LVMF)*’.

Policy P21 – Borough Views

Question 8.15

Are the identified Borough Views (set out in detail in Annex 1 of the NSP) justified? Has there been an assessment process that has considered and discounted other potential Borough Views?

1. Yes. The identified Borough Views in P21 are justified. Annex 1 provides the rationale and detail on the significance of the view. The methodology and terminology we have used to identify and define our Borough Views is consistent with the methodology used for the Mayor of London’s adopted London Views Management Framework (LVMF) (2012). This is set out in EIP27A, Annex 1, paragraphs 2.1 to 2.9.
2. An informal process of consideration was undertaken to assess potential Borough Views. The Council used its specialist knowledge and considered views identified during the preparation of our area-based Supplementary Planning Documents, Area Action Plans, and their respective characterisation studies. Furthermore, throughout the development of the NSP we have routinely considered the impact of tall buildings, on heritage assets and their wider setting (including key views).

Question 8.16

Is Annex 1 ‘Borough Views’ in the NSP justified, effective and in broad conformity with the methodology in the London View Management Framework in respect of the location of the assessment points, the view geometries and the parameters determining the heights of the threshold planes?

1. The methodology and terminology we have used to identify and define our Borough Views is consistent with the methodology used for the Mayor of London’s adopted London Views Management Framework (LVMF) (2012). This is set out in EIP27A, Annex 1, paragraphs 2.1 to 2.9. Each of our Borough Views has a defined Assessment Point. This is the location from which any proposed development within the view must be assessed. Each Assessment Point has coordinates (Easting, Northing and Height (AOD)) that define its exact location.

2. Accurate Visual Representation (AVR) photography must utilise these coordinates with a camera height of 1.6m for consistent analysis. Proposals should also use the Assessment Point to understand and assess heritage significance within views by undertaking a Qualitative Visual Assessment using the Phase A 'Baseline Analysis' and a Phase B 'Assessment of Impact' that is defined in Historic England's Seeing History in the View (2011).

Question 8.17

Is the Borough View to St Paul's from Nunhead Cemetery justified in terms of spatial significance and to what extent has the view been compromised by the 2016 Guy's Cancer Centre building?

1. Yes. The view to St Paul's Cathedral from Nunhead Cemetery is long-standing historically significant view that provides a tight, focused view of St Paul's Cathedral from one of Southwark's most historic locations that is fully-framed by mature trees. The view recognises the 2016 Guy's Cancer Centre Building as a landmark visible in the view, which anchors the location of Guy's Hospital and other medical and science facilities. This landmark denotes a key part of London Bridge's specialised local economy that will attract new specialised services and research and promote health and wellbeing in the local environment.

Question 8.18

Is the approach to Borough View 5 from the Millennium Bridge towards the Tate Modern justified, effective and consistent with the London View Management Framework? Are there consequences for the delivery of the plan's growth proposals for this part of the Borough (such as Bankside and Borough and Blackfriars Road)?

1. Yes. This view ensures the ability to recognise and appreciate the Tate Modern art gallery. The building utilises the former Bankside Power Station that was originally designed by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott with later extensions by Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron. The methodology and terminology we have used to identify and define our Borough Views is consistent with the methodology used for the Mayor of London's adopted London Views Management Framework (LVMF) (2012). This is set out in EIP27A, Annex 1, paragraphs 2.1 to 2.9. This Borough View will not impact the form of tall building clusters already established at Blackfriars Road and London Bridge and supported under Policy 16.

Question 8.19

Are the details in Annex 1 on 'Borough Views' soundly based? As a consequence of the amended threshold planes is the strategy of the Plan deliverable in respect of potential consequences for building heights in parts of the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area?

1. The details in Annex 1 are soundly based. The methodology and terminology we have used to identify and define our Borough Views is consistent with the methodology used for the Mayor of London's adopted London Views Management Framework (LVMF) (2012). This is set out in EIP27A, Annex 1, paragraphs 2.1 to 2.9. Each of our Borough Views has a defined Assessment Point. The clustering of tall buildings in the Old Kent

Road Opportunity Area, is such that the borough views from One Tree Hill and Nunhead Cemetery are preserved and where possible enhanced, as set out in AAP 8: Tall Buildings Strategy – The Stations and the Crossings.