

## **Local Plan Examination**

### **Examination Hearing Session 4 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017 09.30** **in Committee Room 1, Hammersmith Town Hall**

#### **Participants:**

Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Council  
17 - Hammersmith Society  
76 - Queens Park Rangers Football Club  
49 - Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

#### **Agenda**

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

#### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES, LEISURE, RECREATION, GREEN AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, RIVER THAMES, TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

**Is the approach of the Plan to community facilities, leisure and recreation activities, the provision of green and public open space, the River Thames, transport and accessibility justified by the evidence base, consistent with national policy and will it be effective in operation?**

1. Is CF1 (Supporting Community Facilities and Services) based on a robust evidence of needs and existing provision? Is it flexible and will it be effective in delivery?
2. Does the plan reference robustly and accurately the health care services of the Borough and its future infrastructure needs? Is the plan based on sufficient evidence of demand and supply over the Plan period?
3. Is the approach to sport and recreation justified by a sufficiently robust evidence base?
4. Should CF2 (Enhancement and Retention of Community Uses) reference the emergency services/fire stations? Is the plan underpinned by an awareness of the capacity and requirements of emergency services?

How will local needs for new or expanded community uses be determined?

5. Is the approach to QPR FC clear and consistent between Policy CF 4 (Professional Football Grounds) and WRCA 2?
6. How have current open space provision and needs been assessed? What up to date evidence supports Policies OS1 (Parks and Open Space) and

OS2 (Access to Parks and Open Spaces)? Is the approach consistent with national planning policy?

7. Is Policy OS4 (Nature Conservation) justified by the evidence base and is Natural England content with its content? Does the Plan reference Areas of Deficiency in Access to Nature adequately?
8. Is food growing referenced adequately and is the Plan aligned with the London Plan in this regard?
9. Is Margravine Cemetery referenced adequately within the Plan?
10. Are the River Thames policies (RTC1-4) justified by the evidence base with particular regard to the Tidal Foreshore/Management Plan and heritage related matters?
11. Is Policy T1 (Transport) justified by the evidence base and in general conformity with the London Plan?  
  
Is the reference to Crossrail justified and deliverable?  
  
Is the proposed change, ref MC 121, minor (re river)?
12. Are the requirements of Policy T2 (Transport Assessment and Travel Plans) justified and will they be effective in operation/capable of delivery?
13. Is Policy T4 (Parking Standards) justified? How will parking standards (including cycling) be set and managed?
14. Are the Council's proposed changes to Policies T3 and T4 (ref MC 198 and MC 199) minor?

**d) Any other matters**

**e) Close**