

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
1	<b>London Assembly Planning &amp; Housing Committee</b> <i>letter received 12 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee's concerns are set out in a separate document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mayor's response is set out in his letter of 18 May 2009 to Nicky Gavron AM, Chair of the London Assembly's Planning and Housing Committee.</li> </ul>
2	<b>London Development Agency</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given importance of Crossrail to London, support amendments and SPG.</li> <li>SPG refers to net and gross figures, suggests using 1 to give clarity.</li> <li>Given economic circumstances, consider phased payments.</li> <li>Given LDA's role in pump-priming regeneration, skills training etc, need to carefully consider if LDA should be contributing to Crossrail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome.</li> <li>Agreed. SPG will refer to GEA.</li> <li>Agreed. SPG will allow for phased payments.</li> <li>The Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail.</li> </ul>
3	<b>Transport for London</b> <i>letter received 12 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports proposed amendment,</li> <li>Support proposed boundary but feel SPG should be clearer on securing contributions from stations beyond this boundary.</li> <li>Agree that a no exemptions policy is preferable to one that would allow developers to avoid contributing but will need to consider specific circumstances of schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome.</li> <li>Support welcome. Noted. SPG has been strengthened to address this concern.</li> <li>Support welcome.</li> </ul>
4	<b>Government Office for London</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments at this stage, want to discuss matter further over coming weeks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Welcome discussion.</li> </ul>
5	<b>Mr P Carr</b> <i>email received 10 December 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor should press on and deliver Crossrail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
6	<b>GVA Grimley</b> <i>letter received 13 January 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use of S.106 to fund Crossrail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome</li> </ul>
7	<b>British Retail Consortium</b> <i>letter received 22 January 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support proposals, impact of Business Rate Supplement will disproportionately affect retailers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed. Impact on retail sector noted.</li> </ul>
8	<b>London Borough of Hillingdon</b> <i>letter received 22 January 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support approach and suggested policy wordings.</li> <li>Seek clarity over approach towards sites outside of CAZ/loD within 800m of a station.</li> <li>May be opportunities to work with SE region to seek contributions there.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>SPG strengthened to give stronger guidance on seeking contributions in Outer London.</li> <li>This is beyond the Mayor's planning powers, he can only lobby. Mayor will write to Government on this matter.</li> </ul>
9	<b>Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames</b> <i>letter received 26 January 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of approach but has concerns. Policy shouldn't be used to seek contributions in RBKUT as not on route</li> <li>Concern over approach to CiL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. However, the policy is not necessarily about being on routes/benefits, but rather about the impact on the system.</li> <li>Details of CiL uncertain, policy will evolve with consultation</li> </ul>
10	<b>Canary Wharf Group</b> <i>letter received 30 January 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of approach but seek refinements.</li> <li>Imposing charge won't inhibit further growth, but will allow more development to happen, proposed charge is small % of total development costs – won't prevent development.</li> <li>Apply same charge in loD as CAZ, gives certainty, is fair;</li> <li>Policy needs to give clarity on crossrail v other contributions, developments should only pay once.</li> <li>Retail will benefit from Crossrail should contribute</li> <li>Areas outside of centre will benefit case by case approach will lead to lost opportunities, levy at 50% of central rate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome</li> <li>Support welcome</li> <li>loD will be more reliant on Crossrail to mitigate the impacts development and enable growth than CAZ. loD contributions should reflect this.</li> <li>Different schemes in different parts of London may give rise to multiple harms that need mitigation, may be appropriate to seek contributions for more than one thing. But the policy has been redrafted so Crossrail is the priority.</li> <li>S106 is not a betterment levy. Retail causes less impact on the transport network.</li> <li>Lower land values mean charge at suggested rate may prevent development from coming forward, 50% rate bears little relationship to actual impact (see harm index). Also importance of charging low rates on lots of smaller applications. However policy is being strengthened to reflect the importance</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3C.12A – support but should consider all key infrastructure needs and set charge after EiP.</li> <li>• Policy 6A.4 – contributions need to be affordable &amp; fair</li> <li>• Policy 6A.5 – need agreement between Mayor and LPAS over scope and value of S106s</li> <li>• Policy 6A.5A – introduce CiL after full EiP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• of seeking contributions wherever appropriate.</li> <li>• When planning system moves over to CiL suggested approach likely to be required by Govt.</li> <li>• Agreed. 3C.12A amended to refer explicitly to viability.</li> <li>• Agreed. Mayor will develop a protocol to agree with boroughs.</li> <li>• Details of CiL currently unclear, suggested approach likely to be required by Govt.</li> </ul>
11	<p><b>London Borough of Southwark</b> <i>letter received 2 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over impact of charge on major regeneration projects in North Southwark esp. Elephant &amp; Castle on viability and substitution effects.</li> <li>• Use 800m boundary around Crossrail stations rather than CAZ.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments above from Canary Wharf Group. The Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, which LB Southwark supports, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> <li>• This issue was considered when the policy was being drafted. Each station has two entrances/exits - drawing concentric circles from each station entrance/exit, will potentially be confusing, giving rise to multiple boundary issues and therefore greater uncertainty.</li> </ul>
12	<p><b>Corporation of the City of London</b> <i>letter received 3 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feel approach needs further work.</li> <li>• Should be applied to wider uses and a wider area otherwise may fail tests of Circular 05/05.</li> <li>• Charge may delay recovery due to impact on viability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice is that proposed policy is in accordance with relevant legislation/guidance.</li> <li>• See comments of Canary Wharf group above.</li> <li>• JLL research suggests proposed charge will not render schemes unviable.</li> </ul>
13	<p><b>Richard Tracey JP AM London Assembly Member for Merton and Wandsworth</b> <i>email received 3 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports response of Wandsworth, Opportunity Area should be exempt from Crossrail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See first point of response to LB Wandsworth.</li> </ul>
14	<p><b>London Borough of Wandsworth</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support general approach but seek amendments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
	<i>letter received 3 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Battersea/Vauxhall/Nine Elms Opportunity Area from charging area</li> <li>• Not just restricted to offices, charge residential</li> <li>• Sites within 800m of non-CAZ stations should contribute</li> </ul>	<p>contribution to Crossrail but feels it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary that will not provide certainty. However, boundary issue is an important point that merits further examination and will be tested in public consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact (in Circular 05/05 terms) that residential development has on the transport network in relation to rail AM peak is limited and therefore the level of charge that would be justifiable will not be cost effective to administer.</li> <li>• The SPG is to be strengthened to make clear that in areas outside the CAZ and IoD, it should be considered whether it is appropriate that these developments should also contribute to the Crossrail project.</li> </ul>
15	<b>City of Westminster</b> <i>letter received 3 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to have been involved in discussing proposals before they were released for consultation.</li> <li>• Concern over premature application of policy</li> <li>• Over-reliance on AM peak crowding as an indicator of harm leads to flawed methodology</li> <li>• No clear rationale for use of CAZ boundary.</li> <li>• Should apply over wider area as benefits are widespread. Shouldn't be restricted to office uses.</li> <li>• Use headline GEA rate for clarity.</li> <li>• Proposed charge would render many schemes unviable and reduce aff hsg provision in CoW.</li> <li>• Policy 6A.4 needs to clarify priorities between Crossrail, other transport schemes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The point is noted however, the GLA Act is clear that the Assembly &amp; Functional Bodies are consulted first. Boroughs and developers have been extensively consulted during this first phase of consultation, ahead of public consultation.</li> <li>• The draft policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application.</li> <li>• Research shows that the AM peak is the time when there is the greatest level of congestion on the transport network and therefore a reasonable and conservative basis for the indicator of harm.</li> <li>• The CAZ boundary was established in the London Plan 2004 and 2008. As the focus for office development it is the place where congestion impacts of development are highest. Use of a well-understood area gives developers certainty on which to make investment decisions.</li> <li>• It would be unreasonable to burden outer London boroughs with legal and administrative costs that will cost more to collect than they raise and will do little to reduce the headline rate in CAZ/IoD. It would be unreasonable for the Mayor to take S.106 contributions from all land uses. Office uses have greatest AM peak congestion impact on the network.</li> <li>• Agreed.</li> <li>• See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed.</li> <li>• Agreed.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and affordable housing.</li> <li>• Would like to have meetings to discuss possible changes to policy &amp; SPG before formal public consultation begins.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is a useful way forward.</li> </ul>
16	<p><b>Land Securities</b> <i>letter received 4 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy shouldn't be applied retrospectively</li> <li>• Pay charge on first occupation, there must be monitoring of contributions, receipt must be issued.</li> <li>• Proposals must be rigorously tested</li> <li>• Unclear about change from S106 to CiL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It isn't. Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application.</li> <li>• The protocol Mayor is developing between TfL &amp; boroughs will give further guidance on these issues. SPG amended on payment phasing.</li> <li>• Consultation and EiP procedure will ensure this happens</li> <li>• Details of CiL uncertain, approach will evolve with Govt consultation</li> </ul>
17	<p><b>London First</b> <i>letter received 4 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of principle of approach but seek refinements</li> <li>• Must reflect viability; be properly tested; and applied to wider uses and a wider area otherwise may fail tests of Circular 05/05</li> <li>• Methodology must be set out in Plan</li> <li>• Express charge as GEA, more readily used and understood than NIA</li> <li>• Allow phased payment.</li> <li>• Policy &amp; SPG should give clarity over priority for GLA/borough s106 needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualified support welcome.</li> <li>• Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) research suggests proposed charge will not render schemes unviable. The consultation rounds and EiP will ensure approach is rigorously tested. It would be unreasonable to burden Outer London (OL) boroughs with legal and administrative costs that are likely to cost more to collect than they raise and will do little to reduce the headline rate in CAZ/LoD. In these circumstances it was considered unreasonable for the Mayor to seek s106 contributions from all land uses. The policy is therefore consistent with Circular 05/05. However, have amended proposed 3C.12A to refer to viability and will strengthen SPG stance on Outer London.</li> <li>• PPS 12 advises that detailed matters should be set out in SPG. Proposed to include details of scheme in reasoned justification.</li> <li>• SPG amended accordingly.</li> <li>• SPG amended accordingly.</li> <li>• Proposed policy 6A.4 has been amended to clarify. LP policy has to apply London-wide, and not all boroughs are on Crossrail route, need to retain flexibility to deal with different circumstances. Where applicable Crossrail is defined as a key priority - inevitably in some cases there will be a trade off with other S106 calls. Therefore, case-by-case basis will be used to consider if there is a very strong rationale as to why Crossrail should not be the</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of payments should be set out in London Plan Annual Monitoring Report</li> <li>Should be a clear date from which policy applies</li> </ul>	<p>priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mayor will need to develop a protocol with boroughs on the question of collecting and monitoring S106 payments for crossrail. It would therefore be inappropriate for this level of detail to form part of the London Plan.</li> <li>Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application. The weight the Mayor can attach to it increases with each round of consultation up to adoption.</li> </ul>
18	<p><b>London Borough of Camden</b> <i>letter received 5 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to have been involved in discussing proposals before they were released for consultation.</li> <li>Proposed rate will impact on viability and threaten affordable housing delivery.</li> <li>Should be applied over a wider area for more uses, restrictive approach may fail tests of Circular 05/05.</li> <li>500 sqm threshold seen as low,</li> <li>clarity needed over NIA v GEA</li> <li>Public sector and voluntary sector will be affected by proposals</li> <li>Over station developments may be affected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The point is noted however, the GLA Act is clear that the Assembly &amp; Functional Bodies are consulted first. Boroughs/developers have been extensively consulted during this first phase of consultation, ahead of public consultation.</li> <li>See comments of Canary Wharf group above, JLL work does not support this assertion.</li> <li>It would be unreasonable to burden OL boroughs with legal and administrative costs that will cost more to collect than is raised and will do little to reduce the headline rate in CAZ/loD. It would be unreasonable for the Mayor to take s106 contributions from all land uses.</li> <li>Threshold gives clarity and certainty to developers.</li> <li>SPG amended accordingly.</li> <li>Every application will have to be determined on its merits. A blanket approach of the kind suggested would be inappropriate.</li> <li>Network Rail is in discussion with Government on this issue.</li> </ul>
19	<p><b>City Property Association</b> <i>letter received 5 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefits are widespread - charge is unfair in tight focus on offices in CAZ.</li> <li>Impact of charge on viability</li> <li>Concern over impact of charge in current economic climate.</li> <li>Money raised for Crossrail should only be spent on Crossrail, shouldn't be held for more than 3 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S106 is not a betterment levy, redresses harm, caused by office developments in central locations.</li> <li>See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed. Policy 3C.12A altered to reflect viability issues.</li> <li>Current economic climate is not permanent, if adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan will run until 2031, conditions will change.</li> <li>Principle of returning unused contribution is agreed. Given length of construction period longer timeframe would be more realistic.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy shouldn't be applied retrospectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It isn't. Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application.</li> </ul>
20	<p><b>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</b> <i>letter received 5 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support principle but have detailed concerns</li> <li>Would like to have been involved in discussing proposals before they were released for consultation.</li> <li>Proposed charge will impact on viability, delay recovery, take funding for local needs,</li> <li>Apply charge gradually over time so investment decisions can adjust.</li> <li>Should charge over a wider area, Mayor should approach Govt over charging in Berkshire, Essex &amp; Kent.</li> <li>Apply charge to hotel and retail uses</li> <li>Apply charge over a longer time frame</li> <li>Unclear about relationship between Crossrail &amp; CiL</li> <li>Substantial contributions already received from LBTH but will be charged in CAZ city fringe and IoD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualified support welcome.</li> <li>The point is noted however, the GLA Act is clear that the Assembly &amp; Functional Bodies are consulted first. Boroughs/developers have been extensively consulted during this first phase of consultation.</li> <li>See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed. Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> <li>As policy moves through consultation phases, it will gain weight as a material consideration, and developer decisions will reflect this. However, phasing is under consideration.</li> <li>It would be unreasonable to burden OL boroughs with legal and administrative costs that will cost more to collect than they raise and will do little to reduce the headline rate in CAZ/IoD. Charging areas outside London is beyond scope of Mayor's powers, however the point is well made and the Mayor will write to the Government on this matter.</li> <li>It would be unreasonable for the Mayor to take s106 contributions from all land uses. These uses cause less AM peak congestion on the network than offices.</li> <li>If adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan it will run until 2031.</li> <li>Policy will evolve when govt guidance on CiL becomes clearer.</li> <li>Route travels through two areas of Tower Hamlets, therefore both may be required to make contributions to relieve congestion.</li> </ul>
21	<p><b>Wood Wharf Group</b> <i>letter received 5 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3C.12A – charge should be consistent between CAZ and IoD.</li> <li>Policy 6A.4 – needs to offer clarity over priorities.</li> <li>Policy 6A.5 – must reflect viability, funding requirements must be related to development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IoD will be more reliant on Crossrail than CAZ, and therefore contributions should reflect this.</li> <li>Agreed. Policy 6A.4 has been amended to address this issue.</li> <li>Agreed. Proposed wording should not be read as suggesting these issues can be ignored. Policy 3C.12A has been amended to reflect viability issues.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 6A.5A – any crossrail contribution must be deducted from any CiL contribution, application of CiL must reflect market conditions.</li> <li>• Using a zonal approach to charging boundary would be fairer.</li> <li>• Areas outside of London should contribute.</li> <li>• Concerned about future application of policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of CiL uncertain, policy will evolve with consultation</li> <li>• Boundary needs to be consistent to give certainty. It would be unreasonable to burden OL boroughs with legal and administrative costs that will cost more to collect than they raise and will do little to reduce the headline rate in CAZ/loD.</li> <li>• Beyond the Mayor's planning powers, but the Mayor will write to Government on this issue.</li> <li>• Policy applies until funding raised. If adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan will run until 2031.</li> </ul>
22	<p><b>Ballymore Group</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support principle of development contributing to Crossrail. Support use of CAZ/loD boundary, is most equitable way forward, oppose use of concentric zones around stations. However concerned over differential market values within CAZ, impacts on viability</li> <li>• Reason for higher charge in loD requires more justification.</li> <li>• Opportunity Areas (OA) within CAZ may need different approach – further guidance sought.</li> <li>• Broadly support restriction to offices, should clarify applies solely to B1.</li> <li>• Support exemption for residential, significant contributions already attached to residential permissions.</li> <li>• Policy 6A.4 – needs to offer clarity over priorities.</li> <li>• Decisions on when s106 payments are made should form part of S106 negotiations.</li> <li>• Should have clear start date from which</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcome.</li> <li>• Every application has to be determined on its merits. 3C.12A has been amended to refer to viability.</li> <li>• Noted. Technical detail set out in Colin Buchanan &amp; Partners report on GLA website. SPG would become too long and too inflexible if it tried to address the myriad issues of each of the OAs.</li> <li>• Support welcome. The policy is drafted to include all office uses including A2 or sui generis schemes.</li> <li>• Support welcome.</li> <li>• London Plan policy has to apply London-wide, though not all boroughs are on Crossrail route, need to retain flexibility to deal with different circumstances. Policy 6A.4 has been amended to address this concern.</li> <li>• The protocol Mayor is developing between TfL &amp; boroughs will give further guidance on this issue.</li> <li>• Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when</li> </ul>

<b>Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Comments from</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Mayor's response</b>
		policy applies.	determining any application. As policy moves through consultation phases, it will gain weight as a material consideration, developer decisions/funding contributions will reflect this.
23	<b>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support principle, have concerns over detailed wording.</li> <li>• Unhappy at removal of wording over DLR extension from para 3.224</li> <li>• Policy 6A.5A be clear that CiL is for key infrastructure needed to support LP implementation.</li> <li>• Supporting text in 6.23 suggests pooling only needed for strategic transport infrastructure, not so.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualified support welcome.</li> <li>• Reasoned justification for Policy 3C.21A altered to reflect latest position.</li> <li>• Policy will evolve as details of CiL become clear.</li> <li>• Crossrail given as an example but does not mean only transport schemes will require pooling. New paras 6.23a &amp; b refer to infrastructure generally.</li> </ul>
24	<b>CB Richard Ellis</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Bodies and charities should be exempt from charge, as can't off set cost against future profit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every application will have to be determined on its merits. A blanket approach of the kind suggested would be inappropriate.</li> </ul>
25	<b>DP9 on behalf of Royal Mail Group</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be exempt from charge due to business being a public service.</li> <li>• If providing funding for transport improvements elsewhere on network should not have to pay Crossrail charge.</li> <li>• Concerned about blanket application of charge within CAZ/LoD boundary.</li> <li>• Unsure about wisdom of applying charge in current market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every application will have to be determined on its merits.</li> <li>• A blanket approach of the kind suggested would be inappropriate.</li> <li>• The congestion relief for London which Crossrail will deliver is a Mayoral priority. Each application must still be determined on its merits and on a case by case basis. It would be inappropriate to suggest possible blanket exceptions that could undermine the delivery of Crossrail. The Mayor considers that it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary that creates greater uncertainty.</li> <li>• Current economic climate is not permanent, if adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan will run until 2031, conditions will change. See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed.</li> </ul>
26	<b>DP9 on behalf of RT Group</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If providing funding for transport improvements elsewhere on network should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The congestion relief for London which Crossrail will deliver is a Mayoral priority. Each application must still be determined on its merits and on a case</li> </ul>

<b>Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Comments from</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Mayor's response</b>
		<p>not have to pay Crossrail charge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about blanket application of charge within CAZ/LoD boundary.</li> <li>Unsure about wisdom of applying charge in current market.</li> </ul>	<p>by case basis. It would be inappropriate to suggest possible blanket exceptions that could undermine the delivery of Crossrail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mayor considers that it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary that creates greater uncertainty.</li> <li>The current economic climate is not permanent, if adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan will run until 2031, conditions will change. See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed.</li> </ul>
27	<b>English Heritage</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend 6A.4 to make historic environment a priority for S106 funding.</li> <li>SPG does not acknowledge importance of historic environment.</li> <li>SPG should address how CiL will help historic environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan alteration is explicitly for Crossrail. The Proposed amendment would require fuller debate as part of wider LP review.</li> <li>Proposed Alterations and SPG address issue of fund-raising to implement Crossrail.</li> <li>Details of CiL uncertain, policy will evolve with consultation</li> </ul>
28	<b>Jenny Jones AM, Assembly Member Londonwide; Caroline Pidgeon AM, Assembly Member Londonwide; and Valerie Shawcross AM, London Assembly Member for Lambeth and Southwark</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove Elephant &amp; Castle from proposed charging zone, proposals are important for area but proposed charge could seriously impact on scheme's viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. The Mayor feels it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary that will not provide certainty. However, the boundary issue is an important point that merits further examination and will be tested in public consultation.</li> </ul>
29	<b>Treasury Holdings</b> <i>letter received 6 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vauxhall and Nine Elms Opportunity Area should be exempt from charging area, cannot contribute to both Crossrail and Northern Line extension. Make this clear in SPG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See first point of response to LB Wandsworth.</li> </ul>
30	<b>Network Rail</b> <i>letter received 10 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NR should be exempt from contributing to Crossrail as this will divert public funds from other parts of the transport network.</li> <li>Support proposed wording of 6A.5A.</li> <li>Include other examples of public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The congestion relief for London which Crossrail will deliver is a Mayoral priority. Each application must still be determined on its merits and on a case by case basis. It would be inappropriate to suggest possible blanket exceptions that could undermine the delivery of Crossrail.</li> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>One example thought sufficient to illustrate point.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improvements in supporting text 6.22 &amp; 6.23</li> <li>Policy 3C.12A should be redrafted in line with current LP policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3C.12A is a new policy so does not alter current policy wordings. Policies 3C.1, 3C.3, 3C.5, 3C.9, 3C.11&amp; 3C.12 refer to working with partners to deliver transport improvements.</li> </ul>
31	<p><b>DP9 on behalf of Hammersons &amp; Network Rail</b> <i>letter received 11 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on delivering improvements at Victoria Station if funding required for Crossrail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. The Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> </ul>
32	<p><b>King Sturge on behalf of New Covent Garden Market Authority</b> <i>letter received 13 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area will not benefit from Crossrail, too remote to benefit shouldn't have to pay.</li> <li>Cannot pay for Crossrail and other improvements likely to be sought.</li> <li>Unclear what happens if shortfall/surplus in funding.</li> <li>Impact of charge on viability</li> <li>SPG unclear over uses to be charged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. Mayor feels it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary that will not provide certainty.</li> <li>Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> <li>Policy applies until funding raised. Once funding raised application of policy ceases. TfL will report on this annually.</li> <li>See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed.</li> <li>SPG is explicit on this - Offices.</li> </ul>
33	<p><b>London Borough of Lambeth</b> <i>letter received 13 February 2008</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes use of CAZ boundary to determine charging zone, Lambeth gains little, if any, benefit from Crossrail.</li> <li>Charge will prevent development from coming forward, preventing regeneration in Lambeth.</li> <li>Impact at Vauxhall and Waterloo of charging may squeeze out other important improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor feels it provides greater developer certainty to have a well defined boundary and allow exceptions on a case by case basis rather than no boundary or a fluid boundary. Don't accept that development in Lambeth will not have congestion impacts on the network which Crossrail will help address.</li> <li>See comments above from Canary Wharf Group.</li> <li>The Mayor accepts that there may be circumstances where the individual merits of an application mean that it would be unreasonable to seek a contribution to Crossrail. The Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> </ul>
34	<p><b>London Councils</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to have been involved in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The point is noted however, the GLA Act is clear that the Assembly &amp;</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
	<i>letter received 13 February 2008</i>	<p>discussing proposals before they were released for consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over premature application of policy.</li> <li>• Would like to have meetings to discuss possible changes to policy &amp; SPG before formal public consultation begins.</li> <li>• Renegotiate Heads of terms with Govt, encourage Govt to seek contributions from outside of London.</li> <li>• Concern over impact of charge in current economic climate.</li> <li>• Concern over impact of charge on viability, regardless of current circumstances.</li> <li>• Impact of charge on current schemes.</li>   <li>• Broaden out land uses that are charged.</li>   <li>• Take flexible approach to implementing policy</li> <li>• Concern over impact of charge in peripheral CAZ locations.</li> <li>• Unclear about relationship between Crossrail &amp; CiL</li> </ul>	<p>Functional Bodies are consulted first. Boroughs/developers have been extensively consulted during this first phase of consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application.</li> <li>• Suggestion is a useful way forward.</li>   <li>• Both are beyond scope of this consultation, however the Mayor will write to Government on the latter point.</li>   <li>• Current economic climate is not permanent, if adopted, policy will become part of Plan and run until 2026, if in review plan will run until 2031, conditions likely to change over medium to long term.</li> <li>• See comments above from Canary Wharf Group, JLL work does not suggest viability will be harmed.</li> <li>• Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application. As policy moves through consultation phases, it will gain weight as a material consideration, developer decisions/funding contributions will reflect this. Mayor recognises that there may be substitution effects but the major regeneration benefits of Crossrail, which London Councils supports, require Crossrail to have priority.</li> <li>• It would be unreasonable for the Mayor to take s106 contributions from all land uses, especially as other land uses have limited harm in the AM peak when congestion is greatest.</li> <li>• Every application has to be determined on its merits.</li>   <li>• See first point of response to LB Wandsworth.</li>   <li>• Policy will evolve when govt guidance on CiL becomes clearer.</li> </ul>
35	<b>London Borough of Havering</b> <i>letter received 19 February 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support use, in principle, of using S106 funds for Crossrail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed alterations should reflect the specific locations identified in SPG.</li> <li>• Should have clear start date from which policy applies.</li>   <li>• Would like to have been involved in discussing proposals before they were released for consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This level of detail is better set out in SPG.</li> <li>• Policy is a material consideration that the Mayor is entitled to consider when determining any application. As policy moves through consultation phases, it will gain weight as a material consideration, developer decisions/funding contributions will reflect this.</li> <li>• The point is noted however, the GLA Act is clear that the Assembly &amp; Functional Bodies are consulted first. Boroughs/developers have been extensively consulted during this first phase of consultation.</li> </ul>
36	<b>London Thames Gateway DC</b> <i>letter received 12 March 2008</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support principle of seeking contributions subject to impact on viability</li> <li>• Seek more information on charge in IoD and the boundary between this and their Lower Lea Valley Area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcome.</li> <li>• Public consultation version of SPG will include a rate for North IoD. Will provide clarity on boundary issue.</li> </ul>

**Proposed London Plan Crossrail Alteration and draft SPG: initial consultation (4 December 2008 to 6 February 2009) with the London Assembly and the GLA Group Functional Bodies**

No	Comments from	Summary of comments	Mayor's response
----	---------------	---------------------	------------------

**Annex 5 continued...**

**Responses to the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Scoping Report**

These responses to the IIA have been analysed by Entec, the consultants undertaking the sustainability appraisal of this Alteration. They have been fed into the Integrated Assessment Report, published together with the public consultation draft of the Crossrail Alteration.

Organisation	Summary of Contents
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IIA should consider Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL),</li> <li>• Concern funding should not be diverted away from water/flooding infrastructure.</li> <li>• Need to consider a wider range of alternatives.</li> <li>• Impact on Water Framework Directive, diversion from water/flooding infrastructure.</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that historic environment will lose s106 funding that will now go to Crossrail</li> <li>• Concern that S.106 requirement will lead to larger buildings that are unsympathetic to the historic environment</li> <li>• Seek clarification over proposed charging area.</li> </ul>
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comments – content work complies with Habitat Regulations Assessment</li> </ul>
Government Office for the South East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over actual route, extend to Ebbsfleet and Reading</li> </ul>
Government Office for London	<p>Broadly support approach but seek clarification on following issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoping report needs to differentiate between London Plan policy and supporting SPG.</li> <li>• Clarify how any future changes to the SPG would be handled by the IIA, especially for EiP Panel.</li> <li>• Impact on delivery of affordable housing</li> <li>• Scoping report should clarify charging areas</li> <li>• How has Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) been considered.</li> </ul>