

London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Local Plan 2031**Inspector's Matters and Issues for the Examination – Stage 1****Matter 5: Housing**Representations prepared by Lichfields on behalf of Aberfeldy New Village LLP

Issued 27 July 2018

1.0 Matter 5; Issue 5 - Is the level of housing required deliverable?**Question 5.3**

1.1 *The LP acknowledges that there will be a shortfall in the housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. Chapter 6, para 6.4 (page 265) advises the Council will explore ways of addressing this shortfall during the plan period:*

- *What specific measures are the Council proposing the deal with this issue?*
- *Why has the Council not identified sufficient sites for the plan period?*

2.0 Representation

- 2.1 To be in accordance with the London Plan, LBTH is required to deliver 39,314 new dwellings over ten years between 2015 – 2025 which annualised is 3,931 new homes per year. LBTH have rolled forward its annual target to cover the entire plan period which results in a housing supply target for the borough of 58,965 new dwellings.
- 2.2 The housing trajectory provided in Part 6: Appendix 7 shows that during the plan period the Council has a shortfall of approximately 5,320 dwellings in housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. In order to positively manage the development opportunities in the borough at a strategic level, the Council have identified four sub-areas and provided a minimum number of additional homes to be provided in each (see table 1 in chapter 4). Part 4 of the Local Plan also allocates a number of sites within each of the sub-areas.
- 2.3 Within the Lower Lea Valley sub-area, the draft Local Plan states this area is required to deliver a minimum of 5,395 dwellings, along with office, industrial and retail, leisure and infrastructure floorspace. Table 1 on page 62 confirms 5,395 dwellings is a minimum target which represents approximately 11% of the LBTH housing supply target.
- 2.4 Aberfeldy New Village LLP considers that the Plan is unsound as it is not positively prepared and is not consistent with the NPPF as it does not make sufficient provision to meet the housing requirement. In order to address the shortfall in housing supply, the Plan should put greater emphasis on making the most efficient and effective use of sustainable and accessible brownfield sites, to help boost the supply of housing. Aberfeldy New Village LLP questions whether this has been appropriately tested. It is considered that there is greater capacity on previously developed land, particularly by increasing density in redevelopment/regeneration schemes, which the Council should have explored more thoroughly, and that Policy should make a more specific requirement (support and encouragement) for this to be achieved, in order to seek the requirement in full.

- 2.5 While it is recognised that paragraph 214 (Annex 1) of the 2018 NPPF clarifies that policies in the 2012 NPPF will apply for the purpose of examining plans where plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019, it is considered helpful to make reference to the new guidance, particularly in relation to its stance on ‘brownfield first’.
- 2.6 The direction from the Government is clear that “*Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land*” (para. 117). The 2018 NPPF further states that to make the most effect use of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land, planning policies should, among others, “*give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs...*” and “*promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively*” (para. 118).
- 2.7 In response to the Inspector’s question, the Council appear to be relying on the measures included in chapter 8 of LBTH’s Housing Delivery Strategy (September 2017) to address the shortfall. However, this is not followed through with tangible supporting policies in the development plan. For example, density is cited as an area that could assist in meeting the shortfall, with the argument being that LBTH has on average consistently delivered housing at significantly greater densities than elsewhere in London. While this may be the case since 2010/2011, figure 2 in the Housing Delivery Strategy shows that density of residential approvals since 2013/2014 have dropped by nearly 100 dwellings per hectare (dph). The unknown densities of sites within the Poplar Riverside Housing Zone which are yet to be developed is also cited in the Housing Delivery Strategy as a method of reducing the shortfall and specifically states in paragraph 8.18 that “*it is likely that delivery will be greater than currently assumed*”. This should be made clear in planning policy in the Local Plan.
- 2.8 Policy D.DH7 on Density states in paragraph 1 that residential development should be consistent with the guidelines set out in the London Plan. While this is considered to be the correct approach to adopt, supporting text in paragraph 3.76 goes on to state that many developments are looking to exceed the highest density levels in the London Plan (table 3.2) and that these exceptional densities should not be the norm and should remain exceptions. In addition, paragraph 3.79 makes reference to “*where the London Plan density ranges are exceeded...*”. Increasing density should not be exceptional but a clear policy objective of the Plan (123 of the NPPF).
- 2.9 With the decline in the density of residential approvals over the past four to five years and the direction from the Council regarding high density developments, it is unclear how the Council expect density to assist in reducing the housing shortfall. The draft London Plan has also removed reference to the density matrix and so the density ranges referred to in paragraph 3.76 and 3.79 will soon not be applicable. It would appear there is an underlying intent by LBTH to limit the density of development in the Borough. Given the majority of its land is brownfield/previously developed, this is not consistent with the NPPF and, as such is, is not positively prepared or effective. A more robust policy wording to support optimisation of brownfield land and to increase density is required to address this.
- 2.10 In this context draft policy D.DH7 is not effective as it does not respond to changing requirements and it is not consistent with national policy. The policy should be amended to support higher density in appropriate locations. In addition, part b to the policy is not relevant

to density and is more associated to design. The reference to ‘over-development’ in the policy is not consistent with national policy as this term is not defined in the NPPF.

- 2.11 Regarding the specific measures, chapter 9 ‘Monitoring and Response’ of the Housing Delivery Strategy identifies a number of remedial measures to increase the supply of housing if the delivery mechanisms set out in chapter 8 do not operate as anticipated. It is not considered that these remedial measures have been explored to a degree of detail as would be expected and it is noted that there are no key monitoring targets which would result in these remedial measures being undertaken.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Local Plan 2031**Inspector's Matters and Issues for the Examination – Stage 1****Matter 5: Housing**Representations prepared by Lichfields on behalf of Aberfeldy New Village LLP

Issued 27 July 2018

1.0 Matter 5; Issue 5 - Is the level of housing required deliverable?**Question 5.3**

1.1 *The LP acknowledges that there will be a shortfall in the housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. Chapter 6, para 6.4 (page 265) advises the Council will explore ways of addressing this shortfall during the plan period:*

- *What specific measures are the Council proposing the deal with this issue?*
- *Why has the Council not identified sufficient sites for the plan period?*

2.0 Representation

- 2.1 To be in accordance with the London Plan, LBTH is required to deliver 39,314 new dwellings over ten years between 2015 – 2025 which annualised is 3,931 new homes per year. LBTH have rolled forward its annual target to cover the entire plan period which results in a housing supply target for the borough of 58,965 new dwellings.
- 2.2 The housing trajectory provided in Part 6: Appendix 7 shows that during the plan period the Council has a shortfall of approximately 5,320 dwellings in housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. In order to positively manage the development opportunities in the borough at a strategic level, the Council have identified four sub-areas and provided a minimum number of additional homes to be provided in each (see table 1 in chapter 4). Part 4 of the Local Plan also allocates a number of sites within each of the sub-areas.
- 2.3 Within the Lower Lea Valley sub-area, the draft Local Plan states this area is required to deliver a minimum of 5,395 dwellings, along with office, industrial and retail, leisure and infrastructure floorspace. Table 1 on page 62 confirms 5,395 dwellings is a minimum target which represents approximately 11% of the LBTH housing supply target.
- 2.4 Aberfeldy New Village LLP considers that the Plan is unsound as it is not positively prepared and is not consistent with the NPPF as it does not make sufficient provision to meet the housing requirement. In order to address the shortfall in housing supply, the Plan should put greater emphasis on making the most efficient and effective use of sustainable and accessible brownfield sites, to help boost the supply of housing. Aberfeldy New Village LLP questions whether this has been appropriately tested. It is considered that there is greater capacity on previously developed land, particularly by increasing density in redevelopment/regeneration schemes, which the Council should have explored more thoroughly, and that Policy should make a more specific requirement (support and encouragement) for this to be achieved, in order to seek the requirement in full.

- 2.5 While it is recognised that paragraph 214 (Annex 1) of the 2018 NPPF clarifies that policies in the 2012 NPPF will apply for the purpose of examining plans where plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019, it is considered helpful to make reference to the new guidance, particularly in relation to its stance on ‘brownfield first’.
- 2.6 The direction from the Government is clear that “*Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land*” (para. 117). The 2018 NPPF further states that to make the most effect use of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land, planning policies should, among others, “*give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs...*” and “*promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively*” (para. 118).
- 2.7 In response to the Inspector’s question, the Council appear to be relying on the measures included in chapter 8 of LBTH’s Housing Delivery Strategy (September 2017) to address the shortfall. However, this is not followed through with tangible supporting policies in the development plan. For example, density is cited as an area that could assist in meeting the shortfall, with the argument being that LBTH has on average consistently delivered housing at significantly greater densities than elsewhere in London. While this may be the case since 2010/2011, figure 2 in the Housing Delivery Strategy shows that density of residential approvals since 2013/2014 have dropped by nearly 100 dwellings per hectare (dph). The unknown densities of sites within the Poplar Riverside Housing Zone which are yet to be developed is also cited in the Housing Delivery Strategy as a method of reducing the shortfall and specifically states in paragraph 8.18 that “*it is likely that delivery will be greater than currently assumed*”. This should be made clear in planning policy in the Local Plan.
- 2.8 Policy D.DH7 on Density states in paragraph 1 that residential development should be consistent with the guidelines set out in the London Plan. While this is considered to be the correct approach to adopt, supporting text in paragraph 3.76 goes on to state that many developments are looking to exceed the highest density levels in the London Plan (table 3.2) and that these exceptional densities should not be the norm and should remain exceptions. In addition, paragraph 3.79 makes reference to “*where the London Plan density ranges are exceeded...*”. Increasing density should not be exceptional but a clear policy objective of the Plan (123 of the NPPF).
- 2.9 With the decline in the density of residential approvals over the past four to five years and the direction from the Council regarding high density developments, it is unclear how the Council expect density to assist in reducing the housing shortfall. The draft London Plan has also removed reference to the density matrix and so the density ranges referred to in paragraph 3.76 and 3.79 will soon not be applicable. It would appear there is an underlying intent by LBTH to limit the density of development in the Borough. Given the majority of its land is brownfield/previously developed, this is not consistent with the NPPF and, as such is, is not positively prepared or effective. A more robust policy wording to support optimisation of brownfield land and to increase density is required to address this.
- 2.10 In this context draft policy D.DH7 is not effective as it does not respond to changing requirements and it is not consistent with national policy. The policy should be amended to support higher density in appropriate locations. In addition, part b to the policy is not relevant

to density and is more associated to design. The reference to ‘over-development’ in the policy is not consistent with national policy as this term is not defined in the NPPF.

2.11

Regarding the specific measures, chapter 9 ‘Monitoring and Response’ of the Housing Delivery Strategy identifies a number of remedial measures to increase the supply of housing if the delivery mechanisms set out in chapter 8 do not operate as anticipated. It is not considered that these remedial measures have been explored to a degree of detail as would be expected and it is noted that there are no key monitoring targets which would result in these remedial measures being undertaken.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Local Plan 2031**Inspector's Matters and Issues for the Examination – Stage 1****Matter 5: Housing**Representations prepared by Lichfields on behalf of Aberfeldy New Village LLP

Issued 27 July 2018

1.0 Matter 5; Issue 5 - Is the level of housing required deliverable?**Question 5.3**

1.1 *The LP acknowledges that there will be a shortfall in the housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. Chapter 6, para 6.4 (page 265) advises the Council will explore ways of addressing this shortfall during the plan period:*

- *What specific measures are the Council proposing the deal with this issue?*
- *Why has the Council not identified sufficient sites for the plan period?*

2.0 Representation

- 2.1 To be in accordance with the London Plan, LBTH is required to deliver 39,314 new dwellings over ten years between 2015 – 2025 which annualised is 3,931 new homes per year. LBTH have rolled forward its annual target to cover the entire plan period which results in a housing supply target for the borough of 58,965 new dwellings.
- 2.2 The housing trajectory provided in Part 6: Appendix 7 shows that during the plan period the Council has a shortfall of approximately 5,320 dwellings in housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. In order to positively manage the development opportunities in the borough at a strategic level, the Council have identified four sub-areas and provided a minimum number of additional homes to be provided in each (see table 1 in chapter 4). Part 4 of the Local Plan also allocates a number of sites within each of the sub-areas.
- 2.3 Within the Lower Lea Valley sub-area, the draft Local Plan states this area is required to deliver a minimum of 5,395 dwellings, along with office, industrial and retail, leisure and infrastructure floorspace. Table 1 on page 62 confirms 5,395 dwellings is a minimum target which represents approximately 11% of the LBTH housing supply target.
- 2.4 Aberfeldy New Village LLP considers that the Plan is unsound as it is not positively prepared and is not consistent with the NPPF as it does not make sufficient provision to meet the housing requirement. In order to address the shortfall in housing supply, the Plan should put greater emphasis on making the most efficient and effective use of sustainable and accessible brownfield sites, to help boost the supply of housing. Aberfeldy New Village LLP questions whether this has been appropriately tested. It is considered that there is greater capacity on previously developed land, particularly by increasing density in redevelopment/regeneration schemes, which the Council should have explored more thoroughly, and that Policy should make a more specific requirement (support and encouragement) for this to be achieved, in order to seek the requirement in full.

- 2.5 While it is recognised that paragraph 214 (Annex 1) of the 2018 NPPF clarifies that policies in the 2012 NPPF will apply for the purpose of examining plans where plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019, it is considered helpful to make reference to the new guidance, particularly in relation to its stance on ‘brownfield first’.
- 2.6 The direction from the Government is clear that “*Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land*” (para. 117). The 2018 NPPF further states that to make the most effect use of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land, planning policies should, among others, “*give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs...*” and “*promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively*” (para. 118).
- 2.7 In response to the Inspector’s question, the Council appear to be relying on the measures included in chapter 8 of LBTH’s Housing Delivery Strategy (September 2017) to address the shortfall. However, this is not followed through with tangible supporting policies in the development plan. For example, density is cited as an area that could assist in meeting the shortfall, with the argument being that LBTH has on average consistently delivered housing at significantly greater densities than elsewhere in London. While this may be the case since 2010/2011, figure 2 in the Housing Delivery Strategy shows that density of residential approvals since 2013/2014 have dropped by nearly 100 dwellings per hectare (dph). The unknown densities of sites within the Poplar Riverside Housing Zone which are yet to be developed is also cited in the Housing Delivery Strategy as a method of reducing the shortfall and specifically states in paragraph 8.18 that “*it is likely that delivery will be greater than currently assumed*”. This should be made clear in planning policy in the Local Plan.
- 2.8 Policy D.DH7 on Density states in paragraph 1 that residential development should be consistent with the guidelines set out in the London Plan. While this is considered to be the correct approach to adopt, supporting text in paragraph 3.76 goes on to state that many developments are looking to exceed the highest density levels in the London Plan (table 3.2) and that these exceptional densities should not be the norm and should remain exceptions. In addition, paragraph 3.79 makes reference to “*where the London Plan density ranges are exceeded...*”. Increasing density should not be exceptional but a clear policy objective of the Plan (123 of the NPPF).
- 2.9 With the decline in the density of residential approvals over the past four to five years and the direction from the Council regarding high density developments, it is unclear how the Council expect density to assist in reducing the housing shortfall. The draft London Plan has also removed reference to the density matrix and so the density ranges referred to in paragraph 3.76 and 3.79 will soon not be applicable. It would appear there is an underlying intent by LBTH to limit the density of development in the Borough. Given the majority of its land is brownfield/previously developed, this is not consistent with the NPPF and, as such is, is not positively prepared or effective. A more robust policy wording to support optimisation of brownfield land and to increase density is required to address this.
- 2.10 In this context draft policy D.DH7 is not effective as it does not respond to changing requirements and it is not consistent with national policy. The policy should be amended to support higher density in appropriate locations. In addition, part b to the policy is not relevant

to density and is more associated to design. The reference to ‘over-development’ in the policy is not consistent with national policy as this term is not defined in the NPPF.

- 2.11 Regarding the specific measures, chapter 9 ‘Monitoring and Response’ of the Housing Delivery Strategy identifies a number of remedial measures to increase the supply of housing if the delivery mechanisms set out in chapter 8 do not operate as anticipated. It is not considered that these remedial measures have been explored to a degree of detail as would be expected and it is noted that there are no key monitoring targets which would result in these remedial measures being undertaken.