

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Local Plan Partial Review

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist

May 2017

This self-assessment of the Local Plan Partial Review Submission version is based on the Planning Advisory Service’s Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<i>Positively Prepared:</i> the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.		
<p><i>Vision and Objectives</i></p> <p>Has the LPA clearly identified what the issues are that the DPD is seeking to address? Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the DPD is seeking to achieve?</p> <p>Does the DPD contain clear vision(s) and objectives which are specific to the place? Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues, the vision(s) and the objectives?</p> <p>Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</p> <p>Have reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy been considered?</p> <p>Are the policies internally consistent?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD and other documents which set out (where applicable) the vision, strategic objectives, key outcomes expected, spatial portrait and issues to be addressed. • Relevant sections of the DPD which explain how policies derive from the objectives and are designed to meet them. • The strategic objectives of the DPD, and the commentary in the DPD of how they derive from the spatial portrait and vision, and how the objectives are consistent with one another. • Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments through evidenced infrastructure delivery planning. • Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means 	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Local Plan identifies the issues that the Local Plan will address. It is also satisfied that the Local Plan contains a clear vision with a direct relationship between the identified issues, the vision and the objectives.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the Local Plan paints the spatial portrait of the Borough, the function of which is explained within para 2.1.4, or to “<i>establish spatial patterns and common themes, to inform the shaping of the Vision and Strategic Objectives.</i>”</p> <p>Section 2.3 draws together the Borough’s key characteristics, the broad spatial patterns and strategic issues which must be addressed through the policies elsewhere within the plan. They also lead to the overarching vision for the Borough which is explicit in setting out how the Council wishes the Borough to develop over the lifetime of the plan. (CV1: Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success.)</p> <p>The vision has three elements, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To stimulate regeneration across the borough and in areas of change</i> • <i>To enhance the reputation of our national and international destinations</i> • <i>To uphold our residential quality of life</i> <p>Section 3.2 explains how this over-arching vision will be delivered or, “<i>to deliver this vision, strategic objectives are needed to guide decisions of spatial planning. The underpinning issues can be shaped into directional statements of intent, which can directly guide decision</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives? Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p>	<p>of delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure. 	<p><i>making.</i></p> <p>This chapter includes a table which clearly shows the relationship between the issues and the strategic objectives. These seven strategic objectives form the basis of chapters in the delivery section of the Local Plan, namely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> keep life local, foster vitality, offer better travel choices, maintain and extend our engaging public realm, renew our legacy, and increase a diversity of housing and to respect environmental limits. <p>So for example, one of the issues identified by the Council is <i>“providing for new residential development in a way which diversifies tenure patterns and house sizes.”</i> This is translated into <i>“the demand for housing of all types and the current concentrations of housing tenures.”</i> The Strategic Objective is then, <i>“to achieve a diversity of housing.”</i> (CO6.) This is <i>“our strategic objective is to boost the supply of housing to further the aim of sustainable development including a diversity of housing that, at a local level, will cater for a variety of housing needs of borough residents, and is built for adaptability and to a high quality.”</i></p> <p>Chapter 35, “Diversity of Housing” then includes the policies used to determine planning applications: policies concerned with topics including increasing housing supply, delivery of affordable housing, housing standards, meeting specific housing needs, estate regeneration and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</p> <p>There are no gaps in the policies with regard the objectives, as the policies derive from the topics identified to address the Strategic Objectives. So for example, the policies that would address the Strategic Objective of “Fostering Vitality” are those are those which</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>relate to town centres, retail, arts and cultural uses, hotels, creative industries and to businesses. All these policies have been tailored to address and implement the strategic objective (in this case Strategic Objective CO2 or that <i>“the quality of life of our predominantly residential borough is enhanced by a wide variety of cultural, creative and commercial uses which can significantly contribute to the well-being of residents and to the capital’s role as a world city.”</i>)</p> <p>The issues and options consultation (December 2015) sets out the reasonable alternatives that were considered as possible approaches to help achieve the strategic objectives. These were also considered by the IIA which again appraised each of the different reasonable alternatives. The IIA has considered further options and assessed these policy options and alternatives at each stage of the process, and has informed the policy as appropriate. Other reasonable alternatives are considered as and when identified, be this by evolving guidance and policy, new evidence or as a result of representations received.</p> <p>The Policy Formulation reports prepared for Draft, Publication and Submission stages of the Local Plan Partial Review also explain how each of the different alternatives were examined and why the preferred options were chosen.</p> <p>However, the Council does recognise that its hands are tied in terms of the quantum of housing that it must deliver. It has a housing target, a target within the London Plan, and must seek to achieve this.</p> <p>The submission policies are internally consistent with the other adopted policies within the Plan, both those which are the subject of the current review, and those which have already been reviewed, and will sit alongside them.</p> <p>All the policies within the Local Plan are set out to deliver the seven Strategic Objectives, and cross references between policies that cover the same objective are provided. For example, Climate Change, Waste, Flooding, Biodiversity and Air Quality policies all refer to protecting our natural resources, which is one of the seven Strategic</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Objectives (Respecting Environmental Limits.)</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the objectives have realistic timescales. Where relevant, Chapters 5 to 15, the “Places” also include the detailed site allocations. As well as setting out the allocated land use, the principles shaping the development and the necessary infrastructure requirements and planning obligations, they include a specific section concerned with delivery. These set out the delivery agencies, the delivery milestones, the funding arrangements and the site constraints and the risks.</p> <p>The delivery agencies have been consulted on each iteration of the plan. Both the Submission Consultation Statement (May 2017), and the Schedule of Responses (May 2017) include a section concerned with the Vision and the Objectives. This sets out the comments received from the key agencies as well as the Council’s responses to these comments.</p> <p>In addition section 2 of Chapter 29 of the Local Plan considers infrastructure and planning contributions, and how these allow the Local Plan to be “<i>realistic about what can be achieved and when</i>”. It notes that the, “delivery of infrastructure is critical to the delivery of all the strategic objectives of the Local Plan.” As such the chapter contains Policy C1 which provides the basis by which such contributions can, and will, be sought. Chapter 37, “Infrastructure” puts flesh onto the bones, explaining the detailed infrastructure requirements across the borough. This is informed by the Council’s Infrastructure Development Plan. (February 2017).</p> <p>In some cases, for example the estate renewal allocations of Silchester Estates and Warwick Road Estate, the Council itself is the key delivery agency.</p> <p>In the case of the single largest allocation, the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area, the Council has worked closely with the current owners and the key delivery agencies to ensure that the site will be developed within the expected timetable. The Development</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Infrastructure Funding Study for the site identifies the infrastructure required to support the development and that this can be funded from the development. The Council will be producing a Supplementary Planning Document in 2017 to provide further guidance on the development of this site. This document will set out options for development of the site if key infrastructure elements: the Elizabeth Line station and the road bridge cannot be delivered. The timescale for the production of this document is included in the latest Local Development Scheme (May 2017).</p> <p>In addition, Chapter 40 includes the Borough’s housing trajectory, which sets out in some detail how the Council expects to meet its housing targets, over time.</p> <p>The Council’s Local Development Scheme (May 2017) sets out the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure.</p>
<p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paras 6-17)</i></p> <p>Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.</p> <p>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless: —any adverse impacts of doing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evidence base which establishes the development needs of the plan area (see Justified below) and includes a flexible approach to delivery (see ‘Section 3 Effective’, below). • An audit trail showing how and why the quantum of development, preferred overall strategy and plan area distribution of development were arrived at. • Evidence of responding to opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas (for example, the marine 	<p>All the parts of the Local Plan which are subject of the current review are fully compliant with the NPPF. This is set out with the respective Policy Formulation Reports.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned and published an extensive suite of reports which establish the development needs of the Borough. These include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Retail and Leisure Needs Study (NLP) (April 2016) This sets out the need for additional retail and leisure uses across the borough. • The Employment Land Need and Availability Background Paper (2016). This summarises a range of other published reports and studies to determine the unmet need for business uses across the Borough. Of principal importance is the GLA’s London Office Policy Review 2015. • The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Cobweb) (December 2015.) This considers the Borough’s objectively assessed housing

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>—specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</p>	<p>area)</p>	<p>needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2016). This considers need for Gypsies and Travellers. • The Gypsy and Traveller Site Appraisal Study (2017). This considers the opportunities to provide additional pitches for Gypsy and Travellers in the Borough. • Waste Technical Paper for Waste Planning Authorities in the WRWA Area (January 2017) • Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (February 2017) • The Kensal Canalside Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) (PBA) (October 2016) <p>All the relevant studies are included on the examination page of the Council’s website.</p> <p>The intention of the strategic objectives and of the associated policies is to meet these needs identified within these reports and articulated by Policy CP1 (Core Policy: Quanta of Development.)</p> <p>The Council does however recognise that given its built up nature, much of this need will be constrained by capacity.</p> <p>The link between the needs identified within the respective evidence documents and the chosen policy approach are set out within the respective Policy Formulation Reports.</p> <p>The Local Plan is flexible enough to adapt to rapid change as the overall strategy does not rely on the delivery of one particular element in one particular way.</p> <p>Chapter 39 sets out the contingencies and risks for the major sites, the site allocations. The NPPG on Local Plans makes it clear that when delivery of critical infrastructure is uncertain, the Local Plan should address the consequences of this, including possible contingency</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>arrangements and alternative strategies.</p> <p>The Delivery and contingencies have also been considered as part of the Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is reflected within the infrastructure schedule, Chapter 37 of the Local Plan and the Kensal Canalside Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) (PBA) (October 2016).</p>
<p>Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (see model policy at www.planningportal.gov.uk) 	<p>The policies are compliant with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that meet the policy ambitions and criteria will be granted without delay.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been subject to an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). This includes a SA/SEA. The SA Objectives against which the policies within the Local Plan have been assessed are the elements of sustainable development. The IIA Report concludes that the LPPR policies and allocations will have many major beneficial effects across the borough. These include environmental benefits, such as biodiversity, water and land and cultural heritage, and also socio-economic benefits for such issues as equality, health, the economy, transport/accessibility, housing and energy efficiency. This demonstrates the Council's strategy is meeting the development needs of Kensington and Chelsea without significant adverse impacts. Indeed, the IIA indicates the LPPR strategy will deliver development that is sustainable. All of the iterations of the IIA are on the examination page of the Council's website.</p> <p>The Local Plan addresses the three dimensions to sustainable development; the economic, the social and the environmental.</p> <p>Chapter 1 of the Local Plan considers sustainable development. This reflects an amendment made in the previous review, on the "Miscellaneous matters" published in 2014 when the specific issue of conformity with the NPPF was considered. A new para 1.1.6 was added which states, "<i>the policies in the Local Plan follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and show how it is expressed locally. The Council will ensure that planning applications</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<i>that accord with policies in the Local Plan and the London Plan (and where relevant with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</i>
<p><i>Objectively assessed needs</i></p> <p>The economic, social and environmental needs of the authority area addressed and clearly presented in a fashion which makes effective use of land and specifically promotes mixed use development, and take account of cross-boundary and strategic issues.</p> <p>Note: Meeting these needs should be subject to the caveats specified in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (see above).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background evidence papers demonstrating requirements based on population forecasts, employment projections and community needs. • Technical papers demonstrating how the aspirations and objectives of the DPD are related to the evidence, and how these are to be met, including from consultation and associated with the Duty to Co-operate. 	<p>The evidence base used to support the Local Plan is set out in the respective Policy Formulation Reports.</p> <p>Of particular relevance will be the reports setting out the need for additional housing, for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches, for Waste, infrastructure and for additional employment floorspace.</p> <p>These reports, which have informed the Local Plan are all available on line. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Retail and Leisure Needs Study (NLP) (April 2016) This sets out the need for additional retail and leisure uses across the borough. • The Employment Land Need and Availability Background Paper (2016). This summarises a range of other published reports and studies to determine the unmet need for business uses across the Borough. Of principal importance is the GLA's London Office Policy Review 2015. • The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Cobweb) (December 2015.) This considers the Borough's objectively assessed housing needs. • The Joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2016). This considers need for Gypsies and Travellers. • The Gypsy and Traveller Site Appraisal Study (2017). This considers the opportunities to provide additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the Borough. • Waste Technical Paper for Waste Planning Authorities in the WRWA Area (January 2017) • Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (February 2017)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Kensal Canalside Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) (PBA) (October 2016) Kensal Canalside and North Pole Transportation Study (October 2016) <p>The Council has also worked closely with our prescribed Duty to Cooperate bodies to ensure that objectively assessed need is considered appropriately. Details of the actions carried out under our duty to cooperate in included in the respective Policy Formulation Reports.</p> <p>Policy CF5 considers the nature of development within the Borough's Employment Zones. This signals a sea change from the original policies in that it supports mixed use development within these areas, where the newly created residential uses help bring forward an increase in business floorspace. In additional, each of the site allocations support mixed use development, with the nature of this mixed use dependent on the nature of that site. These mixed uses sites assist the Borough in meeting its objectively assessed need for a variety of land uses, not least housing, retail and business uses.</p> <p>A letter of General Conformity has been received from the GLA (March 2017) which confirms that, in the view of the GLA, that the submission policies are in general conformity with the policies within the London Plan.</p> <p>Confirmations of commitment to ongoing joint working have been received from Lambeth, Wandsworth, Hammersmith and Fulham and OPDC.</p>
NPPF Principles: Delivering sustainable development		
1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)		
Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulation of a clear economic vision and strategy for the plan area linked to the Economic Strategy, 	The overarching Vision for the Borough (CV1) is explicit in seeking the provision of a range of job opportunities across the Borough and to support the growth of new business. This includes the range of town

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>encourages sustainable economic growth (21),</p>	<p>LEP Strategy and marine policy documents where appropriate.</p>	<p>centre A class uses, hotels and B class business. The need for additional floorspace is then set out with Policy CP1, which considers the quantum of development which the Council will seek to accommodate over the lifetime of the plan. This includes both office and retail floorspace.</p> <p>Chapter 31 of the LP sets out the policies which are intended to achieve the Strategic Vision (CO2) <i>“to foster vitality”</i>. This states that, <i>“our strategic objective to foster vitality is the quality of life of our predominantly residential borough is enhanced by a wide variety of cultural, creative and commercial uses which can significantly contribute to the wellbeing of residents and to the capital’s role as a world city.”</i> The council recognises that policies are needed to maintain a diverse mix of uses, if the Borough is not merely to become a reflection of high residential land values.</p> <p>The Council has prepared an Employment Land Need and Availability Background Paper (Oct 2016) which looks at the progress made in meeting in the need for new office floorspace identified by the GLA in their 2015 London Office Policy Review. The ELNA, updated through the respective Policy Formulation Report at Publication Policies stage, notes that there is a current under supply of some 86,600 sq m of additional office floorspace over the plan period. The Council’s policies seek to address the needs in the London context, which also recognise the imperative to meet our housing targets.</p> <p>Chapter 31, “Fostering Vitality” is explicit in supporting the provision of a diversity of B classes uses. It notes that <i>“one of the strengths of the borough’s office sector is its diversity, both in terms of location and in terms of premises type.”</i> It goes on to note that, <i>“It is the Council’s ambition to support the delivery through the provision of as wide range of office types in different locations with a distribution across the borough. The Borough can build upon its strengths as an increasingly popular location for the creative sector, whilst retaining the premises required by the more traditional accounting, legal or real estate sectors.”</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>(paragraph 31.3.37)</p> <p>This has a number of elements, with Local Plan Policy CF5 resisting the loss of existing business uses, allowing greater flexibility to try to encourage the provision of new business uses, and by allowing the introduction of higher value uses where this can assist in bringing forward new business development.</p> <p>This approach is only possible, with the exemption granted by the Government in 2013 for the office to residential permitted development rights.</p> <p>The Council has published a report which considers the viability of the office sector across the borough. This Office Market Review (Frost Meadowcroft (July 2014)) supports our approach as concludes that no parts of the Borough are inherently unviable for office development. As such the Council is satisfied that no sites are being protected for employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p> <p>Policies CF1, CF2 and CF3 seek to support the vitality and the viability of our town centres. New town centre uses will be supported in appropriate locations where they can be shown to address a need but where existing centres are not cannibalised. This is one of the central tenets of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Place chapters and, where relevant, the site allocations, are a spatial expression of these policies. They set out the ambitions to promote the Borough's town centres and to provide for employment needs. These allocate land for business and a range of uses which will support the Borough's economy.</p> <p>The policies have been shared with the LEP (now known as LEAP) at each stage, as one of the Borough's duty to cooperate bodies. No feedback has been received despite repeated requests.</p>
Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A criteria-based policy which meets identified needs and is positive and 	The Council recognises that there is potential for the Borough's economy to expand. This is illustrated by the predicted need for

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)</p>	<p>flexible in planning for specialist sectors, regeneration, infrastructure provision, environmental enhancement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22) 	<p>additional office and retail floorspace. The Council also recognises that the principal “barrier to investment” relates less to a lack of infrastructure or homes but to the large differential in value between commercial and residential uses. Unless “required” by the Local Plan, little office floorspace will come forward. This is not to say that the availability of housing is not important, although the Council does recognise that many of those who work within the Borough, do come in from other boroughs.</p> <p>The policies within the Local Plan seek to address this, by supporting the creation of new office floorspace across the Borough and by allowing higher value enabling development to bring forward mixed use sites within the existing Employment Zones.</p> <p>The following Local Plan policies set out the Council’s approach to meeting identified needs for the economy and for employment within the Borough. These set out the type uses which will be appropriate across the Borough.</p> <p>CF1 – Location of new shop uses CF2 – Retail development within town centres CF3 – Diversity of uses within town centres CF5 – Business uses CF6 –Creative and Cultural Businesses</p> <p>The Council’s policies are not prescriptive, other than ordinarily requiring the protection of employment uses. They allow flexibility and support changes of uses within the B class uses.</p> <p>An up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>purpose) has been carried out. This confirms that the Borough has a healthy office market with increasing rents and very low vacancy rates. Delivery of additional office floorspace is hindered by the high value of residential uses (normally the “chosen use”) rather than any weakness of the office market. Availability rates for offices have dropped still further across the Borough since the publication of these studies, now a historic lows of just 1.3%. (Q1 2017)</p> <p>The Local Plan is informed by an up-to-date assessment of the need for business floorspace across the borough, and its ongoing viability.</p> <p>Chapter 37 of the Local Plan considers the infrastructure requirements for development across the borough and for specific sites.</p> <p>The Local Plan recognises that some additional infrastructure is required to help deliver the borough’s strategic sites. These requirements are set out with the respective site allocation sections, with the implications of a failure to deliver within Chapter 39, “Contingencies and Risks for Site Allocations”.</p> <p>Of particular relevance to the delivery of the largest of the strategic sites, Kensal Canalside is the Kensal Canalside Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) (PBA) (October 2016).</p>
<p>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-37)</p>		
<p>Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan and its policies may include such matters as: definition of networks and hierarchies; defining town centres; encouragement of residential development on appropriate sites; allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available; consideration of retail and 	<p>In accordance with the NPPF and the London Plan, the Local Plan includes a suite of policies concerned with maintaining the diversity of uses within the Borough’s town centres, and with supporting their vitality and their viability.</p> <p>These include:</p> <p>CF1 – Location of new shop uses.</p> <p>This policy reiterates the town centre first approach to new town centre uses, whilst supporting the creation of new centres in areas where there</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>leisure proposals which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres.</p>	<p>is a deficiency in retail floorspace.</p> <p>CF2 – Retail development within town centres.</p> <p>This policy requires the scale of new development within a town centre to relate to the size, role and function of the town centre and to reflect the position of that centre within the retail hierarchy. The Council fully endorses the town centre hierarchy as set out within the London Plan.</p> <p>The GLA has confirmed in the Letter of General Conformity (March 2017) that they do not object to the Borough’s approach to town centres/ town centre hierarchy.</p> <p>CF3 – Diversity of uses within town centres.</p> <p>These policies set out what the Council considers to be the appropriate mix of uses within different town centres, and parts of centres.</p> <p>CK1 – Whilst not subject of this review, this policy ordinarily supports the protection of existing shop and other A class town centre uses when located outside a town centre.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an update to its 2010 Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment, the 2016 Retail and Leisure Needs Study which has assessed the need for additional retail and leisure needs across the borough over time. This suggests that the Borough’s centres are currently broadly in equilibrium and there is no need to allocate new sites until at least 2023.</p> <p>The RLNS considers the ability to accommodate this need within existing centres over the longer term, to 2028, concluding that the re-occupation of currently vacant units would be likely to accommodate a little over a third of new retail floorspace needed. The Place chapters and strategic allocations identify a number of other suitable sites, including the creation of new town centres within the Earl’s Court site allocation (CA6), the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area (Policy CA1)</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of the need to expand (the) town centre(s), considering the needs of town centre uses. Primary and secondary shopping frontages identified and allocated. 	<p>and around the Latimer Road Underground station (CF1).</p> <p>The Council has carried out a review of its town centre, within its Shops and Centres Background Paper (December 2015). This review forms one of the supporting reports helping to inform the Local Plan and the boundaries and frontages of the borough's centres.</p> <p>As such the Local Plan has identified primary and secondary frontages and where appropriate has amended the boundaries of the Borough's centres.</p> <p>As set out above, the Council's RLNS has considered the need for additional retail and leisure floorspace over the lifetime of the plan. It confirms that to 2023, the Borough's centres are in equilibrium and there is no need for the creation of a significant amount of new floorspace. That floorspace that is needed, in particular in convenience floorspace, will be allocated within the new centres (identified), and by the use of currently vacant units within the existing centres.</p> <p>Over the longer term, the site allocations for the Earl's Court and Kensal site allocations include allocations for a significant amount of new A class town centre uses.</p>
<p>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)</p>		
<p>Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant include a policy or policies which support the sustainable growth of rural businesses; promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments, and support local services and facilities. 	<p>N/A</p>
<p>4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)</p>		

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29)</p> <p>Balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29) including supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (30)</p> <p>Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. (31)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint working with adjoining authorities, transport providers and Government Agencies on infrastructure provision in order to support sustainable economic growth with particular regard to the facilities referred to in paragraph 31. • Policies encouraging development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport and a range of transport choices where appropriate, particularly the criteria in paragraph 35. • A spatial strategy and policy which seeks to reduce the need to travel through balancing housing and employment provision. • Policy for major developments which promotes a mix of uses and access to key facilities by sustainable transport modes. • If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) • Identification and protection of sites and routes where infrastructure could be developed to widen transport choice linked to the Local Transport Plan. 	<p>In accordance with the NPPF the Council has worked closely with adjoining authorities, transport providers and government agencies in order to support sustainable growth. Our detailed transport policies are set out within our Local Implementation Plan (LIP).</p> <p>The main objectives of the LIP are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve accessibility to places and services • Make it easier for residents to choose walking, cycling and public transport over private car ownership and use • Improve the quality, reliability and inclusivity of public transport • Reduce transport-related air pollution • Manage on-street parking and loading • Improve journey time reliability for all road users • Improve the appearance and efficiency of our streets and places • Reduce the number and severity of road accident casualties <p>Where appropriate, these objectives have been reflected within our planning policies.</p> <p>The LIP is also reflected within the Council’s own Local Infrastructure Plan (2017) where development can help deliver sustainable transport.</p> <p>The objectives within the Local Implementation Plan are reflected in Local Plan policies, and in particular Policy CT1. Policy CT1 addresses most of the points of this criterion, but is not the subject of this review so will not be detailed here.</p> <p>Both policies are a progression from the Strategic Objective of Chapter 21, Better Travel Choices, for “<i>walking, cycling and public transport to be safe, easy, attractive and inclusive for all and preferred by residents and visitors to private car ownership and use.</i>”</p> <p>The second element is the Council’s ongoing support for major</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. (32)</p> <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p> <p>Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. (35)</p> <p>Policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (37)</p> <p>For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities</p>		<p>infrastructure schemes. This is central to the Council’s vision (CV1) with the <i>“provision of better transport” being necessary to “stimulate regeneration across the borough and in areas of change.”</i></p> <p>The Council has been working closely with TfL and with other providers to help bring forward the Elizabeth Line station at Kensal and a station in Chelsea on Crossrail II. The former is closely related to the delivery of the capacity of development required on the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area, as set out in chapter 5.</p> <p>The infrastructure needed to support this development including schools, public transport and roads has been identified in detail in the Transport and Development Infrastructure Funding Study for Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area which are part of the evidence base.</p> <p>Support for new and enhanced rail infrastructure is set out in Policy CT2. As well as new stations at Kensal, North Pole Road and Chelsea the Council also supports the provision of step free access for a number of exiting stations. This is reflected with the site allocations of these sites.</p> <p>The Council is working with TfL to support the delivery of a Crossrail 2 station as set out in chapter 15 King’s Road / Sloane Square under vision, principles, priorities and delivery.</p> <p>We have also worked with Network Rail and Transport for London to deliver a Crossrail 1 station and other transport improvements to serve Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area and the wider area, as set out in chapter 5 Kensal under vision, principles, priorities and delivery.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. (38)</p> <p>The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice. (41)</p>		
<p>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</p>		
<p>Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications' masts and high speed broadband. (43)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new telecommunications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband, noting the caveats in para 44. 	<p>The Council supports the expansion of the electronic communications network, including telecommunications masts and high speed broadband. Such applications will be considered by the policies within Chapter 34 of the LP. Whilst not currently under review it will form part of the final Local Plan. Policy CL6 considers small scale alterations, including telecommunications equipment. Such development will be supported if high quality and discretely located.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>wide range of telecommunications development or insist on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development. (44)</p>		
<p>6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)</p>		
<p>Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of 5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. 20% buffer applies where there has been persistent under delivery of housing(47)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites; plus the buffer as appropriate • Where this element of housing supply includes windfall sites, inclusion of 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48) • A SHLAA 	<p>Five year housing supply</p> <p>The Council has identified a five year supply of specific deliverable sites including a 20% buffer moved forward from later in the plan period. This information is presented in Chapter 40 of the Local Plan and is updated annually in the Authority Monitoring Report. The Council's housing target from the London Plan is 733 dwellings per annum and with the 20% buffer it is 880 dwellings per annum. Over five years this amounts to a target of 4,398 dwellings. Chapter 40 demonstrates a five year supply of 4,416 dwellings.</p> <p>The tables presented in Chapter 40 provide details of the source of the five year housing supply. A significant proportion of the supply is expected to come from site allocations and other large sites (those providing 25 units or more) with planning permission.</p> <p>Windfall Sites</p> <p>The five year housing supply includes an estimate from small sites amounting to a total of 304 units. A small sites estimate of 152 dwellings is assumed for the years 2019/20 and 2020/21. For the first three years estimated completions from sites with planning permission are used. This figure comes from the London SHLAA 2013 and is built into the borough's target of 733 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.69 of the London SHLAA 2013 states that <i>"Small sites are those below 0.25ha. They make a significant contribution to housing</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p><i>delivery in London. The approach to assessing future housing yield from small sites is based on extrapolating historic trends drawing on data from the LDD on housing completions from 2004/05-2011/12 forward. The time series of 2004-2012 provides a robust basis for such a trend as it covers a full market cycle, providing a realistic average for the plan period. The sources of supply from small sites includes change of use, new build, and conversion, thereby reflecting trends such as conversions of houses into flats and infill development.”</i></p> <p>Further details of the small sites assumption are provided in paragraphs 2.70 to 2.72 of the SHLAA 2013.</p> <p>Table 3.16 of the London SHLAA 2013 sets out a small site capacity estimate for the Borough to be 1,519 dwellings over ten years between 2015 – 2025.</p> <p>The reliance on small sites across London is 106,476 dwellings across the same time period as evident in Table 3.16.</p> <p>The London SHLAA 2013 including the small sites estimate was examined in detail as part of the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP). The FALP Inspector’s Report comments on small sites estimate in paragraph 36 and included the statement that <i>“I consider the small sites figures in the SHLAA to be a reasonable assessment of capacity.”</i></p> <p>In addition to the above, the Royal Borough has a distinct character in that it is one of the smallest London Boroughs. It is extremely densely built up with the second highest population density (13,086 residents per sq km) (Table QS102EW Census 2011) in England and Wales. It also has a unique historic environment with nearly three quarters of the borough within designated conservation areas and 4,000 listed buildings. As a result the borough only has a limited supply of large sites and inevitably relies on small sites as a significant source of housing supply.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Vacant units assumption</p> <p>The five year housing supply figure also includes an assumption that 46 vacant units will return to use each year. This figure is also based on the London SHLAA 2013 (Table 3.16). Paragraphs 2.73 to 2.75 and Table 2.10: Vacant potential approaches provide further detail behind the figure.</p> <p>London SHLAA 2013</p> <p>Housing targets across London are set for each borough based on housing capacity. This exercise is undertaken by the GLA with each borough feeding in to the process and was last undertaken in the London SHLAA 2013. The GLA is currently working on a new SHLAA to inform a revised London Plan. The new SHLAA is expected to provide new housing targets for each London borough. The Council continues to work with the GLA on the current SHLAA to provide details of the housing capacity in the borough.</p> <p>The London-wide approach for SHLAA and the robustness of the London SHLAA 2013 was tested at the FALP examination. The Inspector's report on examination states at paragraph 22 that <i>"I acknowledge that the NPPF requires each local planning authority to identify its own objectively assessed housing need. However, in my view, it is the role of the spatial development strategy to determine the overall level of need for London and to guide the distribution of new housing to meet that need. The Mayor points to the acceptance by previous EIP Panels that London constitutes a single housing market area with sub markets which span Borough boundaries. The Mayor also points to the findings of the High Court, following a challenge to the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan, within which in his (undisputed) opinion, the Court accepted that although local variations exist, this did not compromise the view that London constitutes a single housing market area. (emphasis added)</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a supply of developable sites or broad locations for: a) years 6-10; b) years 11-15 	<p>The Council has identified a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and 11 to 15. This information is presented in Chapter 40 of the Local Plan and is updated annually in the Authority Monitoring Report. Chapter 40 provides a clear indication of the site allocations that will contribute to this supply.</p> <p>The Council's housing target over 15 years is 10,995 dwellings. Chapter 40 demonstrates that the Council has identified a supply for 11,694 dwellings over the same period giving a surplus of 699 dwellings over 15 years.</p>
<p>Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained. (47)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A housing trajectory • Monitoring of completions and permissions (47) • Updated and managed SHLAA. (47) 	<p>Chapter 40 of the Local Plan includes the Borough's housing trajectory. This is updated annually in the Council's Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The Council monitors housing approvals and completions and presents this information annually in its Monitoring Report.</p> <p>London SHLAA 2013</p> <p>Housing targets across London are set for each borough based on housing capacity. This exercise is undertaken by the GLA with each borough feeding in to the process and was last undertaken in the London SHLAA 2013. The GLA is currently working on a new SHLAA to inform the London Plan review. The new SHLAA is expected to provide new housing targets for each London borough. The Council continues to work with the GLA on this 2017 SHLAA to provide details of the housing capacity in the borough.</p> <p>The London-wide approach for SHLAA and the robustness of the London SHLAA 2013 was tested at the FALP examination. The Inspector's report on examination states at paragraph 22 that <i>"I acknowledge that the NPPF requires each local planning authority to identify its own objectively assessed housing need. However, in my view, it is the role of the spatial development strategy to determine the overall level of need for London and to guide the distribution of new housing to meet that need."</i> The Mayor points to the acceptance by previous EiP Panels that London constitutes a single housing market</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p><i>area with sub markets which span Borough boundaries. The Mayor also points to the findings of the High Court, following a challenge to the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan, within which in his (undisputed) opinion, the Court accepted that although local variations exist, this did not compromise the view that London constitutes a single housing market area. (emphasis added)</i></p>
<p>Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on the density of development. 	<p>Submission Policy CH1 criterion d. of the Local Plan requires that the number of residential units delivered in new developments are optimised by taking into account the relevant range within the London Plan density matrix.</p> <p>Table 3.2 Sustainable residential quality (SRQ) density matrix (habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare) of the London Plan is considered to be the appropriate tool to optimise site potential. This is because the SRQ density matrix provides different ranges for density based on character setting and Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs).</p> <p>Chapter 4, 4.4.4-5 sets out the Council's vision for estate regeneration and large sites being redeveloped by private landowners and housing associations.</p>
<p>Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand. (para 159)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on planning for a mix of housing (including self-build, and housing for older people • SHMA • Identification of the size, type, tenure and range of housing) required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. (50) • Evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs. (50) 	<p>Chapter 35 of the submitted Local Plan sets out the Council's housing policies. Strategic Objective CO6: Diversity of Housing makes it clear that that the strategic objective not only is to boost the supply of housing but is also to cater for a variety of housing needs.</p> <p>Policy CH1 sets out criteria to increase the borough's housing supply and enable it to meet or exceed its housing targets. Policy CH2 sets out the Council's affordable housing policy and responds to the overwhelming need for affordable housing in the borough as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015. Policy CH3: recognises the need to improve housing standards and has the flexibility in responding to the latest evidence in providing a mix of types and sizes of homes. The latest evidence for housing need in terms of dwelling size is set out in the SHMA 2015 and is included in the</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy on affordable housing and consideration for the need for on-site provision or if off-site provision or financial contributions are sought, where these can these be justified and to what extent do they contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. (50) 	<p>reasoned justification to the policy. Policy CH4 deals with specific housing needs and includes support for older people’s housing, protects houses in multiple occupation, supports self-build/custom housebuilding and build to rent schemes, includes the borough’s policy on student housing and resists the loss of supported houses and hostels. Policy CH5 provides the planning policy framework for Estate Regeneration.</p> <p>Policy CH6 sets out criteria for additional Gypsy and Traveller sites in the borough, the latest evidence of pitch need is set out in the Joint GTANA which is also included in the supporting text to the policy. Further details on Policy CH6 are set out in the Planning Policy for Travellers sites section of the soundness self-assessment checklist.</p> <p>SHMA</p> <p>The Council has submitted a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), December 2015. The SHMA includes the Council’s objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing. It is fully compliant with the requirement of the NPPF and the NPPG on Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment. The SHMA includes an assessment of the need for affordable housing, as also required by the guidance.</p> <p>The SHMA has looked at the borough’s profile, the drivers for demand including demography and strength of the economy, population and household projections including GLA’s short-term and long-term migration scenarios and DCLG projections, market signals, affordable housing need and housing requirements of specific groups.</p> <p>The SHMA also considers the size, type and tenure of housing required, and the needs of different groups including families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes.</p> <p>It should be noted that the borough’s OAN based on GLA’s long-term projections (which yields the highest figure compared to other projections considered) is 575 dwellings per annum and is significantly</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>below the borough’s housing target of 733 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Joint GTANA</p> <p>The Joint Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2016, prepared with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham sets out that there is a total need for 9 pitches between 2015 and 2030 in the study area. The GTANA assesses arising needs of the Traveller community and then applies the Government’s definition of Travellers contained in Annex 1 of the Planning Policy for Traveller sites. The study has been informed by surveys of the Travelling community in the borough.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>As stated above, Policy CH2: Affordable Housing sets out the Council’s affordable housing policy and responds to the overwhelming need for affordable housing in the borough as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015. Policy CH2 also sets out the circumstances in which off-site provision or payments in lieu would be acceptable. Policy criterion f(iii) in particular specifies the approach for viability assessment to calculate payments in lieu by requiring two viability assessments – one reflecting the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing provision on-site and the second with 100% private housing. This criterion is designed to make payments in lieu/on-site provision financially neutral for the developer. Paragraph 35.3.36 makes it clear that the Council supports provision on-site but also sets out the exceptional circumstances where payments in lieu may be acceptable.</p> <p>Paragraph 35.3.38 makes it clear that any payments in lieu would be spent on the Council’s estate regeneration programme to deliver more affordable housing.</p>
<p>In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of allowing some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional 	<p>N/A</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).</p> <p>In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<p>affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens. (This is discretionary)(para 53) • Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55. 	
<p>7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)</p>		
<p>Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of policy or policies which seek to increase the quality of development through the principles set out at para 58 and approaches in paras 59-61, linked to the vision for the area and specific local issues 	<p>Chapter 34 of the Local Plan is concerned with high quality design. The amended policy was reviewed and then adopted in 2014 as part of the Conservation and Design Review. As such does not form part of this review. However, it will form part of the final Local Plan.</p> <p>The overarching policy objective for the Renewing the Legacy chapter (CO5) states that: <i>“our strategic objective to renew the legacy is not simply to ensure no diminution in the excellence we have inherited, but to pass to the next generation a Borough that is better than today, of the highest quality and inclusive for all. This will be achieved by taking great care to maintain, conserve and enhance the glorious built heritage we have inherited and to ensure that where new development takes place it enhances the Borough.”</i></p> <p>Policy (CL1) relates to context and character and states that <i>“the Council will require all development to respect the existing context, character, and appearance, taking opportunities available to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions, including being inclusive for all.”</i></p> <p>Policy CL2 is concerned with design quality, <i>“requiring all development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality.”</i></p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		The principles of “Renewing the Legacy” are reflected in the visions for the Place chapters, and where relevant, the associated allocations.
8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)		
Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a policy or policies on inclusive communities. • Promotion of opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity; safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. (69) 	<p>The Council notes that community interaction, security and inclusivity are all integral parts of high quality design, and supported by existing Policy CL2, which is not part of this review.</p> <p>Similarly policies CK1 and CK2 (also not part of this review) also seek to support the retention/ creation of social and community facilities, with CK3 supporting the creation of “walkable communities.” This is an attempt to ensure that the Borough’s residents have easy access to neighbourhood facilities.</p>
Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local service. • Positive planning for the provision and integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of 	Policy CR3 of the Local Plan was reviewed and adopted in 2014. As such is not subject of this review. However, it will form part of the finished Local Plan. This policy sets out the approach that the Council will take with regard the provision of shared space. It notes that, “ <i>the Council will require opportunities to be taken within the street environment to create places that support outdoor life, inclusive to all, adding to their attractiveness and vitality.</i> ”

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>As set out above Policies CK1, CK2 and CK3 are not subject of the current review. They will, however form part of the final Local Plan. The Local Plan is clear in that the Council will protect existing social and community uses and support the creation of new. This approach is necessary given the differential in value between a social and community use and residential. The Borough will not be unusual in this regard, and without a restrictive policy, the Council would preside over the erosion of social and community uses to residential.</p> <p>The principles of health planning cross-cut the Local Plan. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) includes health indicators as part of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to ensure that the impacts of the policies are properly considered.</p> <p>The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is part of the evidence base that informs the local plan. It provides an infrastructure assessment for the borough. This will include any notified gaps in provision. It includes community facilities and other local services.</p> <p>CIL will be used to contribute towards the provision of the necessary strategic infrastructure as identified in the CIL Regulation 123 list. Further contributions necessary to mitigate the impact of development, or to enable the delivery of the site is detailed in the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document adopted in 2010, with a review of this planned for 2017.</p>
<p>Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. (73) • A policy protecting existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land from development, with specific 	<p>Open space, sports and recreational facilities are not subject to review. The scope of the local plan partial review relates only to planning contributions for open space.</p> <p>Policy CR5 sets out the approach the Council will take to protecting existing open space from development. It states "<i>the Council will protect, enhance and make the most of existing parks, gardens and open spaces, and require new high quality outdoor spaces to be provided.</i>"</p> <p>Sports facilities are social and community facilities are considered as</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>exceptions. (74)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection and enhancement of rights of way and access. (75) 	<p>part of the Keeping Life Local Chapter. This chapter is not being reviewed at this time. Where proposed development generates a need for sports infrastructure, this will be addressed through planning contributions. Further details are included in the Planning Obligations SPD and CIL Regulation 123 list.</p> <p>Each Site Allocation, as part of the relevant Place, identifies the necessary infrastructure, including open space and sports facilities where relevant, required as part of the delivery strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and table set out the open space and sports provision required to support the Local Plan Partial Review, this is informed by the Parks Strategy (2016 -2025), Play Strategy (2006/2009) and Land Underneath the Westway SPD.</p>
<p>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’ (76-78).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy enabling the protection of Local Green Spaces. (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77). Policy for managing development within a local green space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. (78) 	<p>Policy CR5 which covers Open Spaces is not part of the scope of this Local Plan Partial Review (except for the issue of planning contributions).</p> <p>Local Green Spaces can be allocated through neighbourhood plans. Where such allocations are included in “made” neighbourhood plans they would afford the same force as the local plan policies as part of the statutory development plan.</p> <p>Policy OS1 of the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan does designate three sites as “Local Green Space”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Nursey lane • Land behind Kelfield Gardens • Land behind Highlever Road. <p>Whilst this neighbourhood plan has been supported by local referendum, has yet to have been made as is subject of a judicial review.</p> <p>The designation of Meanwhile Gardens as a Local Green Space was proposed in response to consultation for this Local Plan Review. It is a</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) – an area designated for its importance for wildlife and for people to experience nature. NPPG paragraph 11 states that "If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space."
9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)		
<p>Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. (81)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. (83)</p> <p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. (84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where Green Belt policies are included, these should reflect the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. (81) ○ Accord with criteria on boundary setting, and the need for clarity on the status of safeguarded land, in particular. (85) ○ Specify that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. (87) ○ Specify the exceptions to inappropriate development (89-90) ○ Identify where very special circumstances might apply to renewable energy development. (91) 	N/A

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)		
10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)		
Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. (94)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning of new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. • Support for energy efficiency improvements to existing building. • Local requirements for a building's sustainability which are consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy . (95)) 	<p>The Council, through the Local Plan, is fully committed to meet the challenge of climate change and flooding.</p> <p>The strategic objective informing Chapter 36, "Respecting Environment Limits" is explicit, <i>"to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change; significantly reduce carbon dioxide emissions; maintain low and further reduce car use; carefully manage floor risk and waste; improve air quality."</i></p> <p>This is delivered through the policies within the Local Plan, both those within Chapter 36 and elsewhere. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CE1: Climate change • CE2: Flooding • CT1: Improving alternatives to car use. This policy seeks to ensure that high trip generating uses are located in areas well served by public transport. <p>Policy CE1 sets out the targets to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions. It notes that appropriate development will meet the carbon reduction requirements set out in the London Plan.</p> <p>Policy CE2 Flooding deals with flood risk and drainage requirements. The Council is a Lead Local Flood Authority. It has a responsibility for leading the coordination of local flood risk management within the Borough. The Council adopted its Local Flood Risk Management Strategy in July 2015. This strategy forms the framework within which communities has a greater say in local flood risk management decisions. Whilst not a "planning document" is has informed the Local Plan. This is outlined within the respective Policy Formulation Report.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>The Council has also published a “Flood Risk Sequential Test” (February 2017) which assesses all the strategic sites in terms of flooding, to ensure that flood risk is assessed and that development is safe and steered towards areas at lower risk of flooding. This evidence and the Local Plan is supported by the borough-wide Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (March 2014) and Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) (March 2014).</p> <p>Where allocated sites lie within flood zones this is identified in the site constraints in the site information table associated with the allocation.</p>
<p>Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon energy, and identification of key energy sources. (97)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policies to promote and maximise energy from renewable and low carbon sources, • Identification of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17) • Identification of where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. (97) 	<p>Policy CE1 sets out the targets to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions. It notes that appropriate development will meet the carbon reduction requirements set out in the London Plan.</p>
<p>Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account taken of the impacts of climate change. (99) • Allocate, and where necessary re-locate, development away from flood risk areas through a 	<p>See above.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	sequential test, based on a SFRA. (100) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies to manage risk, from a range of impacts, through suitable adaptation measures 	
Take account of marine planning (105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure early and close co-operation on relevant economic, social and environmental policies with the Marine Management Organisation • Review the aims and objectives of the Marine Policy Statement, including local potential for marine-related economic development • Integrate as appropriate marine policy objectives into emerging policy • Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	As a “specific consultation body” and a prescribed Duty to Cooperate body the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) has been consulted at every stage of the Local Plan’s evolution. No comments have been received. Nevertheless, the Council has considered the MMO’s plans as part of the Policy Formulation Report for Policy CE2 Flooding.
Manage risk from coastal change (106)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of where the coast is likely to experience physical changes and identify Coastal Change Management Areas, and clarity on what development will be allowed in such areas. • Provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be re-located from such areas, based on 	N/A

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	SMPs and Marine Plans, where appropriate.	
11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)		
Protect valued landscapes (109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policy or policies to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. • Policy which seeks to minimise the loss of higher quality agricultural land and give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, the Broads and AONBs. 	<p>Biodiversity was considered as part of the “Miscellaneous Matters” review, with an amended Policy CE4 (Biodiversity) being adopted in November 2014. As such, whilst it does not form part of the current review it will be part of the final Local Plan.</p> <p>CE4 notes that, “<i>the Council will protect the biodiversity in, and adjacent to, the borough’s Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and require opportunities to be taken to enhance and attract biodiversity.</i>”</p> <p>The need to protect the natural environment is reflected by policies elsewhere in the plan, including Policy CR5 which “<i>requires all green open space to optimise biodiversity and wildlife habitat</i>”, and CR6 which “<i>requires landscape design to optimise the benefit to wildlife habitat.</i>”</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows how the Council’s Local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) has been considered in providing a context for infrastructure projects in the borough.</p> <p>The Council published the Screening for the Habitats Regulations Assessment in December 2015. This concluded that none of the policies that are being reviewed are likely to have a significant/ any effect on the relevant Natura 2000 sites. No representations were received to the contrary.</p>
Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy which seeks development which is appropriate for its location having regard to the effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity. 	<p>This topic is not subject of the current review. It is considered in Policy CL5, Living Conditions. This policy seeks to ensure that, “<i>the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces is not harmed due to increases in traffic servicing, parking, noise, disturbance, odours or vibration or local microclimate effects.</i>”</p> <p>Where allocated sites are known to be contaminated this is identified in site constraints within the site information table associated with the site</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117)</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and mapping of local ecological networks and geological conservation interests. • Policies to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species 	<p>allocation.</p> <p>See above.</p>
<p>12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)</p>		
<p>Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy for the historic environment based on a clear understanding of the cultural assets in the plan area, including assets most at risk. • A map/register of historic assets • A policy or policies which promote new development that will make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness. (126) 	<p>Conserving and enhancing the historic environment is a central tenet of the Local Plan. It is central to both the “Renewing the Legacy” and the “An Engaging Public Realm” Chapters of the Local Plan. The current review only touches on the contents of each chapter, the majority having formed the body of the dedicated Conservation and Design Review of the Local Plan adopted in December 2014.</p> <p>The Strategic Objective for “An Engaging Public Realm” reads, “<i>our strategic objective for an engaging public realm is to endow a strong local sense of place by maintaining and extending our excellent public realm to all parts of the borough.</i>” The policies within the Chapter have regard to the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment.</p> <p>The only topic of Chapter 34 Renewing the Legacy which is part of the scope of the Local Plan Partial Review is that of archaeology. The review simply proposes to bring the elements of Policy CL4 Heritage Assets of relevance to archaeology up to date to be in line with the latest Historic England Archaeological Priority Area (APA) designations and guidance.</p> <p>The site information table for Policy CA1, the Kensal Opportunity Area, identifies that views from Kensal Green Cemetery, a Grade 1 Registered Park and Garden of Historic Interest, to the development</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		will be particularly sensitive.
13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)		
<p>It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142)</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146)</p>	<p>Account taken of the matters raised in relation to paragraph 143 and 145, including matters in relation to land in national / international designations; landbanks; the defining of Minerals Safeguarding Areas; wider matters relating to safeguarding; approaches if non-mineral development is necessary within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; the setting of environmental criteria; development of noise limits; reclamation of land; plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. This could include evidence of co-operation with neighbouring and more distant authorities.</p>	<p>Policy CE3 Waste subsection (c) safeguards Cremorne Wharf, maximising its use for waste management, water transport and cargo handling purposes.</p> <p>The borough is also subject to the Mayor's Local Aggregate Assessment for London (June 2014) which facilitates the sustainable use of minerals.</p>
<p>Justified: <i>The plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.</i></p> <p>To be 'justified' a DPD needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving: research / fact finding demonstrating how the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts; and evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area. • The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. 		
<p><i>Participation</i></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested</p>	<p>The consultation statement. This should set out what consultation was undertaken, when, with whom and how it has influenced the plan. The statement should show that efforts</p>	<p>Consultation throughout the drafting of the Borough's local plan review has allowed for the effective engagement of all interest parties in accordance with the Council's commitments as set out within its Statement of Community Involvement, Involving People in Planning</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
parties?	<p>have been made to consult hard to reach groups, key stakeholders etc. Reference SCI</p>	<p>published in December 2013.</p> <p>The Submission Consultation Statement (May 2017)– sets out what consultation has been carried out at Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages. This includes consultation with the “general”, “specific” and “prescribed” bodies, as well as the local stakeholders on the Councils “Planning Policy Database”. There are 1,260 consultees in total. The Council has also held a number of Discussion Groups held throughout the borough to help engage with hard to reach groups.</p>
<p><i>Research / fact finding</i></p> <p>Is the plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base? What are the sources of evidence? How up to date, and how convincing is it?</p> <p>What assumptions were made in preparing the DPD? Were they reasonable and justified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The studies, reports and technical papers that provide the evidence for the policies set out in the DPD, the date of preparation and who they were produced by. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections of the DPD (at various stages of development) and SA Report which illustrate how evidence supports the strategy, policies and proposals, including key assumptions. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A very brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to: reports to the council on the issues raised during participation, covering both the front-loading and formulation phases; and any other information on community views 	<p>The plan is fully justified by a sound and credible evidence base. All the relevant evidence base documents and Policy Formulation Reports for each respective chapter/topic area are included on the Council's website, along with their respective dates of preparation and their authors.</p> <p>Details of each of these studies, and how they have informed the formulation of policy are set out in the respective Policy Formulation Reports.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>and preferences.</p> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue), a very brief statement of the evidence documents relied upon and how they support the policy (where this is not already clear in the reasoned justification in the DPD). 	
<p><i>Alternatives</i></p> <p>Can it be shown that the LPA's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives? Have the reasonable alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred approach was arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives, is it clear how and why the decisions were taken?</p> <p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the DPD from the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and consultation documents produced in the early stages setting out how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. This should include options covering not just the spatial strategy, but also the quantum of development, strategic policies and development management policies. An audit trail of how the evidence base, consultation and SA have influenced the plan. Sections of the SA Report showing the assessment of options and alternatives. Reports on how decisions on the inclusion of policy were made. 	<p>The respective policy formulation reports set out, in some detail both the reasonable alternatives as well as the policy approach which the Council has ultimately chosen to take forward for each policy area. The Council has clearly articulated why each non chosen reasonable alternative was rejected.</p> <p>This process has been undertaken for all elements of the plan, including the strategic and the development management policies. Where an option is not reasonable, for example not to meet the Borough's housing targets, this is set out within the policy formulation report.</p> <p>Each of the reasonable alternatives have been subject to a sustainability appraisal carried out on behalf of the Council by Arcadis, within the wider Integrated Impact Assessment. This was an iterative process, with a report submitted alongside each of the policy drafts; or the interim IIA (Dec 2016), the IIA (Feb 2017) and the final submission version of the IIA (May 2017).</p> <p>A full audit trail of the policy alternatives that have been considered is included in Appendix F of the IIA.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
start?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections of the consultation document demonstrating how options were developed and appraised. Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated, including a report on how sustainability appraisal has influenced the choice of strategy and the content of policies. 	
<p>Effective: <i>the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</i></p> <p>To be 'effective' a DPD needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be deliverable Demonstrate sound infrastructure delivery planning Have no regulatory or national planning barriers to its delivery Have delivery partners who are signed up to it Be coherent with the strategies of neighbouring authorities Demonstrate how the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be flexible Be able to be monitored 		
<p><i>Deliverable and Coherent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it clear how the policies will meet the Plan's vision and objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments and initiatives. Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the 	<p>As set out above the Council's vision and objectives are set out in Chapter 3 of the Local Plan, with the table in section 3.2 explaining the relationship between the issues, the strategic objectives and the policies which address these objectives. Each of the seven Strategic Objectives head a chapter its own right, each with a number of policies which will allow the Council to implement the relevant strategic objectives and its vision. These chapters, or the "delivery strategy" are read alongside the</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>of the DPD?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the policies internally consistent? • Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives? • Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved? 	<p>objectives and the identified means of delivery, such as evidence that the plans and programmes of other bodies have been taken into account (e.g. Water Resources Management Plans and Marine Plans).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure. • Section in the DPD that shows the linkages between the objectives and the corresponding policies, and consistency between policies (such as through a matrix). 	<p>“Place chapters”, or those elements of the Local Plan which make up the spacial strategy.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that its policies are internally consistent.</p> <p>The Council is also satisfied that there are no gaps in the policies with regard to the objectives, as all the policies derive from the topics identified to address the Strategic Objectives.</p> <p>So for example, the policies that would address the Strategic Objective of “Fostering Vitality” are those are those which relate to town centres, retail, arts and cultural uses, hotels, creative industries and to businesses. All these policies have been tailored to address and implement the strategic objective (in this case Strategic Objective CO2 or that “<i>the quality of life of our predominantly residential borough is enhanced by a wide variety of cultural, creative and commercial uses which can significantly contribute to the well-being of residents and to the capital’s role as a world city.</i>”)</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the timescales related to these objectives are realistic. The site allocations, sit within the appropriate “place” chapter. These consider delivery of each site. This includes delivery milestones, funding arrangements as well as risks.</p> <p>Chapter 37 of the Local Plan includes an Infrastructure Schedule which sets out the key infrastructure requirements across the Borough over the plan period. This sets out the where, what, why, who and when of infrastructure requirements. This have been derived from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>This can be viewed on the Council’s examination webpages.</p> <p>The Housing Trajectory is included in Chapter 40 of the Local Plan. It covers a 15 year time period to 2030/31. It contains the estimated provision of housing over time. It also includes an assessment of delivery against the annual targets. The Housing Trajectory is updated every year within the Borough’s Monitoring Report.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>The place chapters all contain delivery sections setting out which bodies in addition to the Council will be responsible for delivery of specific projects.</p> <p>The site allocations set out land use, principles and infrastructure and planning contributions while the supporting table details delivery milestones, site constraints and risks.</p>
<p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified? • Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified? • Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A section or sections of the DPD where infrastructure needs are identified and the proposed solutions put forward. • A schedule setting out responsibilities for delivery, mechanisms and timescales, and related to a CIL schedule where appropriate. • Confirmation from infrastructure providers that they support the solutions proposed and the identified means and timescales for their delivery, or a plan for resolving issues. • Demonstrable plan-wide viability, particularly in relation to the delivery of affordable housing and the role of a CIL schedule. 	<p>The Infrastructure table at Chapter 37 sets out and identifies infrastructure needs, with proposed solutions put forward. This section is underpinned by a substantial amount of evidence, in the form of the Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>In addition to Chapter 37, each Strategic Site, as part of the relevant Place, identifies the necessary infrastructure required as part of the delivery strategy. Section 2, the Delivery Strategy sets out the provision of necessary infrastructure alongside the various policies, but specifically within Policy C1 Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Contributions.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure delivery is an on-going corporate process. At its heart is an infrastructure schedule listing details of infrastructure investment in the area. The schedule provides information for all corporate and partner strategies. The schedule is a live document that will grow and develop over time as more partners engage in the process and contribute more infrastructure categories and information.</p> <p>The IDP is a living document that can regularly be updated as and when new infrastructure requirements should arise and as schemes are completed and new requirements are identified. It is not always possible to identify funders, or answer every question, but those involved will work to continually amend the IDP schedule.</p>
<p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <p>Does the DPD reflect the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of the local 	<p>The Local Plan does reflect the concept of spatial planning. Section 1, the "Spatial Strategy" sets out:</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes from a variety of agencies / organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>	<p>authority and other bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies which seek to pull together different policy objectives • Expressions of support/representations from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issues facing the borough (Chapter 2, Issues and Patterns) • The locally distinct vision for the Borough, with supporting Strategic Objectives (Chapter 3, Building on Success) • Where development is planned in broad terms (Chapter 4, Spatial Strategy.) • How it will affect 11 key places in the Borough (Chapters 5 to 15.) <p>The eleven “Place” chapters in the plan show how that place will develop over the lifetime of the plan. These places mainly relate to two of the spatial themes of the vision of the borough: the regeneration of areas of change; and enhancing those places in the borough with a national or international reputation.</p> <p>These places are a spatial expression of the plan. Their intention is to place shape, an ambition which is at the centre of spatial planning.</p> <p>The Local Plan goes beyond traditional land use planning by integrating the plans and programmes of a range of bodies and Council departments into the Plan. These strategies and programmes are set out in section 4, “Corporate and Partner Actions” of chapters 30 to 36 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>For example, Chapter 31, “Fostering Vitality”, includes eight Corporate and Partner Actions. The first three are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning officers will work with land owners and other stakeholders to deliver two new town centres in the north of the borough, in the Kensal and Latimer areas. • The Council’s Planning and Borough Development team will work with South Kensington Estates to improve the island site between Thurloe Street and Thurloe Place. This will be an ongoing process. • The Council’s Economic Development and Regeneration team will work with partners to provide a diverse range of support to residents who wish to start and grow their own business. This will be an

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>ongoing process.</p> <p>In addition the Council has consulted widely at each stage of the Local Plan's progression and had a series of meetings with the key stakeholders. These include the relevant major land owners and well as the major infrastructure providers.</p>
<p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances? • Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions of the plan and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed. • Sections of the annual monitoring report and sustainability appraisal report describing how the council will monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this b. changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the DPD is based • Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances • Sections within the DPD dealing with possible change areas and how they would be dealt with, including mechanisms for the 	<p>Chapter 39 of the Local Plan considers the contingencies and risks for site allocations.</p> <p>The Council has worked and will continue to work closely with internal and external agencies responsible for delivering the infrastructure necessary to see the development of the strategic sites. However, we acknowledge at paragraph 39.1.6 of the Local Plan that there is a risk that infrastructure may not be provided. Contingency plans relating to the site allocations are therefore in place, where required.</p> <p>We have identified the proposed Crossrail station at Kensal as being the infrastructure project which has a medium risk (although we are working hard to reduce this) and could possibly affect the quantum of development proposed if it does not come to fruition. On this basis we have recommended a contingency option of a lower quantum of development on the site and propose improved local accessibility through bus-based improvements. This will we explored in more detail in a forthcoming SPD.</p> <p>Contingency and risk with regard to housing provision has been taken into account in Chapter 35 of the Local Plan, "Diversity of Housing", through the inclusion of a 20% buffer over the housing target for the first 5 years of the plan period, which is also reflected in Chapter 40 Housing Trajectory and Supporting Information.</p> <p>There are clear arrangements for monitoring and reporting results in Chapter 38 of the Local Plan. The regular monitoring of the policies/strategies will allow the Council to take remedial actions in case they fail to deliver.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>rate of development to be increased or slowed and how that would impact on other aspects of the strategy and on infrastructure provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections of the DPD identifying the key indicators of success of the strategy, and the remedial actions which will be taken if adjustment is required. 	
<p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined? Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the DPD? Where the actions required are outside the direct control of the LPA, is there evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to the implementation of the policies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A succinct Duty to Co-operate Statement which flows from the strategic issues that have been addressed jointly. A 'tick box' approach or a collection of correspondence is not sufficient, and it needs to be shown (where appropriate) if joint plan-making arrangements have been considered, what decisions were reached and why. The Duty to Co-operate Statement could highlight: the sharing of ideas, evidence and pooling of resources; the practical policy outcomes of co-operation; how decisions were reached and why; and evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues which need other organisations to deliver on, common objectives for elements of 	<p>The ongoing consultation and discussions that the Council has carried out with the prescribed duty to cooperate bodies are set out in the respective Policy Formulation Reports. The detailed comments made, and the Council's response are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement 2017, available on the examination page of the Council's website.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>strategy and policy; a memorandum of understanding; aligned or joint core strategies and liaison with other consultees as appropriate.</p>	
<p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, (including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations)? • Is it clear how targets are to be measured (by when, how and by whom) and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report? • Is it clear how the significant effects identified in the sustainability appraisal report will be taken forward in the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the plan, through the annual monitoring report? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones • Sections of the current annual monitoring report which report on indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories • Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies • Sections of the current annual monitoring report and the sustainability appraisal report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the DPD against the sustainability appraisal 	<p>Chapter 38 of the Local Plan set out how the effectiveness of the policies within the Local Plan will be monitored. Each policy has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A target • Monitoring indicators • Frequency of monitoring • The source of the data used to monitor the policy. <p>In addition the Council monitors the success of its plan on an annual basis through its monitoring reports. These are wide ranging documents which consider the success of a range of the Council's policies. They have extensive sections concerned with the progress of the Council in meeting its objectively assessed need for a range of land uses.</p> <p>The monitoring reports also contain a chapter (chapter 10 of the 2016 AMR) concerned with the delivery of additional housing (both in terms of completions and permissions) each year. This feeds into the Borough's housing trajectory, which is updated each year in the Monitoring Report. The Monitoring Report also considers a five year housing supply.</p> <p>The Council's IIA considers the monitoring report and notes that "<i>The Council's existing Authority Monitoring Reports already include a robust range of environmental and socio-economic indicators and are prepared in line with EU Directive 2001/42/EC (Article 10(1)), Regulation 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes 2004 and Appendix 10, A Practical Guide to SEA Directive (ODPM). It is proposed to continue the use of these Reports in order to provide continuity to the Council's monitoring for the Publication Version of the LPPR.</i>"</p> <p>Chapter 40 of the Local Plan contains the Housing trajectory and</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>supporting information including affordable housing targets. These have been consulted on and changes proposed where necessary. The housing trajectory within the Local Plan is based on that in the Monitoring Report but has been extended to cover the full period of the strategy.</p>
<p>Consistent with national policy: <i>the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</i></p> <p>The DPD should not contradict or ignore national policy. Where there is a departure, there must be clear and convincing reasoning to justify the approach taken.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification? • Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons. • Studies forming evidence for the DPD or, where appropriate, other information which provides the rationale for departing from national policy. • Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the sustainability report) and/or from the results of community involvement. • Where appropriate, evidence of consistency with national marine policy as articulated in the UK 	<p>The Council considers that all the policies in the Local Plan are consistent with, yet do not merely repeat, national policy. The Council has taken into account national guidance and the policies are considered to be tailored to meet the particular circumstances of the Royal Borough.</p> <p>However, the Council has used a local approach in setting a floorspace threshold of 650 sq m gross internal area for seeking affordable housing in the borough. National policy requires that contributions for affordable housing should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000 sq m¹ (gross internal floorspace - GIA). This measure was introduced to tackle the disproportionate burden of developer contributions on small-scale developers, custom and self-builders.</p> <p>This approach is considered appropriate in the borough due to a number of reasons. The Council's evidence on the Affordable Housing Target Viability Study 2015 included a range of typologies including a scheme comprising four houses and another with five flats. The floorspace of these schemes ranges between 600 sq m and 629 sq m GIA. The evidence together with the extremely high land values</p>

¹ Policy set out in WMS of 28 November 2014 and Paragraph 31 NPPG on Planning Obligations

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>Marine Policy Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations have been considered and dealt with. 	<p>suggests that a local floorspace threshold enabling maximisation of affordable housing should be set. Therefore to further support scheme viability, the larger of the two figures from the Viability Study i.e. 629 sq m GIA rounded up to 650 sq m or 5 units is taken as a suitable threshold. Schemes which meet or exceed this threshold are required to provide affordable housing in-line with Policy CH2. It is considered that setting the threshold at 650 sq m is generally unlikely to affect the exemption in the national policy intended for custom and self-builders as these typically involve building a single unit. In terms of small scale developers, the extremely high land values in the borough mean that affordable housing contributions are not a disproportionate burden on development. There is a strong reliance in the borough on small sites due to its uniquely dense and historic character and most of these are high end developments where it would be viable to provide a contribution for affordable housing.</p> <p>Similarly, a local approach has been used for vacant building credit (VBC). Paragraph 35.3.43 of the Local Plan explains that <i>“National policy provides an incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings². Generally known as the vacant building credit, it requires that the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions may be required for any increase in floorspace. It is considered that vacant building credit does not apply to development in the borough. This is because given the central London location and highly dense character of the borough all sites are brownfield and the vacant building credit will not bring forward more development. Where affordable housing targets are not met only viable levels of affordable housing are required</i></p>

² Policy set out in WMS of 28 November 2014 and Paragraph 31 NPPG on Planning Obligations

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p><i>following consideration of detailed viability appraisals. As previously mentioned the borough also has the highest property values in the UK and development has always come forward in the borough without the need to incentivise it. Applying vacant building credit would run counter to the London Plan’s objective of maximising the provision of affordable housing. This approach has been endorsed by the Mayor’s Draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG, November 2016.”</i></p>

Planning policy for traveller sites

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)		
<p>Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early and effective engagement undertaken, including discussing travellers' accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups. 	<p>The Joint Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2016, was prepared with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. It sets out that there is a total need for 9 pitches between 2015 and 2030 in the study area.</p> <p>Engagement with the community has been undertaken at an early stage throughout both the plan making process and in preparing the GTANA (e.g. a meeting on site was held on 1 July 2015, well in advance of the Issues and Options consultation being published). This includes a workshop with residents, resident surveys to inform the needs assessment and undertaking consultation events on the LPPR at Stable Way.</p> <p>The London Gypsy and Traveller Unit (LGTU) was also consulted on the survey questions. Both the RBKC Gypsy and Traveller Community Development Manager and the RBKC Communications and Public Information Manager reviewed the questions to help ensure maximum engagement</p> <p>The Tenant Management Organisation officers have also had direct involvement in the GTANA.</p>
<p>Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan. • Collaborative working with neighbouring local planning authorities. • A robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to 	<p>See above.</p>

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions.	
Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)		
<p>Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs.</p> <p>Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.</p> <p>Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification, and annual update, of a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set target. Identification of a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. • An assessment of the need for traveller sites, and where an unmet need has been demonstrated a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified. • Policy which takes into account criteria a-h of para 11 	<p>Figure 3.20 of the Joint Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2016 sets out accommodation needs in 5 year bands to 2030 for the study area. The accommodation need is 3 pitches between year 1 and 5, 3 pitches between year 6 and 10 and 3 pitches between year 11 and 15.</p> <p>The needs assessment survey sought to identify any possible land for consideration known to the Traveller community. The Councils were made aware of two possible locations for consideration. The Councils have jointly prepared a Site Appraisal Study Methodology to provide an evidence base on potential new sites. Locations suggested to the Councils through the supplementary survey are being considered through the studies.</p> <p>The SAS applies criteria in the PPTS, Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guidance (DCLG – now cancelled) and Local Plan policies to assess the potential for additional pitches on land suggested to the Councils. LBHF is undertaking an assessment of locations suggested in its area. The RBKC Site Appraisal Study is available as part of the Submission. It concludes that the borough is very constrained and opportunities for additional pitch provision are very limited. One potential opportunity has been identified which will require ongoing work to establish if this site can be brought forward.</p> <p>Policy CH6 sets out criteria which takes into account, but does not duplicate, criteria a-h of PPTS paragraph 11.</p>
Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)		
When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings LPAs		This is not applicable given the urban nature of the Borough.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.		
Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)		
If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers' sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a rural exception site policy is used, and if so clarity that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity. 	This is not applicable given the urban nature of the Borough.
Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)		
<p>Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</p> <p>Exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site ... should be done only through the plan-making process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt boundary revisions made in response to a specific identified need for a traveller site, undertaken through the plan making process. 	This is not applicable as there is no Green Belt in the Borough.
Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)		
Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of the need for sites for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and 	Policy CH6, criteria iv. sets out that "iv. the use could be supported by adequate physical and social infrastructure (such as access to

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.	amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents), or separate sites in close proximity to one another. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N.B. Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites 	education, health, welfare and employment) in the locality.”
Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)		
Local planning authorities should work with the planning applicant and the affected traveller community to identify a site or sites suitable for relocation of the community if a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site, the identification of a site or sites suitable for re-location of the community. 	There are no major development proposals proposed which would require the relocation of the existing site. Policy CH6 sets out “The Council will work closely with London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the Mayor of London and TfL to protect, improve and, if possible, increase the capacity of the existing Westway Travellers’ site at Stable Way”.

Integration of marine and terrestrial planning

As the UK marine area and marine plan area boundaries extend up to the level of mean high water spring tides while terrestrial planning boundaries generally extend to mean low water spring tides (including estuaries), the marine plan area will physically overlap with that of some terrestrial plan. Local authorities with any tidal frontage, even if far inland and not conventionally regarded as coastal, must therefore take full account of the MMO, the MPS and marine plans under S.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the Duty to Co-operate in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. A full list of the local planning authorities whose areas overlap with the UK marine area appears in Appendix One.

Furthermore, the Duty to Co-Operate requires all local planning authorities, even if landlocked, to take account, where relevant, of the MMO's plans and activities when preparing their Local Plans. Finally, the NPPF requires LPAs to take the MPS into account under the tests of soundness (specifically, to test if an emerging DPD is consistent with national policy, which includes the MPS).

The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (the Act) provided for the introduction of a marine planning system for England's inshore and offshore marine area, establishing the Secretary of State as the Marine Planning Authority for these areas. The Act also provided for the establishment of the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and for the Secretary of State to delegate various planning functions. The planning functions including preparation and review were delegated to the MMO in 2010. The Act also provided for the adoption of the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS). The MPS was adopted on 18 March 2011 and provides the policy framework for marine planning and for all decisions likely to affect the marine area.

There are eleven plan areas in English waters, for each of which a Marine Plan will be prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

In practical terms, all activities undertaken in the marine area require land based infrastructure, without which our ability to benefit economically and socially from activities in the marine area would be extremely limited.

The UK Government's vision for the marine environment, as articulated in the MPS, is:

'clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'.

In the absence of a marine plan prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State the MPS is the relevant marine policy document. Where a marine plan has been adopted both the MPS and the Marine Plan are relevant marine policy documents for the marine plan area.

As articulated in the Marine and Coastal Act and the MPS, the Government aims for the MPS and marine planning systems to sit alongside and interact with existing planning regimes across the UK. Specifically, s.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act requires all³ public bodies to:

³ Like the Duty to Co-Operate, no distinction is made by the Marine and Coastal Access Act between public authorities with a tidal frontage and those without. Emphasis is placed on the likelihood of the decision being made affecting the marine area.

Local Plan Partial Review: Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (May 2017)

- take authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise
- state their reasons where authorisation or enforcement decisions are not taken in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans
- have regard to the MPS and relevant Marine Plans when taking decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area which are not authorisation or enforcement decisions⁴

In addition, the MPS seeks integration of marine planning and the terrestrial planning system through:

- Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance
- Liaison between respective responsible authorities for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages
- Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions

These aims are further supported by footnote 36 in the NPPF.

⁴ For example, decisions about what representations they should make as a consultee or about what action they should carry out themselves.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Key requirements under the Duty to Co-Operate		
Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of consistency of aim between relevant local plan policies and marine policy documents (i.e. the MPS and any relevant adopted marine plans) • Proof of collaborative working with the MMO and that the MPS has been taken into account. 	<p>As a “specific consultation body” and a prescribed Duty to Cooperate body the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) has been consulted at every stage of the Local Plan’s evolution. No comments have been received.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Council has considered the MMO’s plans as part of the Policy Formulation Report for Policy CE2 Flooding.</p>
Liaison between respective authorities responsible for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early and effective policy development engagement undertaken, including discussions with the MMO • Evidence of iteration of policies and plans as a result of engagement with the MMO • Evidence of engagement with the MMO in relation to monitoring, implementation and throughout the policy cycle • Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	See above.
Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LPA has shared or provided relevant data to the MMO that can help inform Marine Plans or MPS review • Demonstration that local plan policy has been underpinned by data provided by the MMO or the MPS 	See above.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit cross-referencing in local plan to MPS, the MMO, their roles, and relevant marine plans 	
Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 2: General Principles for Decision-Making⁵		
Sections 2.1 -2.2: The UK vision for the marine environment		
<p>The UK vision for the marine environment ('clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas')</p> <p>Achieving the vision through marine planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference in DPD where appropriate to UK vision for the marine environment Contribution to the vision through local plan policies and supporting text 	See above.
Section 2.4: Considering benefits and adverse effects in marine planning		
Consider benefits and adverse effects of plan policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of benefits and adverse effects of policy on the marine area as appropriate within the DPD's sustainability appraisal 	See above.
Section 2.5: Economic, social and environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

⁵ As the Marine Policy Statement was not targeted specifically at terrestrial planning authorities, some of its sections are, in practice, relevant to marine planning authorities only and/or there is already a comprehensive policy framework governing terrestrial development (e.g. energy infrastructure), Where this is considered to be the case, i.e. where it is considered likely that a terrestrial planning DPD would be found sound without referencing that section, the section in question has been omitted from this checklist.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
considerations		
Contribute to the objectives of relevant EU Directives (Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Water Framework Directive)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to relevant EU Directives in DPD and sustainability appraisal • Consideration of contribution of DPD policies to the objectives of relevant EU Directives 	See above.
Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 3: Policy Objectives for Key Activities		
3.1 Marine Protected Areas		
<p>Incorporate identified areas and features of importance for nature conservation</p> <p>Activities or developments that may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity should be designed or located to avoid such impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of relevant areas and features of importance for nature conservation within relevant marine plan area(s) • Consideration of impacts of policy and/or terrestrial development on those areas and features of importance • Measures to mitigate, monitor and manage negative impacts on those areas and features of importance 	See above.
3.4 Ports and shipping		
<p>Take into account and seek to minimise any negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety</p> <p>Protect the efficiency and resilience of continuing port</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that policy with potential impact on ports and shipping minimises negative impacts on sector • Where relevant, evidence that economic, employment and transport policies are protective of ports and shipping sector 	See above.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
operations		
3.8 Fisheries		
Consider potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that other policies minimise negative impacts on fishing activity and/or aquaculture 	N/A
3.9 Aquaculture		
Consider the benefits of encouraging the development of efficient, competitive and sustainable aquaculture industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that the benefits of aquaculture industry development have been considered 	N/A
3.10 Surface water management and waste water treatment and disposal		
Maximise opportunities for co-existence of waste water infrastructure with other activities in the marine environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to and consideration of the co-existence of waste water infrastructure with other marine activities, including the potential for waste water infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location 	See above.
3.11 Tourism and recreation		
Consider the potential for tourism and recreation in the marine environment and the benefits this will bring to the economy and local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, reference to marine tourism and recreation Evidence that the potential for marine tourism and recreation has been recognised in plan-making 	See above.

Local Plan Partial Review: Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (May 2017)

Appendix One

This is an alphabetical list of all local planning authorities in England whose area overlaps with the UK marine area.

Adur	Chichester	East Cambridgeshire	Hammersmith and Fulham
Allerdale	Chorley	East Devon	Hartlepool
Arun	Christchurch	East Lindsey	Hastings
Babergh	City of London	East Riding of Yorkshire	Havant
Barking and Dagenham	City of Brighton and Hove	Eastbourne	Havering
Barrow-in-Furness	City of Bristol	Eastleigh	Horsham
Basildon	City of Kingston upon Hull	Exeter	Hounslow
Bassetlaw	City of Peterborough	Exmoor National Park	Huntingdonshire
Bexley	City of Plymouth	Fareham	Ipswich
Blackpool	City of Portsmouth	Fenland	Isle of Wight
Boston	City of Southampton	Fylde	Isles of Scilly
Bournemouth	City of Westminster	Gateshead	Kensington and Chelsea
Broadland	Colchester	Gloucester	King's Lynn and West Norfolk
Broads Authority	Copeland	Gosport	Lake District National Park
Canterbury	Cornwall	Gravesham	Lambeth
Carlisle	County Durham	Great Yarmouth	Lancaster
Castle Point	Dartford	Greenwich	Lewes
Chelmsford	Doncaster	Halton	Lewisham
Cheshire West and Chester	Dover	Hambleton	Liverpool

Local Plan Partial Review: Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (May 2017)

Maidstone	Rochford	Taunton Deane	York
Maldon	Rother	Teignbridge	
Medway	Scarborough	Tendring	
Middlesbrough	Sedgemoor	Test Valley	
New Forest	Sefton	Thanet	
New Forest National Park	Selby	Thurrock	
Newark and Sherwood	Shepway	Tonbridge and Malling	
Newcastle upon Tyne	South Cambridgeshire	Torbay	
Newham	South Downs National Park	Torridge	
North Devon	South Gloucestershire	Tower Hamlets	
North East Lincolnshire	South Hams	Wandsworth	
North Lincolnshire	South Holland	Warrington	
North Norfolk	South Lakeland	Waveney	
North Somerset	South Norfolk	Wealden	
North Tyneside	South Ribble	West Devon	
North York Moors National Park	South Somerset	West Dorset	
Northumberland	South Tyneside	West Lancashire	
Norwich	Southend-on-Sea	West Lindsey	
Poole	Southwark	West Somerset	
Preston	Stockton-on-Tees	Weymouth and Portland	
Purbeck	Stroud	Winchester	
Redcar and Cleveland	Suffolk Coastal	Wirral	
Richmond upon Thames	Sunderland	Worthing	
	Swale	Wyre	