

Local Plan Examination

Examination Hearing Session 6

11th October 2017 09.30

Participants:

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council
 073 - GL Hearn On Behalf Of Evergreen Investment Retail Company.
 095 - Colliers and Counsel of Landmark Chambers On Behalf Of Greggs Plc.
 187 - Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society
 295 - Boyer Planning (Philip Allin) On Behalf Of Twickenham Plating Ltd, Percy Chapman & Sons Ltd, Electroline Ltd

Agenda

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

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT; BOROUGH CENTRES

Does the local plan provide the most appropriate and robust strategy towards the economy and the Borough centres with due regard to cross border issues? Is the approach evidenced adequately and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan? Will the approach be effective?

	Borough Centres
1.	Is the approach to retail provision within the Borough over the plan period robust (evidence relating to capacity/needs) and in line with the London Plan?
2.	What evidence supports Policy LP 25 and how will it be implemented effectively? How has the centre hierarchy been defined? Is the 200m ² threshold contained in criteria 2 justified?
3.	Does the Plan take an evidence based approach to the identification of key and secondary retail frontages (LP 26) which is suitably robust? Are these recognised in the Policies Map? Does the Plan take a positive and justified approach towards retail activity in the

	<p>Borough centres and towards local shops and services? Will LP26 (A) prove inflexible in practice?</p> <p>What evidence supports the Plan's intentions with regard to 'over concentration' of uses? Is this consistent with national policy and the London Plan?</p> <p>Does LP 26 allow for banks/building societies to locate reasonably in retail frontages?</p> <p>Is LP 26 criteria F (2 years of marketing) and Appendix 5 justified?</p>
	<p>Economy</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>What robust evidence justifies Policy LP 40 and how will it be implemented effectively, with due regard to viability?</p> <p>Does the policy provide adequate flexibility for potential changing circumstances over the plan period?</p> <p>Does the plan contain flexibility in Policy LP41 by recognising that affordable workspace could be provided by its design or its rent?</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>What robust evidence supports Policy LP41 and how will it be implemented effectively? Is the Borough wide approach to office floorspace justified and consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan?</p> <p>Is the sequential approach to redevelopment justified?</p> <p>Are the Key Office Areas identified through a robust evidence base?</p> <p>Is the provision of affordable office space justified and should the policy contain a reference to SPD?</p>

6.	<p>What robust evidence supports Policy LP42 and how will it be implemented effectively? Is the Borough wide approach to industrial floorspace justified?</p> <p>Is a 2 year marketing period justified and will it be effective in implementation?</p> <p>Is the approach towards locally important industrial land and business parks supported adequately by the evidence base, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?</p>
7.	<p>What robust evidence supports LP 43 and the provision of visitor attractions and accommodation? Is the approach aligned adequately with the London Plan?</p>

d) AOB

e) Close