

**H&BC NDG RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS POSED BY EXTERNAL EXAMINER**

QUESTIONS FROM EXTERNAL EXAMINER	RESPONSE
<p><b>SUTTON COUNCIL AND H&amp;BC NDG</b></p>	
<p>1. Several references are made in the NP to the 100 Acre Bridge and Irrigation Bridge and they are shown on the Plans within the document. For example, paragraph 3.4 (which should refer to the Map on page 13 and not page 6) states that the railway bridges will 'provide access to the WVRP'. However, these bridges across the railway have been demolished. It is not clear to me whether or not it is the aspiration of the Council and the QB to have new bridges constructed. If that is the case, how would they be funded and would such proposals be supported by Network Rail? In the interests of clarity could the position of the Council and the QB be established and appropriate text/plan amendments, that would accurately reflect the current position, be suggested for inclusion in the NP?</p>	<p>This was overtaken by events. After nearly a decade of being under threat, Network Rail finally demolished Hundred Acre and Irrigation Bridges on 25/26 February 2017. This was despite a strong petition from the local community asking Sutton Council to step in and save just one of them. Network Rail were happy to let Sutton Council take on the bridge, but we understand the Council did not want to take on the financial costs or liability. Irrigation bridge was particularly important as a vital DDA compliant access to Beddington Farmlands from Hackbridge, which cannot be secured elsewhere.</p> <p>Whilst we were disappointed with the demolition of Hundred Acre and Irrigation bridges, an online and paper petition submitted to Sutton Council, asking them to support a replacement footbridge was delivered to the Environment &amp; Neighbourhood Committee on 30 March 2017. The Council committed to support provision of a pedestrian bridge in the vicinity of the new Hackbridge School site, where Irrigation Bridge was, and invited the Wandle Valley Forum to take the lead to investigate funding opportunities that are not available to the Council.</p> <p>During Sutton Council's Local Plan hearings, the NDG asked for this commitment to be acknowledged in their new plan. This commitment can now be seen in Sutton's Local Plan 2031 under Policy 5d 'Wandle Valley Renewal - New Infrastructure' - page 34.</p> <p>"support the Wandle Valley Forum to lead on securing external funding for a</p>

	<p>replacement pedestrian bridge."</p> <p>Exact wording of the 'prayer' from the Environment &amp; Neighbourhood Committee that they provided us with below:-</p> <p>Option 3</p> <p>To invite the Wandle Valley Regional Park to take the lead, with interested community groups, to investigate and apply for external funding for a replacement pedestrian bridge (and approaches) in the vicinity of the new Hackbridge School site, recognising that such groups can apply for funding from sources that are not open to local authorities. Indicative capital budget required is in excess of £1m, plus ongoing revenue for maintenance.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4 on page 14 of the plan should be amended to read: "The map on page 13 shows details of the Hackbridge boundary, including development sites, existing pedestrian and cycle access, and public open spaces. It also shows a new DDA compliant bridge across the railway line in approximately the same location as the now- demolished Irrigation Bridge. The new Sutton Local Plan invites the Wandle Valley Regional Park to take the lead, with interested community groups, to investigate and apply for external funding for a replacement pedestrian bridge (and approaches) in the vicinity of the new Hackbridge School site, recognising that such groups can apply for funding from sources that are not open to local authorities"</p> <p>In addition, all the maps need to be replaced with 'proposed pedestrian footbridge'.</p>
<p>2. Policies H&amp;BEP2 and H&amp;BEP3 both refer to proposals 'where a Design and Access Statement is required'. However, I could find no guidance within the NP as to what would trigger</p>	<p>The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government advise that Design and Access Statements are required for the following planning</p>

<p>the requirement for such a Statement. Is this guidance included within any other Council documents and, if so, where?</p>	<p>applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications for major development, as defined in <a href="#">article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2015</a>;</li> <li>• Applications for development in a designated area, where the proposed development consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one or more dwellings; or</li> <li>• a building or buildings with a floor space of 100 square metres or more.</li> <li>• Applications for listed building consent</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Design-and-Access-Statement">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Design-and-Access-Statement</a></p> <p>We would expect developers to answer policies H&amp;BEP2 and H&amp;BEP3, when a Design and Access statement is required by Sutton Council or as defined by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Therefore these policies would not apply to some small applications, such as house extensions.</p> <p>We intend to add text to further clarify this requirement and to cross reference this guidance from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.</p>
<p>3. Policy CIP2 refers to the need to establish a way in which the local community has an input into how money raised</p>	<p>We would like to see a process set up where the NDG are involved in what happens to CIL monies. To date, we have had no involvement. We believe</p>

<p>through Community Infrastructure Levy is spent in the area. Are any such mechanisms in place or proposed?</p>	<p>this is something which will go through our Local Committee.</p>
<p><b>H&amp;BC NDG</b></p>	
<p>1. Policy H&amp;BEP1 refers to improving the character and quality of the public realm. Are there any specific improvements that are being sought?</p>	<p>Specific improvements we would like to see include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>A full review of the ‘Heart of Hackbridge’ scheme (see Appendix A) should be undertaken.</b> Despite best endeavours, parking has now become an obstruction rather than providing a pleasant street scene, as promised. Current parking provision has resulted in poor behaviour by drivers. The set-up at Hackbridge Corner now regularly causes delays, with traffic frequently backed up both ways at various times during the day. Pedestrians remain unsure about whether using courtesy crossings is a good idea or a risk to life! Landscaping attempts have been poorly maintained with trees knocked over and one tree pit having been tarmacked over, now being used as another squeeze in for parked cars. Rain gardens are overgrown weed patches and cycle bars being used to provide an inadequate ‘no parking’ barrier. Limited signage and enforcement has resulted in cars being randomly parked on footpaths. Suffice to say that Sutton Council were badly advised by the architects they employed to ‘experiment’ with Hackbridge and sadly this ended up in much disappointment, particularly in respect of courtesy crossings, which remain contentious and subject to much criticism in two/three audit reports.</li> <li>2. <b>Provision for cyclists</b> remains inadequate and despite regular appeals to Sutton Council, little attempt has been made in and across Hackbridge to improve the experience for cyclists. You will see that this has been highlighted under our transport policies.</li> <li>3. <b>Green Space Management Improvements</b> –this important area is covered in some detail in Section 6 of this plan – Hackbridge Community</li> </ol>

	<p>Action Plan (page 68). We were advised by Sutton Council that ‘improvements’ could not to be regarded as planning policy. Green corridors – Policy EP6 – (pages 50-52)</p> <p><b>4. Future development across Hackbridge to respect the suburban look,</b> as consultations have shown this is a strongly held view by residents. Recent developments have done nothing to respect the suburban character of Hackbridge and recent high rise buildings have been built at the expense of the existing vernacular. Sutton Council needs to look at Hackbridge as a whole, rather than each development in isolation and recognise the extreme intensification that is taking place.</p> <p><b>5. Flooding remains a constant threat</b> in a number of locations across Hackbridge and this needs attention. (See Policy MP1 – paragraph 5.111)</p> <p><b>6. Pedestrian interface from London Road into Hackbridge Station.</b> This needs to be made safer for the growing local population of residents, many of whom are using Hackbridge Station.</p>
<p>2. Whilst the justification for the cycle storage requirements in policy H&amp;BEP2 are set out in the supporting text, no such justification is given for the recycling, outdoor drying and allotment requirements. Could the QB provide the justification for these elements of the policy?</p>	<p>The requirements for cycling storage, recycling, outdoor drying and allotments were very much in response to the experiences existing local residents of Hackbridge. We know how much more difficult it can be to live more sustainably when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we have bicycles stuck in sheds in back gardens of terraced houses, that you have to carry through to house to get out,</li> <li>• or you have no outdoor space and have to rely on an airing rack or dryer to dry your clothes, which either increases the moisture content of the indoor air (encouraging the formation of mould and mildew) or costs a lot of money to run on electricity,</li> <li>• or we don’t recycle as much because there isn’t enough space in the kitchen for separate bins to segregate the waste,</li> <li>• or we would like to garden and grow food but can only afford to live in a flat with no garden.</li> </ul>

	<p>These are all very personal experiences that we would like new developments not to repeat, for a better quality of living standards for future residents and to make it easier for them to reduce their impact on the environment.</p> <p>Previous iterations of this neighbourhood plan contained much detail in respect of recycling, outdoor drying and allotment requirements. We were advised that the level of detail provided was too much and we would not be able to ask a developer to adhere to such detail. Hence it was removed, and in the case of recycling, we were much aggrieved to see the inadequate</p> <p>provision being proposed for new developments, including Wandle Valley Trading Estate. We would be happy to signpost previous versions of our Plan in respect of this detail.</p>
<p>3. Could the QB explain what the difference is between policy LEP1 and LEP3 as they relate to land north of Hackbridge train station?</p>	<p>LEP1 is attempting to raise the issue of <b>loss of current employment land</b> across Hackbridge. It should be clear from the opening section of the neighbourhood plan, Hackbridge has been the subject of much residential development over recent years, with overdevelopment now a likely outcome, once New Mill Quarter, Mayfields, Maple Grove, Mill Green Business Park etc are all completed (2020). Hackbridge will see its population increase by 25-30% with no identifiable employment opportunities (indeed a number of businesses closed to make way for residential development). In addition, there are plans in hand to convert existing employment sites including Hackbridge Station and parts of the site located on Restmor Way into more flats, increasing the residential element of Hackbridge, at the further expense of employment land.</p> <p>LEP3 is attempting to recognise/acknowledge the non-existence of the NDG's right to a say in <b>site allocations</b>. Long before the NDG was formed, Sutton Council had already defined and declared what they wished to see/do in terms of development across Hackbirdge. Indeed, it has been an uphill struggle to understand what the point of a neighbourhood plan is, without the ability to</p>

	<p>determine what is built and where. Suffice to say, having accepted the fact that we have had no say in site allocations, LEP3 is our attempt at pulling together comments from local residents, and as is made clear, represents a set of possibilities/suggestions and uses for the important area of Hackbridge, which is the land including Hackbridge Station.</p>
<p>4. Could the QB explain in what way they anticipate that visitors to the Wandle Valley Regional Park should be catered for, as required by policy LEP2?</p>	<p>Being right at the centre of the Wandle Valley Regional Park provides an excellent opportunity for Hackbridge to capitalise on what would be an important gateway into the park. Visitors would be encouraged to arrive by train and it was very much thought that Mile Road would provide one of a number of access points, with the now demolished Irrigation Bridge providing DDA compliant access. All along this route, it was felt that Hackbridge could provide retail and employment opportunities such as a bike hub (in Culvers Lodge), walking sticks, binoculars etc and other leisure related items. This would all require investment and obviously a champion, with the vision to take this idea and bring it to fruition in Hackbridge. The charity Wandle Valley Regional Park Trust continues to support this aspiration.</p>
<p>5. At the top of page 41 there is reference to re-providing parking at the station. It is not clear if this should be shaded text (as is page 40); or if it is an objective or policy. Could the QB clarify the situation?</p>	<p>Yes, this appears to be a formatting issue and should have been shaded text as part of the 'suggestions for development of Hackbridge Train Station car park and adjoining land'.</p>
<p>6. Objective 3.2 on page 41 refers to the provision of a visitors' centre. Has any progress been made on identifying a suitable site for such a facility?</p>	<p>We were advised that we could not specify a site, especially if on MOL. We do of course have our own suggestions, which we would be happy to discuss.</p>
<p>7. Where can the reader find an explanation of the 'right plant, right place' principle that is referred to in policy EP3?</p>	<p>Right Plant, Right Place is a well-known horticultural principle. There are many online articles and books about this and therefore information about it</p>

	<p>easily accessible. Whilst there is no particular written reference to explain this principle in our plan or appendix, this can, if required be added. The London Plan adopts the same principal for 'Right Tree, Right Place'. It basically means that you select the best plants for the given conditions (i.e. light, type of soil) and not just for ornamental effects.</p>
<p>8. Policy EW&amp;WP1 can be interpreted as requiring a 'One Planet Action Plan' to be submitted with <u>all</u> planning applications, whatever the use or scale of the proposal. Is this the intention of the QB? Does EW&amp;WP1 add anything not already covered by Local Plan policies?</p>	<p>No, the requirement to submit a 'One Planet Action Plan' applies to residential developments with two or more dwellings, or large commercial developments. We intent to provide additional text to clarify this.</p> <p>However, since the 'One Planet Action Plan' is intended to be simple to use, whether by the general public or professionals, we would encourage all developments to consider the 10 principles of the 'One Planet Action Plan', to fully understand the environmental impact of their proposed development. In 2009 Hackbridge was one of 10 neighbourhoods to be chosen to be a Low-carbon Zone. Work was done with local residents to improve the energy efficiency of their homes. This followed earlier work with residents to create the Hackbridge Draft Masterplan, within which improving the environmental performance of the local buildings was paramount. Hackbridge also contains the world renowned Bedzed development, which pioneered low-carbon construction. Residents are concerned about the environmental impact of any new development and wish to build upon the local legacy for high environmental standards.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the 'One Planet Action Plan,' considers the environmental performance of new developments over and above the Building Regulations and the Local Plan.</p> <p>Also in our experience and of great importance to us, is that when the environmental strategy for a development is set out in accordance with the 10 principles of the 'One Planet Action Plan', it makes it clear to the general</p>

	<p>public how the proposed development intends to minimise its environmental impact. Our neighbourhood is concerned about the environmental impact of the new developments and this information should be provided in an easily understood format.</p>
<p>9. How does the QB anticipate that Objective 5.1 on page 55(the introduction of traffic calming measures on the A.237) will be achieved when, as far as I am aware, there is no policy requirement for such works in the NP?</p>	<p>It is noted that our plan does not provide a specific policy in respect of traffic calming measures on the A237. This is because the Heart of Hackbridge was supposed to deliver this. Unfortunately this has not been the case and we are expecting Sutton Council to review this project, as mentioned earlier, but we did not want to lose the objective. Our plan seeks to encourage various forms of transport, including cycling and walking and without improvements to safety (traffic calming measures), residents are unlikely to feel encouraged to step away from their cars!</p>
<p>10. Transport for London states that ‘the plan proposes to reroute the S1 and night bus to serve Hackbridge’. Where in the NP is this ambition set out?</p>	<p>Slightly confused with this question. Are you telling us that TfL has a plan to reroute the S1 and provide a night bus service to cover Hackbridge? We are not aware of this. We do, however, mention these changes in Section 6 – Community Action Plan. Again, we were told that this could not form part of our neighbourhood plan.</p>

# Heart of Hackbridge

## Public Realm Design Guide

### 1.0 Introduction

In February, the Greater London Authority awarded £835K to BioRegional (in partnership with Sutton Council) from the Outer London Fund programme to revitalise Hackbridge high street by improving its “prosperity, sustainability and accessibility”. The funding was increased to £1.2M with the addition of 30% match funding from the Council. Further match-funding from BioRegional and developer contributions takes the overall programme to £3.2M.

On behalf of the Board, Sutton Council is now seeking high-level design advice on how to utilise these funds most effectively to contribute to raising the overall quality of the urban environment in the Hackbridge centre. This brief elaborates upon our requirements.

### 2.0 The Hackbridge Programme

The unique elements of the Hackbridge Outer London Fund scheme are that:

- Economic, social and environmental sustainability run through every aspect of the scheme
- The scheme runs in parallel with major private and public investment in Hackbridge. This will produce economic growth. OLF will be used as a catalyst to secure design and build quality, as well as social and environmental value from this growth.

These investments - overseen by the Council and known as the Hackbridge Programme - will total over £100M during the Outer London Fund period and up to 500M by 2025 by which the time the Programme will be complete. The Programme will include the Felnax development, a potential heat network, energy retrofit projects, a Country Park development 3 times the size of Hyde Park, healthy eating, sustainable transport, River Wandle restoration and other improved natural habitats, and a large number of associated socio-economic projects.

### 2.1 Aim and objectives of the Outer London Fund project

The aim of the project is to 'forge a thriving, sustainable high street set in the natural beauty of the Wandle'. This will create a destination of distinction that will attract residents and other visitors for extended periods of time (half day or more) required to lift Hackbridge from its present designation as a somewhat tired Local Centre to a thriving District Centre characterised by variety, vitality and viability.

The objectives of the Outer London Fund are:

- **Objective 1 Increasing economic resilience of the retail zone:** by helping local shops to respond to the commercial changes brought by new residents and the supermarket, through strategies of diversification, identification of new markets and aesthetic improvements
- **Objective 2 Enhancing the environmental sustainability of the retail zone:** by helping local shops and businesses reduce energy consumption, water consumption and waste, through a programme of information-provision and refurbishment works
- **Objective 3 Improving access to the district centre and nature:** by improving pedestrian and cyclist access and safety in the centre, and creating a green corridor' linking the River Wandle, the district centre and the Wandle Valley Regional Park through planting of trees, signage, access road improvements and street furniture.

### 2.2 Community and planning

Hackbridge is also a frontrunner for neighbourhood planning. The Outer London Funde delivery team and the community-led Neighbourhood Planning Group expect the design guide produced as part of the Outer London Fund project to be utilised across the Outer London Fund scheme, the Hackbridge Programme and any other initiatives that are developed by the Neighbourhood Planning Group.

### 2.3 Sustainability principles

As set out above, social, economic and environmental sustainability lies at the heart of the Outer London Fund scheme and the wider Hackbridge Programme. Together, the Outer London Fund, the Hackbridge Programme and the Neighbourhood Planning Group aim to create the UK's first sustainable suburb. They are designing, and will deliver and monitor, all of their activity through the framework of One Planet Living - a methodology developed by BioRegional together with WWF (World Wildlife Fund).

One Planet Living is a term coined to reflect the fact that we live on just one planet Earth but most people living in “developed” countries consume resources of the equivalent of 3 – 5 planets. It comprises ten principles that need to be addressed if we are to bring our carbon footprint back within sustainable levels. The ten principles are:

- Zero carbon
- Zero waste
- Sustainable transport
- Sustainable materials
- Local and sustainable food
- Sustainable water
- Land use and wildlife
- Culture and community
- Equity and local economy
- Health and happiness

The designs developed for the Outer London Fund scheme, the implementation methodology to be applied, the materials suggested, and the maintenance regime required, will all be judged against these principles and will need to comply with them.

#### **2.4 Governance**

The Outer London Fund scheme is led by a Delivery Board that brings together BioRegional, the Council and public sector partners, businesses and the community. Within this, Sutton Council has lead responsibility for delivery of the public realm improvements. On behalf of the Board, the Council is now seeking high-level design advice on how to utilise these funds most effectively to contribute to raising the overall quality of the urban environment in the Hackbridge centre. This brief elaborates upon our requirements.

#### **3.0 Design Brief**

Through this brief, Sutton Council (on behalf of the Delivery Board) is seeking to procure the services of public realm designers to provide advice on a design philosophy, a delivery “concept”, approach and hierarchy of interventions (with illustrative palette of materials) that will meet the objectives listed in the approved Outer London Fund bid (attached at Appendix 1):

The specific public realm and associated physical projects listed in the bid are:

- Review of highway and pedestrian safety and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures
- Creation of a 20mph zone
- Improved provision and facilities for cyclists
- Creation of green links and other landscaping improvements
- Planting of street trees
- Improvements to the Mile Road Bridge
- Improvements to the access to Hackbridge Station
- Legible London way-finding and signage
- Shop-front improvements and possible enveloping scheme

The Council (and wider Delivery Board) does not wish to implement a series of discrete projects but rather wishes to develop an overall design “concept” and approach within which the individual elements will then be designed and implemented.

Around three quarters of the Outer London Fund funds will be directed at improving the public realm, green corridors, streetscape, shop-fronts and associated physical improvements. The cost sums identified within the bid for each individual project were indicative at the time of the bid and do not need to be strictly adhered to at implementation (though the total amount of Outer London Fund is fixed). The Council and its partners do have access to or influence over additional sums including:

S 106 contributions from a number of the projects in the wider Hackbridge Programme (the Felnax development, the Kelvin House/Centrale development and other schemes)

Additional funding sought or secured from or by third parties (including Sustrans, Southern Railways, Viridor Landfill Trust) and other local sources (for example, The Wrythe, St Helier and Wandle Valley Local Committee) .

These sums will be clarified at the inception meeting.

In the context of these wider overall budgets, we are seeking guidance from the design adviser on a comprehensive design “concept” and approach to the Hackbridge area as a whole and suggestions as to how the approach might be most effectively applied within the Outer London Fund project and wider Hackbridge Programme.

The outputs we require from the Design Brief project are:

- Proposals on an overall design philosophy and “concept” to be applied across the whole area to reflect, in part:
  - The history of the area
  - Our ambitions to create the UKs first sustainable suburb, and
    - Our aspiration to create a District Centre that meets the full range of retail and associated needs whilst also becoming a destination of distinction capitalising on its excellent transport links and its proximity to the beautiful and tranquil River Wandle and the 300 hectare Wandle Valley Regional Park
- A illustrative “palette” of materials and suggestions on how they might be applied to a number of the projects listed above
- Indicative illustrations of how this approach might be applied to a number of the individual projects listed above - comprising sketch schemes and broad costings
- An illustrative and broadly costed maintenance regime that particularly addresses the issue of sustainability.

For the avoidance of doubt, all outcomes will remain the joint property of Sutton Council and BioRegional on behalf of the Delivery Board.

#### **4.0 Applicants' Proposal**

##### **4.1 Timescales**

The Outer London Fund programme starts in 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 and runs until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014. All of the Outer London Fund funds need to be spent within those dates. The Delivery Board wishes to appoint design advisers in May and wishes this piece of work to be concluded before the end of June to enable local consultation on its outcome to be undertaken during July and the rest of the summer. Applicants wishing to tender for this work must indicate that they are able to comply with these timescales.

## **4.2 Tasks**

Applicants are required to indicate their approach to completing the following tasks:

- Review background material - particularly the Hackbridge Masterplan prepared by Tibbalds in 2009, the LIP submission and the draft Neighbourhood Plan (2012)
- Engage with stakeholders through the Delivery Board, the Hackbridge Programme Board, the Hackbridge Neighbourhood Planning Group, and other suggestions from the applicant
- Develop a design philosophy and "concept" (that reflects the three components listed above) to be applied to the Outer London Fund project and wider Programme
- Draw up an illustrative design "palette" of materials and offer suggestions on how they might be applied to the project
- Prepare a number of indicative illustrations of how the design philosophy and "concept" might be applied to some of the projects listed - comprising sketch schemes and broad costings
- Prepare an illustrative and broadly costed maintenance regime that particularly addresses the issue of sustainability
- Make up to three x presentations: one to key Council officers and members of BioRegional; one to the Delivery Board; and one to the Hackbridge Programme Board

## **4.3 Fee proposal**

Applicants should submit a fixed fee proposal for the completion of all the tasks listed above. The proposal should clearly indicate the names, qualifications, experience and day rate of all staff within your team (including any sub-consultants), which staff within your team will complete which task, how much time will be allocated to each task, and the individual cost proposal for each task. All assumptions (related to access to background materials, to stakeholders, to local premises, to preparation of drawings, etc) should be made clear.

Applicants should also indicate within their proposal follow-on fee rates for identified staff for any follow-on work that may arise from this commission with regard to the development of detailed designs for individual projects and/or associated work.

## **4.4 Experience**

Sutton Council (and its partners) is particularly interested in the actual experience that applicants have in the development of a design philosophy and “concept”, an illustrative design “palette”, indicative illustrations, and a maintenance regime, all within the context of maximising social, economic and environmental sustainability. You should include several examples of schemes that have been both planned and implemented (that we can possibly visit) within your submission.

#### **4.5 The Proposal**

The proposal should be limited to approximately 20 pages though supporting documentation can be included in appendices.

#### **4.6 Payment**

Payment for the commission will be made at the end of the contract period on receipt of a full set of design material as described in the outputs section that has been approved by the Delivery Board and the Hackbridge Programme Board.

Steve Pearce

3 April 2012