**LBB comments on Appellant’s Site Allocation 10 note**

In response to ID22, the Appellant has submitted a note and accompanying maps setting out their assessment of the Site Allocation 10 density.

The Council have considered this note and have the following comments:

* As a general point, the Council note that ID21 has been completely ignored by the Appellant. As explained at the inquiry by Ben Johnson on 23 July 2024, this document sets out how the site allocation 10 quantum was derived, based on a developable area of 2.89ha multiplied by the London Plan density matrix upper figure. This was an examination document and therefore the basis on which the allocation was found sound.
* There are a number of errors evident in the Appellant’s note and accompanying maps:
	+ The maps suggest that the appeal site is 10,772sqm (or 1.0772ha), when in fact it is 0.1ha. The error is evident even just looking at the map itself, as the map suggests that the appeal site is bigger (10,772sqm vs 7,704sqm) than Churchill Quarter site, but this is clearly not the case when looking at the map.
	+ The Churchill Quarter boundary does not reflect the boundary of the withdrawn scheme, which included High Street frontage within the conservation area. It is not agreed that the conservation area is a barrier to development in principle.
	+ The tracks at Bromley South station have been erroneously excluded. The allocation quantum could include over station development hence it is right to include the tracks in the developable area.
	+ Even assuming the Appellant’s figures are correct, it is not clear how they have arrived at their figure of 13,257sqm for Sites of Potential Development, looking at page 9 of their map document. Taking the site allocation total area of 45,593sqm, then deducting the site (10,772sqm); conservation area (3,453sqm); TPO (578sqm); sites with permission (5,185sqm); railway exclusion area (6,329sqm); road exclusion area (3,735sqm); and Churchill Quarter (7,704sqm), gives a remaining area of 7,837sqm (or 0.78ha).
	+ Correcting the above calculation with the correct appeal site size gives a remaining area of 17,609sqm (or 1.7ha). This figure would mean that the remaining density requirement to realise the remaining allocation quantum of 729 units (based on the Appellant’s note) is 429 dwellings per hectare (which very close to the total average density figure for the entire site and the Council’s figure in ID22).
* The Appellant’s note does not set out a total developable area across the entire allocation. Without prejudice to the Council’s information set out in ID21 and ID22 and above, the Council calculate the total developable area, based on the Appellant’s information and corrected for the appeal site size error above, to be 2.59ha, calculated as follows:
	+ 0.1ha from the appeal site (correct calculation); +
	+ 0.77ha from Churchill Quarter; +
	+ 1.7ha from potential development sites (using the correct calculation noted above);
	+ = 2.57 hectares of developable area.
* If the sites with permissions post allocation are added (based on information in Mark Batchelor’s proof and set out in ID22), then this would add a further 0.2ha, giving a total developable area of 2.59ha.
* While this is still less than the Council’s figure of 2.89ha, which was the basis on which the allocation was found sound and adopted, it is noted that a 2.59ha developable area would have resulted in a total allocation capacity of 1,103 units (426 dwellings per hectare x 2.59ha).
* Notwithstanding the points above, even if the Appellant’s figures were accepted, the density required to realise remaining numbers (561 dwellings per hectare according to the Appellant’s note) is not a particularly significant increase compared with the baseline allocation density of 426 dwellings per hectare, and is substantially less than the density of the appeal site (922 dwellings per hectare). Even accounting for the Appellant’s comments at paragraph 11 of their note, which the Council does not accept as the density matrix accounts for such spaces in the calculations, these considerations would result in very minor differences to the required density, and would certainly not mean that densities towards 1,000 dwellings per hectare (as proposed by the Appeal site) are necessary.