

# Sustainable Development Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Tuesday, 9 December 2014  
7.00 pm, Committee Room 2  
Civic Suite  
Lewisham Town Hall  
London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Andrew Hagger (Tel: 020 8314 9446 Email:  
andrew.hagger@lewisham.gov.uk) (Tel: 0208 31 49446)

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded  
and/or filmed.

## Part 1

Item		Pages
3.	Mayoral response to the comments of the Sustainable Development Select Committee - Preserving Public Houses and assets of community value	67 - 74
4.	Bakerloo line consultation	75 - 80

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

Mayor and Cabinet		
<b>Report Title</b>	Preserving Public Houses and assets of community value - response to the Sustainable Development Select Committee	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	Item No.
<b>Ward</b>	All	
<b>Contributors</b>	Executive Director of Resources & Regeneration, Executive Director of Community Services and Head of Law	
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	Date: 3 December 2014

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report responds to the referral by the Sustainable Development Select Committee, considered at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 1 October 2014 and seeks to answer two questions raised. The first relates to the status of article 4 directions and asset of community value listings that have been placed on the Baring Hall Hotel and Windmill pubs. The second relates to details of how compensation for the owners of premises under an article four direction will be decided upon, and covers the Catford Bridge Tavern as well as the Baring Hall Hotel.
- 1.2 The report is in two parts. Part 1 addresses the majority of the questions raised. Part 2 covers those parts of the questions which contain information about the financial affairs of the Council, from which the press and public are therefore excluded.

## 2. Purpose

- 2.1 To respond to the matters raised by the Sustainable Development Select Committee in a report to Mayor and Cabinet on 1 October 2014.

## 3. Recommendation

- 3.1 The Mayor is recommended to note the content of this report and agree that it is reported back to the Sustainable Development Select Committee.

## 4. Policy Context

- 4.1 The Planning policy which protects viable local pubs from changes of use is found in the Development Management Local Plan (DMLP). The DMLP, when adopted, will be a Development Plan Document and as such will form part of the Council's policy framework. The DMLP will set out the detailed policies for consideration of planning applications in the borough and will implement the Core Strategy.

## **5. Background**

- 5.1 The Sustainable Development Select Committee produced a document 'Preserving Local Pubs' September 2012, and referred the document to the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 3rd October 2012. According to the Lewisham constitution, Select Committees can refer documents to the Mayor and Cabinet who are obliged to consider the document and respond to its content within two months of receipt.
- 5.2 The Mayor responded to the document with a report dated 5 December 2012 presented to the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 5 February 2013. The Mayor's response addressed the seven recommendations contained in 'Preserving Local Pubs'. The Mayor's response to a number of the recommendations required further action from officers.
- 5.3 A further report was presented to the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 9 September 2014 updating the Committee on the progress made in preserving local pubs. Following that meeting the Sustainable Development Select Committee referred a report to Mayor and Cabinet on 1 October 2014 which recommended that the Mayor note the views of the Committee and agree that the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration be asked to provide a response to the comments raised. Section 6 of this report responds to the issues raised.

## **6. Matters raised by the Sustainable Development Select Committee**

- 6.1 On 9 September 2014, the Select Committee considered a report entitled Preserving public houses and community assets of value. Following discussions at the meeting the Committee referred a report to Mayor and Cabinet, dated 1 October 2014 recommending that the Executive Director of Resources and Regeneration provide a response to the comments made.
- 6.2 The two issues raised and the associated responses are set out below.
1. *The Committee should be provided with updated details on the status of the article four directions and asset of community value listings that have been placed on the Baring Hall Hotel and Windmill pubs. This should include information about any ongoing compensation claims or legal cases relating to these pubs.*
- 6.3 There are two pubs, the Baring Hall Hotel and Catford Bridge Tavern, covered by Article 4 Directions in the borough. The effect of an Article 4 direction is to withdraw the right to undertake specified categories of development without the need for planning permission. In the case of the Baring Hall Hotel permitted development rights to demolish the building without applying for planning permission have been withdrawn. In the case of the Catford Bridge Tavern, permitted development rights to change the use of the building from pub to shop without planning permission have been withdrawn. In terms of their status, both Directions remain in effect.

- 6.4 In the case of the Baring Hall Hotel a compensation claim has been made and negotiations are on-going. No compensation claim has been received for the Catford Bridge Tavern.
- 6.5 In terms of Assets of Community Value, there is no further update on the Baring Hall Hotel, and the report to the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 9 September remains up to date. With regard to The Windmill Pub, the owners are currently appealing to the First Tier Tribunal against the Council's internal review decision to formally list the Windmill Pub. The nominator - CAMRA are currently being consulted as to whether they wish to join the appeal as a second defendant. The Council are awaiting further information from the Tribunal regarding this and as such no date has yet been set for the hearing. Additionally the Council has received formal notice from the owners of their intention to dispose of the asset, which has triggered an initial moratorium period where the nominating group have been invited to confirm their intention to bid on the property. Other eligible community groups in the area will also have the opportunity to make an intention to bid and information on this is being circulated via the Local Assembly coordinating groups in the area and is also on the Council's website - <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/getinvolved/community-support/community-assets/>. If any intentions to bid are received before the moratorium ends at 5 pm on the 19 November, this will trigger a further 6 month moratorium which is designed to give the bidding community group time to raise the funds to offer to purchase the property. Although the Localism Act makes provision for the moratorium periods, it does not give the bidding groups a first right of refusal, determine the price at which the asset can be sold or restrict who the owner should eventually sell the asset to. The Windmill Pub remains closed.

*2. The Committee should be provided with detailed information about how compensation for the owners of premises under an article four direction will be decided upon.*

- 6.6 The threshold for meeting the appropriate criteria for an Article 4 Direction are high; in that it needs to be demonstrated that the development proposed (demolishing the building) would be prejudicial to the proper planning of the area or constitute a threat to the amenities of the area. In both cases the Mayor and Cabinet agreed that these criteria had been met.
- 6.7 The withdrawal of permitted development rights by way of an Article 4 direction may give rise to the liability to compensate the developer. Any person interested in the land may seek compensation for abortive expenditure or other loss or damage directly attributable to the withdrawal of permitted development rights. The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that a planning application should first have been made and permission refused or only granted subject to conditions other than those previously imposed by the development order. Compensation may be claimed not only by owners and tenants, but also by persons with a contractual right to use the land.
- 6.8 Compensation liability arises even if the Council subsequently refuses to confirm the direction. If a direction is made and an express planning application

for demolition is refused or granted on conditions beyond those set out in the Order, the Council may be liable for a compensation claim.

- 6.9 In the case of the Baring Hall Hotel, the Article 4 direction was confirmed, a planning application to demolish the hotel made and refused and a claim for compensation submitted in December 2012. The claim is based on the alleged loss of value at the time of the notice of refusal of planning permission arising from the article 4 Direction, namely 2 November 2012. The claim is principally based on the diminution in the value of the claimant's freehold interests as a consequence of the refusal of planning permission for the permitted development. The diminution is represented by the difference at 2 November 2012 between the value of the property in its existing state and reflecting the Article 4 Direction and refusal of planning permission against the value of the property with the benefit of planning permission for the permitted development. Associated professional fees can also be added to the claim. The claim and the amount arises as a result of the Article 4 Direction only, and is not linked with earlier decisions regarding prior approval for the building's demolition.
- 6.10 Following the claim officers and specialist consultants have been working to achieve a negotiated settlement with the claimant. If an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the claimant may refer it to the Lands Chamber (previously known as the Lands Tribunal). The Lands Chamber's decision on the amount of compensation payable is binding. Costs of the proceedings are likely to be awarded to the successful party. The costs of valuation and legal fees associated with preparing for and appearing at the tribunal-are likely to be substantial. The negotiations are presently on-going and the claimant has not yet resorted to the Lands Chamber. Further details are set out in Part 2 of the report.

## **7 Legal Implications**

- 7.1 Where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that in the circumstance it is expedient that development permitted by schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 ("the GPDO)" should not be allowed, unless permission is granted for it, because the development is prejudicial to the proper planning of their area or constitutes a threat to the amenities of their area the LPA may remove those permitted development rights by a directive under Article 4 of the GPDO . This is know as an Article 4 Direction.
- 7.2 The effect of the Direction is that the permitted development right is withdrawn. The developer, in order to undertake the development will then need to obtain planning permission.
- 7.3 Compensation liability arises (section 108 of the Town and Country Planning Act) when the following conditions are met:

1. an Article 4 Direction withdrawing the permission (permitted development right), making it necessary for an application to obtain planning permission to carry out the development, is made
2. an application for planning permission to carry out the formerly permitted development is made to the planning authority within 12 months beginning with the date on which the Direction took effect
3. permission is refused for the development or granted subject to conditions other than those granted by the GPDO

7.4 If 1, 2 and 3 are met then the Applicant is entitled to compensation. Compensation is payable under two heads (section 107 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990). They are: (1) Abortive expenditure, which includes the preparation of plans for the purposes of any work and similar preparatory works, and (2) other loss or damage directly attributable to the withdrawal of the permitted development, which includes the depreciation of the claimants interest in the land. In all cases the loss must be directly attributable, ie a causal link must be established.

7.5 Any disputed compensation claim is to be referred to the Lands Chamber, (formerly the Lands Tribunal) for determination.

7.6 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

7.7 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

7.8 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

7.9 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the

equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

7.10 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

7.11 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

## **8 Financial Implications**

8.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from this report. There may be future financial implications arising from the outcome of negotiations in respect of any claims received however these are not yet known as either claims have not been received or negotiations not yet concluded. In the case of Baring Hall hotel a claim has been received which is subject to negotiation. Details of the amount of compensation sought are contained within the part 2 report. In the case of the Windmill pub no claim has yet been received. In the case of Catford Bridge Tavern no claim has been received.

## **9 Crime and disorder implications**

9.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report. However the car park area of the Baring Hall Hotel has been subject to fly-tipping and it is understood that the Catford Bridge Tavern was temporarily squatted. Both events can be attributed to the building's and site's periods of vacancy, as much the product of the development process generally as from the Article 4 Directions.

## **10 Equalities implications**



- 10.1 *Shaping our future*, Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham;-

***“Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn.”***

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:

- **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens
  - **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local services
- 10.2 The Council's Comprehensive Equality Scheme for 2012-16 provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council's work on equalities to support the Sustainable Community Strategy and to ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010.
- 10.3 A full Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) (previously known as Equality Impact Assessment) was carried out for the policies in the Council's Core Strategy in February 2009. The overall assessment was that the policies in the Core Strategy would not discriminate and that most policies have a positive impact. Three potential adverse impacts were identified: protection of employment land; designation of mixed use employment locations; and concerns of community groups about the amount of new housing development putting undue stress on the existing network of facilities (shops, transport, health facilities, community facilities and other services) particularly in the Deptford/New Cross area.
- 10.4 The Site Allocations DPD followed on from the Core Strategy and identifies sites, usually 0.25 hectares and above which area likely to be developed during the lifetime of the LDF (2011 – 2026). The Core Strategy sets out the policy context and principles for the development of the allocated sites.
- 10.5 An EAA of the Site Allocations DPD was undertaken in 2011 to identify the positive and negative impacts of the Core Strategy DPD and as a consequence the Site Allocations DPD, on three protected characteristics that were not included in the earlier EIA as it pre-dated the Equality Act 2010. This EAA also provided an update on the Core Strategy EIA.
- 10.6 The Development Management Local Plan proposes specific objectives and policies to help ensure that new development complies with inclusive design principles to ensure that the town centres are safe, attractive and inclusive places. Planning applications for development will need to demonstrate how proposals meet these objectives and policies. The DMLP was the subject of an EAA in 2012.

## 11. **Environmental implications**

11.1 There are no specific environmental implications from this report.

### Background documents

Short Title Document	Date	File Location	File Reference	Contact Officer	Exempt
Development Management Local Plan	2014	Laurence House	Planning Policy	Brian Regan	No
Baring Hall Hotel report to M&C	18 January 2012	Laurence House	Design and Conservation	Philip Ashford	No

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Philip Ashford, Design and Conservation, 3rd floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, Catford SE6 4RU – telephone 020 8314 8533.

# Agenda Item 4

Sustainable Development Select Committee		
Title	Bakerloo Line Extension Consultation	
Key Decision	No	Item No.
Ward	All Wards	
Contributors	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration	
Class	Part 1	9 December 2014

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 TfL have recently launched a public consultation on the Bakerloo Line Extension, and LB Lewisham has appointed experts in rail infrastructure and development planning to work on the Council's formal response. The Council will therefore be submitting a robust response to the consultation, drawing together all the benefits and opportunities presented by such a major investment in transport infrastructure, including opportunities for regeneration, housing and place-making.

## 2. Purpose

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to advise on the Council's latest position on the Bakerloo Line Extension, and to inform the Council's response to TfL's consultation. At the meeting, this report will be accompanied by a presentation by industry experts Parsons Brinckerhoff.

## 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Chair note the contents of this report and the presentation, and provide comments as appropriate to be considered for inclusion in the Council's response to the consultation.

## 4. Policy context

- 4.1 The Bakerloo Line Extension is a key component of the long term transport strategy for Lewisham, and would bring a range of economic, environmental and social improvements to the borough. The benefits of the proposal are formally recognised within the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, and by Transport for London's East Sub-Region Transport Plan.
- 4.2 Within the London Mayor's Transport Strategy (published May 2010) the Bakerloo Line is acknowledged as having an important role in London's transport geography, serving the strategic northwest-southeast corridor. It states that a Bakerloo southern extension "would allow the line to serve inner and outer southeast London. This would create a new southeast to northwest strategic route through the Capital, serving areas with poor transport accessibility and freeing up National Rail capacity at London Bridge for other service Improvements".

4.3 More recently, the London Infrastructure Plan 2050 emphasises the importance of high-capacity, high-frequency radial links, and highlights the Bakerloo Line Extension as a leading option to deliver such enhancements. This would also free up capacity on the rail network, and utilise the spare capacity on the existing section of the Bakerloo Line. This makes the BLE excellent value for money, and one of the most deliverable major rail schemes in London.

## **5. Background**

5.1 Since the inclusion of the Bakerloo Line Extension (BLE) within the London Mayor's Transport Strategy, the Council has been supporting and lobbying for the proposals to extend the Bakerloo Line, so that it may support the regeneration and investment within the borough.

5.2 However, despite a strong business case, the proposal remains unfunded, and is competing for investment alongside other major transport infrastructure projects in London.

5.3 TfL have recently launched a public consultation on the Bakerloo Line Extension, and LB Lewisham has appointed experts in rail infrastructure and development planning to work on the Council's formal response. The Council will therefore be submitting a robust response to the consultation, drawing together all the benefits and opportunities presented by such a major investment in transport infrastructure, including opportunities for regeneration, housing and place-making.

5.4 London faces an unprecedented challenge in meeting the demands of expected growth in the capital's population. The population of Lewisham is projected to reach 318,000 by 2021 (a rise of 43,000 since 2011) and reach 352,000 by 2031 (a rise of 34,000 since 2021).

5.5 In response, the Council is leading the borough through an intense period of regeneration which is transforming previously deprived areas and re-invigorating local places and town centres. Ambitious plans set out in the Council's current strategies set out a plan for growth which is expected to deliver 18,165 new homes across the borough, and 25,000 m<sup>2</sup> of retail and leisure space in Lewisham and Catford town centres.

5.6 However, in order for the borough to help meet the London-wide challenge in a sustainable way, major infrastructure investment such as the Bakerloo Line Extension is required to optimise the opportunities for new housing, through intensification and transformation of key sites.

## **6. Options**

6.1 Three route options are currently being considered:

Route 1 - Elephant and Castle to Beckenham Junction and Hayes via Old Kent Road

Route 2 – Elephant and Castle to Beckenham Junction and Hayes via Camberwell and Peckham

Route 3 – As Option 1 with link to Bromley

## **7. Business Case**

7.1 Despite the current funding gap for major transport projects in London (the scheme is currently unfunded), the project is not prohibitively expensive by rail standards. Transport for London estimate the cost at £2.3 to £2.8 billion. The project is anticipated to stimulate benefits of up to three times the cost, with a predicted Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) in excess of 3.

7.2 The transport business case - the scheme will:

- Create a new strategic route through the Capital (southeast to northwest);
- Introduce high frequency and high capacity tube services;
- Free-up congested rail paths into London Bridge;
- Enhance national rail routes to the South East (reduced journey times)
- Relieve the bottleneck at Lewisham Station;
- Utilise spare capacity on the Bakerloo Line;
- Provide relief to the Jubilee Line;
- Create opportunities to improve accessibility in the south of the borough;
- Provide economic benefits by adding value and promoting growth.

## **8. Timescales**

8.1 The current TfL consultation closes to the public on 7 December 2014. However, the Council and TfL have agreed an extension to the consultation to allow for a detailed response to be developed and submitted by 16 January 2015. The response will be informed by this meeting of the Sustainable Development Select Committee and will be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Business Panel on 16 December, before being submitted for approval by Mayor & Cabinet on 14 January 2015.

8.2 While the delivery of the Bakerloo Line Extension would be relatively straightforward, when compared to other major rail infrastructure projects, there are detailed process that must be followed in relation to design, consultation and establishing the necessary permissions.

8.3 Current work indicates an earliest possible opening by 2030. However, given the criticality of the proposal to sustaining future growth in south east London, every effort will be made to bring forward the delivery of the project to the earliest possible date.

## **9. Activity to date**

9.1 There have been a number of historic proposals to extend the Bakerloo Line, but the current proposals have been developing since 2007/08.

9.2 Throughout this period, LB Lewisham have actively supporting the development of the proposals, in conjunction with GLA, TfL, LB Southwark, and to a lesser extent, LB Bromley.

9.3 This activity has stepped up significantly since October 2012, when Sir Steve Bullock wrote a joint letter with LB Southwark to the Mayor of London in support of the proposals.

**2007/08** – MottMacdonald Engineering Feasibility work identified options 1&2

**May 2010** – BLE and DLR extension to Bromley included in MTS (Mayor's Transport Strategy)

**Aug 2010** – South East London Rail Access Study (SELRAS)

**Jul 2011** – Network Rail published its RUS for London and the South East

**2012** – Mayor's manifesto commits to examine Tramlink, DLR & Bakerloo

**Oct 2012** – Lewisham and Southwark wrote to Mayor in support of BLE

**Aug 2013** – Business case for BLE updated using costs derived from NLE

**Autumn 2013** – DLR options considered with alternative LO extension

**Nov 2013** – Atkins Planning Assessment completed

**Nov 2013** – Lewisham wrote to Isabelle Dedring in support of BLE and LOE package

**Jan 2014** – Old Kent Rd and Bromley Centre included as an OA in FALP

**Mar 2014** – TfL paper to Mayor on rail extensions in south London

**Sep 2014** – TfL launch BLE public consultation (runs to 7 Dec 2014)

## **10. Integrated package of transport proposals**

10.1 The Bakerloo Line Extension is part of a wider transport strategy for south-east London. The Council supports an integrated package of public transport improvements, which include:

- Bakerloo Line Extension (~2030)
- London Overground Extension (~2020)
- A package of bus service enhancements between the two lines to address poor levels of accessibility in the south of the borough (~2020)

10.2 Such a package is required in order to address three key issues:

- To accommodate levels of development already committed
- To sustain increased levels of development due to population growth
- To improve connectivity in the south of the borough, where public transport accessibility is very poor, and where the correlation with social and economic deprivation is clear.

## **11. Financial implications**

11.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

## **12. Legal implications**

12.1 There are no legal implications arising directly from this report.

### 13. Crime and disorder implications

- 13.1 There are no significant implications for the prevention of crime & disorder. However, any issues will be considered in detail as part of the project design process.

### 14. Equalities implications

- 14.1 The Equality Act 2010 became law in October 2010. The Act aims to streamline all previous anti-discrimination laws within a Single Act. The new public sector Equality Duty, which is part of the Equality Act 2010, came into effect on the 5 April 2011.
- 14.2 *Shaping our future*, Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham;-

***“Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn.”***

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:

- **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens
- **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local services

- 14.3 Lewisham's Comprehensive Equalities Scheme (CES) 2012-16 describes the Council's commitment to equality for citizens, service users and employees. The CES is underpinned by a set of high level strategic objectives which incorporate the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.

The Council equality objectives through the CES include:

#### **To improve access to services**

Take reasonable steps to ensure that services are inclusive; responsive to risk; physically accessible and provided through the most efficient and effective channels available.

#### **To close the gap in outcomes for citizens**

Take reasonable steps to improve life chances for citizens by reducing outcome gaps that may exist within the borough as well as those that may exist between the borough and elsewhere.

- 14.4 The Bakerloo Line Extension is part of the Council's long term transport strategy, developed alongside the LIP to ensure that any potential adverse impacts were fully considered and, where necessary, appropriate changes made. The overall findings of the assessment were that the proposals within the LIP do not discriminate or have significant adverse impacts on any of the protected characteristics.

- 14.5 Instead, the focus will;-

- improve access to public transport and employment opportunities for local residents by putting south east London on the Tube network and supporting development and regeneration in the area

- enhance the well-being and journey experience for all citizens by improving capacity and journey times; relieving crowding; reducing traffic congestion and air pollution by offering new public transport options.

## 15. Environmental implications

- 15.1 The preparation of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) has been accompanied by a parallel process of Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA). A part of that process involved the development of objectives against which the proposals in the LIP might be assessed.
- 15.2 With regards to cumulative effects the assessment suggest that with all the policies, schemes and measures implemented through the period of the LIP, there are likely to be significant positive effects on SEA objectives relating to health, air quality, promoting more sustainable modes of transport, promoting safer communities, improving road safety, and improving accessibility in the Borough.
- 15.3 The proposed schemes will reduce hazards and make the road environment more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. It is considered that the imposition of restrictions on vehicle movement referred to in the report, will not adversely impact on either the national or the Council's own air quality strategies.

## 16. Conclusion

- 16.1 In summary, the Council will be submitting a robust response to the consultation, drawing together all the benefits and opportunities presented by such a major investment in transport infrastructure, including opportunities for regeneration, housing and place-making.

### Background documents and originator

Short Title Document	Date	File Location	Contact Officer	Exempt
London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – report to OSC	29/09/14	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/kzusolp">http://tinyurl.com/kzusolp</a>	S.Moss	
Mayoral response to SDSC on the BLE	12/09/2012	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/n55879d">http://tinyurl.com/n55879d</a>	S.Moss	
BLE – Report to the SDSC	25/04/12	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/qxdry3x">http://tinyurl.com/qxdry3x</a>	S.Moss	

For further information please contact Simon Moss, Transport Policy and Development Manager, on 020 8314 2269.