

Item No. 7.	Classification: Open	Date: 22 January 2019	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Deputation requests	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That cabinet considers whether or not to hear a deputation request received from the Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum (OBNF) in respect of the New Southwark Plan (NSP): Proposed Submission Version Amended policies item contained elsewhere on the agenda.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, cabinet can decide:
 - To receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; or
 - That the deputation not be received; or
 - To refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
3. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. Only one member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than five minutes. After this time cabinet members may ask questions of the deputation for up to five minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. The deadline for receipt of deputation requests for this cabinet meeting was Midnight 16 January 2019. The request was received before this constitutional deadline.

Deputation requests

The Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum (OBNF)

5. The Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum have submitted a request for a deputation to highlight what they feel are significant outstanding deficiencies in respect of the New Southwark Plan (NSP) Proposed Submission Version Amended Policies item (contained elsewhere on the agenda) as set out in their submission below:
 - “The immediate negative impact of these deficiencies upon the local environment will be illustrated by specific reference to current planning activity on St Thomas Street which the council is currently shaping with developers through the St Thomas Street East Framework (STSEF) which is supposed to form the policy context.

- Current planning application 18/AP/0900 for a 39 storey tower on the site of Capital House is the lead of four sites on St Thomas Street that constitute the so called STSE Framework. Consultation on the Framework has been problematic so far (clear examples will be given) and whilst it is far from complete, official consultation has already closed on Capital House. The remaining three sites are expected to come forward shortly, while this proposed version of the NSP is itself out for further consultation. Hence the urgency of this deputation.
- **Site Allocations Policies NSP52&53** in the New Southwark Plan constitute a deliberately vague and poorly evidenced policy vacuum by which the council are encouraging insensitive overdevelopment that will cause irreversible harm to the locality particularly in terms of heritage and environmental impact. Contrary to widespread local opinion which has been long buried in the NSP's consultation report, these specific policies should have been amended to properly frame responsible development in line with Historic England Guidance Note 3 and the London Plan.
- **Tall Buildings Policy P14** now makes some gesture of compliance with the draft London Plan which requires local authorities to identify locations it deems suitable for high-rise development and specify the maximum heights it considers acceptable in those locations. However, this compliance is illusory in that it simply specifies that 'these are typically within our Major Town Centres Opportunity Area Cores and in the Central Activities Zone'. This is hopelessly unspecific and would permit high-rise development to carpet most of the north of the Borough. There must be a much more targeted approach if consultation on high-rise locations is to be meaningful and compliant with the Draft London Plan. There is also no meaningful policy guidance on appropriate heights in respect of any parts of the massive area identified as suitable high rise locations.
- 'Townscape significance' is undefined, as are many other terms in this proposed policy including 'proportionate to the significance of the proposed location and the size of the site'. Some guidance as to what these phrases mean is essential if the policy is to have any meaning. This policy requires considerable tightening if it is to be fit for purpose and ready for public consultation.
- The new proposed policy **P70 Local List** appears as an empty gesture of compliance / of the council having 'heard' but not 'listened' to the widespread calls from across the borough up to March 2018 - the council's consideration since then having produced a policy literally one sentence in length that makes no attempt to describe how it will be developed.
- This is perhaps the clearest example of how this proposed version of the NSP, despite the apparent intentions (and their reasons) set out in Amended Strategic Policy SP2 Regeneration that works for all, is 'claiming' but systematically 'failing' to meaningfully engage with its local communities.
- To summarise, the reality on the ground of the council's current planning practice on St Thomas Street (promising but effectively avoiding the cumulative consideration of **impacts**) - could in fact be read as the inverse

of SP2 .6 where (to paraphrase) Stronger communities will be achieved through enhancing local distinctiveness and heritage-led regeneration creating distinctive buildings and places that install pride of place in all our communities.”

Community impact statement

- The Southwark Constitution allows for deputations to be made by groups of people resident or working in the borough.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Cabinet procedure rule 2.11 on deputations:	160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395
Link: (copy and paste into browser) http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s63344/Cabinet%20procedure%20rules_July%202015.pdf		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
None	

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Chidilim Agada, Proper Constitutional Officer	
Report Author	Paula Thornton, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	17 January 2019	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Law and Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	17 January 2019	