

Local Plan Examination

Examination Hearing Session 3

27th September 2017

Participants:

- Richmond upon Thames Borough Council
- 026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Development Ltd.
- 059- Louise Spalding Defence Infrastructure Organisation (LP34)
- 073- GL Hearn On Behalf Of Evergreen Investment Retail Company.
- 118- James Stevens Home Builders Federation.
- 187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

Agenda

- a) Welcome
- b) Factual updates and clarifications
- c) Focus for Discussion:

HOUSING

Is the Local Plan’s approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the London Plan? With particular regard to deliverability, has the Plan been positively prepared and will it be effective in meeting the varied housing needs applicable to the Borough over the plan period?

	LP 34 New Housing
1.	<p>Is Policy LP34 justified, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and aligned adequately with the London Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the Plan been informed by, and is it consistent with, the Council’s (and London’s) Housing Strategy? • Is the evidence in support of the planned level of housing provision robust (with due regard to data relating to population projections and alternative methodologies and the Council’s SHMA)? • Is the SHMA robust, has it used the most up to date housing projections and how does it inform the Plan housing requirement with due regard to the housing market area? How does the Council anticipate that the housing needs identified in the SHMA will be met? • How have market signals been considered? • Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust? • How will the Council address future changes to the London Plan?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should housing targets be referenced clearly as minimums? Are the ranges shown in LP 34 B minimums? • Is the level of proposed housing over the plan period deliverable? How has the housing trajectory been derived and is it robust? Does the Council have a five year supply of housing sites that is consistent with national policy? • To what extent has the council considered increasing the overall level of housing proposed to increase the provision of affordable homes? • Is a 'non-implementation allowance' required? • The consultation document "Planning for the right homes in the right places" sets out a proposed approach to calculating local housing need, on which the Government is seeking further views. It also sets out proposed transitional arrangements for applying that approach. For plans at the examination stage, the proposed transitional arrangement is to progress with the examination using the current approach. In this context, are there any implications for the current examination?¹
	<p>LP 35 Housing Mix and Standards</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><u>Mix</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the housing mix proposed within LP 35 justified by the evidence base and viable? How has this been considered against alternatives? • Is LP 35 sufficiently clear and capable of flexibility in delivery? <p><u>Standards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the requirement to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standard justified? • Is the requirement to comply with the Council's external space standards justified, flexible and capable of effective delivery? • Is LP 35 D clear and capable of effective delivery?
<p>3.</p>	<p>What robust evidence underpins the approach of the Plan towards the housing needs of vulnerable and older people? Does this encompass the need for retirement properties adequately?</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Are the needs of single persons recognised adequately?</p>

¹ Additional question added 18.9.17. Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals (DCLG Sept 2017)

5.	Does the Plan recognise the issues around 'build to rent'? Does the plan acknowledge adequately the provision of private rented housing in the supply side?
	LP 36 – Affordable Housing
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is LP 36 A justified by the evidence base with regard to national policy? • Is a 50% threshold for affordable housing deliverable and viable? Is the Policy consistent with the NPPF, with due regard to positive planning and considerations of viability? • What is the expected tenure mix for affordable housing and is it justified by the evidence base? • Is LP 36 B justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Is it supported adequately by the viability evidence? • Does LP 36 C apply to all schemes and is it consistent with LP 36A? How will it operate in practice? Do all planning applications require a viability assessment? • Does LP 36 contain adequate flexibility to be effective in delivery? • Is the calculation for affordable housing, based on the gross level of development proposed, justified? • Is the Policy consistent with the Mayor's emerging SPG? • Does the plan acknowledge adequately the role of intermediate rent as an affordable housing tenure within private rented developments? • Should the Plan reference self-build opportunities for affordable housing? Are self-build and starter homes referenced adequately and in line with national policy?
	LP 37
7.	What specific housing needs are addressed by LP 37? Is it justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in delivery?

	<p>Should the policy contain clearer targets for the delivery of housing to meet needs, eg for the provision of supported homes or student accommodation et al?</p> <p>Is the approach of LP 37 aligned adequately with the London Plan?</p>
8.	<p>What evidence justifies the approach of the Plan towards gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople and is this sufficiently up to date and consistent with national policy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has the duty to cooperate been employed adequately (and sufficiently widely) to address the issue of gypsy and traveller accommodation effectively? What engagement with relevant communities has been undertaken outside of the Borough?• How have alternatives been considered and discounted?• Is the needs assessment adequate for the entire plan period and how does it relate to Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (caravans and houseboats)? How will the issue of needs assessment and site supply be addressed into the future?
9.	<p>Should LP 39 be more permissive?</p> <p>Is it necessary to reference other LP policies?</p>

d) AOB

e) Close