

Local Plan Examination

Examination Hearing Session 5 **20th June 2017 pm** **in Committee Room 1, Hammersmith Town Hall**

Participants:

Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Council
10 - Quayside (formerly CLS Holdings)
17 - Hammersmith Society
39 - Power Leisure Bookmakers Ltd
60 - Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited

Agenda

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

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT; TOWN CENTRES

Does the local plan provide the most appropriate and robust strategy towards the economy 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?

1. What robust evidence justifies Policy E1 (Providing for a Range of Employment Uses) and how will it be implemented effectively, with due regard to viability?

Does the policy provide clarity for sui generis uses?

Does the plan contain flexibility in Policy E1 by recognising that affordable workspace could be provided by design or rent?

2. What evidence supports Policy E2 (Land and Premises for Employment Uses) and how will it be implemented effectively? Is E2 justified and sufficiently flexible to be effective in operation?

To what extent has the Royal Mail concerns on infrastructure been considered? Should E2 reference the Royal Mail estate?

3. Is Policy E4 (Local Development, Training and Skills Development Initiatives) justified and will it be clearly effective in delivery?

4. What evidence supports Policy TLC1 (Hierarchy of Town and Local Centres) and how will it be implemented effectively?

Is the approach to retail provision over the plan period robust (capacity/needs)?

Is the proposed threshold at TLC 1(g) justified by the evidence base with due regard to national policy?

5. Does the Plan take an evidence based approach to the identification of primary and secondary retail frontages which is robust? Are these recognised in the Policies Map?

Is the Parsons Green Lane Parade accurately identified?

6. Is the quota approach in TLC 2 (Town Centres) justified by the evidence base? Is it clear how the policy will be implemented effectively?

7. Is TLC 3 (Local Centres) and its proportions of A1 uses justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy?

8. Is TLC 4 (Parades et al) and its approach to A1 uses justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy?

9. Is TLC 5 (Impact of Food and Drink) justified, positively prepared and capable of effective implementation? Is it too prescriptive in terms of opening hours?

10. Is TLC 6 (Betting Shops, Pawnbrokers and Payday Loan Shops and Hot Food Takeaways) justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy?

11. Is TLC 7 (Public Houses) justified by the evidence base with particular regard to the viability requirements of 1.a?

d) Any other matters

e) Close