

Local Plan Examination

Examination Hearing Session 1

26th September 2017 am

Participants:

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council

181- Max Millington

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

Agenda

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

LEGAL COMPLIANCE, SPATIAL VISION AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Is the Plan legally compliant? Does the Plan contain a robust spatial vision and justified strategic objectives consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

1.	Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the associated regulations ¹ , including in respect of the publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification?
2.	Does the Plan acknowledge adequately cross border issues, particularly with regard to the Duty to Cooperate on strategic matters? Have there been timely, effective and conclusive discussions with key stakeholders and prescribed bodies on what the plan should contain? How does the Plan align with those of adjacent Boroughs?
3.	Has the production of the Plan followed the Local Development Scheme (is the LDS up to date in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011)?
4.	Has the production of the Plan followed the Statement of Community Involvement? Has the consultation on the submitted plan (and its changes) been adequate?

¹ Particularly, The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

5.	Is the Equalities Impact Assessment adequate and robust in terms of its methodology and conclusions?
6.	Has the Plan been prepared to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in general conformity with the London Plan? What review mechanisms are inbuilt? Is the Plan in general conformity with the London Plan?
7.	Has adequate consideration been given to the Habitat Regulations? Will the implementation of the Plan, alone or in combination, affect adversely any Natura 2000 sites? Is Natural England satisfied with the content of the Plan, particularly with regard to potential effects on Richmond Park SAC?
8.	Does the Plan contain a positively prepared, clear and justified vision for the Borough? How have reasonable alternatives been considered and discounted? Is the spatial vision justified and robust with due regard to inclusive design?
9.	How have the Strategic Objectives been derived, are these adequate and linked to specific policy provision? Are the Strategic Objectives, as worded, consistent with subsequent policy provision, eg meeting peoples' housing needs? Is inclusive design referenced adequately?
10.	To what extent, and through which iterations, has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the submitted Plan ² ? Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and that those reasons are still valid)?
11.	Are issues of development viability recognised adequately by the Plan and its evidence base? Has a final viability assessment been undertaken for the content of the Plan as a whole which supports the deliverability of the plan objectives in a manner consistent with national policy?

² Discussion upon alternative approaches to specific policy content will be undertaken at subsequent and relevant hearing sessions as necessary.

12.	Should the Plan contain a more fulsome and inclusive reference to the role of Neighbourhood Planning? Is the submitted Plan in line with national policy in this regard?
13.	How are changes to the policies map ³ intended to be collated and shown within the Plan? Are the changes proposed to the map currently sufficiently clear and comprehensive?

d) AOB

e) Close

³ To be discussed at Hearing 7 further.