

Putney Society comments on Local Plan 'Main Modifications' March 2023.

Generally:

Several policies about height, density etc. are changing from 'must' to 'should', in particular when complying with the tall buildings map. The effect of this change is to make these policies unenforceable if developers claim viability demands more height or density. The current application for the gas holder site on Swandon Way is a case in point. Any change should instead reflect the recent changes to the Levelling Up Bill which allows targets to be overridden if they result in density significantly greater than the local character.

Noted in (inter alia) MM8, MM10, 11, 13, MM26, 27, 28, 29, MM102,103, 104, 105, 106, MM 115, 116 etc.

MM4 – Dwelling Completions

What accounts for the figure for 2025/26 rising from 1414 to 4008? And the lesser increase in 2023/24?

MM5 PM1 criteria B should be kept. Neither officers nor applicants are necessarily familiar with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

MM8, MM112 etc. Why is one of the Council's own studies not robust? Map 4.1 only seems to show views out of the area, not towards it.

MM114 – Alton Estate

The masterplan has, thankfully, been abandoned. This should refer to the SPD.

MM116 – Queen Mary's. This site is directly adjacent to a Grade 1 listed building. Anything taller than the wings of Roehampton House is wrong.

Map 11.1. We are pleased to note the 'valued views' both ways from Putney's bridges, and down the High Street from the bottom of Putney Hill. There ought to be one more, down Putney Hill from the Green Man junction.

MM146 – Policy LP4. The current wording doesn't seem to have stopped too many developments being permitted at twice or more the policy height. Policy should be strengthened. This is abdication.

MM 229 - LP45 Evening and Night-Time Economy

4. Adding the words 'taking account of the cumulative impact'. We are concerned that this waters down the policy, allowing officers to ignore the impact of any one proposal because (e.g.) there are other bars adjacent.

The Society is concerned by the lack of any policy that reflects Policy S6 in the London Plan: *'Large-scale* developments that are open to the public, and large areas of public realm, should provide and secure the future management of:*

1) free publicly-accessible toilets .. 24 hours a day where accessed from areas of public realm.

We urge the council to consider

- using CIL monies to fund installation of public lavatories, in High Street and/or riverside locations, in accordance with their wish to promote healthy and active lifestyles and reduce health and wellbeing inequalities
- exploring innovative ways of funding capital/revenue costs, perhaps partnering with businesses or other large scale organisations in this regard'.)

MM230, 232 – LP 46 Visitor Accommodation

Extensions to existing hotels make better use of existing (and clearly successful) sites, which all development is supposed to do. These should be treated in the same way as new homes.

MM236, 237 - LP 49 Sustainable Transport. We support the promotion of water borne freight. But vehicle access to piers needs to be considered. Ferry passengers can walk. Parcels can't.