

PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 4: LOCAL PLAN SOUNDNESS & QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Why you should use this part of the toolkit

With your help the Council had drafted the publication version of our Local Plan, the planning document which will be used to help shape the nature of development across the Borough over the next 20 years. We need your views on whether this document is “sound

The purpose of this assessment is to provide a ‘mock’ examination - as far as that is possible - of the drafts of your local plan policies update. It is intended to be particularly helpful for use as part of the development of your emerging local plan policies update and as a final check prior to publication of your Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan policies update. It will help you to identify areas for improvement and understand potential risks to the soundness of the plan or its usability.

How to use this part of the toolkit

There are 50 ‘key questions’ in the assessment matrix below which might seem a lot to get through. But thinking through these questions now could save time and expense further down the line. If you are undertaking a partial plan policies update not all of the content will be relevant to you.

If you are completing this assessment or peer reviewing it for a colleague within or from another authority, you should put yourself into the mind of a Planning Inspector assessing the soundness of the draft local plan policies update by keeping in mind the ‘tests’ as follows. Is the draft local plan update:

- **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and

- **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

For some elements, particularly those concerning clarity, you will also need to consider yourself as an end user of the Local Plan policies update.

Provide a brief answer to each question cross referring to evidence that has informed or supports the local plan policies update in order to justify your reasoning and the score you have attributed. Identify any likely implications of not changing your approach or ways in which you may potentially improve the score either through changes to the plan policies update, evidence or further engagement with developers or infrastructure providers recorded in your statement of common ground. But remember that the local plan policies update doesn't need to be supported by reams of evidence. Evidence needs to be proportionate, clear and robust in line with [PAS advice on proportionate evidence](#).

If you find it helpful, you can score your local plan policies update on the degree to which you meet requirements underpinning the question. You can then add up the scores to calculate your confidence in the local plan policies update (on a scale from -100 to +100) and use this as a benchmark for future improvements. Where a particular question is not applicable to your circumstances, please score +2.

How to use the results of this part of the toolkit

You can use the results of this tool throughout the plan making process to assess the extent to which your plan addresses key soundness requirements. There is no requirement to publish or submit this table to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the independent examination, but you may find the assessment (or some elements) helpful to inform changes to your plan or supporting documents.

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Growth Strategy | | |
| A | <p>In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area</p> | <p>The Plan seeks to accommodate much of the growth needed through the creation of two new neighbourhoods in the Borough’s two Opportunity Areas, the Kensal Canalside and the Earl’s Court Opportunity Areas. These are sites which are suitable to deliver a substantial quantum of the new homes and employment floorspace required, with the necessary supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>The Plan also identifies a number of other areas where some growth is expected. This includes within the Borough’s three Employment Zones, the land beneath the Westway and within the Council’s larger town centres.</p> <p>The Plan also identifies a number of smaller sites outside these areas where some development expected. These will be supplement by development of a number of windfall sites outside these identified areas.</p> |
| B | <p>In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) identify the key factors which informed the distribution of development in the local plan policies update</p> | <p>The Local Plan has identified the key areas of growth, the main areas where opportunities exist to accommodate new development or to increase the density of existing, to create new places and to bring benefits to local communities.</p> <p>The strategy for delivering growth has regard to a number of factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation within the London Plan two Opportunity Areas within the borough. • The London Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2017 • Sites with planning permission or within the planning pipeline • National and local designations such as conservation areas or Public Open Spaces • The impact of development on the built character of borough. This is considered through the borough’s Character Study ¹and the Heritage Impact Assessments of the site allocations. • Sites suitable for new tall buildings • Flood Risk. |

¹ The character study has 4 parts. It can be viewed [here](#), selecting Evidence Base and scrolling to Chapter 6, “Conservation and Design”

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverability of the site/ land owners desire to develop • The viability of delivering new development • The need to protect existing uses (such as offices or social and community uses.) <p>The exercise carried out for identification of site allocations is set out in the Site Allocations Paper (October 2022).</p> |
| <p>C</p> | <p>List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key infrastructure needed to support delivery</p> | <p>Chapter 9 of the Local Plan sets out the main growth areas, with the details of the site allocations included in Chapter 10. The allocations include an assessment of any specific infrastructure need to support delivery. These requirements will be other and above those ordinarily required through Local Plan Policy IOP1 and other relevant policies. They are set out in the Borough’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The main growth areas as identified in Chapter 9 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kensal Canalside and the Earl’s Court Opportunity Areas; • The land underneath the Westway • The three Employment Zones, Latimer/ Freston Road, Kensal and Lots Road. • The larger town centres, or Kensington High Street, Portobello Road, Notting Hill Gate, South Kensington, Kings Road (East) and (West), Earl’s Court, Brompton Cross, Westbourne Grove, Knightsbridge and Fulham Road (West). <p>The allocation are largely located within these areas, although do include a number of smaller sites. All the allocations are set out below.</p> <p>SA1: Kensal Canalside <i>Key Infrastructure and planning contributions:</i> social and community facilities; affordable housing; pedestrian and cycle bridge across railway line, pedestrian, and cycle bridge over Grand Union Canal; public realm and public spaces and improvements to Little Wormwood Scrubs and Kensal Green Cemetery; improved transport infrastructure; landscaping, biodiversity and amenity improvements to Grand Union Canal and on-site renewable energy sources.</p> <p>SA2: Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre</p> |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
| | | <p><i>Key Infrastructure and planning contributions:</i> improvements to underground, bus and rail access including interchange from the West London Line to the underground network; contribute to step-free access to Brompton Station; improved pedestrian link from and through the site to public transport facilities an improved cycle links.</p> <p>SA3: 100/100A West Cromwell Road <i>Key Infrastructure and planning contributions:</i> A contribution to enhancement of the Earl’s Court one way system in line with the Healthy Streets Approach, including safety measures, greening, increased space for active travel and buses, and lower speed limits. Safety improvement and crossing facilities at Warwick Road/ West Cromwell Road junction.</p> <p>SA4: Former Territorial Army Site, 245 Warwick Road SA5: Wornington Green, Phase 3 <i>Key Infrastructure and planning contributions:</i> affordable housing; community centre and associated outdoor space; resident’s room reprovision; reprovision of the open space.</p> <p>SA6: Lots Road South SA7: Edenham Way SA8: Chelsea Farmer’s Market SA9: Units 1014 Latimer Road Industrial Estate</p> <p>SA10: Newcombe House: <i>Key Infrastructure and planning contributions:</i> Delivery of step-free access to southbound platform of Circle and District Line.</p> <p>Small sites. SA11: The Plaza, 535 Kings Road SA12: Harrington Road Car Park SA13: Emmanuel Kaye Building SA14: 142A Highlever Road SA15: Colebrook Court SA16: Holland Road Triangle</p> |

| <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | | <p>Assessment</p> <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| <p>1.</p> | <p>Overall does the local plan policies update clearly articulate the strategy for <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> sustainable development will be delivered and that this is ‘an appropriate strategy’ within the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF?</p> | <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The spatial strategy is clearly articulated. The Local Plan supports ‘good growth’ and the vision to be Green, Inclusive and Liveable which forms the basis of all the policies in the Plan has clear links to delivering sustainable development. The Local Plan shows our broad locations for growth in the key diagram.</p> <p>Chapter 9 identifies those areas where much of the new development needed by the borough will be located. Detail is provided in the allocations set out in chapter 10. The Council has carried out a rigorous assessment of these allocations within the Site Allocations Paper, October 2022 and the Policy Formulation Report for Site Allocations, October 2022.</p> <p>All these allocations have been considered as part of the Councils Integrated Impact Assessment, an exercise which includes SA/SEA. These have also been subject to a Flood Risk Sequential Test and a Heritage Impact Assessment. The Local Plan Viability Study has used a range of typologies that reflect the site allocations as well. These important component parts of sustainable development.</p> <p>The topic based policies also consider where and how sustainable development will be delivered. Chapter 3 sets out the Council’s expectations with regard housing delivery. Chapter 5 considers development within town centres and confirms the town centre first approach for new development. This is repeated in Chapter 6, Businesses. Chapter 4, “Conservation and Design” considers appropriate locations for tall buildings.</p> <p>These topic based policies have also been assessed against reasonable alternatives as part of the Sustainable Appraisal which considers how they will achieve sustainable development.</p> | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 2. | Is it clear how the amount of development identified for any growth areas or major site allocations has been determined – and that the level proposed is deliverable and justified? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>The Local Plan very clearly identifies areas of growth or change and this is set out in Chapter 9: Places. It has a hierarchy by the level of growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating new neighbourhoods – opportunity areas - Areas with potential for some change (the three Employment Zones and the Lancaster West Estate and Notting Dale) - Our larger town centres - Our local centres and neighbourhoods <p>The site allocations set out in Chapter 10 are also classed by their size as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity Areas - Large sites (0.25 ha or more) - Small sites (less than 0.25 ha) <p>The amount of development in site allocations is specified as a minimum. Most of the site allocations are current site allocations in the Local Plan 2019, where the planning history has determined the quantum specified.</p> <p>For the opportunity area sites the starting point has been the quantum indicated in the London Plan 2021. Further testing has been undertaken by the Council particularly for townscape purposes and to establish the building heights. This has resulted in a very high level testing of site capacity which has been helpful in informing the minimum quantum. As stated the quantum of development is stated as a minimum which allows for flexibility. For Earl’s Court Opportunity Area (SA2), the independent reports</p> | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|----|----|---|----|----|
| | | <p>on townscape analysis and viability assessment taken together formed the basis for the minimum quantum of development allocated for the site. The Policy Formulation Report for SA2 provides further detail.</p> <p>There are eight large sites that are being allocated. Barring Lots Road South (SA6) and Edenham Way (SA7) both of which are in Council ownership, the rest have extant planning permissions (although the permission for SA4 245 Warwick Road has expired). The detailed design process accompanying a planning application has informed the quantum of development.</p> <p>For the small sites as design led capacity assessment has been undertaken. For the small sites a high-level design led capacity assessment has been undertaken. Four sites required such an assessment: The Plaza at 535 King’s Road, Emmanuel Kaye Building, Colebrook Court and Holland Road Triangle. The starting point was to determine whether the site would be in mixed use or solely residential. If in mixed use, the proportion of the different uses was worked out on the assumption that the floorspace of the existing use is retained if the use is protected by planning policy.</p> <p>Further capacity for residential was then established based on the surrounding context. This consideration includes tall building thresholds in the area, prevailing building heights around the site, whether there are any listed buildings in and around the site and if the site is within a conservation area or in the setting of a conservation area. The existing building footprint is normally suitable to extrapolate the floorspace based on any additional stories a site could take. Where a site can be redeveloped and there is additional land on the site with a better configuration of massing, this has also been considered. Building setbacks were kept as per the surrounding streetscape. The bedroom size mix in the emerging Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) was used and minimum floorspace standards were used to work out the average unit size. This then yielded the site capacity.</p> <p>Further details are set out in the Site Allocations Policy Formulation Report, October 2022.</p> | | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | | |
| | | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">-2</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">+1</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">+2</td> </tr> </table> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | | | |

| <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | | <p align="center">Assessment</p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p align="center">3.</p> | <p>Is it clear that the local plan policies update provides for the most appropriate level of housing growth using the standard methodology as a starting point? Can you clearly articulate why planned growth levels should not be higher or lower?</p> <p>If you are proposing any material change away from the level of housing indicated by the standard method, can you clearly justify this through evidence?</p> <p>Does the level of housing provide for an appropriate and justified buffer?</p> | <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The Borough is a London Borough where the housing need and target is undertaken through the Spatial Development Strategy i.e. the London Plan 2021.</p> <p>The PPG on Housing and economic needs assessment sets out the standard method. Paragraph 2 of the PPG introduces the standard method which strategic policy-making authorities should follow for assessing local housing need. The standard method uses a formula to identify a minimum annual housing need figure and, importantly, <i>“does not produce a housing requirement figure”</i>.</p> <p>The Policy Formulation Report on Homes Policy HO1, October 2022, section 3 sets out the housing need figure using the standard method and the key paragraphs are set out below.</p> <p>Step 3 of the standard method is key for this Borough. It states that where relevant strategic policies for housing have been adopted within the last 5 years, <i>“the local housing need figure is capped at 40% above the average annual housing requirement figure set out in the existing policies.”</i> It further clarifies that <i>“for areas covered by spatial development strategies, the relevant policies are those contained within the spatial development strategy.”</i> This should also be no older than 5 years. The spatial development</p> | | | | |

| | <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | | <p><u>strategy is the London Plan which was published in March 2021 and therefore within the last 5 years. Based on this our housing need figure would be capped at 40% above the housing requirement of 448 homes per annum or 627 homes per annum.</u></p> <p>Step 4, the cities and urban centres uplift step is a recent addition to the calculation of the standard method updated on 16 December 2020. Adding an extra 35% over the capped 627 homes per annum gives a figure of 847 (rounded up) per annum.</p> <p>The introduction of the cities and urban centres uplift followed the Government’s consultation on Changes to the Current Planning System. When the Government published its response to the Changes to the Current Planning System consultation in April 2021² it stated with regard to London that <i>“It is clear that in London, in the medium term, there will need to be a much more ambitious approach to delivering the homes the capital needs. The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government expects to agree the London Plan with the Mayor shortly. <u>This new plan, when adopted, will set London’s housing requirement for the next 5 years. The local housing need uplift we are setting out today will therefore only be applicable once the next London Plan is being developed.</u> In order to support London to deliver the right homes in the right places, the government and Homes England are working with the Greater London Authority to boost delivery through the Home Building Fund.”</i> (emphasis added)</p> <p>Paragraphs 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 of the NPPG on Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment were added to explain how the cities and urban centres uplift work. While the uplift applies in London, Paragraph 34 states that <i>“the responsibility for the overall distribution of housing need in London lies with the Mayor as opposed to individual boroughs so there is no policy assumption that this level of need will be met within the individual boroughs”</i>.</p> <p>The Council is setting out a stepped housing trajectory to meet the London Plan housing target which is a ten year target of 4,480 homes. The justification for this is set out in detail in the paper RBKC Five Year Housing Land Supply and Stepped Housing Trajectory, October 2022.</p> |

² [Government response to the local housing need proposals in “Changes to the current planning system” - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system)

| | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| KEY QUESTIONS | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 4. | Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release and can you demonstrate that alternatives to Green Belt release have been fully considered? Can you demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: Not applicable to the Borough. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 5. | Is it clear how sites have been selected and have site allocations been made on a consistent basis having regard to the evidence base, including housing and employment land availability assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Detailed methodology for site selection and assessment is set out in the Site Allocations Paper Update (October 2022). All potential sites that were proposed following the Calls for Sites were assessed against a three-stage assessment methodology, including suitability, deliverability and achievability of the sites.</p> <p>Site allocations Policy Formulation Report (October 2022) provides further detail on how policies were developed for each site allocation, based on relevant evidence base. Chapters 3 and 4 of the report set the evidence common to all site allocations as well as the general principles that apply to all sites allocations. The evidence includes the a Heritage Impact Assessment, the Sequential Test, the Character Study, the Integrated Impact Assessment and Local Plan Viability Study. The London SHLAA 2017 includes many of our site allocations and the allocations will assist in meeting the need identified in the Council’s Employment Land Study (October 2021). For the two Opportunity Areas Sites, Kensal Canalside and Earl’s Court, separate Policy Formulation Reports have been produced.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 6. | Does the local plan policies update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>The Borough contains two Neighbourhood Plans, the Norland Neighbourhood Plan and the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan, confirmed in 2014 and 2018 respectively. The borough also contains 2 additional Neighbourhood Forums, Courtfield and Lots Road NF. A NP is not being prepared for the Courtfield NF. The Lots Road NF was only designated in July 2022. The Council has not been informed whether the forum intends to produce a NP.</p> | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Para 67 of the NPPF states that a Council should provide a housing requirement “if requested” to do so by the neighbourhood planning body.” The Council has not received such a request.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Implications of taking no further action:</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | |
| 7. | Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: Each site allocation policy sets out the requirements for land use mix and its quantum, including, where appropriate, any necessary supporting infrastructure.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>A minimum quantum of housing units were identified for each site. Total number of dwellings expected to be delivered across all site allocations can be found in the Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Details on quantum of commercial space required vary depending on site allocation. In some cases, the allocation states as a minimum to re-provide the existing quantum of commercial floorspace, whereas on sites where it was possible to identify a specific quantum of floorspace area required, the requirement is expressed in sq m (GIA). Site allocations that explicitly state minimum amount of commercial floorspace required are Kensal Canalside, Earl’s Court and Lots Road South.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Implications of taking no further action:</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</p> | | | | |
| <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> | <p>What targets have you set for non-residential floorspace or employment land and, if relevant, the number of jobs to be created over the plan period?</p> <p>List these targets and the evidence source for this ‘need’ target?</p> | <p>The Employment Land Study (Iceni BNP Paribas, October 2021) has identified a need for the provision of an additional 60,500 sq m of office (E(g)) floorspace over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The Council’s Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment (Urban Shape, November 2021) has concluded that there will be a modest over supply in comparison retail floorspace (1,100 sq m) to 2043. The Study has identified that there is a need of 8,900 sq m of additional convenience floorspace over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The London Plan 2021 sets a target of 123,000 tonnes of waste to be managed in the borough by 2041.</p> | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">8.</p> | <p>Where and how are the targets referred to above to be delivered? Do the sites and indicative capacities that you have identified demonstrate that these targets are achievable? If you are not allocating sites to meet needs identified, can you justify and explain how those needs will be met?</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">-2</p> <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">-1</p> <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">+1</p> <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">+2</p> <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>Business floorspace The Employment Land Study has identified a need for an additional 60,500 sq m of office (E(g)) floorspace over the lifetime of the plan. The ELS notes that this will be met in a number of ways:</p> <p><i>Retention of existing office space.</i></p> | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|---|
| | | <p>This is only possible through the A4D confirmed in August 2022. This will allow the Council to protect (should it choose to do so), 98% of all its office premises. Policy BC1 (A) is explicit in stating that, “where planning permission is required, protect all offices and office floor space”. (subject to some exceptions)</p> <p><i>Existing commitments</i> These make up much of the future need. As of April 2021 there were 14,017 sq m of office floorspace approved as well as 50,000 sq m of extant permissions (up to 2019/20). This alone equates to 64,100 sq m of office floorspace.</p> <p>In addition the pipeline would also include floorspace allocated, over and above extant permissions. This includes significant allocations for commercial floorspace on our two opportunity areas, or a minimum of 5,000 sq m of office floorspace in Kensal Canalside and a minimum of 20,000 sq m of E(g) floorspace on Earl’s Court OA. It should be noted that 11,632 sq m of office floorspace is already included as an “extant permission” on Earl’s Court. This cannot be added to the 20,000 sq m allocation.</p> <p><i>Intensification of existing sites</i> Policy BC1 (B) supports the provision of new offices less than 1,000 sq m across the borough, with (C) supporting new offices over 1,000 sq m “within a town centre, other accessible area, Opportunity Area or within an Employment Zones” and elsewhere where meet the requirements of the sequential test.</p> <p>BC1(J) encourages an intensification of commercial uses within our Employment Zones, whilst BC1(H) supports new and intensified industrial uses in appropriate parts of the borough</p> <p>Retail need The RLNA has concluded that there will be a modest over supply in comparison retail floorspace (1,100 sq m) to 2043. As such the Council does not need to identify any sites for this use.</p> <p>There is a modest need of 8,900 sq m of convenience floorspace over the lifetime of the plan. As recommended by the RLNA, the Local Plan directs this floorspace to existing centres and to the two Opportunity Areas.</p> |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <p>It is expected that much of this floorspace can be accommodated in existing centres through the filling of vacant units. The 8,900 sq m needed is just 0.02% of the estimated 400,000 sqm of retail and other former A class floor space across the borough. This can easily be accommodated by bringing vacant units back into use.</p> <p>The NLPR includes a number of sites within, or immediately adjoining our town centres, which includes additional retail floorspace. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chelsea Farmers Market (SA7): “retail units at ground level facing 151 Sydney Street”. • Newcombe House (SA9): “retail and leisure uses at ground and lower ground levels bringing active frontage to ground floor”. • Harrington Road Car Park (SA10): “class E commercial frontage to Harrington Road.” <p>The Opportunity Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation SA1 (Kensal Canalside) includes the provision of a “minimum of 2,000 sq m of other non-residential floorspace, including social and community and local shopping facilities”. • Allocation SA2 (Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre) requires the provision of “retail and other uses within Class E sufficient to serve the day-to-day needs of new development and supplement existing facilities in the immediate area...” <p>Leisure floorspace</p> <p>The Leisure Needs Assessment forms part of the wider RLNA (Urban Shape 2022). This concludes that, (RBKC10) “that there is no need to allocate sites outside town centres for ... leisure floorspace over the plan period.”</p> <p>Waste</p> <p>The Council’s Waste Data Study established that there is a total waste management capacity of 90,600 tonnes pa to meet the London Plan apportionment. This is a capacity gap of 32,400 tonnes. This is met through sharing surplus waste management capacity arising in London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation. This is established through the relevant Statement of Common Ground.</p> |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 9. | Does the local plan policies update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this infrastructure? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 10. | Can you demonstrate that the transport and other infrastructure needed to support each growth area or strategic site identified in the local plan policies update: (i) can be funded and delivered; and (ii) is supported by the relevant providers/ delivery agents in terms of funding and timescales indicated? Have you identified the extent of any funding gap? If so, are you able to | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| | KEY QUESTIONS | Assessment | | | | |
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | explain why you are confident that any gap can be addressed? | | | | | |
| | Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3) | | | | | |
| E | What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these. | <p>The cross boundary strategic matters affecting the NLPR are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing delivery • gypsy and travellers • commercial, retail and office space • cultural uses • infrastructure • heritage, tall buildings and protected views • opportunity area sites • green infrastructure • waste • education. <p>These matters are all identified and set out in detail within the Council's Statements of Common Ground (SoCG).</p> | | | | |
| 11. | Does your Duty to Cooperate Statement(s) of Common Ground: (i) identify these issues; (ii) identify the bodies you have engaged with or continue to engage with; and (iii) clearly set out not just the process, but the outcomes of this engagement | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: A Duty to Cooperate (DtC) statement and SoCGs have been prepared and published alongside the Reg. 19 Plan. The DtC and SoCGs identify the cross boundary strategic issues; the bodies the Council has and continues to engage with; and highlights the outcomes of this engagement. No areas of difference or disagreement were identified. | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| highlighting areas of agreement and of difference? | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: The Council's DtC Statement and SoCGs may not be up to date with ongoing dialogue on cross boundary strategic issues. | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Keep DtC and SoCG up to date with ongoing dialogue on cross boundary strategic issues. Should unexpected issues arise, these can be addressed through further SoCGs as part of the examination process. | | | | |
| Are there any aspects of the local plan policies update not in conformity with national policy (or where you will be relying on transitional provisions)? Please set these out and provide justification with reference to evidence for these. Are you satisfied you can robustly defend this on the basis of local evidence? <i>For instance, are you seeking to require affordable housing on sites which are below the threshold of major development as defined by national planning policy?</i> | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | | Housing Policy H3: Community Housing - The Council is seeking to set out affordable housing threshold below the national one. The Council has robust evidence to justify this being the Borough with the highest median land values in the country. The Council justified the same approach in the previous examination and adopted the policy in 2019. The Local Plan Viability Study, September 2022 is the key evidence the Council will be relying on. The Policy Formulation Report on Policy HO3 also provides the justification. | | | | |
| | | Policy TC1 (Location of town centre uses), supports a town centre approach for new "main town centre uses". The Local Plan considers "edge of centre" as a site which is "adjacent" rather than the NPPF definition for retail purposes as being as site within 300 m of a town centre boundary . This is an approach taken by the Council for the last two iteration of the Core Strategy/Local Plan and reflects the borough's small size and the number of centres within it. A 300 m threshold would mean, in practice, that nearly the entire borough would either lie within a centre or at the edge of a centre. This would run counter to the Council's ambitions, and those clearly articulated within the NPPF, for sustainable development where town centre uses and high trip generating commercial uses should be directed, where possible to existing town centres and other accessible areas. | | | | |
| 12. | Are there any specific policies in the local plan policies update where there are differences to any policy approach set out in a relevant strategic planning framework (e.g. the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement). | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | <p>The Council will submit the reg 19 Draft policies to the GLA who will consider whether the polices within it are in general conformity with the London Plan. This will be fully reported at the appropriate time.</p> <p>The Council fully expects all policies to be in general conformity with those in the London Plan.</p> | | | | |
| 13. | Is the local plan policies update: | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in conformity with any 'higher level' plans prepared by the Council; and • properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan? | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The Local Plan has been prepared having close regard to the Council's other strategies. This is confirmed in section 1 which explains that the NLPR links with the Council's other Council's priorities.</p> <p>The NLPR is explicit the policies within the Borough's two neighbourhood plans must be uses when determining any planning application within the relevant Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>The NLPR includes both the allocations set out within the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan (SQWNP) (SA9: Units 1-14 Latimer Road Industrial estate and SA14: 142 Highlever Road). The allocation reflects the requirements within the NP. In addition BC1(K) reflects the ambitions of the SQWNP in allowing the provision of new homes within the Employment Zone, but not requiring that these are dependent on the provision of additional employment floorspace.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| 14. | Does your Consultation Statement demonstrate how you have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date [you should revisit and update this following the publication of your Regulation 19 local plan policies update]? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Consultation Statement add link sets out how the council consulted at each stage of the Local Plan's progression, the comments received and Council's response. This explains that the consultations have been delivered in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement , as published February 2020, and the addendum adopted in March 2021. The addendum considered changes made necessary by the Covid-19 pandemic and associated restrictions. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 15. | Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Council's Integrated Impact Assessment (October 2022) (IIA) includes an SA/SEA which clearly evaluates all policies and site allocations proposed in the NLPR and all reasonable alternatives to these. For example, saving an existing policy or having no Local Plan policy meaning the relevant London | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | <p align="center">Assessment</p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Plan policy would apply. Policies, site allocation and alternatives were all assessed against the SA/SEA framework objectives identified in the Council’s IIA Scoping Report.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>The assessment of reasonable alternatives clearly demonstrates why these haven’t been selected over the proposed policies. For example, because the reasonable alternative would result in more significant positive outcomes, less negative outcomes and/or more uncertain outcomes than the proposed policy or site allocation.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Implications of taking no further action: The IIA assessment of proposed policies and reasonable alternatives may not be up to date with any future modifications to proposed policy and site allocations made after publication of the reg. 19 plan.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Ensure the IIA assessment is kept up to date with any future modifications to policy and site allocations.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | |
| 16. | Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The Council’s IIA assesses the impacts of all proposed policies and site allocations robustly against each SA/SEA framework objective. This assessment is clearly set out in a table format and an overall uncertain, positive, neutral or negative impact is identified against all the SEA framework objectives.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Implications of taking no further action: The IIA assessment of proposed policies and reasonable alternatives may not be up to date with any future modifications to proposed policy and site allocations made after publication of the reg. 19 plan.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Ensure the IIA is kept up to date with any future modifications to policy and site allocations.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | |

| <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | | <p>Assessment</p> <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| <p>17.</p> <p>Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the local plan policies update including how any policies or site allocations have been amended as a result and does it show (and conclude) that the local plan policies update is an appropriate strategy?</p> | <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> | |
| | <p>Reason for score: After the assessment of each proposed policy and site allocation and reasonable alternatives against each SA/SEA framework objective, the Council’s IIA clearly concludes that the NLPR is an appropriate strategy and that the proposed policies and site allocations all result in less uncertain outcomes, less negative impacts and more significant positives impacts than identified alternatives. No amendments to proposed policies and site allocations were required as a result of the SA/SEA assessment.</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>Implications of taking no further action: The IIA assessment of proposed policies and reasonable alternatives may not be up to date with any future modifications to proposed policy and site allocations made after publication of the reg. 19 plan.</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Ensure the IIA is kept up to date with any future modifications to policy and site allocations.</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>18.</p> <p>Is it clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has influenced the local plan policies update?</p> | <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> |
| <p>Reason for score: The Council’s IIA includes an equalities impact assessment (EqIA) that robustly assesses the proposed policies and site allocations and clearly concludes that overall, the NLPR will likely have positive impacts on protected characteristic group members in the borough.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Implications of taking no further action: The IIA and EqIA may not be up to date with any future modifications to proposed policy and site allocations made after publication of the reg. 19 plan.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Ensure the IIA and EqIA is kept up to date with any future modifications to policy and site allocations.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> | | | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| 19. | Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects? | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The Council carried out an initial Habitats Assessment Screening as part of the Issue and Options Consultation. This was sent to the statutory bodies and comments were invited from all consultees as part of the Issues and Options. A copy of the Habitats Screening can be viewed on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council carried out a further scoping to have regard to the draft policies. This Habitats Screening for the Draft Policies can be viewed on the Council's website.</p> <p>Both screenings concluded that a further assessment (stage 2) of the HRA process is not required. The screening assessment does not identify any likely significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects This approach is supported by English Nature the "appropriate nature conservation agency."</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| 20. | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 21. | If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through 'Appropriate Assessment' that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan policies update adequately identify the | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them? | | | | | |
| | | Reason for score: The scoping of the Habitat assessment concluded that the policies within the NLPR are not likely to have any significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site. These conclusions were supported by English Nature. As such no mitigation measures were required. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 22. | Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan policies update? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The screening assessment does not identify any likely significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. No further assessment (stage 2) of the HRA process was required, and the Habitats Regulation Assessment did not influence the local plan policies update. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| Housing Strategy | | | | | | |
| 23. | Can you demonstrate that the policies and proposed allocations in your local plan policies update meet your housing requirement in full and that this can be | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | achieved as a minimum? If not [for instance, because another local authority has agreed to plan for your unmet need], can you explain and robustly justify why? | Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| G | <i>Is there any unmet need in neighbouring areas that you have been formally asked to accommodate? If yes, then list the amount by each local authority area.</i> | No, there has been no request to accommodate unmet need from neighbouring authorities. The London Plan distributes the need figure in any case. The Council has a Statement of Common Ground with neighbouring authorities confirming this. | | | | |
| 24. | Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably to do so? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: See response to G above, not applicable. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 25. | Is there a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery and ensures the maintenance of a 5-year supply during the plan period? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | Is your strategy for delivery and implementation clearly articulated and justified to support the trajectory? | | | | | |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The Council has put forward a stepped trajectory approach which will enable it to meet the London Plan target of 4,480 homes which is over ten years rather than an annual target.</p> <p>This is set out in detail in the paper RBKC Five Year Housing Land Supply and Stepped Housing Trajectory, October 2022.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 26. | Can you confirm: (i) that the local plan policies update will provide for a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites on adoption; and (ii) that beyond this 5 year period sites are developable and (iii) if relevant, you have included a 5 or 20 percent buffer to deal with under-delivery. | -2 No, we do not meet this requirement | -1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement | 0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | +1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | +2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: Yes, the Local Plan will provide for a five year supply of specific deliverable sites and beyond this, developable sites. The Council has used a 20% buffer to deal with under delivery.</p> <p>The sites are all listed in Appendix 1 of the Publication Policies (Regulation 19) document.</p> <p>Further details are set out in the paper RBKC Five Year Housing Land Supply and Stepped Housing Trajectory, October 2022.</p> | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 27. | Does the level of supply provide any 'head room' (that is additional supply above that required) to enable you to react quickly to any unforeseen changes in circumstances and to ensure that the full requirement will be met during the plan period? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Council's housing trajectory shows a 5.6 years' supply using the stepped trajectory approach described in response to Q 25 above. Therefore, it does have some headroom. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 28. | Is the Council reliant on the delivery of any 'windfall' sites (sites not specifically identified in the development plan) during the plan period and if so, how many and when? Is there compelling | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>KEY QUESTIONS</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | <p>evidence to confirm that such sites will continue to come forward?</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>The housing trajectory has a windfall element corresponding to the assumptions used in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 regarding small sites. The figure used in the first five years is 258 homes. In years 6 to 10 it is 645 homes. Further details are set out in the paper RBKC Five Year Housing Land Supply and Stepped Housing Trajectory, October 2022 and the Policy Formulation Report for Policy HO1, October 2022.</p> <p>London Plan paragraph 4.1.8 highlights that modelling in the SHLAA shows a capacity for development on small sites for 12,000 new homes a year. It makes it clear that the reliance on this windfall element is part of the policy framework set out in the London Plan. It goes on to state that <i>“Boroughs should identify as many sites, including small sites, as possible via their Development Plan Documents. However, because of the nature of some sites (as set out above), including the particular incremental characteristics of small sites, boroughs are supported in using windfall assumptions in their five-year housing trajectories based on the numbers set out in Table 4.2. This is because, in contrast with recent annual trends on small sites, the figures in Table 4.2 are considered to better reflect a minimum baseline for housing delivery given the policy focus on developing small sites for housing in this Plan (Policy H2 Small sites) and the package of measures outlined in the London Housing Strategy.” (emphasis added)</i></p> <p>Furthermore, the Council now protects offices/Class E uses from changes to residential in a much more focused area as opposed to the whole Borough which has always been the approach. The area now covered by an Article 4 Direction that came into force in July 2022 is focused on town centres and clusters of offices in the Borough. While it offers protection to the large majority of offices, buildings in Class E use outside of the area covered by the Article 4 Direction would now be able to, in principle, change to residential use.</p> <p>We have undertaken a desktop assessment to understand the scale of housing supply from this new source and this is included in Appendix 2. The assessment assumes that properties no longer protected by the Article 4 Direction are likely to convert to residential where there is a greater differential in values of residential over. In addition, properties that were originally built as a house could be more easily converted</p> | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | back from the commercial use. In areas where residential values are significantly more than commercial, such conversions are even more likely. Our assessment shows around 280 homes could be provided under prior approval or through planning permission. See Appendix 2 of the RBKC Five Year Housing Land Supply and Stepped Housing Trajectory, October 2022 for details. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 29. | Does the local plan policies update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: Local Plan Policy HO3: Community Housing sets out the tenure and type of housing the Council will seek. Policy HO4: Housing Size and Standards sets out the size of homes both for market and community homes. It also sets out accessibility standards for homes. These policies are based on findings in the Local Housing Needs Assessment updated in September 2022. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 30. | Does the local plan policies update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | | | this requirement or not | will meet this requirement | |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>The Local Plan address the needs of a range of groups. It includes the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HO3: Community Housing – provides policies to secure community housing for those on low incomes. It seeks genuinely affordable homes by setting out the preferred products as social rent, London Affordable Rent and Intermediate Rents at the lowest ward level in the Borough which is currently Notting Dale. - HO4: Housing Size and Standards – sets out the size of homes both for market and community homes which will cater to families as well as single person/smaller households based on latest evidence of needs. It also sets out accessibility standards for homes and adopts the ‘optional’ building regulations to ensure all homes are built to the higher accessibility standards given the need and ageing population. - HO5: Specialist Housing – supports a range of housing for older people and resists the loss of supported housing and residential hostels for vulnerable people. - HO6: Other Housing Products – provides the policy for build to rent, co-living and student housing. - HO8: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation sets out a criteria based policy for assessing planning applications for permanent or temporary sites. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 31. | Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | Does the local plan policies update provide for the delivery of the full need for affordable housing? If not, can you explain and justify why? | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 32. | Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence? Does the local plan policies update make adequate provision for the identified needs? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Council has prepared a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment update to support the Local Plan. This confirms that there is no need for additional accommodation for those who fall within the government’s definition of Gypsy and Travellers. The assessment does not identify need for travelling showpeople as there are no travelling showpersons plots in the borough. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| 33. | Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs? | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: There is no identified need for further accommodation for either Gypsies and Travellers or for Travelling Show people.</p> <p>In accordance with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, Policy HO8 includes criteria to assess any planning application that may come forward for traveller pitches.</p> <p>Due to the Borough's built up nature and competing land uses there is no opportunity to allocate further sites for pitches.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| H | List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery | N/A. The Council has not identified any additional need. | | | | |
| Justified approaches to plan policy and content | | | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| 34. | <p>Where thresholds are set in policies which trigger specific policy requirements, are these thresholds justified by evidence and is this clear in the supporting text?</p> <p>[You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]</p> | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The following policies set thresholds which trigger planning requirements. These are considered to be justified by proportionate evidence and this is clearly explained within the supporting text of the relevant policies:</p> <p>GB1 – Circular economy – sets a threshold for major development to submit a circular economy statement. This approach is supported by local evidence in the Evidence Study on Greening Issues (July 2021) as well as the London Plan 2021.</p> <p>GB2 – Whole life-cycle carbon - sets a threshold for major development to submit a whole life-cycle carbon assessment. This approach is supported by local evidence in the Evidence Study on Greening Issues (July 2021) as well as the London Plan 2021.</p> <p>GB3 – Energy and net zero carbon – sets a threshold for major development to be net zero carbon and meet a range of on-site carbon reduction targets. This approach is supported by local evidence in the Evidence Study on Greening Issues (July 2021) and is in accordance with London Plan 2021 Policy SI 2 and the latest energy assessment guidance published by the GLA (currently published in June 2022).</p> <p>GB5 – Overheating – sets a threshold for major development to minimise overheating risk, reduce reliance on active cooling and undertake overheating risk assessment. This approach is supported by local evidence in the Evidence Study on Greening Issues (July 2021) and is in accordance with London Plan 2021 Policy SI 4 and the latest energy assessment guidance published by the GLA (currently published in June 2022).</p> | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <p>GB6 - Air quality – sets a threshold for certain types of development to submit an air quality assessment and dust risk assessment and for certain types of development located in designated Air Quality Focus Areas to adopt an air quality positive. This approach is consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy SI 1.</p> <p>GB15 – Green infrastructure – sets a threshold for major development to achieve a defined urban greening factor score (UGF). This approach is supported by local evidence in the Evidence Study on Greening Issues (July 2021) and is in accordance with London Plan Policy G5.</p> <p>GB16 – Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces – sets a requirement for major development that includes residential floorspace to provide on-site external play space, including for under-fives. This approach is consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy S4.</p> <p>GB17 – Biodiversity – sets a threshold for major development to submit an ecological appraisal. This approach is consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy G6, as well as national policy and the latest national legislation and guidance.</p> <p>GB20 – Contaminated land – sets a threshold for certain types of development to undertake appropriate land contamination investigation work and if required take action to address issues of contaminated land. This approach is in accordance with the national and London Plan policy and guidance.</p> <p>HO2 Small Sites – defined in the London Plan as sites of less than 0.25 hectares.</p> <p>HO3 Housing Size and Standards – applies to all homes as all homes must be built to minimum floorspace standards and provide for the housing needs in the Borough. The policy requires ‘optional’ accessibility standards set out in Building Regulations which is based on the evidence of need of an ageing population and the number of people who have a disability.</p> <p>Policies HO5/HO6/HI7/HO8 do not have a trigger threshold as are about a specific housing type.</p> <p>HO3 Community Housing – The Council will seek to maximise the provision of community housing in the Borough and require community housing from development (including extensions) creating new residential floorspace of 650 sq m GIA or more. Paragraph 3.29 provides further clarification and states “New residential floorspace in Policy HO3 will generally be in addition to existing residential floorspace.</p> |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | | <p>However, where existing residential floorspace is subject to substantial demolition this will also be considered new floorspace. In all cases where the trigger floorspace of 650 sq m of new residential is reached community housing will be calculated collectively on all gross residential floorspace (GIA) on the site.” The justification for this is provided in paragraph 3.27 to 3.28 of the NLPR. Also see response to Q F above.</p> <p>TC1 - Location of town centre uses – requires an impact assessment for new out of centre retail (E(a) floorspace of more than 400 sq m (GEA). This is the scale of a metro format supermarket, development unlikely to have the potential to harm an existing centre. Larger quantum of retail floorspace do have the potential to have an impact, given the very small size of many of our neighbourhood centres. However, any RIA must be proportionate to the size of the development.</p> <p>TC1 - Location of town centre uses – requires an impact assessment for new out of centre retail non-retail town centre uses of more than 2,500 sq m (GEA). This is the threshold recommended within para 90 of the NPPF.</p> <p>BC3 – Affordable Workspace – New development which provides an uplift of more than 5,000 sq m (GIA) must provide affordable workspace equating to a minimum of 10% of the additional employment floorspace. Para 6.30 notes that the scale of relevant development is such that the affordable floorspace being provided is of a scale that can successfully operate in its own right. The viability of the affordable workspace requirements is considered in chapter 8 of the Council’s ELS.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: None | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 35. | Does the local plan policies update avoid deferring details on strategic matters to other documents? If it does, is it clear <i>why</i> matters will be covered in | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | other Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate? | | | this requirement or not | | will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Local plan policies do not defer details on strategic matters to other documents. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 36. | Where the local plan policies update defines a hierarchy do policies throughout the Plan consistently: (i) reflect this hierarchical approach; (ii) make clear the level of protection afforded to designations depending on their status within the hierarchy; and (iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy? [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.] | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: The Local Plan does include a number of hierarchies. Where used they are consistent with National Policy and, where relevant, with the London Plan. The Chapter “Town Centres” sets out the hierarchy of town centres. This is consistent with the London Town Centre Network as per the London Plan. Policy TC1 (Location of town centre uses) sets out the town centre first approach to new town centre uses. | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p align="center">Assessment</p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Policy TC2 (nature of development within town centres) requires all development within the centre to reflect the position of the centre within the network.</p> <p>Policy BC1 (Business uses), sets out a hierarchy for the location for new office development. This is consistent with the town centre first approach, although also supports new offices in our Employment Zones.</p> <p>The Chapter "Conservation and Design" follows the hierarchy for preserving heritage assets in National Policy, and the special considerations to be applied to the different categories of heritage asset are set out within policies CD3, CD4, CD5 and CD6. Undesignated heritage assets and buildings of no heritage interest are covered by more general design policies.</p> | | | | |
| <p align="center">37.</p> | <p>Where policies seek to limit certain uses, is this justified by evidence and is the rationale clear in the supporting text to the policy and in the evidence.</p> <p>[For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]</p> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Policy GB16 (Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces) seeks to protect Metropolitan Open Land, public open space, private communal open space and local green space. This approach is justified in the text and is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy HO1 (Delivery and protection of homes) protects loss of homes including through amalgamations and loss of HMOs. This is justified given the overwhelming need of new homes in the Borough and the NPPF objective of boosting housing supply. Paragraphs 3.13 to 3.18 provide the justification in the NLPR.</p> | | | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|---|
| | | <p>Policy HO5 (Specialist Housing) protects older people’s housing, supported housing and residential hostels. This is based on the evidence of need which is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment. Paragraphs 3.75 – 3.77 provide the justification in the NLPR.</p> <p>Policy HO6 (Other housing products) protects student accommodation. This is based on the evidence of need which is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment. Paragraphs 3.58 – 3.67 provide the justification in the NLPR.</p> <p>Policies TC1 (Location of town centre uses) and BC1 (Business uses) note that the main town centre uses are not permitted outside of identified locations unless these have been sequentially tested. This approach is justified in the text and is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy TC3 (Diversity of uses within town centre). This sets out the proportion of certain non E class town centre uses which may be appropriate within the primary and secondary frontages of our town centres. This approach is justified in the text and is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy TC8 (Hotels) seeks to protect hotels in certain defined parts the borough, unless evidence is provided that the use is no longer viable. The rationale is set out in the supporting text.</p> <p>Policy BC1 (Business uses) seeks to protect offices and industrial uses. The supporting text provides a rational for this approach, implementing the recommendation within the ELS which seeks the protection of offices a necessary if the borough is to meet is OAN for this use.</p> <p>Policy BC1 (Business uses) seeks to resist the un-fettered provision of new homes within our Employment Zones. The supporting text provides a rational for this approach, noting the role that Employment Zones play in supporting our business sector and in providing some of the few opportunities for the creation of new office and business floorspace.</p> <p>Policy SI1 (Social Infrastructure and Facilities) seeks to resist the loss of existing social and community uses. This approach is justified in the supporting text and is consistent with the NPPF and London Plan 2021.</p> |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| 38. | <p>Is it clear that any standards proposed for development are justified and deliverable, taking into account the scale of the development? Where relevant, are they consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Code and National Model Design Code?</p> <p>[For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]</p> | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: HO4 C. Housing Size and Standards adopts the Nationally Described Space Standards.</p> <p>GB16 Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces – sets a requirement for major development that includes residential floorspace to provide on-site external play space, including for under-fives. This approach is consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy S4.</p> <p>S11 Social Infrastructure and Facilities requires new social and community facilities to be well-designed, inclusive and easily accessible. This approach is consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy S1.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| Deliverability | | | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| 39. | Has the viability of the local plan policies update been suitably tested and does this testing cover all requirements including in respect of any required standards, affordable housing provision and transport and other infrastructure needs and if relevant the implications of CIL? | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: The Local Plan has been subject to a whole plan viability assessment – RBKC Viability Study Update (October 2022), which concludes that the appraisal results support the emerging policies, finding them to be generally viable across the Borough. Lack of viability in some of the various circumstances tested means that when those particular sites come forward where viability is marginal, a degree of flexibility will need to be applied. This reflects current practice in the borough and also reflects the approach taken in the London Plan. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 40. | Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence? Is it clear the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan policies update? | -2 No, we do not meet this requirement | -1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement | 0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | +1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | +2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |

| | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| KEY QUESTIONS | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The NLPR reflects the conclusions and recommendations of the whole plan viability assessment – RBKC Viability Study Update (October 2022). It is clear that viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the NLPR policies.</p> <p>In addition, the Publication (Regulation 19) Local Plan has been developed alongside and informed by the viability assessment of the Pre-Publication (Regulation 18) version – RBKC Viability Study (Feb 2022).</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 41. | Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored, and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>The key documents for the monitoring and management of the plan are the IIA, the Authority’s Monitoring Report and the proposed Monitoring Framework.</p> <p>The IIA considers each policy of the plan, testing these against a framework of objectives established at the beginning of the plan making process and updated at each stage. It assesses the impacts of each policy and allows modifications to be made where necessary.</p> <p>The annual Authority Monitoring Reports collect data relevant to the Local Plan, consider permissions and completions and help us consider the effectiveness of the policies within the Local Plan.</p> | | | | |

| | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| KEY QUESTIONS | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | <p>The AMR also reports on the Council’s annual town centre surveys, surveys which allow us to assess the ongoing health of our town centres. The AMRs are available on the Council’s website.</p> <p>Appendix 4 of the NLPR sets out the key monitoring indicators that will be used to indicate whether the policies in the NLPR are have their intended impact.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 42. | <p>Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for <u>plan review</u>?</p> <p>Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?</p> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: Appendix 4 of the Local Plan sets out the principal monitoring indicators. This includes triggers for review. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| | Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity) | | | | | |
| | | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| 43. | Does the local plan policies update clearly set out the timeframe that it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will the strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years <u>from adoption</u> ? Does the evidence relied on to support those policies correspond/cover this whole period? Where larger scale developments are proposed as part of the strategy, does the vision look further ahead (at least 30 years)? | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: Appendix 3 of the Local Plan sets out which policies are strategic and which policies are not. | | | | |
| 44. | Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which <u>adopted</u> Development Plan policies it supersedes? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: Yes. Appendix 2 of the Local Plan is a schedule of saved and superseded policies. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 45. | Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | Reason for score: | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> | | | | |
| | | <p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Local Plan is driven by a string vision (V1), which sets out the Council’s ambitions and the priorities for future development. This vision dovetails with the Council’s other wider or higher level priorities. The three priorities, to be “green”, “inclusive” and “liveable” inform all the other policies.</p> <p>These ambitions will be achieved in two ways – through the “places” and the associate allocations; and through a suite of topic based policies.</p> <p>Great care has been made in drafting the polices in such a way as to be clear and unambiguous, and designed for use in the development management process. Colleagues in the development management team have been involved in the drafting of policies to ensure that they are effective for decision making.</p> <p>The first criterion in each policy normally makes the policy objective clear.</p> | | | | |
| 46. | <p>For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; and (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?</p> <p>Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan policies update are these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?</p> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p> | <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p> | <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p> | <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p> | <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p> |
| | | <p>Reason for score:</p> <p>Where a policy relates to a particular part of the borough, a map has been included within the relevant chapter within the NLPR. Where appropriate, for example the boundary of a conservation area, the area in question will also be included as a searchable GIS layer on the Council’s online planning map to ensure that boundaries can be clearly seen. For the purposes of decision-making online planning map shall be used</p> | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <p>instead of relying on the maps in the Local Plan, as online map allows for zooming in the area and showing greater detail.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.30 of the NLPR clarifies that the specific constraints layers on the Proposals Map will be available in a digital format on the Council’s website to provide clear and legible boundaries.</p> <p>Thematic policies</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Air Quality Focus Areas. The boundaries of AQFAs are also provided on an online interactive map. <p>Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map showing parks and open spaces in the borough categorised in accordance with the Policy GB16. <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map showing site allocations and other sites in the Housing Trajectory. Site allocations boundaries are provided on an online interactive map, while sites in the housing trajectory are included for illustrative purposes only. • Map showing area of North Kensington where Policy HO3(M) will apply. The boundary corresponds with CIL Charging Zones F and H which can be viewed on an online interactive map. <p>Design and Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Archaeological Priority Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and St Paul’s Strategic View. All layers can be viewed on an online interactive map. • Map of Tall building definition for specific localities. For illustrative purposes only. Boundaries in greater detail can be viewed on an online interactive map. • Map of Suitable locations for tall buildings and maximum heights. Suitable locations are all identified using Sites Allocations References and maximum building heights range is shown in the key for each site. |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Protected Views. This shows a location and direction of the view. More details are in Conservation Area Appraisals. <p>Town centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of all town centres. The boundaries of the centres and of the primary and secondary frontages is provided on an online interactive map. • Area of retail deficiency. • SW5, the areas where hotels will not be protected. <p>Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Employment Zones and business premises in the Borough. The detailed boundaries are also viewable on an online interactive map. • Map of Areas where Article 4 Direction for removal of PDR for changes of use from Class E to Class C3 applies for illustrative purposes only. Detailed boundaries can be viewed on an online interactive map. • Affordable workspaces. Map showing CIL charging areas F and H and the two opportunity areas. Detailed boundaries can be viewed on an online interactive map. <p>Social Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Social Infrastructure – for illustrative purposes only. Decision making should be based on the established use of the premises, case by case. If the established use falls under the definition of social and community uses, the Policy SI1 will apply. <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of Cycle Routes Network – for illustrative purposes only. <p>Allocations</p> <p>The NLPR includes a number of site allocations. The detailed boundaries of all these allocation are included within the plan, and repeated within the online planning map.</p> <p>Places</p> |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | The NLPR includes a number of Places, or areas where they may be opportunities for future development. Each is informed by a vision. However, these places do not have place specific policies, and as such no detailed boundaries have been drawn up. The Place Map has been included to draw the reader’s attention to key features and / or opportunities. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 47. | Does each local plan policies update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: The NLPR policies have been carefully drafted to make it clear the type of development that they will promote. Where development promotes a specific type of use, this is generally referred to within the policy itself. For example policy BC1 (Business) set out the uses that will be supported within the borough’s three Employment Zone, noting the difference in approach for those parts of the Freston/ Latimer Employment Zone which lies within the SQW Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Many terms relating to forms of development are also defined within the Glossary, such as ‘major development’.</p> <p>The site allocations note the specific type (and were appropriate quantum) of development required for that site.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been specifically drafted to promote the use of positive wording, and policies are generally phrased to stipulate the type of development that will be supported. Only in exceptional circumstances, where it is considered necessary to achieve the objectives of the policy, does the Local Plan seek to include negative language (e.g. GB16(B) “the following open spaces are protected, and any loss will be resisted”).</p> | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: None | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 48. | <p>Do policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on (i) scale; (ii) use; or (iii) location of development proposed.</p> <p>[Note: If you have said ‘all development’ this implies equal application irrespective of the development scale/use/location and this may not be either justified or deliverable]</p> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: Policies have been drafted to clearly stipulate the type of uses and (where appropriate) the scale of that use will be appropriate in a particular area.</p> <p>Some policy will apply to all developments such as the London Plan requires all development to meet air quality neutral benchmarks which is set out in Policy GB6: Air Quality or Policy CD2: Design quality, character and growth requiring all development to meet the highest standard of urban design and architectural quality. Other policies have very specific thresholds or relate to a specific type of development such as housing for older people. This is clear in the policies.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |

| | KEY QUESTIONS | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p> |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> | <p>State how many policies are in your local plan update?</p> <p>Can you list any policies within the local plan update that: (i) repeat parts of other policies within the plan; (ii) replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.</p> | <p>There are 104 policies in the NLPR, including 16 site allocations and 19 “place” policies. Of these 92 are new policies and 12 “saved” from the previous document. The latter do not form part of this review.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been drafted in such a way as to avoid internal repetition.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been drafted in such a way as to avoid unnecessary repetition of paragraphs in the NPPF. One policy, TC1: Location of new town centre uses, makes specific referenced to the NPPF and the need for new town centre uses to take the town centre first approach.</p> <p>Reference to the NPPF have been included in supporting text where necessary, but care has been taken not to merely replicate or repeat policies in the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the Local Plan should be read as whole, and as such cross referencing should not be necessary. However, some cross referencing has been included when considered necessary to sign post particular requirements, often at the request of applications as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The policies which include any cross referencing are: GB18 (Trees and Landscape) xr to GB17 (Biodiversity); GB19 (Waste Management) xr to Policy GB2 (Circular economy); HO1 (Delivery and Protection of Homes) xr to HO3 (Community Housing); HO5 (Specialist Housing) xr to H03 (Community Housing); HO6 (Other Housing Products) xr to HO3 (Community Housing); TC4 (The Evening Economy) xr to T3 (Al fresco dining).</p> <p>The Council recognises that the Local Plan must be in general conformity with the Local Plan. As such there are references throughout the supporting text to the London Plan. However, references within the Policies are limited. These include a number of the policies relating to housing, reiterating the need to meet the London Plans housing targets, and the mechanisms by which the London Plan requires the provision of affordable homes. These include HO1, which references the London plan housing target; HO2, which references the London Plan’s small sites component of meeting the Housing target; HO3 which references to the threshold approach to the provision of community housing and viability testing; HO6, which references the LP’s definition of student housing. In addition CD7, references Policy D9 and the London Plan treatment of tall buildings.</p> |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| 49. | <p>Based on the above, have you tried to avoid unnecessary repetition (of the NPPF or other policies within the local plan policies update) and cross referencing in policies?</p> <p>If you find duplication or repetition you may want to take minute to consider whether this is appropriate.</p> | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: Cross-reference within the Local Plan to other policies or other guidance at the national (e.g. NPPF and PPG), London (e.g. London Plan 2021 and LPGs) and local (e.g. Local Plan and SPDs) level is limited to instances where it is considered necessary to clarify application of the policy or helpful for signposting purposes. For example, the supporting text of policies GB1, GB2 and GB3 refer to relevant London Plan 2021 policies (SI 7 and SI 2) as the approach set out in the London Plan forms part of the evidence justifying the approach proposed in the Local Plan policy. The exact policy wording and criteria are not repeated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Housing – The Local Plan sets out bespoke policies for the Borough such as introducing a stepped trajectory in Policy HO1, setting out a local threshold for community housing and tenure mix in Policy HO3. Similarly, our approach to other types of housing is based on local needs. A conscious effort is made to avoid duplication but where necessary cross reference to the London Plan is made for completeness to the reader.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy TC1 (Location of town centre uses) does repeat the town centre first/ sequential test for new main town centre uses. This is considered necessary given that this is the principle that drives this approach. For clarity inclusion within the NPPF (with a cross reference to the NPPF and the London Plan) is considered appropriate. This also reflects comments received from consultees.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: None | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a | | | | |

| KEY QUESTIONS | | Assessment | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 50. | Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| | | <p>Reason for score: Reference to regulatory requirements such as building regulations and British standards are limited to where it is considered necessary to clarify application of the policy or helpful for signposting purposes. For example, the supporting text of Policy GB3 – energy and net zero carbon refers to Part L of the building regulations as it is considered necessary because the policy seeks to exceed those minimum standards. The exact wording of such regulatory requirements are not repeating in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Housing Policy HO4 by necessity adopts the optional building regulations but sets out a bespoke percentage requirement.</p> <p>Policy TC4 (the evening economy) does note the role that the licencing and environmental health regimes can have in mitigating impact of evening uses. However, it also note that the planning regime will be better placed to mitigate, or resist entirely, if/when appropriate.</p> | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: None | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |
| 51. | Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker? | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| | | No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| <p>[For instance, policies should avoid using overly subjective terms such as “to the Council’s satisfaction”, “considered necessary by the Council”</p> | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | KEY QUESTIONS | Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i> | | | | |
| | or “appropriate” without associated clarification.] | | | | | |
| | | Reason for score: The policies within the NLPR have been drafted in such a way as to be clear and unambiguous. | | | | |
| | | Implications of taking no further action: | | | | |
| | | Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: | | | | |
| | | Reviewer Comments: | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Date of assessment: | |
| Assessed by: | |
| Checked by: | |
| Overall Score: | |
| Comments: | |

