

Richmond Local Plan

MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS WITH DRAFT HEARINGS PROGRAMME

Inspectors

Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

and

Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

Hearings commence 1000 Tuesday 25 June 2024

Civic Centre, 44 York Street, Twickenham, TW1 3BZ

This programme should be read in conjunction with
the Inspector's Briefing Note

Charlotte Glancy
Programme Officer

Tel: 01903 776601

Mobile: +447519 628064

E-mail: bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

Web:
https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/draft_local_plan/draft_local_plan_examination

The Examination Library is managed by the Programme Officer and contains all submission documents, representations and information relating to the examination. It will be updated as further documents are submitted. Documents can be downloaded from the examination website. In the run up to the examination paper copies can be provided if necessary, by contacting the Examination Office, C/O Banks Solutions, 80 Lavinia Way, East Preston, West Sussex, BN16 1DD

Important Notes

- Participants should only respond to the questions which directly relate to their previously submitted written representations on the plan. Please clearly indicate in your statement(s) the question(s) you are answering.
- Further statements should be proportionate in length to the number of questions being answered and should not, in total, exceed 3,000 words per Matter.
- The plan is being examined as submitted by the Council. Therefore, at this stage, it is not necessary to consider the merits for development of sites not included in the plan ("omission sites"). Should it be determined that there is a need for additional or different sites to be allocated, we will, in the first instance, ask the Council to consider how it would wish to proceed with the Examination.
- The questions concerning soundness are primarily focussed on the plan's policies. Insofar as they relate to the plan's soundness other elements of the plan, including the supporting text, will be considered as part of the discussion of the relevant policies.

TIMETABLE

The Main Matters (MM) are set out in detail below.

WEEK 1

Day 1 – 1000 - Tuesday 25 June 2024

- Inspectors' Opening Statement
- Council's Opening Statement
- Main Matter 1 – Legal Requirements and Overarching Issues
- Main Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy (Policies 1 and 2)

Participants [Day 1]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 2 – 1000 - Wednesday 26 June 2024

- Main Matter 3 – Delivering new homes and an affordable borough for all (Policies 10 – 16)
- Main Matter 4 – Hampton and Hampton Hill (Site Allocations 1 – 5)
- Main Matter 5 – Teddington and Hampton Wick (Site Allocations 6 – 9)

Participants [Day 2]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 3 – 1000 - Thursday 27 June 2024

- Main Matter 6 – Twickenham, Strawberry Hill & St Margarets (Site Allocations 10 – 19)
- Main Matter 7 – Whitton & Heathfield (Site Allocations 20 – 22)
- Main Matter 8 – Ham, Petersham & Richmond Park (Site Allocations 23 – 24)

Participants [Day 3]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 4 – Friday 28 June 2024 - Reserve

Reserve Morning if Required (MM1 to MM8)

WEEK 2

Day 5 – 1000 - Tuesday 2 July 2024

- Main Matter 9 – Richmond & Richmond Hill (Site Allocations 25 – 30)
- Main Matter 10 – Kew (Site Allocations 31 – 34)
- Main Matter 11 – Mortlake & East Sheen (Site Allocations 35 – 38)
- Main Matter 12 – Barnes

Participants [Day 5]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 6 – 1000 - Wednesday 3 July 2024

- Main Matter 13 – Responding to the climate emergency and taking action (Policies 3 – 9)
- Main Matter 14 – Shaping and supporting our town and local centres as they adapt to changes in the way we shop and respond to the pandemic (Policies 17 – 20)
- Main Matter 15 – Increasing jobs and helping business to grow and bounce back following the pandemic (Policies 21 – 27)

Participants [Day 6]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 7 – 1000 - Thursday 4 July 2024

- Main Matter 16 – Protecting what is special and improving our areas (Policies 28 – 33)
- Main Matter 17 – Increasing biodiversity and the quality of our green and blue spaces, and greening the borough (Policies 34 – 43)

Participants [Day 7]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 8 – Friday 5 July 2024 (Morning Only)

Reserve Morning if Required (MM9 to MM17)

WEEK 3

Day 9 – 1000 - Tuesday 9 July 2024

- Main Matter 18 – Improving design, delivering beautiful buildings and high-quality places (Policies 44 – 46)
- Main Matter 19 – Reducing the need to travel and improving the choices for more sustainable travel (Policies 47 – 48)
- Main Matter 20 – Securing new social and community infrastructure to support a growing population (Policies 49 and 50)

Participants [Day 9]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

Day 10 – 1000 - Wednesday 10 July 2024

- Main Matter 21 – Creating safe, healthy and inclusive communities (Policies 51 – 54)
- Main Matter 22 – Implementation, Delivery and Monitoring (Policy 55)

Participants [Day 10]

London Borough of Richmond and TBC

WEEK 4 – Reserve Week

Should additional hearing sessions or time be required the timetable will be adjusted to allow for hearings to continue from Tuesday 16 July 2024

Please note

Timings - whilst the start time for each day is fixed, the morning, afternoon, and lunch breaks and close of sessions are dependent on the discussions during the hearing and therefore maybe subject to change.

The Inspectors' have set out their Main Matters and Issues below. These are based on the main headings and chapters of the Richmond Local Plan. This will allow everyone who wishes to make representations at the Hearing to participate at the appropriate time.

The hearings programme is draft and maybe subject to minor changes please ensure that you keep updated at the examination website.

MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIQs)

Abbreviations

RLP – Richmond Local Plan

LP – The London Plan

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework

Main Matter 1 – Legal Requirements and Overarching Issues

Duty to Cooperate

Has the Council met the duty to cooperate and is this clearly evidenced? In particular:

- Have all the relevant strategic matters in relation to this duty been clearly identified?
- Has the Council maximised the effectiveness of plan-making activities by engaging constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with the prescribed bodies, in the preparation of the Plan in the context of these relevant strategic matters? Does the evidence clearly set this out?

London Plan

- Is the RLP in 'general conformity' with the London Plan as required by the provisions of Section 24 of the 2004 Act?

Does RLP meet all other legal requirements, specifically:

- Does the content and timescale for preparation of RLP accord with the latest version of the Local Development Scheme?
- Has RLP consultation complied with the Statement of Community Involvement and public consultation requirements in the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012?
- Has RLP been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and have the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment been met? Is it clear how the SA influenced the final plan and dealt with mitigation measures?
- Have the requirements for appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations been met? Have the results of the Habitats Regulations Assessment been carried forward in the RLP?
- Has the preparation of RLP complied with the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012?

- Does the 'policies map' correctly illustrate geographically the application of policies of the RLP?

Consistent with National Policy

Does RLP accord with national policy for plan making in the NPPF, specifically:

- Does RLP contribute to the achievement of the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social, and environmental?
- Has it been positively prepared 'in a way that is aspirational but deliverable'? (Paragraph 16 of the NPPF)
- Is RLP consistent with the NPPF in all other respects? Or if not, what is the justification for any inconsistency?
- Do the policies in RLP provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

POLICIES

Main Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy (Policies 1 and 2)

- Is the Spatial Strategy for the London Borough of Richmond justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, including the London Plan?
- Is the plan period sufficiently defined i.e., clearly written and unambiguous?
- Is the living locally concept (Policy 1) and spatial strategy (Policy 2) supported by robust and up to date evidence and otherwise soundly based?

Main Matter 3 – Delivering new homes and an affordable borough for all (Policies 10 – 16)

- Does the Plan and in particular Policy 10 New Housing make adequate provision to meet Richmond's housing needs for the whole plan period (15 Years) and does the plan clearly set out a delivery trajectory that is achievable?

- Is the plan consistent with the Government objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, as expressed in the NPPF? Do the Council's latest HDT results have implications for the housing delivery and trajectory expectations in the submitted plan?
- Policy 11 Affordable Housing- Are requirements for affordable housing positively prepared, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable? Are the plan's requirements consistent with the NPPF and in general conformity with the LP?
- Does Policy 12 adequately address the needs for all types of housing and the needs of different groups in the community?
- Having regard to *Lisa Smith v SSLUHC* [2022] EWCA Civ 1391 dated 31st October 2022, a judgement regarding the interpretation of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) and the application of that policy to Gypsies and Travellers who have ceased to pursue nomadic lifestyles. Does the RLP make adequate provision to meet the housing requirement for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People in Richmond? Or considering this Judgement does the Council judge it necessary to review their assessment of Traveller site needs for the Borough?
- Policy 16 Small Sites – Is the annual requirement of 234 new homes per annum (3510 over the plan period) in accordance with Policy H2 of the LP consistent with the available evidence and deliverable?
- Are the delivering new homes and an affordable borough for all policies clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

PLACE BASED STRATEGIES AND SITE ALLOCATIONS

Main Matter 4 – Hampton and Hampton Hill (Site Allocations 1 – 5)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?

- Would the location of Site Allocation 2 Platts Eyot, Hampton contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, including in relation to flood risk?
- Is wording of the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 5 – Teddington and Hampton Wick (Site Allocations 6 – 9)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 6 – Twickenham, Strawberry Hill & St Margarets (Site Allocations 10 – 19)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 7 – Whitton & Heathfield (Site Allocations 20 – 22)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 8 – Ham, Petersham & Richmond Park (Site Allocations 23 – 24)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 9 – Richmond & Richmond Hill (Site Allocations 25 – 30)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?

- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 10 – Kew (Site Allocations 31 – 34)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 11 – Mortlake & East Sheen (Site Allocations 35 – 38)

- Is the area strategy and are the site allocation policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Do the housing site allocations show how they will contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?
- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Main Matter 12 – Barnes

- Is the area strategy for Barnes justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance and local context; and are they in 'general conformity' with the LP?
- Is it clear how any housing provision could contribute to the achievement of the RLP's overall housing requirement over the plan period and the timescale for delivery?
- Is it clear how the expectations for employment, commercial, retail, social and community infrastructure will contribute to an evidenced need?

- Is the policy clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals in Barnes?

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Main Matter 13 – Responding to the climate emergency and taking action (Policies 3 – 9)

- Is the plan’s response to the climate emergency justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national policy and guidance, local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Are the requirements of Policies 3 – 9 which seek to tackle the climate emergency both viable and deliverable when applied alongside all other policy requirements of the plan?
- Do the Policies 3 –9 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- Is the plan’s policy for flood risk (Policy 8) prepared with the objective of achieving sustainable development and does it avoid unnecessary duplication of national policy and guidance?
- Has Policy 9 (Water Resources and Infrastructure) been shaped by engagement with all stakeholders, including infrastructure providers and statutory consultees?
- Is the RLP consistent with Government policy in the written ministerial statement by Baroness Penn, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Levelling-up, Housing and Communities on of 13 December 2023, in relation to local energy efficiency standards? Particularly, where it states ‘that the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned building regulations’?

Main Matter 14 – Shaping and supporting our town and local centres as they adapt to changes in the way we shop and respond to the pandemic (Policies 17 – 20)

- Are the requirements set out in Policies 17 - 20 justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?

- Are the policies clearly defined and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
- Policy 19 (D) Is the term 'over-concentration of similar uses' sufficiently defined?
- Is the proposed 400m school exclusion zone for fast food takeaways justified by appropriate available evidence?

Main Matter 15 – Increasing jobs and helping business to grow and bounce back following the pandemic (Policies 21 – 27)

- Are the requirements justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Do the policies provide a clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- Are the policies clearly written and unambiguous?
- Does RLP make adequate provision to meet Richmond's economic growth requirements for the plan period and its timescale for delivery?
- Is the requirement to retain all office and industrial space justified?
- Is Policy 22 (D) referring to the agent of change principle? Should this be referenced unambiguously?
- Policy 26 Visitor Economy - Are restrictions on short stays exceeding 90 days justified by appropriate available evidence?

Main Matter 16 – Protecting what is special and improving our areas (Policies 28 – 33)

- Are the requirements of the protecting what is special and improving our areas policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Do Policies 28 – 33 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

- Do the policies serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy? Is the wording consistent with national policy?
- Policy 29 Designated Heritage Assets - Is the policy approach to the submission of outline planning applications in conservation areas justified and consistent with national policy?

Main Matter 17 – Increasing biodiversity and the quality of our green and blue spaces, and greening the borough (Policy 34 – 43)

- Are the requirements of the increasing biodiversity and the quality of our green and blue spaces, and greening the borough policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- Are the policies clearly written and unambiguous?
- Do the policies serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy? Is the wording consistent with national policy or is there evidence to justify any deviation?
- Are the circumstances under which financial contributions are sought within Policy 37 clearly written and unambiguous? Is it clear how any financial contribution will be calculated and on what the money would be spent? Is the requirement deliverable?
- Are requirements for urban greening supported by available evidence and would they be deliverable alongside all other requirements?
- Is the RLP consistent with Government guidance that 'plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified' (PPG Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214)? As such, is 20% biodiversity net gain justified by specific local circumstances and evidence? Is it deliverable alongside other requirements?
- Is the RLP consistent with Government guidance that states 'It will also be inappropriate for plans or supplementary planning documents to include policies or guidance which are incompatible with this framework, for

instance by applying biodiversity net gain to exempt categories of development' (PPG Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214)?

- Is the removal of permitted development rights for all development involving a new dwelling consistent with national policy and guidance? Is there clear evidence to support the requirement?
- Policy 39 Biodiversity and Geodiversity (Appendix 4) – Are the proposed alterations to SINCS justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context?
- Policy 40 (E) - Is the requirement for all development adjoining the Thames to provide a public riverside walk deliverable?

Main Matter 18 – Improving design, delivering beautiful buildings and high-quality places (Policies 44 – 46)

- Are the requirements of the Improving design, delivering beautiful buildings and high-quality places policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- Do the policies serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy? Is the wording consistent with national policy?
- Policy 44 (E) – Design Process - Are the requirements to enter into a PPA; engage with the Richmond Design Review Panel; and provide 3D digital massing models justified by specific local evidence? Are the requirements deliverable?
- Policy 44 (F) – Design Process - Is the requirement for design codes on all major planning applications justified by specific local evidence?
- Policy 45 – Tall and Mid-Rise Buildings - Is the policy consistent with Policy D9 of the London Plan?

Main Matter 19 – Reducing the need to travel and improving the choices for more sustainable travel (Policies 47 – 48)

- Are the reducing the need to travel and improving the choices for more sustainable travel policy requirements justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?

Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

- Is it clear how the need for any financial contributions would be triggered, calculated and spent? Is this justified by specific local evidence?
- Policy 47 - Are the Transport Impact Assessment thresholds contained in Table 23.1 justified by local evidence?
- Policy 48 (I and J) Are requirements for car club spaces or financial contributions in lieu fully justified by local evidence? Are the proposals informed by effective engagement with car club providers?
- Policy 48 (K and L)- Is there clarity regarding the movement of passengers and freight via the river?

Main Matter 20 – Securing new social and community infrastructure to support a growing population (Policies 49 and 50)

- Are the requirements for social and community infrastructure justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national policy and guidance, local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Are the requirements of Policies 49 and 50 deliverable?
- Do the policies give clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Main Matter 21 – Creating safe, healthy and inclusive communities (Policies 51 – 54)

- Are the requirements justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, and meeting the requirements of the London Plan?
- Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

- Is it clear how the need for any financial contributions would be triggered, calculated and spent? Is this justified by specific local evidence?
- Policy 53 (O) - Is it clear in what circumstances the Council will seek a monitoring fee in relation to construction management plans?
- Policy 54 (C) - Are the requirements in relation to basement development clear without recourse to SPD's and other documents that have not been examined alongside the RLP?

Main Matter 22 – Implementation, Delivery and Monitoring (Policy 55)

- Will the Council's monitoring and review processes for the RLP be effective in assessing the success or failure of delivery and what alternatives might reasonably be provided if necessary?