

Local Plan Examination

Examination Hearing Session 3 **14th June 2017 09.30**
in the Small Hall, Hammersmith Town Hall (+ contingency for overrun on
15th June)

Participants:

Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Council
10 - Quayside Lodge (formerly CLS Holdings)
24 - Home Builders Federation
45 - Berkeley Group (St James & St George) & St William
47 - Stanhope PLC
49 - Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (HO10 only)

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?

HO1 – Housing Supply

1. Is Policy HO1 justified and how will it be implemented effectively?
 - How has the Plan been informed by, and is it consistent with, the Council's (and London's) Housing Strategy?
 - Is Policy HO1 consistent with National Planning Policy Framework and aligned adequately with the London Plan?
 - 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 2016 SHMA)?
 - Is the SHMAA 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?
 - Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust?
2. Should housing targets be referenced as minimums?

3. 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?
4. Are the needs of single persons recognised adequately?
5. 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?
Is a 'non-implementation allowance' required?
6. 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?

HO2 – Housing Conversion and Retention

7. What evidence supports the content of Policy HO2 and is the policy justified?

HO3 – Affordable Housing

8. Is Policy HO3 justified and effective and consistent with national policy?
 - Does the LP reference 'starter homes' robustly? Should the Plan reference self-build opportunities for affordable housing? Are self-build and starter homes referenced adequately and in line with national policy?
 - Is the Policy consistent with the Mayor's emerging SPG?
 - Is the Council's proposed change, ref MC 70, minor?
 - Does the plan acknowledge adequately the role of intermediate rent as an affordable housing tenure within private rented developments?
9. 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?
10. Is the approach for viability assessments for each scheme justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

To what extent has 'pepper potting' been considered in relation to its potential effect upon the viability of developments?

HO4 – HO9

11. Is Policy HO4 (Housing Quality and Density) justified and aligned with the London Plan? Is it flexible?

12. Is HO5 (Housing Mix) justified and deliverable? What is the evidence for the housing mix proposed by HO5 and how has this been considered against alternatives?
13. Is HO6 (Accessible Housing) justified, deliverable with regard to viability and consistent with national policy?
14. Should HO7 (Needs of people who need care and support) include a target for the provision of supported homes?
15. Is HO8 (Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation) justified and is it clear how it would be implemented effectively?
16. Should the plan confirm that student accommodation (Policy HO9) does not contribute to the housing target? Are the policy criteria sufficiently clear for effective implementation?
17. Is HO11 (Detailed Residential Standards) justified and flexible?

HO10 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

18. 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? What engagement with relevant communities has been undertaken outside of the Borough?
19. Has the duty to cooperate been employed adequately (and sufficiently widely) to address the issue of gypsy and traveller accommodation effectively?
20. How have alternatives been considered and discounted? Has consideration been given to accommodating needs elsewhere within the Borough?
21. 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?

d) Any other matters

e) Close