Annex A
Updated Changes to London Plan as a result of Directions

| DR1 | Policy H10             | the need for additional family housing and the role of one and  |  |  |  |
|-----|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|     | (A)(9)                 | two bed units in freeing up existing family housing.  |  |  |  |
| DR2 | Policy D3 (A) and part | The design-led approach   |  |  |  |
|     | of (B)                 | A All development must make the best use of land by following a design led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations. Optimising site capacity means ensuring that development is of the most appropriate form and land use for the site. The design-led approach requires consideration of design options to determine the most appropriate form of development that responds to a site's context and capacity for growth, and existing and planned supporting infrastructure capacity (as set |  |  |  |
|     |                        | out in Policy D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities), and that best delivers the requirements set out in Part DB.  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | B Higher density developments should generally be promoted in locations that are well connected to jobs, services, infrastructure and amenities by public transport,  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | walking and cycling, in accordance with Policy D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities.  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | Where these locations have existing areas of high density   |  |  |  |
|     |                        | buildings, expansion of the areas should be positively  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | considered by Boroughs where appropriate. This could also include expanding Opportunity Area boundaries   |  |  |  |
|     |                        | where appropriate.  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | C In other areas, incremental densification should be   |  |  |  |
|     |                        | actively encouraged by Boroughs to achieve a change in  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | densities in the most appropriate way. This should be interpreted in the context of Policy H2.  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | ₿ D Development proposals should:   |  |  |  |
| DR2 | Paragraph 3.3.1        | For London to accommodate the growth identified in this Plan in an inclusive and responsible way every new development needs to   |  |  |  |
|     | 3.3.1                  | make the most efficient use of land by optimising site capacity.  This means ensuring the development's form is the most  |  |  |  |
|     |                        | appropriate for the site and land uses meet identified needs.  The design of the development must optimise site capacity.   |  |  |  |
|     |                        | Optimising site capacity means ensuring that the development  |  |  |  |
|     | 1                      | opaniong site supusity insuits chouring that the development  |  |  |  |

|     |                           | takes the most appropriate form for the site and that it is   |  |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
|     |                           | consistent with relevant planning objectives and policies. The  |  |
|     |                           | optimum capacity for a site does not mean the maximum capacity;   |  |
|     |                           | it may be that a lower density development – such as <b>Gg</b> ypsy and   |  |
|     |                           | Ttraveller pitches – is the optimum development for the site.   |  |
| DR3 | Paragraph                 | Delete Paragraph 4.2.12 and 4.2.13, re-number Paragraph 4.2.14  |  |
| DD4 | 4.2.12-13                 | The national continuous and an advantage of additional industrial   |  |
| DR4 | Policy E4(C)              | The retention, enhancement and provision of additional industrial   |  |
|     | including                 | capacity across the three categories of industrial land set out in  |  |
|     | footnote 103              | Part B should be planned, monitored and managed., having  |  |
|     |                           | regard to the industrial property market area and borough-<br>level categorisations in Figure 6.1 and Table 6.2. This should  |  |
|     |                           | ensure that in overall terms across London there is no net  |  |
|     |                           | loss of industrial 103 floorspace capacity (and operational yard  |  |
|     |                           | space capacity) within designated SIL and LSIS. Any release of  |  |
|     |                           | industrial land in order to manage issues of long-term vacancy and  |  |
|     |                           | to achieve wider planning objectives, including the delivery of   |  |
|     |                           | strategic infrastructure, should be facilitated through the processes   |  |
|     |                           | of industrial intensification, co-location and substitution set out in  |  |
|     |                           | Policy E7 Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution and  |  |
|     |                           | supported by Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL).  |  |
|     |                           | Supported by Folicy Lo offdesglo industrial Locations (OIL).  |  |
|     |                           | <sup>103</sup> Defined as the overall range of uses set out in Part A of  |  |
|     |                           | Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support  |  |
|     |                           | London's economic function  |  |
| DR4 | Paragraph                 | Based upon this evidence, this Plan addresses the need to retain  |  |
|     | 6.4.5                     | provide sufficient industrial, logistics and related capacity through   |  |
| 1   | 0.4.5                     | provide Sufficient industrial, logistics and related capacity timough   |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net  |  |
|     |                           |   |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here   |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace   |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  108 Defined as total proposed industrial floorspace (see Part A), divided by the total proposed site area. Source: London   |  |
|     | including                 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  108 Defined as total proposed industrial floorspace (see Part A), divided by the total proposed site area. Source: London Employment Sites Database, CAG Consultants, 2017: 65 per  |  |
| DR4 | including footnote 108    | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  108 Defined as total proposed industrial floorspace (see Part A), divided by the total proposed site area. Source: London Employment Sites Database, CAG Consultants, 2017: 65 per cent is the default plot ratio assumption for industrial and                   |  |
| DR4 | including<br>footnote 108 | its policies. by seeking, as a general principle, no overall net loss of industrial floorspace capacity across London in designated SIL and LSIS. Floorspace capacity is defined here as either the existing industrial and warehousing floorspace on site or the potential industrial and warehousing floorspace that could be accommodated on site at a 65 per cent plot ratio 108 (whichever is the greater).  108 Defined as total proposed industrial floorspace (see Part A), divided by the total proposed site area. Source: London Employment Sites Database, CAG Consultants, 2017: 65 per cent is the default plot ratio assumption for industrial and warehousing sites |  |

|     | including    | and/or new appropriate locations supported by                    |  |  |
|-----|--------------|--|--|--|
|     | footnote 110 | appropriate evidence.  |  |  |
|     |              |  |  |  |
|     |              | 6.4.7 All boroughs in the Central Services Area should           |  |  |
|     |              | recognise the need to provide essential services to the          |  |  |
|     |              | CAZ and Northern Isle of Dogs and in particular                  |  |  |
|     |              | sustainable 'last mile' distribution/ logistics, 'just-in-time'  |  |  |
|     |              | servicing (such as food service activities, printing,            |  |  |
|     |              | administrative and support services, office supplies,            |  |  |
|     |              | repair and maintenance), waste management and                    |  |  |
|     |              | recycling, and land to support transport functions. This         |  |  |
|     |              | should be taken into account when assessing whether              |  |  |
|     |              | substitution is appropriate.                                     |  |  |
|     |              | 6.4.8 Where industrial land vacancy rates are currently well     |  |  |
|     |              | above the London average, Boroughs are encouraged to             |  |  |
|     |              | assess whether the release of industrial land for alternative    |  |  |
|     |              | uses is more appropriate if demand cannot support industrial     |  |  |
|     |              | uses in these locations. Where possible, a substitution          |  |  |
|     |              | approach to alternative locations with higher demand for         |  |  |
|     |              | industrial uses is encouraged.                                   |  |  |
| DR4 | Table 6.2    | Delete table setting out borough categories for industrial land  |  |  |
|     |              | release/retention  |  |  |
| DR4 | Figure 6.1   | Delete map showing setting out borough categories for industrial |  |  |
|     |              | land release/retention   |  |  |
| DR4 | Policy       | 4) strategically coordinate Development Plans to identify        |  |  |
|     | E5(B)(4)     | opportunities to substitute industrial capacity and function of  |  |  |
|     |              | Strategic Industrial Locations where evidence that alternative,  |  |  |
|     |              | more suitable, locations exist. This release must be carried     |  |  |
|     |              | out through a planning framework or Development Plan             |  |  |
|     |              | Document review process and adopted as policy in a               |  |  |
|     |              | Development Plan. All Boroughs are encouraged to evaluate        |  |  |
|     |              | viable opportunities to provide additional industrial land in    |  |  |
|     |              | new locations to support this process. This policy should be     |  |  |
|     |              | applied in the context of Policy E7 Industrial intensification,  |  |  |
|     |              | co-location and substitution.                                    |  |  |
| DR4 | Policy E5(D) | Development proposals for uses in SILs other than those set      |  |  |
|     | including    | out in Part A of Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and      |  |  |
|     | renumbering  | services to support London's economic function, (including       |  |  |
|     | of E5(E) as  | residential development, retail, places of worship, leisure and  |  |  |
|     | E5(D)        | assembly uses), should be refused except in areas released       |  |  |
|     |              | through a strategically co-ordinated process of SIL              |  |  |
|     |              | consolidation. This release must be carried out through a        |  |  |

|     |              | planning framework or Development Plan Document review process and adopted as policy in a Development Plan or as part of a co-ordinated masterplanning process in collaboration with the GLA and relevant borough.  |
|-----|--------------|---|
| DR4 | Policy E7(C) | Mixed-use development proposals on Non-Designated Industrial Sites which co-locate industrial, storage or distribution floorspace with residential and/or other uses should also meet the criteria set out in Part Ds D2 to D4 below.   |
| DR4 | Policy E7(D) | The processes set out in Parts B and C above must ensure that:  |
|     |              | 1) the industrial uses within the SIL or LSIS are intensified to deliver an increase (or at least no overall net loss) of capacity in terms of industrial, storage and warehousing floorspace with appropriate provision of yard space for servicing  |
|     |              | the industrial and related activities on-site and in surrounding parts of the SIL, LSIS or Non-Designated Industrial Site are not compromised in terms of their continued efficient function, access, service arrangements and days/hours of operation noting that many businesses have 7-day/24-hour access and operational requirements |
|     |              | 23) the intensified industrial, storage and distribution uses are completed in advance of any residential component being occupied  |
|     |              | <ul><li>34) appropriate design mitigation is provided in any residential element to ensure compliance with 1 and 2 above with particular consideration given to:</li></ul>  |
|     |              | <ul> <li>a) safety and security</li> <li>b) the layout, orientation, access, servicing and delivery arrangements of the uses in order to minimise conflict</li> <li>c) design quality, public realm, visual impact and amenity for residents</li> <li>d) agent of change principles</li> </ul>  |
|     |              | <ul> <li>d) agent of change principles</li> <li>e) vibration and noise</li> <li>f) air quality, including dust, odour and emissions and potential contamination.</li> </ul>   |

| DR4  | Paragraph | Whilst the majority of land in SILs should be retained and               |
|------|-----------|--|
| DIX4 | 6.7.2     | intensified for the industrial-type functions set out in Part            |
|      | 0.7.2     | A of Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to              |
|      |           | support London's economic function, tThere may be scope                  |
|      |           | for selected parts of SILs or LSISs to be consolidated or                |
|      |           | appropriately substituted. This should be done through a                 |
|      |           | carefully co-ordinated plan-led approach (in accordance with             |
|      |           | Parts B and D of Policy E7 <sup>4</sup> -Industrial intensification, co- |
|      |           | location and substitution) to deliver an intensification of              |
|      |           | industrial and related uses in the consolidated SIL or LSIS              |
|      |           | and facilitate the <b>release of some land</b> for a mix of uses         |
|      |           | including residential. Local Plan policies' maps and/or OAPFs            |
|      |           | and masterplans (as relevant) should indicate clearly:                   |
|      |           | and musterplans (as relevant) should maleute oleany.                     |
|      |           | i. the area to be retained, substituted and/or intensified as SIL        |
|      |           | or LSIS (and to provide future capacity for the uses set out in          |
|      |           | Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) and Policy E6 Locally     |
|      |           | Significant Industrial Sites) and  |
|      |           | ii. the area to be released from SIL or LSIS (see illustrative           |
|      |           | examples in Figure 6.3). Masterplans should cover the whole of the       |
|      |           | SIL or LSIS, and should be informed by the operational                   |
|      |           | requirements of existing and potential future businesses.                |
| DR4  | Paragraph | Southwark is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) which will set          |
|      | 2.1.16    | out how the BLE will enable significant residential and employment       |
|      |           | growth. The Old Kent Road OA contains the last remaining                 |
|      |           | significant areas of Strategic Industrial Locations that lie in close    |
|      |           | proximity to the CAZ and the only SILs within Southwark. The AAP         |
|      |           | should <del>plan for no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity</del> |
|      |           | and set out how industrial land can be intensified and provide           |
|      |           | space for businesses that need to relocate from any SIL identified       |
|      |           | for release. Areas that are released from SIL should seek to co-         |
|      |           | locate housing with industrial uses, or a wider range of commercial      |
|      |           | uses within designated town centres. Workspace for the existing          |
|      |           | creative industries should also be protected and supported.              |
| DR4  | Paragraph | The Planning Framework should quantify the full development              |
|      | 2.1.33    | potential of the area as a result of Crossrail 2. It should ensure that  |
|      |           | industrial, logistics and commercial uses continue to form part of       |
|      |           | the overall mix of uses in the area, with no net loss of industrial      |
|      |           | floorspace capacity, and that opportunities for intensification of       |
|      |           | industrial land and co-location of industrial and residential uses are   |
|      |           | fully explored. Tottenham and Walthamstow contain clusters of            |

See also paragraphs 6.4.5 to 6.4.8 for definition of industrial floorspace capacity

|     |                     | creative industries which should be protected and supported. The Planning Framework should also protect and improve sustainable access to the Lee Valley Regional Park and reservoirs, and ensure links through to Hackney Wick and the Lower Lea Valley. Planning frameworks should include an assessment of any effects on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation and appropriate mitigation strategies.   |
|-----|---------------------|--|
| DR4 | Paragraph           | Housing Zone status and investment by Peabody in estate renewal  |
|     | 2.1.53              | in the area will improve the quality of the environment and bring new housing opportunities. To deliver wider regeneration benefits to Thamesmead, other interventions to support the growth of the Opportunity Area are needed. These include: the redevelopment and intensification of employment sites to enable a range of new activities and workspaces to be created in parallel with new housing development; a review of open space provision in the area to create better quality, publicly accessible open spaces; the creation of a new local centre around Abbey Wood station, the revitalisation of Thamesmead town centre and Plumstead High Street; and improved local transit connections. The Planning Framework should ensure that there is no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity. |
| DD4 | Dorograph           |  |
| DR4 | Paragraph<br>2.1.56 | Industrial and logistics uses will continue to play a significant role in the area. The Planning Framework should ensure that there  |
|     |                     | is no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity, and that   |
|     |                     | industrial uses are retained and intensified, and form part of   |
|     |                     | the mix in redevelopment proposals. Belvedere is recognised as having potential as a future District centre.   |
| DR5 | Policy G2           | A The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development:   |
|     |                     | development proposals that would harm the Green Belt should be refused except where very special circumstances exist   |
|     |                     | 2) subject to national planning policy tests, the  |
|     |                     | enhancement of the Green Belt to provide appropriate multi-  |
|     |                     | functional beneficial uses for Londoners should be supported.  |
|     |                     | B Exceptional circumstances are required to justify  |
|     |                     | either the extension or de-designation of the Green Belt   |
|     |                     | through the preparation or review of a Local Plan. The   |
|     |                     | extension of the Green Belt will be supported, where   |
|     |                     | appropriate. Its de-designation will not be supported.   |

| DR6 | Policy C3(A)        | Matropolitan Open Land (MOL) is afforded the same  |  |  |
|-----|---------------------|--|--|--|
| DKO | Policy G3(A)        | Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) is afforded the same status and level of protection as Green Belt:  |  |  |
|     |                     | 1) Development proposals that would harm MOL should be refused. MOL should be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national planning policy tests that apply to the Green Belt  |  |  |
|     |                     | 2) boroughs should work with partners to enhance the quality and range of uses of MOL.   |  |  |
| DR6 | Policy G3(C)        | Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken through the Local Plan process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining boroughs. MOL boundaries should only be changed in exceptional circumstances when this is fully evidenced and justified, taking into account the purposes for including land in MOL set out in Part B ensuring that the quantum of MOL is not reduced, and that the overall value of the land designated as MOL is improved by reference to each of the criteria in Part B.   |  |  |
| DR7 | Policy H14          | Delete Policy H14 B in its entirety.   |  |  |
| DIX | and                 |  |  |  |
|     | supporting<br>text  | Modify Policies C and D as follows:  C. Boroughs that have not undertaken a needs assessment since 2008 should use the figure of need for Gypsy and Traveller gypsy and traveller accommodation provided in Table 4.4 as identified need for pitches until a needs assessment, using the definition set out above, is undertaken as part of their Development Plan review process.  D. Boroughs that have undertaken a needs assessment since 2008 should update this based on the definition set out above as part of their Development Plan review process |  |  |
|     |                     | Delete supporting text paragraphs 4.14.1. 4.14.2, 4.14.3, 4.14.4, 4.14.7 and re-number remaining paragraphs  |  |  |
|     |                     | In Policy H14 sections A, E and G and supporting text paragraphs 4.14.5, 4.14.6, 4.14.8, 4.14.9, 4.14.11 and 4.14.12: Replace the terms 'Gypsy and Traveller' and 'Gypsies and Travellers' respectively with the phrases gypsy and traveller and gypsies and travellers in line with PPTS.   |  |  |
| DR8 | Paragraph<br>0.0.21 | The Plan provides an appropriate spatial strategy that plans for London's growth in a sustainable way and has been found sound by the planning inspectors through the examination in public. The housing targets set out for each London Borough are the basis for planning for housing in London. Therefore, boroughs do not need to revisit these figures as part of their Local Plan development, unless they have additional evidence that   |  |  |

|     |            | suggests they can achieve deliv                                 | erv of hous    | sing above these                |
|-----|------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|
|     |            | figures whilst remaining in line                                |                |                                 |
|     |            | established in this Plan.                                       |                |                                 |
| DR9 | Table 10.3 | Location  | Number of beds | Maximum parking provision*      |
|     |            | Central Activities Zone   | All            | Car free                        |
|     |            | Inner London Opportunity Areas                                  |                |                                 |
|     |            | Metropolitan and Major Town<br>Centres                          |                |                                 |
|     |            | All areas of PTAL 5 – 6   |                |                                 |
|     |            | Inner London PTAL 4   |                |                                 |
|     |            | Inner London PTAL 3   | <u>AII</u>     | Up to 0.25 spaces per dwelling  |
|     |            | Inner London PTAL 2   | <u>All</u>     | Up to 0.5 spaces per dwelling   |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 4   |                |                                 |
|     |            | Outer London Opportunity Areas                                  |                |                                 |
|     |            | Inner London PTAL 0 – 1   | <u>All</u>     | Up to 0.75 spaces               |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 3   |                | per dwelling                    |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 4   | <u>1 – 2</u>   | <b>Up to 0.5 - 0.75</b>         |
|     |            |   |                | spaces per                      |
|     |            |   |                | dwelling <sup>+</sup>           |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 4   | <u>3+</u>      | Up to 0.5 - 0.75                |
|     |            |   |                | spaces per<br>dwelling*         |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 2 – 3   | 1-2            | Up to 0.75 spaces               |
|     |            |   |                | per dwelling                    |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 2 – 3   | <u>3+</u>      | Up to 1 space per dwelling      |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 0 – 1   | 1-2            | Up to 1.5 space per dwelling    |
|     |            | Outer London PTAL 0 – 1   | <u>3+</u>      | Up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling ^ |
|     |            | * Where Development Plans sp                                    | ecify lower    |                                 |
|     |            | standards for general or operat                                 | -              |                                 |
|     |            | ~ With the exception of disable Policy T6.1 Residential Parking | -              | parking, see Part G             |
|     |            | 1 chey 10.1 Residential Larking                                 | <u>L</u>       |                                 |

|      |   | * When considering development proposals that are higher density or in more accessible locations, the lower standard shown here should be applied as a maximum.  ^ Boroughs should consider standards that allow for higher levels of provision where there is clear evidence that this would support additional family housing Where small units (generally studios and one bedroom flats) make up a proportion of a development, parking provision should reflect the resultant reduction in demand so that provision across the site is less than 1.5 spaces per unit |
|------|---|--|
| DR10 | Policy<br>T6.3(A)<br>Retail<br>Parking<br>Standards | The maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.5 should be applied to new retail development, unless alternative standards have been implemented in a Development Plan through the application of Policy G below. New retail development should avoid being car-dependent and should follow a town centre first approach, as set out in Policy SD7 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents.   |
| DR10 | Policy<br>T6.3(G)<br>NEW                            | G. Boroughs may consider alternative standards in defined locations consistent with the relevant criteria in the NPPF where there is clear evidence that the standards in Table 10.5 would result in: a. A diversion of demand from town centres to out of town centres, undermining the town centres first approach. b. A significant reduction in the viability of mixed-use redevelopment proposals in town centre.   |
| DR11 | Paragraphs 4.1.11 to 4.1.13                         | Delete paragraph 4.1.11and re-number remaining paragraphs.   |