

CHAPTER 1 FRAMEWORK FOR PLAN POLICIES

Policy/Para 02.03

Modification ref: D/FRAM/05

Issue

'Emphasis on providing a more sustainable pattern of development' should be restored.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.1. Paragraph 2.2 of the UDP states the national policy on sustainable development. In my view D/FRAM/05 does not derogate from that. Consequently I concur with the factual updating of the UDP by this modification to accord with the regional planning principles of RPG9 (2001).

RECOMMENDATION

1.2. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/05.

Policy/Para 02.08

Modification ref: D/FRAM/07

Further modification ref: D/FRAM/35

Issue

An additional objective 'Promoting social inclusion and tackling deprivation and discrimination' before 'improving London's transport' should be inserted.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.3. The new paragraph inserted by D/FRAM/07 omits the London Plan objective on social inclusion. I concur with the Council's acceptance of the GLA's suggested further modification as D/FRAM/35.

RECOMMENDATION

1.4. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/07 as further modified by D/FRAM/35.

Policy/Para 02.09

Modification ref: D/FRAM/08

Issue

Paragraphs 2.9, 2.10, and 2.11 should not be deleted.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.5. The deletions comprise reference to the Mayor of London's Strategic Planning Advice which mentions such areas as Richmond Park and the Riverside. I find the reference originated in the 1994 LPAG advice which was assimilated in the 1996 Strategic Guidance

Final Version

for London. However, that is about to be superseded by the London Plan. I consider both the draft UDP Review and the emerging London Plan maintain the spirit of the earlier documents.

In the circumstances I agree with the LPA that these paragraphs are no longer essential to the UDP.

RECOMMENDATION

1.6. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/08.

Policy/Para **02.10/02.11**

Modification ref: **D/FRAM/09**

Issue

Paragraphs 2.9, 2.10, and 2.11 should not be deleted.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.7. The deletions comprise reference to the Mayor of London's Strategic Planning Advice which mentions such areas as Richmond Park and the Riverside. I find the reference originated in the 1994 LPAG advice which was assimilated in the 1996 Strategic Guidance for London. However, that is about to be superseded by the London Plan. In my view both the draft UDP Review and the emerging London Plan maintain the spirit of the earlier documents. In the circumstances I agree with the LPA that these paragraphs are no longer essential to the UDP.

RECOMMENDATION

1.8. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/09.

Policy/Para **02.19**

Modification ref: **X/FRAM/20**

Issue

Projections of the economically active population will need to be reviewed in the light of forthcoming projections by the GLA.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.9. I agree that this will be necessary in the light of the current downward trend but in the absence of the necessary information it is not yet appropriate to make any further modification.

RECOMMENDATION

1.10. I recommend that the UDP be modified by X/FRAM/20.

Final Version

Final Version

Policy/Para **02.33**

Modification ref: **D/FRAM/23**

Issue

The deleted references to 'sustainable development' and 'sustainability' in paragraphs 2.33 and 2.34 respectively and the first part of paragraph 2.35 should be restored.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.11. Paragraph 3.33 is regarded by objectors as an attempt by the Council to distance itself from the core issues rather than an attempt to strengthen the overall environmental agenda in the Borough, thereby downgrading sustainability as the foundation of the UDP. In the LPA's view it concerns the application of the principle of sustainability so that the simplification of the Plan text increases the focus on protecting and enhancing the character of the Borough.

1.12. I observe that Paragraph 2.2 of the UDP states the national policy on sustainable development. In my view D/FRAM/23 does not derogate from that; rather does it explain how such objectives are intended to permeate the Plan. To my mind the reference to the overarching strategic guidance confirms that. I consequently concur with D/FRAM/23.

RECOMMENDATION

1.13. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/23.

Policy/Para **02.34**

Modification ref: **D/FRAM/25**

Inspector's note

The reference in this objection to 'sustainability 'and 'sustainable development' is identical to that made to D/FRAM/23 that I deal with above.

RECOMMENDATION

1.14. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/25.

Para ref: 2.34
Modification ref: X/FRAM/24

Issue

It is extraordinary that sustainability and sustainable development do not figure highly in the Council's considerations.

Inspector's note

I deal with this subject in relation to D/FRAM/23 and D/FRAM/25 above.

RECOMMENDATION

1.15. I recommend that the UDP be modified by X/FRAM/24.

Policy/Para 02.35

Modification ref: D/FRAM/27

Issue

'Improving or enhancing ' should be inserted before 'the character and appearance'.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.16. The objector considers the suggested insertion necessary since some areas within the Borough may be in need of such an approach. In my view the general tenor of the UDP as a whole properly reflects the distinctive character and needs of the Borough and the suggested insertion is unnecessary.

RECOMMENDATION

1.17. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM//27.

Modification ref: D/FRAM/28

Issue

'Sustainable' should not be replaced by 'efficient'.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.18. I am inclined to agree that it is not clear what is meant by an efficient building. In my view the clarity of the Plan could be improved by linking this consideration to the use of resources as a measure of sustainability. I shall recommend a further modification accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

1.19. I recommend that the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/28, save that 'efficient' be replaced by 'resource-efficient'.

Paragraph ref: 2.35

Modification ref: D/FRAM/29

Issue

References to 'discouraging the use of private vehicles' and 'an overall reduction in traffic' should be restored.

Inspector's appraisal and conclusion

1.20. In the LPA's view the objective of the modification is to widen the choice of mode of

Final Version

travel as the means of encouraging less use of the private car. To my mind this approach essentially depends on improving the attraction of using public transport otherwise car use will not reduce. I accept this as a realistic objective.

RECOMMENDATION

1.21. I recommend the UDP be modified by D/FRAM/29.