


| | |
|---|---|
|  | London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham COUNCIL 30 January 2013 |
| SOUTH FULHAM RIVERSIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) | |
| Report of the Leader | |
| Open Report | |
| For Decision Yes Key Decision: No | |
| Wards Affected: Sands End Ward | |
| Accountable Executive Director: Nigel Pallace, Executive Director of Transport and Technical Services | |
| Report Author: Jackie Simkins, Planning Regeneration Officer | Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 3460 E-mail: Jackie.simkins@lbhf.gov.uk |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report seeks a resolution to adopt the South Fulham Riverside draft Supplementary Planning Document as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to the Council's adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (CS). The South Fulham Riverside is one of five regeneration areas identified in the CS and this SPD will provide additional guidelines to the CS to assist towards a comprehensive approach to regeneration. The SPD will therefore help guide growth and change in the area over the next 20 years in line with the CS and London Plan (2011).
- 1.2. Attached to the report is the SPD (Appendix 1); a summary of the main issues raised in the representations received during the statutory public consultation period that took place between 30 March 2012 until 11 May 2012 (Appendix 2); a tracked changed version of the draft SPD highlighting changes made to the document in response to comments received during the consultation exercise (Appendix 3); and the Equalities Impact Assessment report (Appendix 4).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. That Full Council resolve to adopt the South Fulham Riverside Supplementary Planning Document (Appendix 1).**

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1.** The draft SPD has been through extensive public and statutory consultation and refinement over the last two years. As well as targeted workshops involving local residents during its preparation the draft SPD has also been through two rounds of public consultation. This went beyond requirements within the Town and Country Planning Act and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and gave a broad range of people the opportunity to comment and influence the final version of the SPD.
- 3.2.** Many sites within the regeneration area are coming forward for redevelopment hence the importance of adopting the SPD and putting in place more detailed guidance to steer future development in the area in line with the vision and objectives in the Strategic Policy for SFR in the CS.

4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 4.1.** The purpose of the SPD is to provide planning guidance related to the policies set out in the CS and the London Plan (2011). Whilst not forming part of the Council's Development Plan for the Borough, once adopted the SPD guidelines will be a material planning consideration when determining planning applications in the area.
- 4.2.** The South Fulham Riverside regeneration area is identified in the CS for potential major residential led mixed use regeneration. The regeneration area is located in the south of the borough next to the River Thames. It is bounded in the west by Broomhouse Drawdock and the grounds of the Hurlingham Club and in the east by the West London Line embankment and Cremone Railway Bridge. The northern boundary generally follows the line of Carnwath Road and Townmead Road extending along Imperial Road incorporating the National Grid Gas Holder's site. The area has a south facing river frontage of 1,700 metres.
- 4.3.** The CS Strategic Policy for South Fulham Riverside indicates the potential for a target of 2,200 additional homes by 2032 and 300 to 500 new jobs.

5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

5.1. Summary of Key Elements of the SPD

The SPD is split into 14 chapters:

- **Vision** Sets out the Borough's aspirations for the regeneration area.
- **Introduction** - This section introduces the SPD and sets out the purpose and status of the document. It outlines details and outcomes from two workshops held by the Princes Foundation during the preparation of this draft SPD attended by local developers/ landowners, local residents, resident groups and local interest groups.
- **Executive Summary** – Summarises the content of each of the 14 chapters and 5 appendices within the SPD.
- **Contextual Overview** - Summarises details regarding the socio economic, physical and transport and movement context which provides the evidence base for the proposed interventions. Full details of these sections are included in the appendices.
- **Planning Policy** - Sets out the current planning policy context detailing national, regional and local policy relevant to the regeneration area.
- **Issues and Objectives** - Summarises the key issues affecting South Fulham Riverside which have informed the key objectives for the area.
- **Area Planning Framework and Land Use Strategy** - This chapter sets out the overarching principles regarding future development in the regeneration area. The key focus is to bring vacant and under used sites back into use by developing a mixed use neighbourhood connected to the river supported by necessary transport interventions to support this growth. The main land use will be medium density residential led mixed use, new small scale commercial in the most accessible areas and retail for day to day needs. Intensification in community uses will be required to support this growth with new open space, children's play space and leisure uses linked to the river.
- **Housing** - This chapter sets out the key principles that will guide the new homes in the area in particular tenure mix, unit size mix, housing typologies, residential standards and amenity space.
- **Urban Design Strategy** - Outlines guiding principles regarding the future development including the creation of a riverside character, new links to the river walkway, protecting heritage assets, building heights relating to the local context, open space and enhanced public realm.

- **Development Capacity Study** - Considers the quantum of land with potential for future redevelopment in the regeneration area (21.8 hectares based on the Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment and tested the maximum development capacity that could be achieved taking into account the guiding principles regarding urban design, housing and transport capacity. The transport study outcome set the medium density option as the target quantum of development due to the local capacity within the transport network and the accessibility of public transport.
- **Transport Interventions** - Outlines the outcome from the Transport Study and Transport Study Addendum that was commissioned to inform the quantum of additional development that the current infrastructure could support within the regeneration area. Both studies concluded that the growth anticipated in the Medium Density option could be supported if a number of key transport interventions were made including expansion of the Wandsworth Bridge Road/Carnwath Road/ Townmead Road junction and a new route through to the Kings Road in the north east of the regeneration area.
- **Social Infrastructure** - Considers the social infrastructure (new schools, health facilities, open space, play space, library and community facilities, police facilities and employment and skills training) required to support the potential increase in homes and jobs.
- **Environmental Strategy** - Outlines requirements relating to climate change mitigation and adaption, air quality, waste, land contamination and construction, water, noise and vibration and ecology.
- **Delivery and Implementation Strategy** - A Delivery and Infrastructure Funding Study was undertaken in 2012 which investigated the infrastructure required to support the potential growth of homes and jobs in the area. The infrastructure required to support the anticipated growth is listed in this chapter. Details regarding how developer contributions will be assessed and collected are also detailed.

5.2. Supporting Evidence Documents.

A number of supporting documents have been produced in order to inform this SPD. A summary of each document is set out below:

- **Appendix 1 Socio Economic Context** - Considers the socio economic context of the area including data on population, ethnicity, deprivation, employment and income, crime, housing and health. The social and community infrastructure has been mapped across the whole of the Sands End Ward (that includes the regeneration area) identifying education facilities including schools and nurseries, health facilities, libraries and

community halls/centres and shopping areas and highlighting gaps in provision and accessibility.

- **Appendix 2 Physical Context** - Details the physical context of the area including the history, heritage and archaeology. Open space and children's play space have been mapped across the area and gaps in accessibility and level of provision considered. Urban design issues considered in the area include infrastructure and connectivity, built form and urban grain, building heights, mass and scale, views and landmarks, these considerations have shaped the content of the urban design strategy (Chapter 9). Existing land use and land with potential for redevelopment has been considered including possible phasing of re-development.
- **Appendix 3 Transport and Movement Context** - Highlights the existing highway and public transport networks that are currently a key development constraint to growth in the regeneration area. The section considers the existing context regarding the highway network including stress points, underground, rail, buses, and riverboat, cycling, and walking.
- **Appendix 4 The Princes Foundation Workshop Consultation Report** - Full details of the consultation workshops and their outcome.
- **Appendix 5 Delivery and Infrastructure Funding Study (DIF)** – Assesses the overall infrastructure requirement, the extent to which there should be new infrastructure and how this could be funded.
- **Sustainability Appraisal** – Assesses the potential impacts of the document on a range of environmental, social and economic criteria.
- **Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix 4 of this report)** – Assesses the potential impacts of the document on a number of identified minority groups.
- **Statement of Consultation** – A statement setting out those consulted in preparation of the SPD, how the consultations were carried out, a summary of the main issues raised in those consultations (“the Consultation Summary Report”) and how the representations have been addressed in the SPD (“the Consultation Responses Schedule”).
- **Consultation Summary Report (Appendix 2 of this report)** – Provides a summary of the comments raised during the consultation on the second draft of the SPD.
- **Consultation Response Schedules** – Sets out the comments received during consultation on the second draft of the SPD and officers' responses to these comments.
- **Jacobs Transport Study Report 2010 and Addendum 2012** – These studies considered the impact of public transport and highway networks as

a result of the proposed regeneration and identified key strategic infrastructure required to support this development.

5.3. Key issues arising from statutory consultation and amendments made to the SPD in response.

- **Thames Tideway Tunnel**

- **Summary of comments made**

- The SPD should have due regard to the policy support for the Thames Tunnel Project, the DCLG Safeguarding Direction and the safeguarded wharf status of Hurlingham.
- The Thames Tunnel is included in the adopted National Policy Statement for Waste Water 2012 (NPS) as a nationally significant project hence there should be more emphasis of this project in the SPD and how it can operate alongside the regeneration of South Fulham.
- Many residents still strongly oppose the Thames Tunnel Sewer on the Carnwath Road sites.

- **Response**

- Chapter 5 – Planning Policy has been updated to include details regarding the NPS and the DCLG Safeguarding Direction on the three sites affected by the Thames Tunnel. The wording has been changed at 7.2.8 as only Hurlingham, Whiffin and Carnwath Road industrial estate are required for the Thames Tunnel and no other adjoining sites, also current proposals include a permanent access building on the eastern part of Whiffin Wharf.

- **Safeguarded Wharves**

- **Summary of comments made**

- The SPD should highlight London Plan policy regarding development adjacent to safeguarded wharves which should be designed to mitigate any potential conflicts with cargo-handling.
- There was an emphasis on treating all three safeguarded wharves the same rather than promoting consolidation of wharf capacity east of Wandsworth Bridge Road.
- A request was made to explain the proposals around how consolidation of wharf capacity could occur. There was a lot of support for Hurlingham Wharf to be used for river transport or river use in line with its safeguarding status.
- The SPD was premature in its approach to release Hurlingham Wharf from safeguarding as the Mayor's review of safeguarding has not yet completed. (The current recommendation in the Mayor's draft safeguarding review is that all three wharves in South Fulham Riverside remain safeguarded).

- **Response**

- The text at 7.2.7 has been updated to ensure the approach taken regarding safeguarded wharves is compliant with the London Plan 2011. It makes it clear that it will be the responsibility of developers of safeguarded wharves to justify the viability of any proposed scheme for the

consolidation of replacement capacity onto an alternative site. It also refers to the London Plan regarding the redevelopment of safeguarded wharves for other land uses should only be accepted if the wharf is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne freight handling (criteria for assessing the viability of wharves are set in paragraph 7.77 of the London Plan). Text has also been added regarding guidance for the redevelopment of sites adjoining safeguarded wharves in line with London Plan policy.

- **Housing**

- **Summary of Comments made**

Concern was expressed that there will be a lack of social housing in the regeneration area.

- **Response**

This chapter remains with just a few minor changes linked to policy updates (Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Submission July 2012) as it relates to amenity space and children's play space. Further clarity is provided at 4.2.16 and 8.4 regarding the potential number of new homes anticipated in the regeneration area, the indicative target from the CS is 2,200 additional homes however if all sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) overcame some of their impediments to delivery and came forward for redevelopment this could deliver circa 4,000 additional homes. The guidance regarding new homes refers back to Core Strategy policy which aims to achieve more mixed and balanced communities.

- **Building Heights, Mass and Scale**

- **Summary of comments made**

- There was support for opening up the riverside to create an appealing destination with general building height guidelines of 4 – 6 storeys rising to 7 on the riverfront and select areas for fine grain buildings at 10 storeys.
- Concern was expressed regarding the building height guidelines west of Wandsworth Bridge Road, many requesting a maximum guideline of 4 storeys.
- Some thought the SPD was too restrictive in suggesting only a few locations for increased height and massing.
- Others requested a fuller rationale for the two key focal points identified for tall buildings.

- **Response**

A new section has been provided in Appendix 2, 2.15, River Edge Definition, and then summarised at 4.2.13. This new section includes an examination of LBHF and parts of Wandsworth riverside development and reveals a trend of larger scale buildings that in areas respond successfully in height to the width of the river and create strong edge definition and a comfortable relationship with the riverside walk. This provides further evidence to support the guidance regarding building heights at para.9.6 that remains unchanged. In addition, Appendix 2 fully analyses the existing context regarding built form, urban grain, height, mass and scale and

guidance at 9.6.3 “Key focal points and tall buildings” already fully explains the rationale behind the guidance regarding the location of tall buildings.

- **Design Standards**

- **Summary of Comments made**

- It has been expressed that the design guideline principles were too generic hence may prove ineffective at managing development proposals to a high standard. The key principles should be revisited to ensure they are comprehensive and are then expanded on in the supporting text.

- **Response**

- The “Key Urban Design Principles” have been refocused and placed at the front of the chapter to provide greater clarity.

- **Conservation**

- **Summary of comments made**

- Concern was expressed that the River Thames should be defined as a key heritage asset.

- **Response**

- This has been revised in the SPD through the inclusion of a new key principle requiring that all development should demonstrate how it contributes to conserving and enhancing the strategic importance of the Thames.

- **Proposed Highways Interventions**

- **Summary of comments made**

- Concern has been expressed regarding the potential expansion of the Wandsworth Bridge junction and the increased traffic this would bring to the area.

- Concern regarding the increase in traffic anticipated onto the Kings Road as a result of the potential growth in new homes.

- A number of people consider there are flaws in the Jacobs Transport Study and hence its recommendations regarding transport interventions are unreliable.

- Support for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Thames to Battersea requests that it be given greater emphasis in the SPD.

- **Response**

- The SPD has been updated at 11.6.2 to make it clear that further refined assessments will be required to take forward the conclusions from the Transport Study and Addendum particularly in regard to defining the details of the high priority transport interventions. In addition, revised wording makes it clear that every development proposal needs to be accompanied by a robust transport assessment. Revised wording in relation to the pedestrian/cycle bridge over the River Thames is highlighted as a desirable intervention.

- **Community Uses**

- **Summary of comments made**

- -Concern has been expressed regarding the closure of the Sands End Community Centre and that the new location for the community hub at Hurlingham and Chelsea school is not a central location.

- - Concern was expressed that adjoining RBKC could be affected regarding increased demand for its services when sites close the borough boundary are developed. Some want the SPD to be more specific regarding the types of community uses proposed to support the regeneration. Concern has been expressed that the growth in new homes will impact adversely on the infrastructure in the area especially traffic. Concern was expressed that further investigations should be undertaken to ensure that the Sands End clinic would be able to accommodate the increased population.

- **Response**

- The DIF study is a background report linked to the SPD which has considered in detail the infrastructure requirements in the regeneration area linked to the indicative phasing of sites coming forward for redevelopment. The indicative list of required infrastructure is listed at Figure 14.1, however, this will need to be constantly reviewed and updated as it forms part of the proposed Borough-wide Community Infrastructure Levy to help ensure the required infrastructure is provided linked to actual growth in new homes. Specific mention is made at 12.4 that the adequacy of the existing Sands End Clinic to accommodate projected growth will need to be further considered.

5.4 Process

Once adopted, the SPD must be made available during normal office hours, together with an adoption statement. The adoption statement is a document that specifies the date of adoption and that anyone with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the SPD may apply, not later than 3 months after adoption, to the High Court for permission to apply for a judicial review of the decision to adopt the SPD. The council must ensure that the SPD is available at its offices, and publish it on the council's website. The Council must also ensure that the adoption statement is sent to anyone who requested notification.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 6.1.** As the land ownership is relatively fragmented in the South Fulham Riverside regeneration area, having an adopted SPD assists in securing strategic objectives that benefit the whole area even though individual sites may be developed individually and at different times.
- 6.2.** The SPD does not create new policy but provides further guidance and clarity to deliver the vision and strategic objectives for South Fulham Riverside within the Core Strategy. An adopted SPD would however help

to guide future change to ensure development optimises and realises the full potential and benefits of the area.

- 6.3.** The draft SPD has been through extensive consultation and refinement over the last two years that went beyond the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act and the Council's adopted LDF document Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and gave a broad range of people the opportunity to comment and influence the final version of the SPD.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1.** In line with the SCI, at the early preparation stage of the SPD, targeted workshops were held involving local residents, residents groups, amenity groups, landowners and developers to help shape the first draft of the SPD. Two workshops were held in July and September 2010 facilitated by the Princes Foundation. The outcome from the workshops was summarised as a set of emerging design principles in "Princes Foundation Workshop Consultation Report".
- 7.2.** The South Fulham Riverside Regeneration Area was included within the Draft Core Strategy Options 2009 and Proposed Submission Core Strategy 2010. Comments received in response to these two consultations have informed the SPD.
- 7.3.** The SPD has also been through two rounds of public consultation. The first round of public consultation was undertaken in April – May 2011 and 119 responses were received. These comments were considered and responded to and informed the drafting of the second draft of the SPD, which underwent consultation in March – May 2012. Several consultation techniques were used to engage the public and interested parties and encourage feedback namely;
- Consultation newsletter distributed to properties in and around the regeneration area;
 - Public notice in local papers;
 - Press Release encouraging residents to have their say;
 - SPD distributed to interested parties;
 - Availability of the SPD for inspection at several public locations;
 - Notified by letter/e-mail those who commented on the first draft of the SPD
 - 1,500 letters sent to statutory consultees and individuals and groups on the LBHF Local Development Framework data base including special interest groups and resident organisations.
 - Drop in sessions advertised in the newsletter were held locally during the consultation period to explain the SPD in more detail and answer any queries.
 - Dedicated consultation e-mail address.

- 7.4.** 83 written responses were received from a wide range of respondents including local amenity groups, local residents and businesses, residents groups, landowners, developers, statutory organisations and a range of special interest groups.
- 7.5.** The responses to the second draft of the SPD have been considered and where appropriate, they have informed the production of the final SPD (see Appendix 3 of this report for a track changed version of the SPD). A summary of the consultation responses is appended to this report (Appendix 2).

8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1.** An Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) has been prepared and is attached to this report (Appendix 4). The EQIA was included as a supporting document when the SPD underwent its second (statutory) round of consultation during March – May 2012 although no specific comments were received on the EQIA. The EQIA has since been updated in response to comments received on the SPD and supporting documents during the second round of public consultation to reflect updates made to the SPD.
- 8.2.** Generally, development consistent with the SPD guidelines would have a positive impact on those with protected characteristics delivering benefits in terms of improvements to transport, improved connectivity and permeability and access to open space including play space, access to services such as schools, health facilities and shops, new social infrastructure, new employment and housing.
- 8.3.** The final version of the EQIA Action Plan has been updated to advise that the requirements regarding social infrastructure (schools, health, open space etc.) are kept under regular review so that facilities are available for use linked to growth in the population envisaged in the Core Strategy and SPD.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1.** Adopting the SPD will mean that the document is a material consideration to which regard will have to be had when considering any planning application in the SPD area.
- 9.2.** The Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 (as amended) and The Town and Country Planning (Local Development Document) Regulations 2004 (as amended) require that the SPD be in conformity with the council's Core Strategy and in general conformity with the London Plan.

- 9.3. The requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Document) Regulations 2004 (as amended) in respect of consultation and finalising the SPD are explained in Section 7 of this report.
- 9.4. The Council's statutory duty under the Equality Act 2010 is relevant. The protected characteristics to which the Public Sector Equality now include age as well as the characteristics covered by the previous equalities legislation applicable to public bodies (i.e. disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, sexual orientation, religion or belief and sex).
- 9.5. The South Fulham Riverside SPD has been reviewed by Legal Counsel who has confirmed that it is not in conflict with the adopted development plan and that it complies with the requirements for an SPD.
- 9.6. Although it is not required for an SPD a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been produced to minimise any risk if there were to be a legal challenge.

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. This report seeks a resolution to adopt the South Fulham Riverside draft Supplementary Planning Agreement as a Supplementary Planning Agreement (SPD) to the Council's Core Strategy (2011). The SPD has been through a rigorous process of statutory public consultation between 30 March 2012 until 11 May 2012 and costs incurred during this process have been contained within existing budgets. There are no additional costs associated with adopting the SPD as recommended in this report.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1. The subject of the report is not included on a departmental or corporate risk register.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

| No. | Description of Background Papers | Name/Ext of holder of file/copy | Department/ Location |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | NONE | | |

LIST OF APPENDICES:

- **Appendix 1** - South Fulham Riverside Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- **Appendix 2** – Consultation Summary Report
- **Appendix 3** - A tracked version changed version of the South Fulham Riverside SPD highlighting changes made to the document in response to comments received during the statutory consultation exercise.
- **Appendix 4** - Equalities Impact Assessment