|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chapter 9 Sustainable Infrastructure** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.9.1 | | SI1 A 1 & 2 | | A 1) ~~D~~**d**evelopment proposals should not…  2) ~~D~~**d**evelopment proposals should use design solutions to prevent or minimise increased exposure to existing air pollution and make provision to address local problems of air quality | |  | | Readability | | |
| MSC.9.2 | | SI1 A 3 | | A London’s air quality should be significantly improved and exposure to poor air quality, especially for vulnerable people, should be reduced:  3) ~~The development of large-scale redevelopment areas, such as Opportunity Areas and~~ **masterplans and development briefs for large-scale development proposals** ~~those~~ subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment should propose methods of achieving an Air Quality Positive approach through the new development. ~~All other developments should be at least Air Quality Neutral.~~ | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.3 | | SI1 A 3A | | *Insert new clause SI1 3A*  A London’s air quality should be significantly improved and exposure to poor air quality, especially for vulnerable people, should be reduced:..  **3A Major development proposals must be at least air quality neutral and be submitted with an Air Quality Assessment.** | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.4 | | SI1 A 4 | | A 4) ~~D~~**d**evelopment proposals must demonstrate how they plan to comply with… | |  | | Readability | | |
| MSC.9.5 | | SI1 A 5 | | A London’s air quality should be significantly improved and exposure to poor air quality, especially for vulnerable people, should be reduced:  **~~5) Air Quality Assessments (AQAs) should be submitted with all major developments, unless they can demonstrate that transport and building emissions will be less than the previous or existing use.~~** | |  | | Consistency within the Plan- | | |
| MSC.9.6 | | SI1 A 6 | | A 6) ~~D~~**d**evelopment proposals should ensure that where emissions need to be reduced, this is done on-site… | |  | |  | | |
| MSC.9.7 | | SI1  Paragraph 9.1.1 | | 9.9.1 … The impacts tend to be most heavily felt in some of London’s most deprived neighbourhoods, and by people who are most vulnerable to the impacts. **The Mayor is committed to making air quality in London the best of any major world city, which means not only meeting and maintaining legal limits for Nitrogen Dioxide as soon as possible but also working to achieve World Health Organisation targets for other pollutants such as Particulate Matter.** | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.8 | | SI1  Footnote 116 | | Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010, or subsequent revisions thereof [**http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/1001/contents/made**](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/1001/contents/made) | |  | | Factual Update | | |
| MSC.9.9 | | SI2 A | | A Major development should be net zero-carbon. This means reducing ~~carbon dioxide~~ **greenhouse gas** emissions ~~from~~ **in** ~~construction and~~ operation~~,~~ and minimising both annual and peak energy demand in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:  1) ~~B~~**b**e lean: use less energy and manage demand during ~~construction and~~ operation.  2) ~~B~~**b**e clean: exploit local energy resources (such as secondary heat) and supply energy efficiently and cleanly. ~~Development in Heat Network Priority Areas should follow the heating hierarchy in Policy SI3 Energy infrastructure~~.  3) ~~B~~**b**e green: **maximise opportunities for renewable energy by** ~~generate~~ **producing**, stor~~e~~**ing** and us**ing** renewable energy on-site | | London Boroughs, London Tenants, LETI, London First, Individuals, Green Party, Friends of the Earth, Just Space, Solar Trade Association, BSRIA | | Clarification and consistency within the plan | | |
| MSC.9.10 | | SI2 A 3A | | **A 3A) Be seen: monitor, verify and report on energy performance.** | | LETI, UK Green Building Council, Solar Trade Association. London Boroughs, London Sustainable Development Commission, Hornsey & Wood Green Labour, Ashden, Levitt Bernstein, BWB Consulting, Fuel Poverty Action, Individuals, BSRIA | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.11 | | SI2 B | | B Major development **proposals** should include a detailed energy strategy to demonstrate how the zero-carbon target will be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy ~~and will be expected to monitor and report on energy performance.~~ | | LETI, UK Green Building Council, Solar Trade Association, London Boroughs, London Sustainable Development Commission, Hornsey & Wood Green Labour, Ashden, Levitt Bernstein, BWB Consulting, Fuel Poverty Action, Individuals | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.12 | | SI2 C and footnote 117 | | C ~~In meeting the zero-carbon target a~~ **A** minimum on-site reduction of at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations117 is ~~expected~~ **required for major development**. Residential development should ~~aim to~~ achieve 10 per cent, and non-residential development should ~~aim to~~ achieve 15 per cent through energy efficiency measures. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided**, in agreement with the borough, either**:  1) through a cash in lieu contribution to the ~~relevant~~ borough’s carbon offset fund, ~~and/~~or  2) off-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain.  117 Building Regulations 2013. If these are updated, the policy threshold will be reviewed **https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/conservation-of-fuel-and-power-approved-document-l** | | Ashden, LETI, Boroughs (Ealing, Greenwich), Boroughs (Merton), Green Party, Putney Society, ACE, London First, Southern Housing Group, BSRIA | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.13 | | SI2 D | | D Boroughs must establish and administer a carbon offset fund. Offset fund payments must be ring-fenced to implement projects that deliver ~~greenhouse gas~~**carbon** reductions. The operation of offset funds should be monitored and reported on annually. | |  | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.14 | | SI2 DA | | *Insert new paragraph SI2 DA*  DA **Major development proposals should calculate and minimise carbon emissions from any other part of the development, including plant or equipment, that are not covered by Building Regulations, i.e. unregulated emissions.** | | London First, Canary Wharf Group, Clarion Housing Group, CIBSE, British Property Federation | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.15 | | SI2 DB | | *Insert new paragraph SI2 DB*  DB **Development proposals referable to the Mayor should calculate whole life-cycle carbon emissions through a nationally recognised Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions taken to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions.** | | LETI, UK Green Building Council, Sustainability consultants (Etude, Levitt Bernstein etc) Just Space, Hornsey & Wood Green Labour, Individuals | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.16 | | SI12 Figure 9.2 | | *figure 9.2 amended to show ‘be seen’ stage* | | LETI | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.17 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.4 | | 9.2.4 A zero-carbon target for major residential developments has been in place for London since October 2016 **and applies to**~~. This target will be extended to include~~ major non-residential developments **from 2019.**~~on final publication of this Plan (expected 2019).~~ | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.18 | | SI2  Footnote 119 | | 119 Building Regulations 2013. If these are updated, the policy threshold will be reviewed. **https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/conservation-of-fuel-and-power-approved-document-l** | |  | | Factual Update | | |
| MSC.9.19 | | SI2  Footnote 121 | | 121 For examples see London Environment Strategy **2018** | |  | | Factual Update | | |
| MSC.9.20 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.5A | | *Insert new paragraph 9.2.5A*  9.2.5A **The Mayor recognises that Building Regulations use outdated carbon emission factors and that this will continue to cause uncertainty until they are updated by Government. Further guidance on the use of appropriate emissions factors will be set out in the Mayor’s Energy Planning Guidance to help provide certainty to developers on how these policies are implemented.** | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.21 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.6 | | 9.2.6 Developments are expected to achieve carbon reductions beyond part L from energy efficiency measures alone to reduce energy demand as far as possible. Residential development should ~~aim to~~ achieve 10 per cent and non-residential development should ~~aim to~~ achieve 15 per cent over part L. | | Ashden, LETI, Boroughs (Ealing, Greenwich) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.22 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.7 | | 9.2.7… However, offset funds ~~do~~ have the potential to unlock carbon savings from the existing building stock through energy efficiency programmes and by installing renewable technologies – typically more expensive to deliver in London due to the building age, type and tenure. | |  | | Readability | | |
| MSC.9.23 | | SI2 Paragraph  9.2.9 | | 9.2.9… Major developments are required to monitor and report on energy performance, such as by displaying a Display Energy Certificate (DEC)**,** and reporting to the Mayor for at least five years via an online portal to enable the GLA... | |  | | Readability | | |
| MSC.9.24 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.9A | | *Insert new paragraph 9.2.9A*  9.2.9A **Operational carbon emissions will make up a declining proportion of a development’s whole life carbon emissions as operational carbon targets become more stringent. To fully capture a development’s carbon impact, a whole life-cycle approach is needed to capture its unregulated emissions (i.e. those associated with cooking and small appliances), its embodied emissions (i.e. those associated with raw material extraction, manufacture and transport of building materials, and construction) and emissions associated with maintenance and eventual material disposal). Whole life-cycle carbon emission assessments are therefore required for development proposals referable to the Mayor. Major non-referable development should calculate unregulated emissions and are encouraged to undertake whole life-cycle assessments.** | | LETI, UK Green Building Council, Sustainability consultants (Etude, Levitt Bernstein etc) Just Space, Hornsey & Wood Green Labour, Individuals | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.25 | | SI2  Paragraph  9.2.10 | | 9.2.10… As a minimum, energy strategies should contain the following information:  a. A calculation of the energy demand and carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions covered by Building Regulations and, separately, the energy demand and carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions from any other part of the development, including plant or equipment, that are not covered by the Building Regulations (i.e. the unregulated emissions), at each stage of the energy hierarchy.  b. Proposals to reduce carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions beyond Building Regulations through the energy efficient design of the site, buildings and services, whether it is categorised as a new build, a major refurbishment or a consequential improvement.  c. Proposals to further reduce carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions through the use of zero or low-emission decentralised energy where feasible, prioritising connection to district heating and cooling networks and utilising local secondary heat sources. (Development in Heat Network Priority Areas should follow the heating hierarchy in Policy SI3 Energy infrastructure). | |  | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.26 | | SI2  Paragraph 9.2.10 | | 9.2.10 d. Proposals to further reduce carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions ~~through~~ **by maximising opportunities to produce** ~~the generation~~ and use ~~of on-site~~ renewable energy **on-site**, utilising storage technologies where appropriate. | | Boroughs (Camden, H&F) Green Party, Friends of the Earth, Just Space, Solar Trade Assoc. Individuals | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.27 | | SI2  Paragraph 9.2.10 | | 9.2.10 h. **A plan for monitoring and annual reporting of** ~~Proposals for how~~ energy demand and carbon ~~dioxide~~ emissions post-construction ~~will be monitored annually (~~for at least five years~~)~~. | |  | | Clarification and readability | | |
| MSC.9.28 | | SI2  Paragraph 9.2.10 | | 9.2.10 k. ~~Proposals to minimise~~ ~~the embodied carbon in construction~~ A whole life-cycle carbon emissions assessment, and actions to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions (for development proposals referable to the Mayor). | | LETI, UK Green Building Council, Sustainability consultants (Etude, Levitt Bernstein etc) Just Space, Hornsey & Wood Green Labour, Individuals | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.29 | | SI3 B 3 | | B… 3) major heat supply plant **including**  ~~4) possible~~ opportunities to utilise **heat from** energy from waste **plants**… | | CIBSE, Boroughs (H&F), GLA Labour Group, London Waste and Recycling Board, North London Waste Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.30 | | SI3 B 11A | | *Insert new clause SI3 B 11A*  **11A)** **opportunities to maximise renewable electricity generation and incorporate demand-side response measures**. | | London Sustainability Exchange, LETI, London Sustainable Development Commission, Individuals, Hoare Lea LLP, Siemens, Solar Trade Association, Friends of the Earth, Ashden | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.31 | | SI3 D | | Major development proposals within Heat Network Priority Areas should have a communal **low-temperature** heating system | | The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG), Arup, Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.32 | | SI3 D 1 | | D1… b) use ~~available~~ **zero-emission or** local secondary heat sources (in conjunction with heat pump, if required~~, and a lower temperature heating system~~)  ~~c) generate clean heat and/or power from zero-emission sources…~~ | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.33 | | SI3 D 1 | | D1… ~~d) use fuel cells (if using natural gas in areas where legal air quality limits are exceeded all development proposals must provide evidence to show that any emissions related to energy generation will be equivalent or lower than those of an ultra-low NOx gas boiler)…~~ | |  | | Clarification and readability | | |
| MSC.9.34 | | SI3 D 1 | | D1… e) use low**-**emission combined heat and power (CHP) **(only where there is a case for CHP to enable the delivery of an area-wide heat network)** ~~(in areas where legal air quality limits are exceeded all development proposals must provide evidence to show that any emissions related to energy generation will be equivalent or lower than those of an ultra-low NOx gas boiler)~~ | | London Boroughs, LEDNet, ClientEarth, BSRIA | | Clarification and readability | | |
| MSC.9.35 | | SI3 D 2 | | D2 CHP and ultra-low NOx gas boiler communal or district heating systems should be designed to ensure that **they meet the requirements of policy SI1 (A)** ~~there is no significant impact on local air quality.~~ | | Environment Agency | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.36 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.2 | | 9.3.2… Decentralised energy will become an increasingly important element of London’s energy supply and will help London become more self-sufficient **and resilient** in relation to its energy needs. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.37 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.2A | | *Insert new paragraph 9.3.2A*  **9.3.2A Many of London’s existing heat networks have grown around combined heat and power (CHP) systems. However, the carbon savings from gas engine CHP are now declining as a result of national grid electricity decarbonising, and there is increasing evidence of adverse air quality impacts. Heat networks are still considered to be an effective and low-carbon means of supplying heat in London, and offer opportunities to transition to zero-carbon heat sources faster than individual building approaches. Where there remains a strategic case for low-emission CHP systems to support area-wide heat networks, these will continue to be considered on a case by case basis.** | | BSRIA | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.38 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.3 | | 9.3.3... Data relating to new and expanded networks will be regularly captured and made publicly available **Major development proposals outside Heat Network Priority Areas should select a low-carbon heating system that is appropriate to the heat demand of the development, provides a solution for managing peak demand and avoids high energy bills for occupants.** | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.39 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.5 | | 9.3.5... The Mayor also supports the development of low-temperature networksfor both new and existing systems as this allows cost-effective use of low-grade waste heat. **It is expected that network supply temperatures will drop from the traditional 90⁰C-95⁰C to less than 70⁰C depending on system design. Further guidance on designing and operating heat networks will be set out in the updated London Heat Network Manual.** | | LETI | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.40 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.6 | | ~~9.3.6 Further information about the relevance of CHP in developments of various scales will also be provided in the Energy Planning Guidance document, which will be kept updated as technology changes. However, it is not expected that gas engine CHP will be able to meet the standards required within areas exceeding air quality limits with the technology that is currently available.~~ **Low-emission CHP in this policy refers to those technologies which inherently emit very low levels of NOx. It is not expected that gas engine CHP will fit this category with the technology that is currently available. Further details on circumstances in which it will be appropriate to use low-emission CHP and what additional emissions monitoring will be required will be provided in further guidance. This guidance will be regularly updated to ensure that it reflects changes in technology.** | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.41 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.7 | | 9.3.7 Increasing the amount of ~~new~~ renewable energy ~~sources in London developments~~ is supported **and development proposals should identify opportunities to maximise renewable energy production on-site**. This includes the use of ~~energy from waste schemes that are connected to a heat network, as well as~~ solar photovoltaics**, heat pumps** and solar thermal, both on buildings and at a larger scale on appropriate sites. There is also potential for wind and hydropower-based renewable energy in some locations within London. **Innovative low- and zero-carbon technologies will also be supported.** | | London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.42 | | SI3 Paragraph 9.3.8 | | 9.3.8… switch to electri**c**~~fying~~ heating systems (such as through heat pumps)... ~~Energy masterplans are expected to identify any necessary electricity infrastructure.~~ | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.43 | | SI3  Footnote 124 | | 124 Based on data from London Energy and Greenhouse Gas Inventory (LEGGI) [**https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/leggi**](https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/leggi) | |  | | Factual Update | | |
| MSC.9.44 | | SI3  Paragraph 9.3.10 | | 9.3.10 ~~National Grid~~ **Cadent Gas** and ~~Southern Gas Networks~~ **SGN** operate London’s gas distribution network. Both companies are implementing significant gasholder de-commissioning programmes**,** replacing them with smaller gas pressure reduction stations... | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.45 | | SI3 Figure 9.3 | | Heat Network Priority Areas ~~and Heat Density in London~~  Relative heat demand based on fuel use kWh/m2/year  Remove layer showing areas where legal air quality limits are exceeded, and remove from key | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.46 | | SI4 A | | A Development proposals should minimise ~~internal heat gain and the~~ **adverse** impacts **on** ~~of~~ the urban heat island through design, layout, orientation, ~~and~~ materials **and the incorporation of green infrastructure**.… | | Environment Agency, Natural England, London Boroughs, Kent County Council, Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE), Green Party, Twinn Sustainability, Trees and Design Action Group, landscape Institute | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.47 | | SI4 B | | B Major development proposals should demonstrate through an energy strategy how they will reduce the potential for **internal** overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems in accordance with the following cooling hierarchy: | | BSRIA | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.48 | | SI4 B | | *Reordering of clauses B 1 & 2* | | CIBSE | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.49 | | SI4 B 2 | | B2) reduce the amount of heat entering a building through orientation, shading, **high** albedo **materials**, fenestration, insulation and the provision of green ~~roofs and walls~~ **infrastructure** | | Environment Agency, Natural England, London Boroughs, Kent County Council, Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE), Green Party, Twinn Sustainability, Trees and Design Action Group, landscape Institute | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.50 | | SI4 Paragraph 9.4.1 | | 9.4.1... This, combined with a growing population**, urbanisation** and the urban heat island effect, means that **London must manage heat risk** in new developments, using the cooling hierarchy set out above. | |  | | Consistency with other GLA strategies | | |
| MSC.9.51 | | SI4 Paragraph 9.4.2 | | 9.4.2… These circumstances can lead many people to feel too hot or not be able to sleep, but for those with certain health conditions, and **‘at risk’ groups such as** some young or elderly Londoners, the effects can **be serious and** **worsen health conditions** ~~be potentially lethal.~~ Green **infrastructure** ~~roofs~~ can provide some mitigation of this effect by shading roof surfaces and through evapotranspiration. **Development proposals should incorporate green infrastructure in line with Policies G1 Green infrastructure and G5 Urban greening.** | | Environment Agency, Natural England, London Boroughs, Kent County Council, Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE), Green Party, Twinn Sustainability, Trees and Design Action Group, landscape Institute | | Clarification and Consistency with other GLA strategies | | |
| MSC.9.52 | | SI4 Paragraph 9.4.3 | | 9.4.3 Many aspects of building design can lead to increases in overheating risk, including high proportions of glazing and an increase in the air tightness of buildings. **Single-aspect dwellings are more difficult to ventilate naturally and are more likely to overheat, and should normally be avoided in line with Policy D4 Housing quality and standards.** There are a number of low-energy~~-intensive~~ measures that can mitigate overheating risk. These include solar shading, building orientation and solar-controlled glazing. These include solar shading, building orientation and solar-controlled glazing. **Occupant behaviour will also have an impact on overheating risk. The Mayor’s London Environment Strategy sets out further detail on actions being taken to address this.** | | Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE), London Boroughs Max Fordham LLP, Ashden, Individuals | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.53 | | SI4 Paragraph 9.4.4 | | 9.4.4 **Passive ventilation should be prioritised, taking into account external noise and air quality in determining the most appropriate solution.** The increased use of air conditioning systems is not desirable as these have significant energy requirements and, under conventional operation, expel hot air, thereby adding to the urban heat island effect~~. Therefore, passive ventilation should be prioritised~~… | | CIBSE, Boroughs (Merton, Southwark) Barratts | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.54 | | SI4 Paragraph 9.4.5 | | 9.4.5… TM 59 should be used for domestic developments and TM 52 should be used for non-domestic developments. In addition, TM 49 guidance and datasets should also be used to ensure that all new development is designed for the climate it will experience over its design life. ~~The GLA’s Energy Planning Guidance provides f~~**F**urther **information will be provided in guidance** on how these ~~guidance~~ documents and datasets should be used | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.55 | | SI5 C  New footnote 124A | | C Development proposals should:…  2) achieve at least the BREEAM excellent standard **for the ‘Wat 01’ water category124A or equivalent** (commercial development)  3) ~~be encouraged to~~ incorporate measures such as smart metering, water saving and recycling measures, including retrofitting, to help to achieve lower water consumption rates and to maximise future-proofing.  *Insert new footnote 124A*  **Achieve at least a 12.5% improvement over defined baseline performance standard** | | London Boroughs, Hoare Lea, Developers | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.56 | | SI5 D | | D In terms of water quality**,** Development Plans should:…  2) support ~~strategic~~ wastewater treatment infrastructure investment to accommodate London’s growth and climate change impacts… | | Thames Water | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.57 | | SI5 EA | | *Insert new clause SI5 EA*  **EA Development Plans and proposals for strategically or locally defined growth locations with particular flood risk constraints or where there is insufficient water infrastructure capacity should be informed by Integrated Water Management Strategies at an early stage.** | | Environment Agency, Thames Water, London Assembly, Green Party, Just Space, London Borough of Lewisham | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.58 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.1 | | 9.5.1 Londoners consume on average ~~156~~ **149** litres of water per person per day – around ~~17~~ **8** litres above the national average… | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.59 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.2 | | *Amend footnote 125 as follows:*  Planning Practice Guidance: Paragraph 014 **of ‘Housing: optional technical standards’ (DCLG, 27 March 2015)** ~~Reference ID: 56-014-20150327~~: Where there is a clear local need, ~~boroughs~~ **local planning authorities** can set out Local Plan policies requiring new dwellings to meet the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement **of 110 litres/person/day.** | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.60 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.4 | | 9.5.4 **Thames Water has set out in its draft Water Resources Management Plan its preferred approach to** ~~Variations of the following four~~ strategic water supply options to serve London **and parts of the Wider South East.** ~~are under consideration through Thames Water’s Water Resource Management Plan process and one or a combination of some of these are expected to be proposed to serve parts of the Wider South East including London:~~ **These include:**  **• direct river abstraction from the Thames linked to augmenting river flows using treated sewage works effluent in east and west London**   * ~~treatment / re-use of effluent from sewage treatment works – likely within London~~   **~~•~~** ~~desalination – potentially within London~~  **~~•~~** ~~transfer of river water from the River Severn to the River Thames catchment~~  • a new reservoir – likely to be near the Upper Thames in Oxfordshire. | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.61 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.5 | | 9.5.5 The Mayor ~~is reviewing~~ **has reviewed** the available information on each of the supply options alongside evidence of their impacts on Londoners and Mayoral priorities. **A strategic approach to water supply networks to ensure future water resilience and in particular the timely planning for a new strategic water resource to serve London and the Wider South East is important.** In ~~preparing~~ its Water Resource Management Plan~~s~~, Thames Water ~~is exploring~~ **has explored** coordinated supply options with the other water companies serving London and the South East of England through the Water Resource South East expert group. Water Resource East ~~is undertaking~~ **has undertaken** similar work in the East of England area. **A more strategic approach to water supply networks is supported to ensure future water resilience.** All this ~~will~~ involve**s** **partnership working** with key stakeholders within London and beyond its boundaries. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.62 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.8 | | 9.5.8 In relation to **wastewater and improvements to the water environment,** Water Framework Directive requirements should be maintained through the Thames River Basin Management Plan and the Catchment Plans prepared by the Catchment Partnerships, of which there are 12 in London. These Partnerships share lessons, experiences and best practice, and help achieve a coordinated approach to delivering the Thames River Basin Management Plan. **Development Plans should be supported by evidence, which demonstrates that the development planned for**  **a. will not compromise the Thames River Basin Management Plan objective of achieving ‘Good’ status, or cause deterioration in water quality; and**  **b. will be supported by adequate and timely provision of wastewater treatment infrastructure.** | | London Boroughs, Environment Agency | | Consistency within the Plan and Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.63 | | SI15 Paragraph 9.5.10 | | 9.5.10 The Thames Tideway Tunnel is under construction and will help to improve the water quality of the River Thames by significantly reducing the frequency of untreated sewage being discharged into the Thames (known as combined sewer overflows). ~~Thames Water is also planning a major sewer tunnel in the Counters Creek catchment of west London.~~ **Sustainable drainage** measures are of particular importance in areas with sewer capacity limitations and their widespread implementation over the coming decades will help the resilience of London and avoid the need for further major sewer tunnel projects. **Thames Water is taking a long-term approach to drainage and wastewater management planning. Its London 2100 plan will identify the most appropriate strategy for ensuring London’s drainage and wastewater systems can meet the needs of London over the next 80 years in the most sustainable way.** | | Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham, Thames Water | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.64 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.12 | | 9.5.12 ~~Integrated Water Management Strategies should be considered for major development locations such as Opportunity Areas, where particular flood risk and water-related constraints such as limited sewer capacity require an integrated approach to the provision of infrastructure and management of risk~~ **Development Plans and proposals should demonstrate that they have considered the opportunities for integrated solutions to water-related constraints and the provision of water infrastructure within strategically or locally defined growth locations. These could be Opportunity Areas or growth locations defined in Local Plans. Where such opportunities are identified, development plans should require an integrated and collaborative approach from developers. This could for example lead to the establishment of local water reuse systems or integrated drainage networks. Integration with the planning of green infrastructure could deliver further benefits**. | | Environment Agency | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.65 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.13 | | 9.5.13 A water advisory group **with representatives from across the water sectors in London** has been established to advise the Mayor **and share information** on strategic water and flood risk management issues **across the capital**. | | London Borough of Hillingdon, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.66 | | SI5  Figure 9.4 | | Update Figure - Addition of the Combined Sewer System | |  | | Consistency with other GLA strategies | | |
| MSC.9.67 | | SI5 Paragraph 9.5.14 | | 9.5.14… The modelling does not consider how waste water is routed through the network, so it should be noted that some ‘green’ areas will flow into ‘red’ areas and hence increasing flows upstream will exacerbate performance in the downstream catchments. **The hatched area on the map shows the portions of the sewer system that are generally combined sewers, which means they capture both waste water and surface water flows.** | |  | | Consistency with other GLA strategies | | |
| MSC.9.68 | | SI6 A 1 | | A To ensure London’s global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:  ~~1) achieve greater digital connectivity than set out in part R1of the Building Regulations~~ | | Home Builders Federation, Developers | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.69 | | SI6 A 2 | | A To ensure London’s global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:  2) ensure that sufficient ducting space for ~~future digital~~ **full fibre** connectivity infrastructure is provided **to all end users within new developments, unless an affordable alternative 1GB/s-capable connection is made available to all end users** | | London Sustainability Exchange | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.70 | | SI6 A 3 | | A To ensure London’s global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:  3) meet ~~requirements~~ **expected demand** for mobile connectivity ~~within~~ **generated by** the development ~~and~~ | | Persimmon Homes | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.71 | | SI6 A 3 | | A To ensure London’s global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:  3A) take appropriate ~~mitigation~~ measures to avoid reducing mobile connectivity in surrounding areas**; where that is not possible, any potential reduction would require mitigation** | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.72 | | SI6 A 4 | | A To ensure London’s global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:  4) support the effective use of **rooftops and** the public realm (such as street furniture and bins) to accommodate well-designed and **suitably** located mobile digital infrastructure. | | Mobile UK | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.73 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.3 | | 9.6.3 Better digital connectivity with a focus on **capability,** affordability, security, resilience and the provision of appropriate electrical power supply should be promoted across the capital. The specific requirements of business clusters, such as a symmetrical**-capable** service with the same upload and download speeds, should also be met. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.74 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.4 | | 9.6.4 Given the fast pace at which digital technology is changing, a flexible approach to development is needed that supports innovation and choice. Part R1 of the Building Regulations 2010 requires buildings to be equipped with ~~high-speed (~~at least 30 MB/s~~)~~ ready in-building physical infrastructure, however new developments using **full fibre to the property or other** higher-grade infrastructure ~~could~~ **can** achieve connectivity speeds ~~closer to~~ **of** 1GB/s. **Developers should engage early with a range of network operators, and development proposals need to be appropriately designed to be capable of providing this level of connectivity to all end users. Mechanisms should also be put in place to enable further future infrastructure upgrades**. Innovation is driving reductions in the size of infrastructure, with marginal additional unit costs, but greater digital connectivity is needed in more locations. | |  | | Clarification and consistency within the plan | | |
| MSC.9.75 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.4A | | **9.6.4A Development proposals should also demonstrate that mobile connectivity will be available throughout the development and should not have detrimental impacts on the digital connectivity of neighbouring buildings. Early consultation with network operators will help to identify any adverse impact on mobile or wireless connectivity and appropriate mitigation measures to avoid/mitigate them.** | | Mobile UK | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.76 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.4B | | **9.6.4B Access for network operators to rooftops of new developments should be supported where an improvement to the mobile connectivity of the area can be identified. Where possible, other opportunities to secure mobile connectivity improvements should also be sought through new developments, including for example the creative use of the public realm.** | | Mobile UK | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.77 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.5 | | 9.6.5… (see Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support London’s economic function, Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL), Policy E6 Locally Significant Industrial Sites and Policy E7 **Industrial I**~~i~~ntensification, co-location and substitution ~~of land for industry, logistics and services to support London’s economic function~~). | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.78 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.6 | | 9.6.5 The Mayor will work with ~~providers~~ **network operators,** developers, councils and Government to develop guidance and share good practice to increase awareness and capability amongst boroughs and developers of the effective provision of digital connectivity and to support the delivery of policy requirements. The Mayor will also help to identify spatial gaps in connectivity and overcome barriers to delivery to address this form of digital exclusion, in particular through his ~~‘not-spot’~~ **Connected London** work. Boroughs should encourage the delivery of high-quality / world-class digital infrastructure as part of their digital strategies or corporate plans. | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.79 | | SI6 Paragraph 9.6.7 | | 9.6.7 Digital connectivity supports smart technologies in terms of the collection, analysis and sharing of data on the performance of the built and natural environment, including for example, **resource including** water and energy consumption, **waste,** air quality, noise and congestion… | | London Waste and Recycling Board | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.80 | | SI6  Figure 9.5 | | **Broadband speed 2016** *(MAP TO BE AMENDED)*  Update with more recent data and bands from Ofcom. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.81 | | SI7 A 1 | | A Waste reduction, increases in material re-use and recycling, and reductions in waste going for disposal will be achieved by **the Mayor, waste planning authorities and industry working in collaboration to**:  1) promot~~ing~~**e** a more circular economy that improves resource efficiency and innovation to keep products and materials at their highest use for as long as possible  2) encouragi~~ng~~**e** waste minimisation and waste avoidance through the reuse of materials and using fewer resources in the production and distribution of products  3) ensur~~ing~~**e** that there is zero biodegradable or recyclable waste to landfill by 2026  4) meet~~ing~~ or exceed~~ing~~ the recycling targets for each of the following waste streams and generating low-carbon energy in London from suitable remaining waste:  a) municipal waste127 – 65 per cent by 2030  b) construction~~,~~ **and** demolition ~~and excavation~~ waste – 95 per cent by 2020  5) design~~ing~~ developments with adequate and easily accessible storage space that supports the separate collection of dry recyclables (at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food. | | London Waste and Recycling Board (LWarB), London Waste Planning Forum (LWPF), South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.82 | | SI7 Paragraph 9.7.3 | | 9.7.3… The Mayor is committed to meeting or exceeding the recycling targets for each of the following waste streams, and to generating low-carbon energy in London from suitable remaining waste:…  **•** construction~~,~~ **and** demolition ~~and excavation~~ waste – 95 per cent recycling by 2020 | | London Waste and Recycling Board (LWarB), South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.83 | | SI7  Paragraph 9.7.3A | | *Insert new paragraph 9.7.3A*  **9.7.3A Modelling suggests that if London achieves the reduction and recycling set out above, it will have sufficient Energy from Waste capacity to manage London’s non-recyclable municipal waste, once the new Edmonton and Beddington Lane facilities are operational.** | | Environment Agency | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.84 | | SI7 Paragraph 9.7.4A | | *Insert new paragraph 9.7.4A*  **9.7.4A It is recognised that the particular characteristics of excavation waste are such that it is extremely difficult to recycle this waste stream. The Mayor expects referable applications to demonstrate through a supporting Circular Economy Statement that the best environmental option practicable for the management of excavation material will be used. This could, for example, include using the material as a resource within the construction of the proposed development or seeking opportunities for such material to be used in other local construction projects.** | | London Waste Planning Forum (LWPF), Environment Agency | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.85 | | SI7 Paragraph 9.7.6 | | 9.7.6 Further guidance on Circular Economy Statements will be produced. **These Circular Economy Statements are intended to cover the construction phase of development.** | | South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG), London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.86 | | SI8 B 3 | | B3 Development Plans should:…  3) identify the following as suitable locations to manage borough waste apportionments:…  b) Strategic Industrial Locations and Locally Significant Employment Sites ~~/ land~~ | |  | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.87 | | SI8  Paragraph 9.8.1 | | 9.8.1… The bulk of this waste is CD&E waste. Approximately 1.3mt of waste was exported overseas. **The term net self-sufficiency is meant to apply to all waste streams, with the exception of excavation waste. The particular characteristics of this waste stream mean that it will be very challenging for London to provide either the sites or the level of compensatory provision needed to apply net self-sufficiency to this waste stream.** | | London Boroughs, London Waste Planning Forum (LWPF) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.88 | | SI8  Paragraph 9.8.3 | | 9.8.3… The Mayor will work with boroughs, the London Waste and Recycling Board, and the London and neighbouring Regional Technical Advisory Bodies to address cross-boundary waste flow issues**. An example of joint working would be ongoing updates to the London Waste Map and monitoring and management solutions for waste arisings from London.** | | London Boroughs, London Waste Planning Forum (LWPF), South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.89 | | SI8  Paragraph 9.8.6 | | 9.8.6… Boroughs are encouraged to collaborate by pooling their apportionment requirements. **Boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites to those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release.** | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.90 | | S18 Footnote 133 | | [~~http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/environment/putting-waste-good-use/making-the-most-of-waste~~](http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/environment/putting-waste-good-use/making-the-most-of-waste)[**https://www.london.gov.uk/file/665524/download?token=Q28HNWvK**](https://www.london.gov.uk/file/665524/download?token=Q28HNWvK) | |  | | Factual Update | | |
| MSC.9.91 | | SI8  Paragraph 9.8.13 | | 9.8.13 Examples of the ‘demonstrable steps’ required under part D3 of Policy SI8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency are:  **•** ~~A~~**a** commitment to source truly residual waste – waste with as little recyclable material as possible.  **•** ~~A~~**a** commitment (via a Section 106 obligation) to deliver the necessary means for infrastructure to meet the minimum CO2 standard, for example investment in the development of a heat distribution network to the site boundary, or technology modifications that improve plant efficiency.  **•** ~~A~~**a** n agreed timeframe (via a Section 106 agreement) as to when proposed measures will be delivered.  **•** ~~T~~**t**he establishment of a working group to progress the agreed steps and monitor and report performance to the consenting authority. | |  | |  | | |
| MSC.9.92 | | SI9  Paragraph 9.9.2 | | 9.9.2… When assessing the throughput of a site, the maximum throughput achieved over the last ~~three~~ **five** years should be used. | | London Waste Planning Forum, London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.93 | | SI9 Paragraph 9.9.3 | | 9.9.3… If such increases are implemented over the Plan period, it may be possible to justify the release of waste sites without capacity re-provision if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity available elsewhere **in London** at appropriate sites over the Plan period… | | South East Waste Planning Advisory Group SEWPAG, | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.94 | | SI10 A | | A An adequate supply of aggregates to support construction in London will be achieved by:  ~~4) meeting the target of 95 per cent recycling/re-use of construction, demolition and excavation waste by 2020 and recycling 50 per cent of that waste as aggregates by 2020.~~ | | London Aggregate Working Party (LAWP) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.95 | | SI10 B 1 | | **B 1)** Development Plans should make provision for the maintenance of a landbank (i.e. seven years’ supply) of at least five million tonnes of land-won aggregates up to 2041, in particular through a landbank apportionment of:  ~~1~~**a**) at least 1.75 mt to London Borough of Havering  ~~2~~**b**) at least 0.7 mt to London Borough of Redbridge  ~~3~~**c**) at least 1.75 mt to London Borough of Hillingdon  ~~4~~**d**) at least 0.7 mt to London Borough of Hounslow. | | London Aggregate Working Party (LAWP) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.96 | | SI10 B 2 | | *Insert new clause SI10 B 2*  **B 2) ensure sufficient capacity of aggregates wharves and aggregate rail depots is available to ensure a steady and adequate supply of imported and marine aggregate to London.** | | Mineral Production Association | |  | | |
| MSC.9.97 | | SI10 B 3 | | *Insert new clause SI10 B 3*  **B 3) support the production of recycled aggregate and, where practicable, expand capacity at/or adjacent to aggregate wharves and rail depots and quarries during their operational life, within or adjacent to major construction projects.** | |  | |  | | |
| MSC.9.98 | | SI10 C | | C All Mineral Planning Authorities in London should identify and safeguard ~~aggregate resources~~ in Development Plans~~, including aggregate recycling facilities.~~ **sand and gravel resources from development that would otherwise sterilise future potential extraction.** | | London Aggregate Working Party (LAWP) | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.99 | | SI10 D | | D To reduce the environmental impact of aggregate~~s~~ **facilities**, Development Plans should:...  **2A) ensure planning conditions are imposed on new aggregate facilities so that noise, dust and traffic impacts are effectively controlled.**  **2B) ensure new development in proximity to safeguarded sites are designed to avoid and mitigate potential conflicts, in line with the Agent of Change principle.** | | London Aggregate Working Party (LAWP), Mineral Production Association | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.100 | | SI11 Paragraph 9.11.4 | | 9.11.4 In addition to avoiding or mitigating adverse construction and operational impacts (noise, dust, visual intrusion, vehicle movements and lighting, on both the natural and built environment, including air quality and the water environment), any fracking proposal would need to take full account, where relevant, of the following environmental constraints:…  **•** ~~G~~**g**roundwater or surface water | |  | |  | | |
| MSC.9.101 | | SI12 B | | B Development Plans should use the Mayor’s Regional Flood Risk Appraisal and their Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as well as ~~Surface Water Management Plan~~ **Local Flood Risk Management Strategies**, where necessary, to identify areas where particular **and cumulative** flood risk issues exist and develop actions and policy approaches aimed at reducing these risks... | | London Borough of Bexley, Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee | | Factual update and clarification | | |
| MSC.9.102 | | SI12 C | | C Development proposals ~~which require specific flood risk assessments~~ should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed. This should include, where possible, making space for water and aiming for development to be set back from the banks of watercourses. | | London Borough of Bexley | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.103 | | SI12 F | | F Development proposals adjacent to flood defences will be required to protect the integrity of flood defences and allow access for future maintenance and upgrading. ~~Where possible~~ **Unless exceptional circumstances are demonstrated for not doing so,** development proposals should **be** set ~~permanent built development~~ back from flood defences to allow for **any** foreseeable **future maintenance and** upgrades **in a sustainable and cost-effective way.** | | Environment Agency, London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.104 | | SI12 FA | | *Insert new clause SI12 FA*  **FA Natural flood management methods should be employed in development proposal due to their multiple benefits including increasing flood storage and creating recreational areas and habitat.** | | Environment Agency,  Natural England, London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.105 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.1 | | 9.12.1 In London, the boroughs are **Lead Local Flood Authorities** (LLFAs) and are responsible, in particular, for local surface water flood risk management and for maintaining a ~~register of~~ flood risk **management assets register**. They ~~identify areas of flood risk to help inform appropriate locations for development~~ **produce Local Flood Risk Management Strategies**. LLFAs should cooperate on strategic and cross-boundary issues. | | London Borough of Greenwich | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.106 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.3 | | 9.12.3 The ~~Environment Agency’s~~ **Thames Estuary 2100 Plan** (TE2100)**, published by the Environment Agency, and endorsed by Government,** focuses on **a partnership approach** to tidal flood risk management… | | Environment Agency | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.107 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.4 | | 9.12.4 The concept of ~~Lead~~ Local ~~Flood~~ Authorities producing **Riverside Strategies** was introduced through the TE2100 Plan to improve flood risk management in the vicinity of the river, create better access to and along the riverside, and improve the riverside environment… | | Environment Agency,  London Borough of Newham | | Factual correction | | |
| MSC.9.108 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.5 | | 9.12.5 The Environment Agency’s Thames River Basin District **Flood Risk Management Plan** is part of a collaborative and integrated approach to catchment planning for water. **Measures to address flood risk should be integral to development proposals and considered early in the design process. This will ensure they provide adequate protection, do not compromise good design, do not shift vulnerabilities elsewhere, and are cost-effective. Natural flood risk management in the upper river catchment areas can also help to reduce risk lower in the catchments.** Making space for water when considering development proposals is particularly important where there is significant exposure to flood risk along tributaries and at the tidal-fluvial interface. The Flood Risk Management Plan should inform the boroughs’ Strategic Flood Risk Assessments | | Environment Agency, London Borough of Hillingdon | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.109 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.6 | | 9.12.6 In terms of mitigating **residual risk**, it is important that a strategy for **resistance and then resilience including** safe evacuation and quick recovery to address such risks is in place; this is also the case for utility services… | | London Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Hillingdon | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.110 | | SI12 Paragraph 9.12.7 | | 9.12.6 ~~Development adjacent to flood defences will be required to protect the integrity of existing flood defences. Wherever possible it should be set back from the banks of watercourses and flood defences to allow their management, maintenance and upgrading to be undertaken in a sustainable and cost-effective way.~~ | |  | | Readability | | |
| MSC.9.111 | | SI13 A | | A Lead Local Flood Authorities should identify – through their Local Flood Risk Management Strategies and Surface Water Management Plans – areas where there are particular surface water management issues and aim to reduce these risks. **Increases in surface water run-off outside these areas also need to be identified and addressed.** | | London Borough of Merton | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.112 | | SI13 B | | B Development proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy**. There should also be a preference for green over grey features**:  1) **rainwater use as a resource (for example** rainwater harvesting**,** ~~(including a combination of green and~~ blue roofs **for irrigation**)  2) **rainwater** infiltration **to ground at or close to source** ~~techniques and green roofs~~  3) rainwater attenuation in ~~open water~~ **green infrastructure** features for gradual release **(for example green roofs, rain gardens)**  4) rainwater discharge direct to a watercourse (unless not appropriate)  ~~5) rainwater attenuation above ground (including blue roofs)~~  ~~6) rainwater attenuation below ground136~~  7) **controlled** rainwater discharge to a surface water sewer or drain  8) **controlled** rainwater discharge to a combined sewer. | | Environment Agency, London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.113 | | SI13 C | | C Development proposals for impermeable paving should be refused ~~where appropriate~~ **unless they can be shown to be unavoidable**, including on small surfaces such as front gardens and driveways. | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.114 | | SI13 D | | D Drainage should be designed and implemented in ways that ~~address issues~~ **promote multiple benefits including increased** ~~of~~ water use efficiency, **improve** ~~river~~ water quality, **and enhance** biodiversity, **urban greening,** amenity and recreation. | | Environment Agency, Natural England, London Borough of Southwark, London Borough of Hillingdon | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.115 | | SI13 Paragraph 9.13.1 | | 9.13.1 London is at particular risk from surface water flooding, mainly due to the large extent of impermeable surfaces. Lead Local Flood Authorities have responsibility for managing surface water drainage through the planning system, as well as **ensuring that appropriate** maintenance arrangements **are put in place**. **Local Flood Risk Management Strategies** and **Surface Water Management Plans** should ensure they address flooding from ~~sewers, drains~~ **multiple sources including surface water,** ~~and~~ groundwater~~, and run-off from land~~ and small watercourses that occurs as a result of heavy rainfall. | | London Borough of Tower Hamlets, London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.116 | | SI13 Paragraph 9.13.2 | | 9.13.2 Development proposals should aim to get as close to greenfield run-off rates137 as possible depending on site conditions. The well-established **drainage hierarchy** set out in this policy helps to reduce the rate and volume of surface water run-off. Rainwater should be managed as close to the top of the hierarchy as possible**.** ~~and t~~**T**here should be a preference for green over grey features**, and drainage by gravity over pumped systems**... | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.117 | | SI13 Footnote 137 | | The runoff that would occur from a site in undeveloped **natural** state. | |  | |  | | |
| MSC.9.118 | | SI13 Paragraph 9.13.3 | | 9.13.3… This should include suitable pollution prevention **filtering** measures**, ideally by using soft engineering or green infrastructure**. **In addition, if direct discharge is to a watercourse where the outfall is likely to be affected by tide-locking, suitable storage should be designed into the system.**.. | | Environment Agency | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.119 | | SI14 BA | | *Insert new* clause SI14 BA  **BA Development Plans and development proposals should seek to maximise the multifunctional benefits waterways provide.** | | London Borough of Sutton, Regents Network, Community Groups | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.120 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.1 | | 9.14.1…This network of linked waterways – also known as the Blue Ribbon Network - is of strategic importance for London. Every London borough contains some waterways – 17 border the Thames and 15 contain canals (see Figure 9.6) | | London Borough of Hillingdon, Canal and River Trust, London Parks and Gardens Trust, London Wildlife Trust, Regents Network, Just Space | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.121 | | SI14 Figure 9.6 (title) | | Figure 9.6 - London’s Network of Waterways **(the Blue Ribbon Network)** | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.122 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.2 | | 9.14.2 London’s waterways are multifunctional assets. They provide transport and recreation corridors; green infrastructure; a series of diverse and important habitats; a unique backdrop for important heritage sites, landscapes, views, cultural and community activities; ~~and~~ **as well as** drainage, flood and water management **and urban cooling** functions. As such, they provide environmental, economic and health and wellbeing benefits for Londoners **and play a key role in place making of** **neighbourhoods. They also provide a home for Londoners living on boats. The waterways** ~~They~~ are protected and their water-related use - in particular safe and sustainable passenger and freight transport, tourism, cultural, community and recreational activities, as well as biodiversity - is promoted. Many of these functions are also supported by boroughs’ local Riverside Strategies, the Environment Agency’s Thames River Basin Management Plan and the Port of London Authority’s Vision for the Thames. **In addition to the Thames, other water spaces, and in particular canals, have a distinct value and significance for London and Londoners.** | | London Borough of Sutton, Regents Network, Canal and River Trust, Local community groups | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.123 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.4 | | 9.14.4 The River Thames is a strategically-important and iconic feature of London. **It is a focal point for London’s identity reflecting its heritage, natural and landscape values as well as cultural opportunities.** Its character changes on its way through London… | | Historic England | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.124 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.6 | | 9.14.6 Joint Thames Strategies should cover:…  • opportunities for environmental**/ecological** and urban design improvements…   * **river crossings and other structures** | | London Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.125 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.8 | | 9.14.8 **Additional stretches of the** River Thames should not be designated as Metropolitan Open Land, as this may restrict the use of the river for transport infrastructure related uses. | | London Borough of Richmond, Historic England, Kew Society, Regents Network, West London River Group | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.126 | | SI14 Paragraph 9.14.9 | | 9.14.9… The South East Inshore Marine Plan is currently under development as part of a suite of Marine Spatial Plans139 **under the Marine Policy Statement**… | | Marine Management Organisation | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.127 | | SI15 B | | B …Alternative use of a boatyard site should only be accepted if the facilities of the site are re-provided at a site with equivalent or enhanced facilities **in Greater London**. Proposals for a new strategic-scale boatyard site, at an appropriate site within London, will be supported. | | London Forum of Amenity & Civic Societies | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.128 | | SI15 C | | C Development proposals to facilitate an increase in the amount of freight transported ~~by river~~ **on London’s waterways** should be supported. | | Regents Network, Cemex Ltd | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.129 | | SI15 F | | F Development proposals which increase the use of safeguarded wharves for waterborne freight transport, especially ~~on~~ **the reactivation of** wharves which are currently not handling freight by water, will be supported. | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.130 | | SI15 Paragraph 9.15.2 | | 9.15.2 The PLA and Transport for London’s Pier Strategy **will** promote~~s~~ extending river services to East London and its growth areas to encourage modal shift to the river. This will relieve road congestion and better integrate other forms of transport such as walking and cycling. | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.131 | | SI15 Paragraph 9.15.5 | | 9.15.5… The Mayor will regularly review wharf safeguarding to ensure the changing need for waterborne freight is addressed. **Where the transition of wharves from waterborne freight to other uses is acceptable, the re-use of those wharves for waterborne public transport use should be considered.** | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.132 | | SI16 AA | | AA Development proposals ~~for~~ **should protect and enhance, where possible, water-related** cultural, educational and community facilities and events, **and new facilities** should be supported and promoted, but should take into consideration the protection and other uses of the waterways. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.133 | | SI16 AB | | AB Development proposals that increase the provision of water sport centres and associated new infrastructure will be supported if a deficit in provision has been identified locally, and if the infrastructure does not negatively impact on navigation **or on the protection of the waterway (see Policy SI17 Protecting and enhancing the London’s waterways)**. | | London Wildlife Trust, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, London Borough of Newham | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.134 | | SI16 D | | D ~~New mooring facilities should be:~~ **Development proposals adjacent to waterways should** **protect and enhance, where possible, existing moorings. The provision of new moorings** **and required facilities should be supported and promoted, if they are** | | London Borough of Enfield, National Bargee Travellers Association | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.135 | | SI16 D 1 | | D 1) ~~supported as part of development proposals, but should be~~ off-line from main navigation routes, in basins or docks, unless there are ~~no~~ negative impacts on navigation **or on the protection of the waterway (see Policy SI17 Protecting and enhancing London’s waterways)** | | London Wildlife Trust, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, London Borough of Newham | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.136 | | SI16 D 1A | | **D 1A) appropriately designed including the provision of wash mitigation, where necessary** | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.137 | | SI16 E | | E ~~Major development schemes adjacent to waterways should consider the provision of new moorings.~~ | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.138 | | SI16 G | | G Development proposals along waterways should **protect and enhance inclusive public access to and along the waterway front and** explore opportunities for new, extended, improved and inclusive access infrastructure **to/from the waterways**. | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.139 | | SI16 H | | H Development proposals should improve and expand the Thames Path and the towpaths**, improve alignment with the waterway where relevant,** **enhance them as walking routes,** and provide better linkages to the transport network... | |  | | Consistency within the Plan | | |
| MSC.9.140 | | SI16 Paragraph 9.16.1 | | 9.16.1 New development should utilise the waterways **(also known as the Blue Ribbon Network)** for transport purposes where possible, but also for active water-based leisure, and for informal waterside recreation or access. In order to make the maximum use of London’s waterways a range of supporting infrastructure is required including jetties, moorings, slipways, steps and waterside paths ~~and cycleways~~ (piers, wharves and boatyards are addressed in Policy SI15 Water transport)… | | London Borough of Hillingdon, Canal and Rivers Trust, London Parks and Gardens Trust, London Wildlife Trust, Regents Network, Just Space | | Clarification and readability | | |
| MSC.9.141 | | SI16 Paragraph 9.16.2 | | 9.16.2 **Moorings and moored boats are an integral part of the character of the waterways.** There has been a significant increase in the number of boats on London’s waterways (from 2,000 in 2010 to 5,000 in 2016), with a notable increase in central and eastern parts of London’s canal network. There is a deficit of residential, leisure, visitor and commercial moorings **and required facilities (such as power, water, and waste disposal)** to meet the increase in demand. The Canal and River Trust is producing a London Mooring Strategy which will provide an overview of the number of people living on boats on the canal network. It will identify zones for potential additional moorings. Some community-based projects to create residential moorings may be considered as community-led housing (part A.4 of Policy H2 Small sites). In addition, a number of creative businesses such as artists’ studios and post-production facilities are located on boats. **Development proposals for residential moorings in particular should consider innovative solutions to address site-specific conditions, including wash, to enable the creation of new appropriate moorings without detrimentally impacting on navigation.** | | London Borough of Enfield, National Bargee Travellers Association, Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.142 | | SI16 Paragraph 9.16.3 | | 9.16.3 Historic steps and slipways to the Thames foreshore are vital for enabling access ~~for~~ **to/from** activities and events. The Thames Path and the towpaths are particularly important in terms of providing safe access for a large number of Londoners along the waterways, facilitating their enjoyment of the river as well as providing health and wellbeing benefits **as walking routes**... | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.143 | | SI16 Paragraph 9.16.4 | | 9.16.4 Complementing development proposals for cultural facilities and events, the Mayor~~’s~~ **is producing, in partnership with the Port of London Authority, a case for a** Cultural ~~Strategy~~ **Vision** for the River **Thames. It** aims to increase Londoners’ engagement with the River **for culture and leisure purposes**, including ~~an increase in~~ night-time use and ~~engagement with~~ **focusing on** under-used areas. It also provides information on the heritage and importance of the River Thames **and its banks** to London**’s cultural life, especially in Opportunity Areas**. | |  | | Factual update | | |
| MSC.9.144 | | Policy SI17 Title | | Protecting **and enhancing** London’s waterways | |  | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.145 | | SI17 AA | | *Insert new clause SI17 AA*  **AA Development Plans should support river restoration and biodiversity improvements.** | | London Wildlife Trust | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.146 | | SI17 A | | A Development proposals that facilitate river restoration, including opportunities to open culverts, naturalise river channels, protect **and improve** the foreshore**, the floodplain, riparian and adjacent terrestrial habitats, water quality as well as** ~~and increase~~ the heritage ~~and habitats~~ value, should be supported ~~if appropriate~~. Development proposals to impound and ~~constrain~~ **narrow** waterways should be refused. | | London Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency | | Clarification and readability | | |
| MSC.9.147 | | SI17 B | | B Development proposals should support and improve the protection of the distinct open character and heritage of waterways **and their setting**. | | London Borough of Enfield | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.148 | | SI17 C | | C Development proposals into the waterways, including permanently moored vessels ~~and development into the waterways~~ should generally only be supported for water-related uses **or to support enhancements of water-related purposes.** | | Berwin Leighton Paisner LLP | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.149 | | SI17 D | | D Development proposals along London’s canal network, docks, other rivers and water space (such as reservoirs, lakes and ponds) should respect their local character**,** ~~and~~ environment **and biodiversity** and should contribute to their accessibility and active water-related uses. Development Plans should identify opportunities for increasing local distinctiveness **and recognise these water spaces as environmental, social and economic assets**. | | London Wildlife Trust, London Borough of Sutton, Regents Network | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.150 | | SI17 E | | E On-shore power at water transport facilities should be ~~provided~~ **considered** at wharves and residential moorings to help reduce air pollution. | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.151 | | SI17 Paragraph 9.17.2 | | 9.17.2… The specific siting of such facilities requires careful consideration so that navigation, hydrology, biodiversity and the character and use of waterways are not compromised. **The waterways should not be used as an extension of developable land in London, nor should parts be a continuous line of moored craft.** | | West London River Group | | Clarification | | |
| MSC.9.152 | | SI17 Paragraph 9.17.3 | | 9.17.3… This includes the requirement in this policy to ~~provide~~ **consider providing** on-shore power at wharves and moorings. | | Port of London Authority | | Clarification | | |
| **Chapter 10 Transport** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.10.1 | T1 A | | A Development Plans and development proposals should support **and facilitate**:… | | London Cycling Campaign | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.2 | T1 Paragraph 10.1.1 | | 10.1.1… In order to help facilitate this, an integrated strategic approach to transport is needed, with an ambitious aim to reduce Londoners’ dependency on cars in favour of increased walking, cycling and public transport use. Without this shift away from car use, **which the policies in the Plan and the Mayor’s Transport Strategy seek to deliver,** London cannot continue to grow sustainably. | |  | |  | |
| MSC.10.3 | T1 Paragraph 10.1.3 | | 10.1.3 The Mayor will work with partners to minimise ~~servicing and delivery~~ **freight** trips on the road network including through consolidation… | |  | | Consistency – within the Plan | |
| MSC.10.4 | T1 Paragraph 10.1.5 | | 10.1.5 Rebalancing the transport system towards walking, cycling and public transport, including ensuring high quality interchanges, will require sustained investment including improving street environments to make walking and cycling safer and more attractive, and providing more, better-quality public transport services to ensure that alternatives to the car are accessible, affordable and appealing. **Achieving this is expected to result in different outcomes in different places, including modal splits in central, inner and outer London, as shown by Figure 10.1.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.5 | T1 Figure 10.1A | | *Insert new figure Figure 10.1A*  **Figure 10.1A Mode shares in central, inner and outer London expected to be required for a city-wide 80 per cent share for walking, cycling and public transport** | |  | |  | |
| MSC.10.6 | T2 C | | C In Opportunity Areas and other growth areas, new and improved walking, cycling and public transport networks should be planned at an early stage, with delivery phased appropriately to support mode shift towards active **travel** and public transport ~~travel~~. Designs for new or enhanced streets must demonstrate how they deliver against the ten Healthy Streets Indicators. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.7 | T2 Paragraph 10.2.2 | | 10.2.2 This Plan supports the implementation of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy which aims to deliver the infrastructure and public realm required to significantly increase levels of walking, cycling and public transport use throughout London. It aims to make the city more accessible**, inclusive** and welcoming to all, so that every Londoner can be active every day, creating a healthier city~~, inclusive of~~ **for** people from all backgrounds, ensuring inequalities are reduced. | | Just Space, The Access Association, Inclusive Design and Access Panel | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.8 | T2 Paragraph 10.2.3 | | 10.2.3 The Healthy Streets Approach is an evidence-based approach to improve health and reduce health inequalities, which will help Londoners use cars less, and walk, cycle and use public transport more. It supports the delivery of the Mayor’s aim that by 2041 all Londoners will be able to undertake at least the 20 minutes of active travel each day needed to stay healthy. It also requires better management of freight so the impact of moving goods**,** **carrying out servicing** and **supporting construction** ~~delivering~~ ~~services~~ on London’s streets is lessened. To ~~deliver~~ **apply** the Healthy Streets Approach, changes are required at strategic, network and street level. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.9 | T2 Paragraph 10.2.4 | | 10.2.4 Londoners’ direct interaction with the Healthy Streets Approach will be through the streets they use every day. The Healthy Streets Approach aims to bring about positive changes to the character and use of the city’s streets. High-quality, pleasant and attractive environments **with clean air** and enough space for dwelling, walking, cycling and public transport use must be provided. The dominance of vehicles should be reduced by using design to ensure slower vehicle speeds and safer driver behaviour. Measures ~~which~~ **that** improve Londoners’ experience of individual streets, including greening, to encourage them to live active lives should be embedded within new development. | | Campaign for Better Transport, London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.10 | T2 Paragraph 10.2.5 | | 10.2.5… As part of this, the Mayor will work with the freight industry, its customers and London’s boroughs to develop more creative solutions to managing freight ~~and deliveries~~… | |  | | Consistency within the plan | |
| MSC.10.11 | T3 B | | B Development Plans and development decisions should ensure the provision of sufficient and suitably-located land for the development of the current and expanded public and active transport system to serve London’s needs, including by:  1) safeguarding existing land and buildings used for **public** transport**, active travel** or **related** support functions (unless alternative facilities are provided to the satisfaction of relevant strategic transport authorities and service providers that enable existing transport operations to be maintained and expanded if necessary)…  3) safeguarding **London’s walking and cycling networks** ~~the Walk London Network protecting access to and improving the Thames Path and, where relevant, improving its alignment with the Thames.~~ | | London Borough of Hammersmith and Fullham, Sustrans | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.12 | T3 D | | D In Development Plans and development decisions, **particular** priority should be given to **securing and supporting the** delivery~~ing~~ **of** upgrades to Underground lines, securing Crossrail 2, the Bakerloo l~~L~~ine e~~E~~xtension, river crossings and an eastwards extension of the Elizabeth ~~L~~line. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.13 | T3 Table 10.1 (title row) | | Scheme | Cost**1** | Timescale  1 low: <£100m, medium: £100m-£1bn, high: >£1bn | |  | |  | |
| MSC.10.14 | T3 Table 10.1 | | ~~A new~~ **Walk and cycle** river crossing ~~for~~ ~~pedestrians and cyclists~~ between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.15 | T3 Table 10.1 | | Bakerloo ~~L~~line e~~E~~xtension. | |  | | Readability | |
| MSC.10.16 | T3 Table 10.1 | | *Insert new row*  **Beam Park station | low |2020-2030** | | London Borough of Havering | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.17 | T3 Table 10.1 | | Coach hub(s) reprovision | medium | 2020-20**23** ~~30~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.18 | T3 Table 10.1 | | *Insert new row*  **Crossrail 2 eastern branch (subject to further assessment) | high |2020-2041** | | London Borough of Newham | | Consistency with other GLA Strategies | |
| MSC.10.19 | T3 Table 10.1 | | Heathrow Airport Southern Access (required ~~for~~ **if** airport expansion **proceeds**) | ~~medium~~  **high** |2020-2041 | | London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Network Rail | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.20 | T3 Table 10.1 | | Heathrow Airport Western Access (required ~~for~~ **if** airport expansion **proceeds**) | ~~medium~~  **high** |2020-2041 | | London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Network Rail | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.21 | T3 Table 10.1 | | *Insert new row*  **London Overground extension - West London Orbital** | | London Borough of Barnet and London Borough of Brent | | Consistency with other GLA Strategies | |
| MSC.10.22 | T3 Table 10.1 | | Northern ~~L~~line e~~E~~xtension. | |  | | Readability | |
| MSC.10.23 | T3 Paragraph 10.3.3 | | 10.3.3 The Elizabeth l~~L~~ine, due to open in 2019, will increase capacity within central London by about ten per cent, relieving crowding on the Tube network**, and** reducing journey times ~~from east and west London to central London~~ ~~and the Isle of Dogs,~~ and ~~reducing~~ congestion at **stations** ~~Paddington, Liverpool Street and in the West End. This will mean that an extra 1.5 million people will be within 45 minutes’ commuting distance of central London. The Elizabeth Line has been designed to allow for future increases in capacity, given the expected demand associated with an increasing population and growing employment in the areas it serves.~~ **An eastward extension to the Elizabeth line could support thousands of new homes and jobs along the route in Bexley and north Kent. The extension could link to High Speed 1 at Ebbsfleet and boost rail connectivity throughout the Wider South East.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.24 | T3 Paragraph 10.3.5 | | 10.3.5 Extending the Bakerloo l~~L~~ine is also necessary to provide extra capacity on the Tube in south east London, enabling capacity for up to for 65,000 passenger journeys during the morning and evening peak. Increasing connectivity and reducing journey times will enable the Bakerloo ~~L~~**l**ine ~~E~~**e**xtension to support more than 25,000 new homes and 5,000 jobs. | |  | | Readability | |
| MSC.10.25 | T3 Paragraph 10.3.5A | | *Insert new paragraph 10.3.5A*  **10.3.5A A key means of improving the efficiency of the transport network and unlocking growth potential is to eliminate physical barriers to movement, including in places where the Thames divides the communities on either side of it. Increasing the number and capacity of public transport links, as well as walking and cycling crossings, across the Thames will help to improve access to employment opportunities, support the development of thousands of new homes and enable healthier lifestyles.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.26 | T4 B | | B… Transport assessments should focus on embedding the Healthy Streets Approach within, and in the vicinity of, new development. Travel **P**~~p~~lans, **P**~~p~~arking **D**~~d~~esign and **M**~~m~~anagement **P**~~p~~lans**, C**~~c~~onstruction **L**~~l~~ogistics **P**~~p~~lans and ~~d~~**D**elivery and ~~s~~**S**ervicing ~~P~~**P**lans will be required in accordance with relevant Transport for London guidance142. | | N/A | | Readability | |
| MSC.10.27 | T4 D | | D Where the ability to absorb increased travel demand through active travel modes has been exhausted, existing public transport capacity is insufficient to allow for the travel generated by proposed developments, and no firm plans and funding exist for an increase in capacity to cater for the increased demand, planning permission ~~may~~ **will** be contingent on the provision of necessary public transport and active travel infrastructure. | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.28 | T4 Paragraph 10.4.1 | | 10.4. 1 It is important that the impacts and opportunities which arise as a result of development proposals are identified and assessed so that appropriate mitigations and opportunities are secured through the planning process. **Transport assessments** are therefore necessary to ensure that planning applications can be reviewed and assessed for their specific impacts and for their compatibility with the Healthy Streets Approach. **Consideration of the potential impacts on internationally important wildlife sites should also be assessed, where required.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.29 | T4 Paragraph 10.4.4 | | 10.4.4 ~~Ideally,~~ ~~n~~ **N**ew development that will give rise to significant numbers of new trips should be located in places well-connected by public transport, with capacity adequate to support the additional demand, or where there is a realistic prospect of additional access or capacity being provided in time to meet the new demand… | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.30 | T5 A | | A Development Plans and development proposals should help remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment in which people choose to cycle. This will be achieved through:…  2) securing the provision of appropriate levels of cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. Developments should provide cycle parking **at least** in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.2, and should be designed and laid out in accordance with the guidance contained in the London Cycling Design Standards. **Development proposals should demonstrate how cycle parking facilities will cater for larger cycles, including adapted cycles for disabled people.** | | London Borough of Camden, The Access Association, Inclusive Design and Access Panel, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Wheels for Wellbeing, London Borough of Havering, PFL Spaces, Arup, London Sports | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.31 | T5 AA | | **AA Development Plans requiring more generous provisions of cycle parking based on local evidence will be supported** | | London Borough of Hackney | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.32 | T5 E | | E Where the final ~~land~~ use **class** of a development is not determined at the point of application, the highest potential applicable cycle parking standard should be applied. | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.10.33 | T5 F | | F **All development proposals should provide** ~~A~~**a** minimum of two short-stay and two long-stay cycle parking spaces ~~must be provided for all land uses in all locations~~ **except** ~~with the exception of~~ ~~Class C3-C4 uses and Class A uses~~ where ~~the~~ **a** size threshold **is** specified in Table 10.2 **and** has not been met | | London Cycling campaign | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.34 | T5 Table 10.2 C3-C4 long stay requirement | | 1 space per studio or 1 person 1 bedroom dwelling  1.5 spaces per **2 person** 1 bedroom ~~unit~~ **dwelling**  2 spaces per all other dwellings | | London Borough of Lewisham, London Borough of Ealing, British Land, Berkeley Group | | Multiple respondents felt the 1.5 spaces for all 1 beds was an excessive requirement | |
| MSC.10.35 | T5 Table 10.2 C3-C4 short stay requirement | | **5 to 40 dwellings: 2 spaces**  **Thereafter:** 1 space per 40 ~~units~~ **dwellings** | | London Cycling Campaign | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.36 | T5 Table 10.2 Station requirements | | To be considered on a case by case basis through liaison with TfL. The level of provision should take into account the type and location of the station, current and future rail and cycle demand and the potential for journey stages to and from the station to be made by cycle. A ~~Future growth, though a~~ step-change in provision is expected, especially at termini, in order to meet the Mayor’s mode share target. | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.10.37 | T5 Paragraph 10.5.3 | | 10.5.3 The minimum standards for short-stay (for visitor / customer) cycle parking for Class A Uses and long stay cycle parking (for employees) for office use in the boroughs identified on Figure 10.2 are thus set at twice the level as elsewhere – though the Mayor will support other boroughs adopting these higher standards **borough-wide or** for defined areas through their Development Plan documents (such as existing Mini-Hollands, and Liveable Neighbourhoods or Opportunity Areas). | | London Borough of Enfield | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.38 | T5 Paragraph 10.5.6 | | 10.5.6… For nurseries and primary schools, an appropriate proportion of **long-stay** cycle parking **spaces for students** ~~provision~~ may be met through scooter parking... | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.39 | T5 Paragraph 10.5.9 | | 10.5.9 The provision of space for folding bicycles is **generally** not an acceptable alternative to conventional cycle parking~~, as these cycles are only used by a minority of cycle owners, tend to be less affordable and can present difficulties for some users~~. **An exception may be applied in office developments in the CAZ, where the location of rail termini lends itself to greater levels of folding bicycle use. This should only be applied for up to 10 per cent of long-stay spaces and where the full provision could not otherwise be provided.** Provision of cycle hire caters for a different market of cyclist and also should not be accepted in lieu of cycle parking. | | City of London Corporation, PFL Spaces, HB Reavis UK Limited, Get Living London, Argent (Property Development) Services LLP, London Property Alliance | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.40 | T6 B | | B Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking (‘car-lite’). **Car-free development has no general parking but should still provide disabled persons parking in line with part D of this policy.** | | London Borough of Hillingdon, London Borough of Newham, London borough of Brent, London and Continental Railways, South West London and St George's Mental Health NHS Trust, David Bonnett Associates, Inclusive Design and Access Panel, Get Living London, The Access Association | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.41 | T6 BA | | **T6 BB An absence of local on-street parking controls should not be a barrier to new development, and boroughs should look to implement these controls wherever necessary to allow existing residents to maintain safe and efficient use of their streets.** | | Royal Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Brent London Travel Watch, Aitch Group and an individual, as well as concerns about overspill parking from London Borough of Bromley, London Borough of Bexley, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Redbridge, Westminster City Council, London Borough Lewisham, London Borough of Barnet, London Borough of Richmond, Individuals | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.42 | T6 E  new footnote 144A | | E Where car parking is provided in new developments, provision should be made for infrastructure for electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles **in line with policies T6.1, T6.2, T6.3 and T6.4**. **All operational parking should make this provision, including offering rapid charging as required144A. New or redeveloped petrol filling stations should provide rapid charging hubs and/or hydrogen refuelling facilities.**  *Insert new footnote 144A*  **Where operational parking spaces are provided on-street, such as loading bays, any physical infrastructure required should not negatively affect pedestrian amenity** | | London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Sutton, Arcadis LLP, Brixton Society | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.43 | T6 F | | F Adequate provision should be made for efficient deliveries and servicing **and emergency access**. | | London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, London Ambulance Service | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.44 | T6 G | | G A ~~Car~~ Park**ing** Design and Management Plan should be submitted alongside all applications which include car parking provision, indicating how the car parking will be designed and managed, with reference to Transport for London guidance on ~~car~~ parking management and ~~car~~ parking design. | | Wheels for Wellbeing | | Readability | |
| MSC.10.45 | T6 H | | H Boroughs wishing to adopt **more restrictive general or operational parking policies will be supported, including** borough-wide or other area-based car-free policies ~~will be supported~~. Outer London boroughs wishing to adopt minimum residential parking standards through a Development Plan Document (within the maximum standards set out in Policy T6.1 Residential parking) must only do so for parts of London that are PTAL 0-1. Inner London boroughs should not adopt minimum standards. Minimum standards are not appropriate for non-residential ~~land~~ use~~s~~ **classes** in any part of London. | | London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Islington, City of London Corporation, London Borough of Camden | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.46 | T6 I | | I Where sites are redeveloped, existing parking provision should be reduced to reflect the current approach and not be re-provided at previous levels where this exceeds the standards set out in this policy. **Some flexibility may be applied where retail sites are redeveloped outside of town centres in areas which are not well served by public transport, particularly in outer London.** | | Tesco Stores Ltd, Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd, Landsec, Clarion Housing Group | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.47 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.1 | | 10.6.1 To manage London’s road network and ensure that people and businesses can move about the city as the population grows **and housing delivery increases significantly**, new parking provision must be carefully controlled. The dominance of vehicles on streets is a significant barrier to walking and cycling ~~and~~ reduces the appeal of streets as public places **and has an impact on the reliability and journey times of bus services**. Reduced parking provision can facilitate higher-density development and support the creation of mixed and vibrant places that are designed for people rather than vehicles. As the population grows, a fixed road network cannot absorb the additional cars that would result from a continuation of current levels of car ownership and use. Implementing the parking standards in this Plan is therefore an essential measure to support the delivery of new housing across the city. **In some areas, it will be necessary for boroughs to introduce additional parking controls to ensure new development is sustainable and existing residents can continue to park safely and efficiently.** | | Royal Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Brent London Travel Watch, Aitch Group, London Borough of Bromley, London Borough of Bexley, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Redbridge, Westminster City Council, London Borough of Lewisham, London Borough of Barnet, London Borough of Richmond | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.48 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.2 | | 10.6.2 Maximum standards for car parking take account of PTAL as well as London Plan spatial designations and ~~land~~ use **classes**… | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.10.49 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.4 | | 10.6.2 Where no standard is provided, the level of parking should be determined on a case-by-case basis taking account of Policy T6 Car parking, **current and future** PTAL and ~~future levels~~ **wider measures** of public transport, walking and cycling connectivity. | | New Policy Institute | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.50 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.7 | | 10.6.7 Motorcycle parking will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Where provided, each motorcycle parking space should count towards the maximum for car parking spaces at all ~~land~~ use~~s~~ **classes**. | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.10.51 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.8 | | 10.6. 8 **Where electric vehicle charging points are provided on-street, physical infrastructure should ideally be located off the footpath. Where charging points are located on the footpath, it must remain accessible to all those using it including disabled people.** ~~In order to meet the Mayor’s target for carbon-free travel by 2050, all operational parking must provide infrastructure for electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.52 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.8A | | *Insert new paragraph 10.6.8A*  **10.6.8A Surface-level car parking should be permeable where possible in accordance with Policy SI13 Sustainable drainage.** | | Thames Water | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.53 | T6.1 D | | D Outside of the CAZ, and to cater for infrequent trips, car club spaces may be considered appropriate in lieu of private parking. **Any car club spaces should have active charging facilities.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.54 | T6.1 G | | G Disabled persons parking should be provided for new residential developments. Residential development proposals delivering ten or more units must, as a minimum:  1) **ensure that for three per cent of dwellings,** ~~ensure that~~ at least one designated disabled persons parking bay ~~per dwelling for three per cent of dwellings~~ is available from the outset  2) demonstrate on plan and as part of the ~~Car~~ Parking Design and Management Plan, how **an additional seven per cent of dwellings could be provided** ~~the remaining bays to a total of one per dwelling for ten per cent of dwellings can~~ ~~be requested and provided when required as~~ **with a** designated disabled persons parking **space** in ~~the~~ future **upon request**. **This should be provided as soon as existing provision is shown to be insufficient** ~~If disabled persons parking provision is not sufficient, spaces should be provided when needed either upon first occupation of the development or in the future~~. | | Royal Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Lambeth | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.55 | T6 Table 10.3 | | Maximum parking provision\*  Car free**~**  Up to 0.25 spaces per **dwelling** ~~unit~~  Up to 0.5 spaces per **dwelling** ~~unit~~  Up to 0.75 spaces per **dwelling** ~~unit~~  Up to 1 space per **dwelling** ~~unit~~  Up to 1.5 spaces per **dwelling** ~~unit~~ ~~1~~ **^**  **\* Where Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards for general or operational parking, these should be followed**  **~ With the exception of disabled persons parking, see Policy T6.1 G**  ~~1~~ **^** 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 | | London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Islington, City of London Corporation, London Borough of Camden | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.56 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.10 | | ~~Car~~ Parking Design and Management Plans should provide details of how initial and future provision of disabled persons parking spaces will be made, managed and enforced. They should show where these spaces will be located and demonstrate how their availability will be made clear to residents prior to occupation to inform their housing decision. Where a bay is being marked up for a particular resident, this should be done prior to occupation. Details should also be provided of how existing or future residents would request a bay, how quickly it could be created and what, if any, provision of visitor parking for disabled residents is available. ~~At~~ **In** **car-free developments, at** no time should any space marked on plan for future disabled persons parking be used for general parking… | | Wheels for Wellbeing, Get Living London | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.57 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.12A | | *Insert new paragraph 10.6.12A*  **10.6.12A Parking spaces should be leased rather than sold to ensure the land they take up is used as efficiently as possible over the life of a development. This includes enabling disabled persons parking bays to be used by those who need them at any given time and ensuring enlarged bays are available to be converted to disabled persons parking bays as required. Leasing allows for spaces with active charging points to serve electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles, and can more easily support passive provision becoming active. Leasing also supports parking provision to be adaptable to future re-purposing, such as following changes transport technology or services. Leases should be short enough to allow for sufficient flexibility in parking allocation to reflect changing circumstances.** | | Get Living London, Galliard Homes | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.58 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.12B | | *Insert new paragraph 10.6.12B*  **10.6.12B Car clubs count towards the maximum parking permitted because they share many of the negative impacts of privately owned cars. However in some areas, car club spaces can help support lower parking provision and car-lite lifestyles by enabling multiple households to make infrequent trips by car.** | | London Borough of Camden, London Borough Richmond, London Borough of Redbridge, London Borough of Lambeth, Westminster City Council, London Assembly Transport Committee, London Assembly Planning Committee, Bexley Labour Group, Zipcar, Federation of Small Businesses, Berkeley Group, London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies, Hoare Lea LLP, Highams Park Planning Group, MSP Strategies Ltd | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.59 | T6.2 C | | C Car parking ~~standards~~ ~~for~~ **provision at** Use Classes Order B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage or distribution) employment uses should have regard to these office parking standards~~,~~ **and** take account of the significantly lower employment density in such developments**.**~~, and consider a~~**A** degree of flexibility **may also be applied** to reflect different trip-generating characteristics. **In these cases, appropriate provision for electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles should be made.** | | London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Sutton, Arcadis LLP, Brixton Society | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.60 | T6.2 G | | G A ~~Car~~ Park**ing** Design and Management Plan should be submitted alongside all applications which include car parking provision. | | Wheels for Wellbeing | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.61 | T6 Table 10.4 | | Maximum parking provision\*  Car free**^**  **\* Where Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards for general or operational parking, these should be followed**  **^ With the exception of disabled persons parking, see Policy T6.5** | | London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Islington, City of London Corporation, London Borough of Camden | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.62 | T6.3 A | | A The maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.5 should be applied to new retail development. **New retail development should avoid being car-dependent and should follow a town centres first approach, as set out in Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents.** | | Lidl UK GmbH, Canary Wharf Group, Kew Society, Tesco Stores Ltd | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.63 | T6.3 EA | | *Insert new clause T6.3 EA*  **EA Where car parking is provided at retail development, provision for rapid electric vehicle charging should be made** | | London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Sutton, Arcadis LLP, Brixton Society | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.64 | T6 Table 10.5 | | Maximum parking provision\*  Car free**^**  **\* Where Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards for general or operational parking, these should be followed**  **^ With the exception of disabled persons parking, see Policy T6.5** | | London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Islington, City of London Corporation, London Borough of Camden | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.65 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.15A | | **10.6.15A Where significant provision of car parking at retail development can be justified, provision of rapid electric vehicle charging facilities should be made. Supplementary Planning Guidance on what provision is required will be provided.** | | London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Sutton, Arcadis LLP, Brixton Society | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.66 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.17 | | 10.6.17 Hotels and leisure uses should be located in accessible locations to encourage walking**,** ~~and~~ cycling and public transport use. **Where Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards for general or operational parking, these should be followed.** | | London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Enfield, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Islington, City of London Corporation, London Borough of Camden | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.67 | T6 Table 10.6 | | Retail, recreation**, hotels** and leisure - 6 per cent - 4 per cent  Transport car parks - 5 per cent - 5 per cent  **Medical and health facilities - 6 per cent - 4 per cent**  Religious buildings and crematoria - Minimum two spaces or 6 per cent, whichever is the greater - 4 per cent  Sports facilities - Refer to Sport~~s~~ England Guidance | | Sport England | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.68 | T6 Paragraph 10.6.18 | | 10.6.18… The provision of disabled persons parking bays should be regularly monitored and reviewed to ensure the level is adequate and enforcement is effective. **All proposals should include an appropriate amount of** ~~Some~~ Blue Badge parking**,** ~~should be~~ **providing at least one space** ~~provided~~ even if no general parking is provided. | | Arup, Inclusive Design and Access Panel | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.69 | T7 – Policy title | | **~~Freight~~ ~~and~~ Deliveries, servicing and construction** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.70 | T7 A | | **Development Plans,** Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks, Area Action Plans and other area-based plans should include freight ~~and servicing~~ strategies. These should seek to:  1) reduce freight trips to, from and within these areas  2) coordinate the provision of infrastructure and facilities to manage freight ~~and servicing~~ at an area-wide level  3) ~~seek to~~ reduce **noise and** emissions from freight, such as through sustainable last-mile schemes and the provision of rapid electric vehicle charging points for freight vehicles… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.71 | T7 C | | C ~~Wharves and~~ ~~railheads involved in the distribution of aggregates should be safeguarded~~ ~~in line with Policy SI9 Safeguarded waste sites, Policy SI10 Aggregates and Policy SI5 Water infrastructure.~~ **Development Plans should safeguard railheads unless it can be demonstrated that a railhead is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for rail-based freight-handling. The factors to consider in assessing the viability of a railhead include:**   * + **Planning history, environmental impact and its relationship to surrounding land use context – recognising that the agent of change principle will apply**   + **Location, proximity to the strategic road network and existing/potential markets**   + **Existing and potential contribution the railhead can make towards catering for freight movements by non-road modes**   + **The location and availability of capacity at alternate railheads, in light of current and projected capacity and market demands.** | | Port of London Authority, Freight on Rail, Network Rail | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.72 | T7 E | | E Development proposals for new consolidation and distribution facilities should be supported provided that they:…  3) reduce **noise and** emissions from freight ~~and servicing~~ trips… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.73 | T7 F | | F Development proposals should facilitate sustainable ~~freight~~ **deliveries** and servicing, including through the provision of adequate space for servicing**, storage** and deliveries off-street… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.74 | T7 I | | I Development proposals must **consider the use of rail/water for the transportation of material and** adopt ~~appropriate~~ construction site design standards ~~to~~ **that** enable the use of safer, lower trucks with increased levels of direct vision on waste and landfill sites, tip sites, transfer stations and construction sites. | | Freight on Rail, Brett group, Port of London Authority. | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.75 | T7 IA | | *Insert new clause T7 IA*  **IA The construction phase of development should prioritise and maintain inclusive, safe access for people walking or cycling at all times** | | Westminster City Council | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.76 | T7 Paragraph 10.7.2 | | 10.7.2 Currently many deliveries of non-urgent goods are made, unnecessarily, at congested times of the day. ~~Lorries and vans less than half full and as~~ **As** many as two in every three delivery slots are missed, leading to repeat trips that cause additional congestion and emissions. Many van and lorry trips could be avoided or re-timed if freight ~~and servicing~~ activity were better consolidated. Regional consolidation and distribution centres at the edge of London are needed to serve the city and town centres, coupled with micro-distribution centres in central and inner London. ~~The identification and~~ ~~protection of new sites for load consolidation at a range of scales in central, inner and outer London to aid sustainable last-mile consolidation is supported.~~ | | John Lewis Partnership | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.77 | T7 Paragraph 10.7.3 | | 10.7.3 The Mayor will work with all relevant partners to improve the **safety and efficiency** of freight ~~and servicing~~ across London and support consolidation within and beyond London, as well as the retiming of movements to avoid peak hours. **Improved on-site storage can reduce the need for deliveries during peak hours.** Where kerbside loading is required it should be designed to minimise the impact on other road users and pedestrians and seek to minimise the transfer distance from vehicle to destination. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.78 | T7 Paragraph 10.7.6 | | 10.7.6… The plans should be monitored and managed throughout the construction and operational phases of the development. TfL’s f Freight tools including CLOCS (Construction Logistics and Community Safety), **FORS Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme) or** **equivalent** should be utilised to plan for and monitor site conditions to enable the use of vehicles with improved levels of direct vision. This should be demonstrated through a Site Assessment within a Construction Logistics Plan. Development proposals should demonstrate ‘good’ on-site ground conditions ratings or the mechanisms to reach this level. **enabling** **the use of vehicles with improved levels of driver direct vision. To support the procurement of these vehicles and to minimise road danger, the Mayor has introduced his Direct Vision Standard, which rates HGVs on a star rating from 0 (lowest) to 5 (highest), based on how much the driver can see directly through their cab windows** | | London Boroughs, Sustrans | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.79 | T8 B | | B The Mayor supports the role of **the airports serving** London’s ~~airports~~ in enhancing **the city** ~~London’s~~ spatial growth, particularly within Opportunity Areas well connected to the airports by public transport and which can accommodate significant numbers of new homes and jobs. | |  | |  | |
| MSC.10.80 | T8 C | | C The environmental **and health impacts** of aviation must be fully acknowledged and the aviation industry should fully meet its external and environmental costs particularly in respect of noise, air quality and climate change; any airport expansion scheme must be appropriately assessed and if required demonstrate that there is an overriding public interest or no suitable alternative solution with fewer environmental impacts. | | London NHS Clinical Commissioning Group | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.81 | T8 I | | I Development of general and business aviation activity should ~~generally~~ be supported providing this would not lead to additional environmental harm **or negative effects on health**, or impact on scheduled flight operations. Any significant shift in the mix of operations using an airport – for example introduction of scheduled flights at airports not generally offering such flights – should ~~normally~~ be refused. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.82 | T8 Paragraph 10.8.4 | | 10.8.4 The Mayor recognises the need for additional runway capacity in the south east of England, but this should not be at the expense of London’s environment or the health of its residents. ~~Hundreds of thousands of Londoners are already exposed to illegal levels of air pollution and significant noise pollution as a result of Heathrow airport’s current operations and activities.~~ **Heathrow airport's current operations are already a cause of concern for hundreds of thousands of Londoners, ‎with its significant noise impacts and illegal levels of air pollution.** | | Heathrow Airport | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.83 | T8 Paragraph 10.8.5 | | 10.8.5 **Any** ~~A~~airport expansion **proposals** should only be taken forward on the basis that noise impacts are avoided, minimised and mitigated, and proposals should not seek to claim or utilise noise improvements resulting from technology improvements unrelated to expansion… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.84 | T8 Paragraph 10.8.6 | | 10.8.6 **Any** ~~A~~airport expansion **proposals** should not worsen existing air quality or contribute to exceedance of air quality limits, nor should ~~it~~ **they** seek to claim or utilise air quality improvements resulting from unrelated Mayoral, local or national policies and actions… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.85 | T8 Paragraph 10.8.7 | | 10.8.7 The Mayor will therefore strongly oppose any expansion of Heathrow Airport that would result in additional environmental harm **or negative public health impacts**. Air quality gains secured by the Mayor or noise reductions resulting from new technology must be used to improve public health, not to support expansion. The Mayor also believes that expansion at Gatwick could deliver significant benefits to London and the UK more quickly, at less cost, and with significantly fewer adverse environmental impacts. Stansted Airport could, in due course, make better use of its single runway if its flight cap were raised, subject to appropriate environmental mitigation and controls. London City Airport is working to upgrade its passenger facilities and enhance operational efficiency in conjunction with **the introduction of additional environmental mitigation measures and what amounts to** ~~the introduction of additional environmental mitigation measures and what amounts to~~ a reduction of its maximum permitted number of movements ~~and the introduction of additional environmental mitigation measures~~… | | London City Airport | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.86 | T8 Paragraph 10.8.8 | | 10.8.8… It will not be sufficient to rely on schemes designed to cater for background growth such as the Elizabeth ~~L~~**l**ine, Thameslink and Crossrail 2… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.10.87 | T9 Paragraph 10.9.1 New footnote 146 | | 10.9.1… The Mayor’s first MCIL (MCIL1) was introduced in 2012 to contribute to Crossrail 1 (the Elizabeth ~~L~~**l**ine) funding, and was designed as a single rate community infrastructure levy for each London borough, covering all development other than education and health…  *Insert new footnote 146B*  **Devolution: a capital idea, London Finance Commission 2017** | |  | | Clarification | |
| **Chapter 11 Funding the London Plan** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.11.1 | DF1 A | | A Applicants should take account of Development Plan policies when developing proposals and acquiring land. **Development proposals should provide the infrastructure and meet the other relevant policy requirements necessary to ensure that they are sustainable and to support delivery of the Plan.** … | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.11.2 | DF1 D | | D When setting policies seeking planning obligations in local Development Plan Documents and in situations where it has been demonstrated that planning obligations cannot viably be supported by a specific development, applicants and decision-makers should firstly apply priority to affordable housing and necessary public transport improvements, and following this:  1) ~~R~~**r**ecognise the role large sites can play in delivering necessary health and education infrastructure; and 2) R**r**ecognise the importance of affordable workspace, and culture and leisure facilities in delivering good growth. | |  | |  | |
| MSC.11.3 | DF1 C | | C Where it is accepted that viability of a specific site should be considered as part of an application, the borough should determine the weight to be given to a viability assessment alongside other material considerations, **ensuring that developments remain acceptable in planning terms.** … | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.11.4 | DF1 E | | E Boroughs are also encouraged to take account of the **infrastructure prioritisation in** part D in developing their Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and **determining the infrastructure that will be funded through borough CIL** ~~Regulation 123 list~~. | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.11.5 | DF1 Paragraph 11.1.4  New footnote 146A | | 11.1.4… These may include circumstances where an applicant is required to provide significant infrastructure improvements to facilitate delivery of a development (beyond the level that would typically be required for the scale of development)**146A**, or where the value generated by a development would be exceptionally low.  *Insert new footnote 146A*  **The need for infrastructure provision to facilitate a site being brought forward for development or the presence of abnormal development costs will impact land value and the cost should not necessarily be born through a reduction in planning obligations.** | | London Boroughs | | Consistency with other GLA strategies | |
| MSC.11.6 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.5 | | 11.1.5… The application should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, with the decision-maker determining the weight to be given to viability alongside other relevant material considerations. **This should ensure that proposals remain acceptable in planning terms.** | | London Boroughs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.11.7 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.8  New footnote 146B | | 11.1.8 **London’s growth is important for the whole of the United Kingdom. Almost a quarter of the country’s output, and around 30 per cent of its economy-related tax take is generated in the Capital146B. For London to continue to grow as set out in this London Plan, Londoners will need access to genuinely affordable homes and good jobs, supported by necessary social infrastructure, transport, utilities, and green infrastructure. However, the Mayor currently possesses limited powers to fund affordable housing and infrastructure.** There is a significant gap between the public-sector funding required to deliver and support London’s growth, and the amount currently committed to London. In many areas of the city, major development projects are not being progressed because of the uncertainty around funding. **In the short-term, it is therefore necessary for London and Londoners to have greater certainty over the public funding that central government plans to commit to the city’s growth.**  *Insert new footnote 146B*  **Devolution: a capital idea** **London Finance Commission, 2017** | |  | | Clarification and readability | |
| MSC.11.8 | DF1 Paragraph 11.1.11 Footnote 147 | | London Infrastructure Plan 2015**– can be downloaded here** [**https://www.london.gov.uk/file/19038/download?token=1Zj5uQZf**](https://www.london.gov.uk/file/19038/download?token=1Zj5uQZf) | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.11.9 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.19 | | 11.1.19 In order to accelerate and / or de-risk housing development in the capital the Mayor is already making funding available, and he has secured £~~3.15~~**4.82** billion to support **116**~~90~~,000 affordable housing starts by 202~~1~~**2**… | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.11.10 | DF1 Paragraph 11.1.22 | | 11.1.22… As a minimum, this role should mirror that operated by ~~the~~ Homes **England** ~~and Communities Agency~~, which directly manages the release of surplus Government landholdings outside London. | |  | | Factual correction | |
| MSC.11.11 | DF1 Paragraph 11.1.28 | | 11.1.28 Transport in London is funded through a combination of sources, including:  **•**   Business Rate Retention under Mayoral control, which is replacing existing direct Government grants for operations and new capital investment from 2017-18  **•**   ~~R~~**r**evenue from fares and other ‘user pays’ sources (e.g. Congestion Charging)  **•**   ~~N~~**n**on-fare sources (e.g. advertising and property)  **•**   ~~C~~**c**ontributions from the London boroughs and the private sector, for example, developer funding for associated transport investments  **•**   ~~O~~**o**ther specific grants  **•**   TfL ‘prudential borrowing’ against future revenue | |  | | Readability | |
| MSC.11.12 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.29 | | 11.1.29 In addition, for the Elizabeth Line project, there are specific ring-fenced funds (e.g. specific levies such as the Business Rate Supplement and Mayoral CIL). **The intention is that from April 2019 MCIL2 will supersede the current Mayor’s Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL1) and the associated planning obligation/S.106 charge scheme applicable in central London and the northern part of the Isle of Dogs. Subject to consultation and examination in public, MCIL2 will be ringfenced to contribute £4.5 billion of funding for Crossrail 2.** | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.11.13 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.30 | | 11.1.30…The Elizabeth Line, Northern Line extension, Overground extension **to Barking Riverside** and Silvertown Tunnel have identified funding packages and will be delivered in the early years of the Plan. … | |  | | Factual correction | |
| MSC.11.14 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.31 Footnote 149 | | **Devolution: a capital idea,** London Finance Commission 2017. | |  | | Factual Update | |
| MSC.11.15 | DF1 paragraph 11.1.34 Footnote 151 | | **Through the Department for Education’s** ~~Basic Need/ and~~ Devolved Formula Capital **funding**. | |  | | Factual Update | |
| MSC.11.16 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.44 | | 11.1.44…In general, decisions on where to invest in infrastructure are determined on a demand-led **or network capability and capacity** basis. … | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.11.17 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.45 Footnote 153 | | Mayor’s London Environment Strategy **2018**. | |  | | Factual Update | |
| MSC.11.18 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.55 | | 11.1.55…This is of concern because cultural infrastructure is important to local communities, to the tourism industry and to sustaining the creative economy, which is a source of significant employment growth and worth £4~~2~~**7** billion to London’s economy. | |  | | Factual Update | |
| MSC.11.19 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.64  New footnote 155A | | 11.1.64 ~~In recognition of this, and following an invitation for TfL to bring forward proposals for funding infrastructure projects from land value uplift, the Government has agreed to establish a joint task force (including the GLA and TfL) to explore the options for piloting a Development Rights Auction Model on a major infrastructure project in London~~. **Major transport investment can significantly increase the value of land, particularly if it is close to a train station or transport hub. Land value capture is a term used to describe the use of this increase in land value to fund investment in public services, such as transport. In 2017 the Government announced a taskforce155A to investigate a new way of paying for infrastructure projects, such as new public transport, including via land value capture. The Government asked the taskforce to look at the so called 'Development Rights Auction Model' of land value capture. TfL prepared a report, which studied the model in detail, and found that it would be unlikely to raise significant funding in London.**  *Insert new footnote 155A*  **The taskforce is led by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Mayor of London's Office, and includes HM Treasury, the Department for Transport, TfL and London Councils.** | |  | | Factual update | |
| MSC.11.20 | DF1  Paragraph 11.1.65 | | 11.1.65 There are a range of **other infrastructure investments and interventions that can increase the value of land, and** other options for capturing land value uplift**.** ~~, and~~ ~~t~~**The** Mayor will continue to work with government to explore all avenues for ensuring Londoners receive the vital infrastructure required to support growth. | |  | | Clarification | |
| **Chapter 12 Monitoring** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.12.1 | Policy M1  Table 12.1 | | Increase in the supply of new homes over the period (monitored against housing completions and the net pipeline of approved homes), towards meeting the 66,000 net additional homes needed each year up to **March 2029**~~2030~~. | |  | | Clarification | |
| **Annex 1 Town Centre Network** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.A1.1 | Figures A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A1.4 and A1.5 | | *All figures to be updated to align with changes to Table A1.1 noted below.* | |  | |  | |
| MSC.A1.2 | Town Centre Network and Future Potential Network Classification | | **District centres –** distributed more widely than Metropolitan and Major centres, providing convenience goods and services, **and social infrastructure** for more local communities and accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. Typically, they contain 5,000–50,000 sqm of retail, leisure and service floorspace. Some District centres have developed specialist shopping functions. | | Levitt Bernstein | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.3 | Figure A1.4 supporting text | | Office Guidelines  Table A1.1 and Figure A1.4 set out those town centres where specific approaches to offices are recommended, as informed by the London Office Policy ReviewA2 **and borough evidence**. | | Royal Borough of Kingston | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.4 | Figure A1.4 | | Amend the second line in the key in Figure 1.4: "**A/potential** CAZ satellite". | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.5 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Knightsbridge – increase night time economy from NT3 to NT2 | | Westminster City Council, Marble Arch Partnership | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.6 | Table A1.1 – Town Centre Network | | Bexleyheath – increase commercial growth potential from Low to Medium | | London Borough of Bexley | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.7 | Table A1.1 – Town Centre Network | | Bexleyheath – increase night time economy from NT3 to NT2 | | London Borough of Bexley | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.8 | Table A1.1 – Town Centre Network | | Wembley – classify as future potential metropolitan town centre | | London Borough of Brent, individual, Brent Cyclists (LCC Local Group in Brent) | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.9 | Table A1.1 – Town Centre Network | | Camden Town – remove as future potential metropolitan town centre | | London Borough of Camden, Camden Town CAAC, Chairs of Camden's Conservation Area Advisory Committees, the Camden HS2 Association of Resident's Groups for Engagement (CHARGE) | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.10 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Southall – nominate night time economy as NT3 | | London Borough of Ealing | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.11 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Hackney Central - reclassify from a district town centre to a major town centre | | London Borough of Hackney | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.12 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Streatham – increase night time economy from NT3 to NT2 | | London Borough of Lambeth | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.13 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Canada Water – increase from district town centre to major town centre and remove future potential status as major town centre | | London Borough Southwark | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.14 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Peckham – nominate as ‘C - Protect small office capacity’ in office guidelines | | London Borough Southwark | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.15 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Wandsworth – nominate night time economy as NT3 | | London Borough of Wandsworth | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.16 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Petts Wood – decrease residential growth potential from medium to incremental | | London Borough of Bromley, Jo Johnson MP,  Petts Wood & District Residents' Association | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.17 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | West Wickham – decrease residential growth potential from medium to incremental | | London Borough of Bromley | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.18 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Herne Hill – add centre and nominate as district town centre | | London Borough of Lambeth, Southwark | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.19 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Stamford Hill – add centre, nominate as district town centre and identified a strategic area for regeneration | | London Borough of Hackney | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.20 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Leyton – nominate as Strategic area for regeneration | | London Borough of Waltham Forest | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.21 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Southfields – remove from table | | London Borough of Wandsworth | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.22 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Edgware Road/Church Street – nominate night time economy as NT3 | | Westminster City Council | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.23 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Edgware Road/Church Street – increase commercial growth potential from low to medium | | Westminster City Council | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.24 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | London Bridge – decrease residential growth potential from medium to incremental | | Team London Bridge | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.25 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Edgware Road South – nominate night time economy as NT3 | | Westminster City Council, | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.26 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Marylebone High Street - nominate night time economy as NT3 | | Westminster City Council, | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.27 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Marylebone Road – increase commercial growth potential from low to medium | | Westminster City Council | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.28 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Warwick Way/ Tachbrook Street - increase commercial growth potential from low to medium | | Westminster City Council | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A1.29 | Table A1.1 - Town Centre Network | | Belvedere – nominate as future potential district town centre | | London Borough of Bexley | | Clarification | |
| **Annex 2 Inner and Outer London Boroughs (No changes to this annex)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Annex 3 Glossary** | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC.A3.1 | Glossary (Abbreviations) | | BREEAM  Building Research Establishment ~~e~~**E**nvironmental ~~a~~**A**ssessment ~~m~~**M**ethod | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.2 | Glossary (Abbreviations) | | Public Transport Access~~ibility~~ Level | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.3 | Glossary (Abbreviations) | | **SAC**  **Special Areas of Conservation** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.4 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Active provision for electric vehicles  A~~n actual~~ socket **or equivalent** connected to the electrical supply system that vehicle owners can **use to** ~~plug~~ **recharge** their vehicle ~~into~~ (see also ‘Passive provision for electric vehicles’). | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.5 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Affordable housing  See Policy H5.  ~~Affordable housing is Social Rented, Affordable Rented and Intermediate Housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. This is a broad definition of affordable housing and is consistent with the 2012 NPPF. Paragraphs 4.7.3- 4.7.6 of this Plan set out the Mayor’s preferred affordable housing tenures~~  ~~Social rented housing is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency.~~  ~~Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80 per cent of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).~~  ~~Intermediate housing is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the affordable housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing.~~  ~~Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as “low cost market” housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.6 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Agent of Change principle  The principle places the responsibility of mitigating the impact of **nuisances** **(including** noise**)** from existing ~~noise~~ **nuisance** generating ~~businesses~~ **uses** on proposed new development close by, thereby ensuring that residents **and users** of the new development are protected from ~~noise~~ **nuisances,** and existing ~~businesses~~ **uses** are protected from ~~noise~~ **nuisance** complaints. Similarly, any new ~~noise~~ **nuisance** generating development, for example a music venue, will need to put in place measures to mitigate noise impacts on existing development close by. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.7 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Areas of Deficiency in access to nature  **Areas where people have to walk more than one kilometre to reach a publicly accessible Metropolitan or Borough Site of Importance for Nature (SINC).** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.8 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Areas of Deficiency in access to public open space  **Areas lacking in sufficient publicly accessible open space, as defined by a set of standards in Policy G4.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.9 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Attributes (World Heritage Sites)**  **Attributes are tangible or intangible aspects of a World Heritage property which are associated with or express the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and can be the physical elements, the relationships between elements and / or time related processes. The UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (the Operational Guidelines) indicate a range of types of attribute which might convey OUV, including form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions: techniques and management systems; location and setting; language and other forms of intangible heritage; and spirit and feeling. Attributes identified for a property should flow from the adopted Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.** | | Historic Royal Palaces | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.10 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Authenticity (World Heritage Sites)**  **Authenticity relates only to cultural properties and is about the link between attributes and Outstanding Universal Value. It is embodied in those characteristics that most truthfully reflect and embody the cultural heritage values of a place. They can be expressed in the variety of types of attributes listed in the definition of attributes (*Operational Guidelines*).** | | Historic Royal Palaces | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.11 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Biodiversity offsets  **Measures to improve existing or create replacement habitat where there are unavoidable impacts on wildlife habitats resulting from development or change of land use.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.12 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Blue / water space  Areas covered by water including the River Thames and other rivers, canals, reservoirs, lakes and ponds. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.13 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | ~~Brown roofs~~  ~~Roofs which have a layer of soil or other material which provides a habitat or growing medium for plants or wildlife.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.14 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Car club  ~~These are schemes such as city car clubs and car pools, which facilitate vehicle sharing.~~ **A short-term car rental service that allows members access to cars parked locally for a per-minute, per-hour or per-day fee.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.15 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Circular economy  An economic model in which resources are kept in use at the highest level possible for as long as possible in order to maximise value and reduce waste, moving away from the traditional linear economic model of ‘make, use, dispose’ | | London Borough of Camden, SEWPAG | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.16 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Communal heating systems**  **A communal heating system supplies heat to multiple properties from a common heat source. It may range from a district system heating many buildings to a system serving an individual block of flats.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.17 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Community led housing  **Schemes that are genuinely community-led all share three common principles: meaningful community engagement and consent occurs throughout the development process (communities do not necessarily have to initiate the conversation, or build homes themselves); there is a presumption that the community group or organisation will take a long-term formal role in the ownership, stewardship, or management of the homes; and the benefits of the scheme to the local area and/or specified community group are clearly defined and legally protected in perpetuity.** | | Community Led Housing London | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.18 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Conservation (heritage) | | Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.19 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Construction, ~~and~~ demolition and excavation waste  This is waste arising from the **excavation,** construction, repair, maintenance and demolition of buildings and structures, including roads. It consists mostly of brick, concrete, hardcore, subsoil and topsoil, but it can contain quantities of timber, metal, plastics and occasionally special (hazardous) waste materials. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.20 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Creative Enterprise Zone**  **A Mayor of London initiative to establish clusters of creative production, which provide affordable premises and enterprise-related incentives for artists and creative businesses, pro-culture planning and housing policies, and offer career pathways and creative jobs for local communities and young people.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.21 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Decentralised energy**  **A range of definitions exist for decentralised energy. In the context of the London Plan, it refers to low-and zero-carbon power and/or heat generated and delivered within London. This includes microgeneration, such as photovoltaics on individual buildings, through to large-scale heat networks.** | | London Sustainable Development Commission | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.22 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Freight  **A general term to refer to trips made for the purposes of delivering goods, enabling servicing activity or supporting construction.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.23 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Green corridors  ~~This refers to r~~ **R**elatively continuous areas of open space leading through the built environment, which may ~~be~~ link~~ed~~ ~~and may not be publicly accessible~~**to each other and to the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land**. **They often consist of rivers, railway embankments and cuttings, roadside verges, canals, parks, playing fields and extensive areas of private gardens**. They may allow animals and plants to be found further into the built-up area than would otherwise be the case and provide an extension to the habitats of the sites they join. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.24 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Green cover**  **The total area covered by vegetation and water across London. It not only includes publicly accessible and publicly managed vegetated land (i.e. green space) and waterways, but also non-accessible green and blue spaces, as well as privately owned vegetated land including private gardens and agricultural land, and the area of vegetated cover on buildings and in the wider built environment such as green roofs, street trees and rain gardens.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.25 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Green infrastructure  A network of green **and blue** spaces – and features such as street trees and green roofs - that is planned, designed and managed to deliver a range of benefits. These include **promoting mental and physical health and wellbeing;** ~~mitigating flooding, cooling the urban environment~~ **adapting to the impacts of climate change and the urban heat-island effect; improving air and water quality; encouraging walking and cycling**; **supporting landscape and heritage conservation; learning about the environment; supporting food growing** and **conserving** **and** enhancing biodiversity and ecological resilience, **alongside more traditional functions of green space such as play, sport and recreation and ~~as well as~~ providing more attractive places for people.** | | Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.26 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Green space**  **All vegetated open space of public value (whether publicly or privately owned), including parks, woodlands, nature reserves, gardens and sports fields, which offer opportunities for sport and recreation, wildlife conservation and other benefits such as storing flood water, and can provide an important visual amenity in the urban landscape.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.27 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | ~~Green Space Factor~~  ~~A planning tool to ensure new developments provide adequate urban greening.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.28 |  | | Greening  The improvement of the appearance, function and wildlife value of the urban environment through ~~soft landscaping~~ use of vegetation or water. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.29 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Habitable Room**  **A habitable room is any room used or intended to be used for sleeping, cooking, living or eating purposes. Enclosed spaces such as bath or toilet facilities, corridors, hallways, utility rooms or similar should not be considered habitable rooms.** | | Orbit, Levitt Bernstein | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.30 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Habitable Floorspace**  **Habitable floorspace is all floorspace with a floor to ceiling height of 1.5m or over within a habitable room. Floorspace within habitable rooms with a floor to ceiling height of between 0.9m and 1.5m is counted as 50 per cent of its floor area and any floor area with a floor to ceiling height lower than 0.9m is not counted as habitable floorspace.** | | Orbit, Levitt Bernstein | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.31 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)**  **Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is used as a systematic framework to identify the potential impacts of a development proposal, policy or plan on the health and wellbeing of the population and highlight any health inequalities that may arise. HIA should be undertaken as early as possible in the plan making or design process to identify opportunities for maximising potential health gains, minimising harm, and addressing health inequalities.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.32 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Health inequalities**  Health inequalities are systematic, avoidable and unfair differences in mental **and/**or physical health between groups of people. These differences affect how long people live in good health, and are mostly a result of differences in people’s homes, education and childhood experiences, their environments, their **income,** jobs and employment prospects, their access to good public services and their ~~habits~~**everyday opportunities to live healthier lives**. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.33 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Houses~~ing~~ in ~~m~~Multiple ~~o~~Occupation (HMOs)  ~~Housing occupied by individuals of more than one household living together not as a family in non-self-contained accommodation.~~  **HMOs are dwellings which are shared by three or more tenants who form two or more households and share a kitchen, bathroom or toilet. HMOs for between three and six people are classed as C4 whereas HMOs for more than six people are Sui Generis.** | |  | | Clarification. | |
| MSC.A3.34 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Impermeable surface**  **Mainly artificial structures (such as pavements, roads, driveways, parking areas and rooftops) that are covered by materials impenetrable to water (such as asphalt, concrete, brick and stone). Impermeable surfaces also collect solar heat in their dense mass. When the heat is released, it raises air temperatures (see ‘Urban heat island’).** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.35 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Integrity (World Heritage Sites)**  **Integrity is a measure of the completeness or intactness of the World Heritage property and its attributes which express the Outstanding Universal Value it holds (UNESCO Operational Guidelines).** | | Historic Royal Palaces | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.36 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Low Emission Zone (LEZ)  ~~A charging zone across most of Greater London for vehicles that do not meet emissions standards for particulate matter.~~ **A charging zone across most of Greater London for vehicles (excluding cars) that do not meet emissions standards.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.37 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Main town centre uses**  **Retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres, and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.38 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Operational parking  **Parking for vehicles which are required for the function of a building or the activities within it. This can include spaces for fleet vehicles, taxis or loading bays, but does not include parking for personal travel such as commuting.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.39 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Outstanding Universal Value  ~~A property that has a c~~Cultural and/or natural significance that is so exceptional that it transcends national boundaries **and is of common importance for both present and future generations**. A**n individual** ~~s~~**S**tatement of Outstanding Universal Value is **agreed and** adopted by **the** UNESCO~~’s~~ ~~intergovernmental~~ World Heritage Committee **for each World Heritage Site** at the time of its inscription ~~and may be subsequently amended~~ ~~by the Committee~~. **This** Value~~s~~ can be **expressed by** physical, architectural or intangible **attributes** **that are** ~~They will be~~ embodied in the buildings, spaces, monuments, artefacts and archaeological deposits within the site, the setting and views of and from it. Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are key references for the effective protection and management of World Heritage Sites and can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>.  **See also Attributes, Authenticity, and Integrity.** | | Historic England | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.40 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Passive provision for electric vehicles  The network of cables and power supply necessary so that at a future date a socket **or equivalent** can be added easily **to allow vehicle owners to recharge their vehicle** (see also ‘Active provision for electric vehicles’). | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.41 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Precision-manufactured homes**  **Homes built using a high proportion of components which are produced using modern and technologically-driven methods of manufacture, with this production often taking place offsite and the components then assembled onsite.** | | London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.42 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Public Transport Access~~ibility~~ Levels (PTALs)  Public Transport Access~~ibility~~ Levels (PTALs) are calculated across London using a grid of points at 100m intervals. For each point walk time to the public transport network is combined with service wait time (frequency) to give a measure of public transport network density.  TfL has made pre-calculated PTALs available on WebCAT, its web-based connectivity assessment toolkit (www.tfl.gov.uk/WebCAT). Users can view PTALs for any location in London alongside contextual information such as the local street network, rail stations and bus stops. **Users can also view the PTALs resulting from planned improvements to and extensions of the public transport network.** ……… | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.43 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Ramsar Site  **Nature conservation site** **d**~~D~~esignated under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance 1971. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.44 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Secondary materials (Waste)**  **Waste materials that can be used in reuse, recycling and re-manufacturing processes instead of or alongside virgin raw materials. This can include waste materials from demolition and excavation, or discarded items such as furniture and electrical products.** | | London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB), London Waste Planning Forum | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.45 |  | | **Significance (Heritage)**  **The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.** | | Historic England | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.46 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)**  **Areas of land chosen to represent the best wildlife habitats in London and areas of land where people can experience nature close to where they live and work. Sites are classified into Sites of Metropolitan, Borough and Local Importance depending on their relative value. Unlike SSSIs, SINCs are not legally protected, but their value must be considered in any land use planning decision. Procedures for the identification of SINCs are set out in Appendix 5 of the Mayor’s London Environment Strategy.** | | Individuals | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.47 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)  **Areas of land with ecological or geological interest of national importance. They are designated by Natural England** ~~A classification notified~~ under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981 as amended) **and have legal protection**. ~~All the London sites of biodiversity interest are included within sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.48 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Special Policy Areas  Areas that are defined locally ~~in specific and exceptional circumstances~~ **particularly** where development pressures and market conditions could lead to the loss of valued specialist clusters of uses or functions identified as having particular significance to London’s unique identity, economic function or cultural heritage. | | Westminster City Council, Just Space | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.49 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Strategic Industrial Locations  London’s **largest concentrations** ~~main reservoirs~~ of industrial, logistics and related capacity for uses that support the functioning of London’s economy. | | Just Space, Green Party Group, Vital OKR | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.50 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Sustainable development  **There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The economic role means contributing to a strong, responsive and competitive economy. The social role means supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities. The environmental role means contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. To achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.**  ~~Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future set out five ‘guiding principles’ of sustainable development: living within the planet’s environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly.~~ | | MHCLG, Historic England, London Assembly Planning Committee, Camden Town CAAC, Camden CAACs | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.51 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Urban greening  Urban greening describes the **act of adding** green infrastructure elements that are most applicable in ~~central~~ London ~~and London’s town centres~~. Due to the morphology and density of the built environment in the~~se areas~~ **city**, green roofs, street trees, and additional vegetation ~~techniques such as soft landscaping,~~ are the most appropriate elements of green infrastructure. | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.52 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Urban Greening Factor**  **A land-use planning tool to help determine the amount of greening required in new developments.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.53 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Visitor Accommodation**  **Leisure and business accommodation that provides temporary overnight accommodation on a commercial basis, including serviced accommodation such as hotels, bed and breakfast, guesthouses, hostels and campus accommodation, and non-serviced accommodation such as self-catering apart-hotels, caravans and camping.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.54 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | Water space  **See Blue/water space.** ~~Area covered by water (permanently or intermittently), not adjacent land that is normally dry, and including the River Thames, other rivers and canals, and reservoirs, lakes and ponds.~~ | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.55 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Whole life cycle carbon**  **Whole life-cycle carbon emissions are the total greenhouse gas emissions arising from a development over its lifetime, from the emissions associated with raw material extraction, the manufacture and transport of building materials, to installation/ construction, operation, maintenance and eventual material disposal.** | |  | | Clarification | |
| MSC.A3.56 | Glossary  (Definitions) | | **Zero-emission**  **Activity that causes no release of air pollutants and carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases.** | |  | | Clarification | |