



**Examination into the Havering Local Plan  
2016 - 2031**

**Further response from London Borough of Havering  
to Inspector- Addendum to January 2019 document**

**Actions arising from the Havering Local Plan  
Examination in Public October 2018**

**22<sup>nd</sup> March 2019**

## **Matter 1 Legal compliance and Duty to Co-operate**

### **1.1 Position statement with progress on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)**

1.1.1 All SoCG have been sent out to the relevant authorities for signatures. We have received signed SoCG from the following authorities:

- Thurrock Council
- Brentwood Council
- Basildon Council
- London Borough Bexley
- Essex County Council
- Environment Agency
- Newham
- London Borough of Redbridge
- Rochford
- London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
- Greater London Authority
- Chelmsford City Council
- Natural England

1.1.2 We await signed copies back from the following authorities:

- London Borough of Waltham Forest
- Highways England

We have been chasing these agreements since the Examination in Public and the authorities have agreed the content but have not yet sent back the signed copy. We have been advised this should be with us in next two weeks.

## **Matter 4 Gypsy and Traveller**

### **4.1 Review GTAA information regarding 'unknown' households and revise as necessary (Detail to be provided in letter from Inspector)**

This information can be found in the Response to the Inspectors letter (12<sup>th</sup> November 2018) document.

### **4.2 Consider the scope for unauthorised pitches to help address identified needs (Detail to be provided in letter from Inspector)**

This information can be found in the Response to the Inspectors letter (12<sup>th</sup> November 2018) document.

## **Matter 8 Connections**

**8.1 Policy 24 Parking standards - If the inspector finds that that the plan is not sound in relation to this issue, is there any middle ground which can be met that will satisfy the requirements of both TfL and LBH?**

**How would Council modify the policy to make it sound?**

Following the Local Plan Examination in Public (EiP) in October 2018, the Inspector asked that both London Borough of Havering (LBH) and Transport for London (TfL) have further discussions around the unresolved issues around Parking Standards to see if a compromise could be reached.

Following the examination, Havering's Assistant Director of Planning wrote to TfL Acting Manager – London Plan and Planning Obligations Team setting out the basis for Policy 24 *Parking Provision and Design*, specifically setting out the rationale for applying minimum parking standards for sites with a PTAL of 2 and minimum standards for the most accessible parts of the borough such as Romford.

Following this correspondence, LBH wrote to TfL to arrange a meeting with Senior TfL officers to discuss the unresolved matters related to Policy 24. This meeting was held on Friday 18<sup>th</sup> December and was attended by the Assistant Director of Planning and the Development and Transport Planning Group Manager at LBH, TfL's Acting Manager for London Plan and Planning Obligations Team within City Planning, and other TfL Officers.

Discussions were held between the two organisations on how best to achieve a positive outcome for the Havering Local Plan Examination. At the meeting TfL reiterated its "firm" position regarding parking standards for Romford and the possible scope for a more flexible approach in other areas of Havering where it was recognised by both TfL and LBH that there is much less public transport provision. It was agreed at that meeting that both organisations needed to work jointly to explore this further. TfL agreed to provide LBH with datasets to help identify locations where minimum standards could be proposed.

In early January, TfL sent the LBH Transport Planning Team Leader datasets to assist with identifying potential locations where minimum standards could be applied.

Following a review of this data, a meeting was held with TfL on 25<sup>th</sup> February to try and reach an agreement on where in the borough minimum standards could be applied. TfL reiterated their position as is set out in the current London Plan, that:

- minimum standards would be acceptable within areas of the borough that are PTAL's 0-1 providing they are within the London Plan Maximum Standards; and
- a more flexible approach could be taken to some parts of the borough that are PTAL 2, providing it can be justified.

TfL reiterated its position that they would not accept minimum standards in any circumstances for any other parts of the borough (ie 3 – 6 PTAL).

LBH agreed to bring the minimum standards that are set out within Table 5 of the Local Plan to be within the London Plan Maximum standards (Table 6.2) which is something that TfL asked LBH to compromise on as part of this discussion.

TfL agreed to assess a number of different scenarios for applying minimum standards to different parts of the borough that are PTAL 2, the purpose of which was to determine the extent of Havering that would be covered by minimum parking standards. These scenarios included:

- Areas outside London Plan Opportunity Areas (ie Romford and Rainham)
- Area at least 800m away from town centres
- Areas at least 800 metres away from rail stations.

TfL's scenario testing found that applying minimum standards in areas of the borough that are PTAL 2 and are at least 800m or more away from rail stations, in addition to areas that are PTAL's 0-1, would cover a significant proportion of the borough.

A conference call was held between LBH and TfL on 6<sup>th</sup> March. LBH and TfL discussed the scenarios that have been looked at and LBH reiterated its preference for an agreement to be reached with TfL on areas of PTAL 2 that were at least 800m away from rail stations.

Progress on the discussion that LBH officers have had with TfL since the start of the year has been reported back to the Council's administration.

Havering Council maintains its stance on applying minimum parking standards for the most accessible parts of the borough such as Romford. A key reason for this is that Table 6.2 car parking standards in the current London Plan states that the most accessible parts of the boroughs (PTAL's 5 and 6) have a parking provision standard of "up to one space per unit". LBH is of the view that a standard of 0.5 spaces per unit is within this parking standard and also reflects the further comment on the London Plan that "all developments in areas of good public transport accessibility (in all parts of London) "should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit". A parking standard of 0.5 spaces per unit is considered to be well within these parameters.

Whilst a lot of progress has been made by both parties through these discussions and a compromise was close, London Borough of Havering and Transport for London have not been able to reach a full agreement on all the outstanding parking matters from the Examination.

LBH informed TfL of the Council's intention to retain the Local Plan position on parking in the most accessible parts of the borough (PTAL's 5-6) in a phone call on 18<sup>th</sup> March. TfL have subsequently indicated to the Council that because of this

stance they are not able to support LBH's position on having minimum parking standards for some parts of the borough that have a PTAL of 2. TfL have said however, that if Havering's proposed minimum standards for PTALs 5-6 were to be removed, the standards set out in Table 5a for PTAL 2 would be acceptable.

Appendix 1 summarises the following:

- What are the London Plan Maximum Parking Standards (Table 1)
- What Parking Standards are LBH seeking (Table 2)
- What is the compromise TfL are looking for (Table 3)

## **Appendix 1**

### **Residential Parking Requirements –**

**Table 1 : What are the London Plan Residential Car Parking Standards?**

<b>Maximum residential parking standards</b>			
Number of bedrooms	1-2	3	4 or more
Parking spaces	Less than 1 per unit	Up to 1.5 per unit	Up to 2 per unit

**Table 2 : What Residential Parking Standards are LBH seeking?**

Minimum Parking Standards for sites in PTAL 0-2\*

<b>1 Bedroom</b>	<b>2 bedrooms</b>	<b>3 bedrooms</b>	<b>4+ bedrooms</b>
Less than 1 parking space per unit	Less than 1 parking space per unit	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	Up to 2 spaces per unit

\*Areas of PTAL 2 where minimum standards set out in table 5 will be applied are specifically parts of the borough that are PTAL 2 and are 800 metres or more away from rail stations. The London Plan parking standards will apply to all other parts of the borough that are PTAL 2.

<b>PTAL</b>	<b>Parking Provision</b>
3-4	London Plan standards
5-6	Minimum standard of 0.5 spaces per unit

**Table 3 : What is the compromise that TfL are looking for?**

If the LBH requirement for minimum standards for PTAL's 5-6 was to be removed, TfL would be prepared to accept the minimum parking standards for PTAL 2 as set out in Table 2 above. If this was to happen the LBH Residential Parking Standards would be as set out in the table below:

<b>PTAL</b>	<b>Parking provision required</b>
0-2	LBH Minimum Standards
3-4	London Plan standards
5-6	London Plan standards