

























































**Hotels and business accommodation Alternative 1: Continue to apply a criteria based approach to new hotels**

Commentary: This option balances other criteria such as residential amenity and impact on public realm with the need for hotel accommodation but leads to loss of office floorspace. Criteria could include protection of historic assets. Provides social facilities associated with hotels.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Hotels and business accommodation Alternative 2: Identify areas where hotels should be restricted**

Commentary: Provides opportunity to protect the commercial core from hotel development. Enables efficient provision of services for hotels, and policing associated with hotels, in more restricted areas where they are needed. Opportunity for beneficial uses of historic assets.

Focuses hotel waste issues in particular areas – opportunity for collective waste management. More efficient servicing reduces air quality impacts. Provides social facilities associated with hotels. Potential to manage noise levels more effectively.

Timescale: Medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Hotels and business accommodation Alternative 3: Identify areas where hotels should be encouraged**

Commentary: Impact on economy depends on where hotels are encouraged. Enables efficient provision of services for hotels, and policing associated with hotels, in more restricted areas where they are needed. Opportunity for beneficial uses of historic assets. Focuses hotel waste issues in particular areas – opportunity for collective waste management. More efficient servicing reduces air quality impacts.

Encouragement for hotels increases water use. Provides social facilities associated with hotels. Potential to manage noise levels more effectively. Potential to locate hotels in east of City providing jobs and training for City fringe residents.

Timescale: Medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Hotels and business accommodation Alternative 4: Prioritise types of accommodation which specifically satisfy business needs (e.g. serviced apartments)**

Commentary: This option would provide accommodation suitable for the needs of businesses. Enables provision of specific services for business accommodation. Could put additional pressure on open spaces with impacts for biodiversity. Reduces emissions from transport if business visitors can stay close to workplace. Provides suitable accommodation for workers reducing pressure on other types of housing. May not provide social facilities.

Timescale: Medium term

Geographic scale: Local with some regional impacts

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

## Historic environment

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 5.6:** *How can the Local Plan help new development conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets? What should the Local Plan say about the setting of heritage assets? Should we include policies and guidance within the Local Plan on non-designated heritage assets?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban and green	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Historic environment	Alternative 1 Protect only designated heritage assets and their settings	↑	↑		↑↑	-	-	-	↑	↑	-	-	↑	-	↑	-
Historic environment	Alternative 2 Protect designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings	↓	↕		↑↑	-	-	-	↑	↑	-	-	↑	↑	↑	-

#### Historic environment Alternative 1 Protect only designated heritage assets and their settings

Commentary: The current situation where designated heritage assets and their settings are protected is generally seen as providing a positive environment where businesses want to locate. This provides interest, attracting workers to the City's varied built environment and opportunities for social and cultural facilities and education.

Timescale: Short, medium and long term

Geographic scale: local regional and national – some heritage assets are of national importance

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – failure to protect heritage assets could lead to permanent loss

**Historic environment Alternative 2 Protect designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings**

Commentary: Protecting more heritage assets could limit economic development in some areas. The impact of further protection on the public realm could be beneficial if an appropriate balance was struck between preservation and public realm enhancement around newly designated assets. More protected spaces would enhance health and wellbeing associated with historic and cultural environment.

## Tall buildings and views protection

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 4.8:** *Should further intensification be encouraged within the Eastern Cluster? Should the current policy area be retained or should it be modified? If so where and how?*

**I&O Question 5.9:** *Should we maintain the current approach to local view protection in the City? If not, how should the approach be changed and which views should be affected?*

**I&O Question 5.12:** *Should we continue to promote tall building development in the City and should these buildings continue to be clustered? Should the current tall building cluster in the east of the City be altered? Are there any other areas of the City which could accommodate tall buildings without compromising its distinctive character and heritage?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 1 Promote tall buildings in the existing eastern cluster only	↕↑	↑↓	↑	↑	↕	↕	↑↓	↑↓	-	↓	-	-	-	-	-
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 2 Protect additional views	↓	↑↓	-	↑↑	-	↑	↑	↑↑	-	↑	-	↑↑	-	-	-
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 3 Allow tall buildings in appropriate locations outside of strategic views and St Paul's Heights	↑↑	↑↓	↓↑	↓	-	↕	↑	↑↓	-	↕	-	-	-	-	-

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
	elsewhere in the City															
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 4 Allow tall buildings in appropriate locations having regard to the settings of strategic heritage assets	↑↑	↑↓	↓↑	↓	-	↕	↑	↑↓	-	↕	-	-	-	-	-

**Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 1: Promote tall buildings in the existing eastern cluster only**

There is a finite limit to the concentration of tall buildings that can be accommodated in the Eastern Cluster without causing congestion affecting servicing of buildings and the attractiveness of the public realm. If tall buildings were to be restricted to the Eastern cluster this could affect economic growth by restricting the total additional business floorspace in the City. However the clustering of tall buildings provides an attractive business environment and assists in the provision of collective security. Concentrating tall buildings in the eastern cluster would increase the need for waste management higher up the waste hierarchy to reduce the need for transport of waste off site in congested streets. Clustering tall buildings could lead to adverse impacts on daylight and sunlight within this area. This option would provide greater opportunities for district heating and cooling networks to supply clustered buildings but could exacerbate the urban heat island effect. This option would put more pressure on the scarce open spaces in the eastern cluster but this could be mitigated through building design creating public open space at ground level and terraces and viewing galleries elsewhere within buildings. Concentrating tall buildings in a small area could have negative transport implications resulting in congestion of servicing and delivery vehicles. The high density of development in the eastern cluster could have detrimental impacts particularly on mental health.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Local - Eastern cluster

Temporary or permanent: temporary – it would be possible to reverse the high density in future but unlikely since reductions in floorspace on redevelopment are unlikely to be viable.

### **Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 2: Protect additional views**

Commentary: Protecting additional views would further restrict the potential for development of employment space to serve the business City. This option would further limit the efficient use of land but could assist in avoiding the traffic and pedestrian congestion associated with tall buildings. It would provide more protection for historic buildings at a regional scale and would reduce potential for light pollution and overshadowing and microclimate impacts associated with tall buildings. This option would result in retention of open spaces elsewhere in London as viewing points and encouragement of visitors to view cultural attractions.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: City wide and beyond

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – it would be possible to reverse the protection in future

### **Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 3: Allow tall buildings in appropriate locations outside of strategic viewing corridors and St Paul's Heights elsewhere in the City**

Allowing tall buildings elsewhere in the City provides greater potential for flexibility to meet the needs of business for additional floorspace. This option would enable distribution of tall buildings to other parts of the City thus avoiding congestion of the public realm in the eastern cluster but potentially affecting the settings of more heritage assets. Provision of tall buildings could lead to adverse impacts on daylight and sunlight in the surrounding area. Tall buildings can provide a base load for district heating and cooling networks. Tall buildings elsewhere in the City would put pressure on the open spaces nearby but the design of buildings could provide new open spaces. Tall buildings could create local servicing and delivery problems depending on the surrounding road network. Spreading the tall buildings to other parts of the City is less likely to lead to mental health problems associated with high density urban stresses.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: City wide and beyond if tall buildings affect skyline and views

Temporary or permanent: Temporary - it would be possible to reverse the high density in future but unlikely since reductions in floorspace on redevelopment are unlikely to be viable

### **Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 4: Allow tall buildings in appropriate locations having regard to the settings of strategic heritage assets**

A refined version of Alternative 3 was identified at Regulation 19 Revised Proposed Submission stage to recognise the fact some tall buildings may be in strategic river prospects in the London View Management Framework. As the sustainability effects of this alternative are judged to be broadly the same as those described above, it receives the same effects as Alternative 4.



Revised Proposed Submission stage

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 1 Accommodate development within the identified tall building areas	↑↑↑↓↓↓	↑	↑	↕	↕	-	↑	↑↓	-	↓	-	-	↕	-
Tall buildings and views protection	Alternative 2 Spread development evenly throughout the City	↑↑↓↓	↑↓	↓	↓	↑	-	↓	-	-	↑	-	-	-	-

**Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 1: Accommodate development within the identified tall building areas**

Tall buildings have the potential to enhance the City’s international and national reputation and so supporting further tall buildings in the City of London is likely to attract interest and subsequent investment in the City, and help meet office demand targets, which will have beneficial effects on the economy. There are two identified tall building areas within the City: (1) City Cluster; and (2) Fleet Valley. Restricting tall buildings to these two areas could affect economic growth by restricting the total additional business floorspace in the City. Conversely, concentrating tall buildings allows for the agglomeration of business and related economic active and so provides an attractive business environment, and assists in the provision of collective security. These two areas are the only areas found to be less sensitive and less constrained than the rest of the City where tall buildings would likely impact on protected views and have adverse effects on the character of the area. Therefore, directing development towards these two locations would help prevent these adverse effects and benefit the townscape and overall character of the area. This is borne out by draft findings of a Strategic Visual Impact Assessment<sup>4</sup> which concludes that the proposed tall building clusters would enhance the townscape and contribute towards creating a more defined impact on the overall City skyline, compared to a future baseline that only includes completion of committed developments. Conversely, modern tall buildings could

<sup>4</sup> City of London Tall Buildings Policy Strategic Visual Impact Assessment – October 2023 Draft

have adverse effects on the historic environment and there is a limit to the concentration of tall buildings that can be accommodated in these areas without causing congestion and affecting the servicing of buildings and attractiveness of the public realm. Furthermore, as is the case with Alternative 1 assessed at Issues and Option stage, this scale of development would increase the need for waste management higher up the waste hierarchy, so as to reduce the need for transport of waste off-site in streets that experience traffic congestion. This option would, however, provide greater opportunities for district heating and cooling networks to supply clustered buildings but could exacerbate the City's microclimate. There would also be pressure on open space in the area with adverse effects on health and wellbeing, although this could be mitigated to an extent through the incorporation of public open space and other leisure facilities, including viewing galleries, terraces and green roofs. Concentrating tall buildings in these two areas could have negative transport implications resulting in congestion of servicing and delivery vehicles.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Local – City Cluster and Fleet Valley

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – it would be possible to reverse the high density in future but unlikely since reductions in floorspace on redevelopment are unlikely to be viable.

### **Tall buildings and views protection Alternative 2: Spread development evenly throughout the City**

The development spread across the whole City would increase the amount of office floorspace within the City, attracting businesses to the area and a subsequent increase in job opportunities. Under this option, however, the buildings would be evenly distributed unlike as under Alternative 1, and so may not contribute to the City's international and national reputation whereby tall buildings are used to represent the dominance of a place. Spreading development throughout the City would result in there not being clearly defined areas for business and so there would be none of the benefits associated with concentrating businesses and related economic activity, in addition to the sustainability benefits associated with clustering. Although the entirety of the City is renowned for being the financial capital of England, there are still other land uses within the City such as residential, education and culture and it may not be appropriate to have tall buildings in locations such as this. The City is sensitive to development and spreading development throughout the area could potentially impact protected views, the skyline and the general townscape character of the area, including its heritage. Conversely, spreading development across the area would mean that development would be less dense and so the overall effect on landscape and townscape may be limited. This option would not provide greater opportunities for district heating and cooling networks, as the development would not be clustered. However, spreading development evenly could help mitigate the urban heat island effect. There are also fewer opportunities for collective security if development is evenly spread. There may, however, be greater opportunities for waste management, as the roads would be less congested generally and pressure spread more evenly across different transport nodes. Under this option, the height of existing buildings could be increased instead of building new tall

buildings from scratch. Although this would involve the reuse of existing buildings, it may not be as achievable to meet certain environmental standards by upgrading existing building stock than starting from scratch.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Local - City

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – it would be possible to reverse this form of development in future but unlikely since reductions in floorspace on redevelopment are unlikely to be viable

# Design

## Revised Proposed Submission stage

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime reduction	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education
Design	Alternative 1 Require maximum retention of existing buildings and structures, with no demolition	↓↓↓	↑	-	↕	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	-	-	-	-	-
Design	Alternative 2 Adopt a retrofit first approach	↑↑↑	↑↓	-	↕	↑	↑	↑	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Design	Alternative 3 Allow demolition and redevelopment for all development	↑↑↑↓↓↓	↑↓	-	↕	↓	↑	↑	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### Design Alternative 1: Require maximum retention of existing buildings and structures, with no demolition

This option focusses on retrofitting existing buildings with no redevelopment. This is particularly important considering the built environment contributes significantly to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Retaining and retrofitting existing buildings would improve their environmental performance and significantly reduce their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, in addition to embodied carbon when compared to new development. Repurposing existing buildings can make them more comfortable and so attractive to businesses and lower their operation costs. Retrofit can also enhance the safety and accessibility of a building. The purpose of retrofitting is to reduce carbon emissions, enhance climate resilience and improve access and environmental performance of historic buildings, and so significant beneficial effects are expected in relation to climate change mitigation and resilience. However, as redevelopment would not be supported, there would be limited opportunity to extend existing buildings upwards or outwards, preventing the delivery of additional office floorspace. This option therefore has the potential to significantly hinder economic growth in the City of London with adverse effects on the City’s international and national reputation as a centre for finance and business. However, according to the City’s ‘Future of Office Use’ report (2023), take-up of second hand office stock in the City has declined following the COVID-19 pandemic, low availability rates and the fact businesses are looking for better quality office space capable of accommodating hybrid

working solutions and collaboration. Retrofitting existing building could therefore counteract this trend. Further to this, the Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) require commercial properties to have an Energy Performance Certificate of C or above by 2037 or B or above by 2030. If these standards are not met, new leases cannot be signed, therefore improvements are required to incorporate these offices with the effective stock. Preventing any new development would release pressure on the public realm and existing open space and preserve the character of the area. Further to this, retrofitting existing buildings would be an efficient use of previously developed land. Retrofitting historic buildings could be challenging, as fitting new systems for high energy efficiency and low energy consumption could have an impact on heritage significance and could potentially alter the appearance of the building. This option would reduce waste associated with building construction and deconstruction, whilst also enabling waste to be managed further up the waste hierarchy and in doing so supporting circular economy principles.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Mainly local but with national and international implications

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – will need to be responsive to environmental standards as they change and evolve

**Design Alternative 2: Adopt a retrofit first approach for developments, prioritising retention of existing buildings while allowing redevelopment where it would be more sustainable or suitable**

This option adopts a retrofit first approach to development and so ensures existing building stock is suitable and meets MEES, but also supports the redevelopment of existing buildings where appropriate. As such, it has the potential to increase availability of office floorspace whilst also improving the environmental performance of existing buildings. Therefore, this option would support economic growth and help retain the City's reputation as an international and national destination for business and finance, in addition to having many environmental benefits. New development could, however, increase pressure on the public realm and open spaces due to the limited availability of land in the Square Mile, which could result in some loss of space between buildings with adverse effects on the character of the area, although this is dependent on the final design, scale and layout of a scheme. Conversely, retrofitting existing buildings could safeguard existing spaces and secure high quality design, in addition to making efficient use of previously developed land. It is unknown what effect retrofitting existing buildings would have on the historic environment, as fitting new systems for high energy efficiency and low energy consumption (e.g. adding insulation, replacing windows and installing new heating and cooling systems) could alter the historic fabric of the building. The reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings, structures and materials reduces reliance on virgin resources and minimises embodied carbon. The purpose of retrofitting is to reduce carbon emissions, enhance climate resilience and improve access and environmental performance of historic buildings, and so beneficial effects are expected in relation to climate change mitigation and resilience.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Mainly local but with national and international implications

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – will need to be responsive to environmental standards as they change and evolve

**Design Alternative 3: Allow demolition and redevelopment for all developments**

Supporting the demolition and redevelopment of buildings within the City would contribute more significantly towards CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than retrofitting existing buildings, as it would require the deconstruction of existing buildings, the production of new materials and construction of new buildings, which would contribute towards CO<sub>2</sub> levels and increase embodied carbon. This could prevent the City from becoming zero carbon. The option could have both positive and negative effects in relation to economic growth, as although developers would be given opportunities to provide something bigger and better than what was there previously, it is likely that there would be a lot of disruption during construction which could adversely affect the City's attractiveness to businesses and visitors in the short term. While redevelopment could involve enhancements to the public realm and character of the area, it might also cause disruption to the public realm such as problems with accessibility as a result of building work. Allowing redevelopment has the potential to affect the historic character of the area, although this is dependent on the final design, scale and layout of development. With regard to waste management, demolishing and redeveloping sites would result in higher whole lifecycle carbon emissions when compared to retrofitting existing buildings and increase the need for materials. Redevelopment would, however, present opportunities to achieve sustainable design and construction which may in some instances be more viable than retrofitting existing buildings.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Mainly local but with national and international implications

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – buildings can be designed to be adaptable for other uses in the future

## Energy CO<sub>2</sub> emissions

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 6.1:** *Should we identify and positively plan for infrastructure such as district heating and smart grid technologies to enable a more sustainable, low carbon future for the City? What technologies and infrastructure are likely to be viable and operationally feasible in the City? Should they be required in certain types of developments?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime reduction	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Energy CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	Alternative 1 Assist developers to achieve zero carbon by strategic planning for energy	↑↓	↑	-	-	↑↑	↑	↑	-	-	↑↑	-	-	↑	-	-
Energy CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	Alternative 2 Continue the current practice of site by site energy planning	↑↓	↓	-	-	↓	↓	↑	-	-	↓	-	-	↑	-	-

### Energy CO<sub>2</sub> emissions Alternative 1: Assist developers to achieve zero carbon standards by strategic planning for Energy

Commentary: Strategic planning for energy will enable infrastructure to be provided enabling businesses to adopt low carbon energy solutions, with the least disruption to the public realm and transport network but energy infrastructure is expensive to install. A co-ordinated approach should avoid on-site CHP which is more damaging to air quality, by promoting decentralised energy infrastructure on a wider scale. This could include energy from waste serving the city from sites beyond the City boundary. Reducing energy and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will have long term benefits reducing climate change effects on health (overheating flooding etc)

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: local – City and surrounding boroughs

Temporary or permanent: permanent – if infrastructure is enabled this could lead to a permanent change in the way energy is supplied and carbon emissions reduction. Increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will lead to permanent change in climate

**Energy CO<sub>2</sub> emissions Alternative 2: Continue the current practice of site by site energy planning**

Commentary: A piecemeal approach to energy planning could result in uncoordinated impacts on public realm and transport network. Site by site approach could lead to more emissions from on-site CHP and is unlikely to include energy from waste. Reducing energy and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will have long term benefits reducing climate change effects on health (overheating flooding etc)

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – failure to address CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will lead to permanent change in climate



## Air quality

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 6.3** Should we identify and encourage specific local measures to improve air and water quality, conserve water and minimise flood risk, minimise noise and light pollution and eliminate potential land contamination. If so what should they include?

**I&O Question 6.7** How can we reduce the impact of motor vehicles traffic on air quality? What measures could reduce exposure to pollution? Should we encourage alternative modes of travel, including electric vehicles, providing appropriate electric charging infrastructure without causing street clutter?

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Air quality	Alternative 1 Implement local solutions such as reassignment of vehicle space and stricter emission limits	↓	↑	↑	↑	↕	↑	↕	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	↑
Air quality	Alternative 2 Employ London-wide initiatives only	↕	↑	-	↑	↕	↑	↕	-	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	↑

### **Air quality Alternative 1: Implement local solutions such as reassignment of vehicle space and stricter emissions limits**

Commentary: Radical changes to vehicle access or emissions limits could impact on costs of supplying and servicing City businesses. This option could improve the City's public realm alongside London wide initiatives which would reduce diffuse pollution arising outside the City, and tighter London wide limits on construction emissions which come into force in 2020. Vehicle restrictions could provide some security benefits. Pollution impacts on the fabric of historic buildings would be reduced. Stricter emissions limits associated with demolition and construction could result in reduced waste if demolition becomes uneconomic. The impact of lowering emissions of PM10s and NOX could have uncertain

impacts on carbon emissions depending on the response (if diesel is replaced by petrol vehicles CO2 emissions could rise). Reassignment of vehicle space could generate more open space, reduce noise impacts and improve residential amenity. Reduction in vehicle traffic and stricter emission targets could assist delivery businesses in neighbouring boroughs (costs will be less for these businesses than for those travelling further) and should lead to more efficient use of the remaining road space

Timescale: Medium to long term (these changes could take several years to implement)

Geographic scale: Regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary - changes could be reversed

### **Air quality Alternative 2: Employ London wide initiatives only**

Commentary: London wide initiatives will address some City air quality issues without local cost implications compared with other London business locations. London wide initiatives will improve the City's public realm to some degree. Stricter emission limits associated with demolition which will come into force in 2020 will improve emissions from construction work and could reduce waste if demolition becomes less viable. The impact of lowering emissions of PM10s and NOX could have uncertain impacts on carbon emissions depending on the response. If diesel is replaced by petrol vehicles CO2 emissions could rise if replaced by electric vehicles it depends on the source of the electricity used. London wide initiatives to tackle air quality should encourage more efficient use of road space leading to less congestion in the long term.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – changes could be reversed

## Transport

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 6.4:** What actions could the City Corporation take to reduce congestion in the City?

**I&O Question 6.6:** Should we promote consolidation centres, even though this may require the use of land outside the City and over which the Local Plan has no jurisdiction?

**I&O Question 6.8:** How can more space and pedestrian routes be created in and around large developments? How can we create more space for pedestrians? Should certain streets in areas of high congestion be pedestrianised or time limited, or should certain types of vehicles be restricted in those areas?

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Transport	Alternative 1 Site by site approach to transport & public realm	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	-	↕
Transport	Alternative 2 Local Plan strategic approach to transport and public realm	↑↑	↑	↑	↕	↑	↑	↑	↕	↕	↑↑	↕	↕	↕	-	↕
Transport	Alternative 3 Prioritise public transport	↑↑	↑↑	↑	↑	↕	↑↑	↑↑	↑	↑	↕	-	↑	↑	↑	↑
Transport	Alternative 4 Prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement	↕	↕	↕	↑	-	↑	↑	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↑↑	↕	↕
Transport	Alternative 5	↕	↑↑	↑↑	↕	↕	↑↑	↑↑	↕	↕	↑↑	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
	Manage vehicle movement through restrictions & consolidation centres															

### Transport Alternative 1: Site by site approach to transport and public realm

Commentary: This approach could result in lack of co-ordination leading to congestion which is detrimental to the local economy and to the public realm. Although this approach has been successful during the period of the current Local plan further intensification may result in more acute problems resulting in the need for collective security measures or consolidated transport of goods and waste in the future. Open spaces and biodiversity are not necessarily protected since this option only considers impacts from individual sites in isolation. A site by site approach may consider the needs of residents, and visitors in a fragmented way with uncertain impacts on residential amenity, social and cultural facilities and health.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local but with regional implications

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

### Transport 2: Local Plan strategic approach to transport and public realm

Commentary: A strategic approach will take account of a range of factors and interactions between them. This is likely to enhance the public realm and enable implementation of collective security measures and measures to reduce transport emissions. Waste transport could be considered strategically enabling sustainable transport via river or rail where appropriate. Open spaces and biodiversity are not necessarily protected. A strategic approach focussing on transport and movement could fail to take account of residential amenity social, cultural and health facilities.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – strategy could be adjusted and impacts reversed

### **Transport Alternative 3: Prioritise public transport**

Commentary: This option enables access for all to job opportunities, social health and education facilities whilst minimising damage to the environment. Reduced air pollution protects historic assets, open spaces and biodiversity from damage. This option could be detrimental to other road users such as servicing and waste vehicles. Prioritising public transport on the roads could be detrimental to cyclists depending on designs for road layouts.

Timescale: Short, medium and long term

Geographic scale: Regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

### **Transport Alternative 4 Prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement**

Commentary: Balance is required between pedestrian/ cycle and vehicle movements – pedestrian/ cycle priority could be detrimental particularly for buses and delivery/service vehicles. Prioritising cycling is positive for the safety of cyclists but could lead to conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. Lower pollution levels will be beneficial for historic buildings. The impact of this option on open spaces, biodiversity, overall transport and movements, housing, social facilities and education will depend on the specific measures that are implemented. Greater use of active transport modes will reduce emissions and improve health outcomes.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local but with regional implications

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – could be reversed in future to allow more vehicles

### **Transport Alternative 5 Manage vehicle movement through restrictions and consolidation**

Commentary: Outcomes would depend on the specific restrictions that are put in place however the positive management of vehicle movements should improve the public realm and reduce vehicle emissions within and beyond the City. Use of consolidation centres could enable vehicle security checking before vehicles enter the City. Restrictions would need to take account of the time banding currently in place for waste collection. The impact of this option on open spaces, biodiversity, housing, social facilities, health and education will depend on the specific measures that are implemented.

Timescale: medium to long term

Geographic scale: regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – could be reversed in future

## Waste

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 6.11:** *What measures could we take to secure waste reduction associated with development? Should we promote circular economy principles, zero waste plans and on-site management of waste for large developments?*

**I&O Question 6.12:** *Should we continue to rely on waste management facilities outside the City? If so, how should we co-operate with other waste planning authorities to ensure adequate and appropriate planning for waste?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Waste	Alternative 1 Promote circular economy, zero waste plans and on-site waste management	↓	↑	↑	-	↑↑	↕	↑	-	-	↑	-	-	↕	-	-
Waste	Alternative 2 Develop local facilities for waste management	↓	↓	-	-	↑↑	↓	↑	↕	↕	↑↑	-	-	-	-	-
Waste	Alternative 3 Continue to rely on waste facilities elsewhere	↕	↑↓	-	-	↓↓	↑↓	↓	-	-	↓↓	-	-	↓	-	-

### **Waste Alternative 1: Promote circular economy, zero waste plans and on-site waste management**

Commentary: On site waste management would reduce commercial office space. Waste reduction and on site waste management reduces need for on street waste collections with potential for anti social behaviour. Impact of on-site waste management on local air quality are uncertain. Reduced waste transport will reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Regional

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

### **Waste Alternative 2: Develop local facilities for waste management**

Commentary: Requiring local waste facilities through provision of land in the City will reduce potential use of floorspace or land for businesses. Local facilities could have detrimental local impacts on public realm through waste deliveries and processing. This option would enable waste to be managed further up the waste hierarchy with a reduction in waste transport and associated emissions. Local waste facilities could take up scarce open space and increase nuisance but could enable additional uses within open spaces. Provides potential for generating energy or compost from waste locally.

Timescale: medium to long term

Geographic scale: City, London and wider south east England

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – waste sites could revert to other uses in future

### **Waste Alternative 3: Continue to rely on waste facilities elsewhere**

Commentary: Waste facilities elsewhere are likely to increase in cost as waste planning authorities reduce capacity for imported waste but use of City land for waste would be uneconomic use of valuable land with detrimental impacts on public realm. Transport of waste adds to traffic volumes, air pollution and carbon emissions with impacts on health. Larger more cost effective facilities elsewhere could be better managed to protect the environment than many smaller facilities.

Timescale: short to medium term

Geographic scale: City, London and wider south east England

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – waste facilities can be changed to other uses in future

## Flood risk

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 6.15:** *Should we require flood resistance and resilience measures for new development and refurbishment schemes within the City Flood Risk Area? If so what measures should be specified?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime reduction	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Flood risk	Alternative 1 Require flood resilience measures in development schemes at risk of flooding	↓	↑	-	↑	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	-	-	↑	-	↑
Flood risk	Alternative 2 Rely on building owners to install flood resilience measures	↕	↕	-	↕	-	↕	↕	↕	↕	-	-	-	↕	-	↕

#### **Flood risk Alternative 1: Require flood resilience measures in development schemes at risk of flooding**

Commentary: Cost and space required for resilience measures could impact economy. Ensures that resilience measures are incorporated into designs where needed and protecting historic assets. Well designed flood resilience measures will assist in minimising danger of contamination through flooding. Will enable standard design of flood resilience measures along river Thames – City’s largest open space. Suitable flood resilience measures to account for disability etc

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

#### **Flood risk Alternative 2: Rely on building owners to install flood resilience measures**

Commentary: Uncertainty regarding whether building owners will install flood resilience measures and what type of measures. Could result in ad hoc measures

Timescale: Medium to long term



Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

## Open spaces

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.1:** *Should we continue to protect or enhance the existing open spaces in the City? How can we deliver more open space in the City?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime reduction	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Open spaces	Alternative 1 Protect all existing open space	↑↓	↑	-	↑	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	↑	↑	-	↕
Open spaces	Alternative 2 Allow development on some open space	↕	↕	-	↕	-	↓	↓	↕	↓	↕	-	↕	↕	-	↕
Open spaces	Alternative 3 Require additional open space to be provided with development	↑↓	↑	-	↑	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	↑	↑	-	↕

#### **Open spaces Alternative 1: Protect all existing open space**

Commentary: Provides attractive environment with space for relaxation but restricts development of offices. Protects existing historic parks and gardens. Existing open space provides opportunity for air quality improvement, climate mitigation & resilience and biodiversity. Provides pleasant walking routes, opportunities for social interaction with health benefits. Equality impacts depend on whether open spaces are open to the public.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – could be reversed in future

**Open spaces Alternative 2: Allow development on some open space**

Commentary: Could reduce the attractiveness of the City for businesses and workers and put additional pressure on remaining public realm. Limited development of facilities such as toilets and sports facilities could enable better use of open spaces. May affect historic parks and gardens or settings of historic buildings. Would reduce area of green space with detrimental impacts for air quality, carbon emissions and biodiversity. Could lead to loss of pedestrian routes. May restrict opportunities for social interaction. Equality impacts depend on whether open spaces are open to the public.

Timescale: Short, medium and long term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – once built on, open space is likely to be lost forever

**Open spaces Alternative 3: Require additional open space to be provided with development**

Commentary: Could impact on viability of development but provides an attractive environment. Protects existing historic parks and gardens and could improve settings of historic assets. Provides more space with potential for positive impacts on air quality, carbon emissions and biodiversity. Provides pleasant walking routes with potential for additional pedestrian links, opportunities for social interaction with health benefits. Equality impacts depend on whether open spaces are open to the public.

Timescale: Short, medium and long term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary, although planning obligations can require maintenance for a set period

## Retailing

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.5:** *Should the number or role of the Principal Shopping Centres be modified and / or should the boundaries of existing PSCs be amended? Is it still an appropriate policy objective to prioritise A1 units over other retail uses in PSCs?*

**I&O Question 7.6:** *Do the retail links still serve a clear purpose or should we allow retail uses throughout the City? Should isolated retail units continue to be protected?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Retailing	Alternative 1 Continue to focus A1 retail uses in existing Principal Shopping Centres and other retail in Retail Links	↕	↑	↑	↑	↑	-	-	-	-	↑	-	↑	-	-	-
Retailing	Alternative 2 Modify number or role of Principal Shopping Centres (e.g. remove A1 priority in PSCs)	↑	↑	↑	↕	↑	-	-	-	-	↕	-	↕	-	-	-
Retailing	Alternative 3 Consider retail development throughout	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	-	-	-	-	↓	↓	↕	-	-	-

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
	the City adopting a site by site assessment															

**Retailing Alternative 1: Continue to focus A1 retail uses in existing Principal Shopping Centres and other retail in Retail Links**

Commentary: Retail uses support the business City and extend the range of job opportunities in the City but focussing it in PSCs could prevent expansion to other parts of the City. Focussing retail enables more effective security/policing, waste collection and deliveries & servicing. Current PSCs include historic areas such as Leadenhall Market and Fleet Street. Focussed retail provides opportunities for collective climate mitigation and resilience measures and suitable open spaces for shoppers. PSCs provide vibrant social environment. Impact on transport and cultural facilities depends on what measures are implemented

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Retailing Alternative 2: Modify the number or role of Principal Shopping Centres (e.g. remove A1 priority in PSCs)**

Commentary: Retail uses support the business City and extend the range of job opportunities in the City. This option should ensure that all areas of the City are well served with retail. Focussing retail enables more effective security/policing, waste collection and deliveries & servicing. Identification of new PSCs is needed to establish whether the areas chosen and associated policies will result in protection for historic assets such as those at Smithfield General Market and Poultry Market. Focussed retail provides opportunities for collective climate mitigation and resilience measures and suitable open spaces for shoppers. PSCs provide vibrant social environment

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Retailing Alternative 3: Consider retail development throughout the City adopting a site by site assessment**

Commentary: Retail uses support the business City and extend the range of job opportunities in the City. Allowing retail development throughout the City could weaken the role of PSCs reducing their attractiveness for time constrained workers but could provide local retail units close to workplaces. Dispersed retail could make servicing, security and policing more problematic and make collective public realm enhancements less likely. Site by site assessment will determine whether heritage assets are conserved with each site being considered separately. Dispersed retail provides utility without providing a collective social experience and could impact on residential amenity if shops open late near residential premises.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

## Housing numbers

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.8:** *Should we plan to meet the London Plan housing target, or the level of need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment? Is there a need to exceed the London Plan housing target to address wider London housing need?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Housing numbers	Alternative 1 Plan to meet London Plan target only (141 units per annum)	↕	-	-	↑	-	-	-	-	-	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↕
Housing numbers	Alternative 2 Plan to meet the level of need identified in the SHMA (125 units per annum)	↕	-	-	↑	-	-	-	-	-	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↕
Housing numbers	Alternative 3 Plan to significantly exceed the London Plan housing target	↓↓	↓	↕	↕	↓	↓	↕	↓	↓	↑	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	↕

### Housing numbers Alternative 1: Plan to meet London Plan target only (141 units per annum)

Commentary: Economic growth could be affected by the cost and availability of housing in London. Any additional housing contributes to alleviating this pressure on housing but housing in the City can restrict the use of adjoining land for employment. This option could provide beneficial uses for historic buildings. Provision of housing will reduce the need to travel for some individuals. More housing will put more

pressure on social, health and educational facilities but this will be limited with low numbers of additional housing. Impact on equality will depend on the type of housing provided

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future

### **Housing numbers Alternative 2: Plan to meet the level of need identified in the SHMA (125 units per annum)**

Commentary: Economic growth could be affected by the cost and availability of housing in London. Any additional housing contributes to alleviating this pressure on housing but housing in the City can restrict the use of adjoining land for employment. This option could provide beneficial uses for historic buildings. Provision of housing will reduce the need to travel for some individuals. More housing will put more pressure on social, health and educational facilities but this will be limited with low numbers of additional housing. Impact on equality will depend on the type of housing provided

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future.

### **Housing numbers Alternative3: Plan to significantly exceed London Plan housing target**

Commentary: Compromises City's position as global financial business centre. This option could increase the number of residents in the City to a point where further supporting health and education services are needed thus putting pressure on available land and public realm. More residents result in more opportunity for crime but greater degree of surveillance. Could provide beneficial uses for historic buildings but new residential blocks may also be needed to significantly increase housing – may conflict with heritage. Higher levels of waste generated and water use by households. Increases opportunity for decentralised energy networks through providing different load profile from offices but more residents lead to higher energy use & carbon emissions. Could put additional pressure on open spaces and biodiversity. More housing in the City would reduce the need to travel if residents also work in the City. Impact on equality depends on the type of housing provided.

Timescale: Medium to long term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future.



## Revised Proposed Submission stage

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education
Housing numbers	Alternative 1 Plan to meet London Plan target until 2029 and then meet national policy requirements	↕	-	-	↑	-	-	-	-	-	↑	↑↑	↓	↓	↓

### **Housing numbers Alternative 1: Plan to meet London Plan target of 146 units per annum until 2029 and then meet national policy requirements of 102 units per annum until 2040**

Commentary: Economic growth could be affected by the cost and availability of housing in London. Any additional housing contributes to alleviating this pressure but housing in the City can restrict the use of adjoining land for employment. This option could provide beneficial uses for historic buildings. Provision of housing will reduce the need to travel for some individuals. More housing will put more pressure on social, health and educational facilities but this will be limited with low numbers of additional housing. Although, meeting the London Plan housing target up to 2029 would ensure a higher level of housing is delivered in the City than identified in the SHMA, so as to help alleviate the housing shortage in London.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future

The Corporation also considered an alternative option of meeting the level of need identified in the SHMA (103 units per annum). This option is the same as Alternative 2 considered at Issues and Options (Regulation 18) stage, although the identified need has decreased from 125 to 103 units per annum. As this option would not be sufficiently distinct, it has not been appraised as an additional option. This is in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance.

## Housing location

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.7:** *Should we define the boundaries of existing residential areas more clearly to indicate where in the City further residential development will be permitted? Or should residential development be permitted anywhere in the City as long as the particular site is not considered suitable for office use and residential amenity consistent with a city centre location can be achieved?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Housing location	Alternative 1 Restrict new housing to established residential clusters	↑	↑	↑	-	↑	↑	-	↑	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Housing location	Alternative 2 Permit housing anywhere in the City if site is unsuitable for office use	↓	↕	↕	↑	↓	-	-	-	-	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕

### Housing location Alternative 1: Restrict new housing to established residential clusters

Commentary: Clustering of housing protects businesses from the need to preserve amenity for residents and assists in collective security for residential properties. This option enables efficient waste collection and the provision of health and education services. This option enables efficient delivery and servicing of residential communities, provides suitable loads for CHP and provides opportunities to provide suitable open space for social interaction between residents.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future

**Housing location Alternative 2: Permit housing anywhere in the City if site is unsuitable for office use**

Commentary: Permitting housing anywhere in the City could lead to isolated dwellings where provision of services and security is problematic. This option could enable beneficial uses for historic buildings. It could cause inefficiencies in waste collection, delivery and servicing arrangements and provision of health and educational support.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Permanent – housing unlikely to change to other uses in future

## Affordable housing

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.11:** *Should the level of affordable housing required in the City be increased to allow the supply of rented affordable housing to be retained alongside starter homes? Is the approach to seeking commuted sums and delivering affordable housing acceptable?*

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Affordable housing	Alternative 1 Retain current affordable housing targets	↑↓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Affordable housing	Alternative 2 Increase level of affordable housing required	↑↓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑

#### **Affordable housing Alternative 1: Retain current affordable housing targets**

Commentary: Lack of affordable housing could impact on recruitment for City businesses but this level of affordable housing is unlikely to address the wider issue. Affordable housing requires supporting social, cultural, health and education facilities – more affordable housing the more cost effective this is to provide.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local and London – affordable housing requirements for City developments are frequently provided elsewhere

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – affordable housing status could change

**Affordable housing Alternative 2: Increase level of affordable housing required**

Commentary: Lack of affordable housing could impact on recruitment for City businesses - this level of affordable housing is unlikely to address the wider issue. Affordable housing requires supporting social, cultural, health and education facilities – more affordable housing the more cost effective this is to provide.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Local and London – affordable housing requirements for City developments are frequently provided elsewhere

Temporary or permanent: Temporary – affordable housing status could change

## Social and community infrastructure

### Issues and Options stage

**I&O Question 7.14:** Should we plan to meet the need for social and community services in full within the City, or work with partners in neighbouring boroughs?

Issue	Alternatives	Economic growth	Built environment and public realm	Safe environment and crime reduction	Heritage assets	Waste management	Environmental protection	Climate change mitigation and resilience	Open spaces	Biodiversity and urban greening	Transport and movement	Housing	Social and cultural facilities	Health	Education	Equality and inclusion
Social and community infrastructure	Alternative 1 Meet need for social and community infrastructure in the City	↓	-	-	-	↓	-	-	-	-	↑	↓	↑	↕	↕	↑
Social and community infrastructure	Alternative 2 Work with partners in neighbouring boroughs to meet social and community infrastructure needs	↑↑	-	-	-	↑↑	-	-	-	-	↓↓	↑↑	↑	↑↑	↑↑	↑

### Social and community infrastructure Alternative 1: Meet need for social and community infrastructure in the City

Commentary: This option could use floorspace that is needed for commercial development. Could lead to increased hazardous waste in the City from health facilities. Reduces the need to travel for residents visiting health facilities etc. Could occupy space which would be better used for housing. Local facilities provide easier access and contribute to sense of community but associated costs could reduce the range of health, education or social facilities provided. Local facilities provide easier access for disabled or less mobile older people

Timescale: Medium term

Geographic scale: Local

Temporary or permanent: Temporary

**Social and community infrastructure Alternative 2: Work with partners in neighbouring boroughs to meet social and community infrastructure needs**

Commentary: Frees up premises for commercial development in the City. Larger scale facilities better for waste management and transport. Increases need to travel for residents visiting health facilities etc. More efficient use of space since facilities will serve a wider community. Provides facilities elsewhere which are more difficult for City residents and workers to access. Provides access to a wider range of services due to economies of scale/ reduced cost of provision per head. Could be less accessible for some less mobile residents but wider range of facilities which could provide for the needs of different races or religious groups.

Timescale: Short to medium term

Geographic scale: Regional City, neighbouring boroughs and outer London for facilities associated with open spaces

Temporary or permanent: Temporary