

**Examination into the London Borough
of Hackney Core Strategy & Proposals Map DPD**
Inspector • Michael J Hetherington BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI
Programme Officer • Simon Osborn BA TechRTPI
1 Lower Farm Cottages
Puttock End, Belchamp Walter,
Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 7BA
Tel 01787 238097
Email simon@poservices.co.uk

INSPECTOR'S MATTERS, ISSUES & QUESTIONS

Please note: This paper has been amended following the Pre-Hearing Meeting on 26 May 2010. Accordingly, it replaces the draft version issued in May 2010.

Notes:

1. The Council's housing and employment evidence bases have been the subject of initial written questions from the Inspector to the Council. These questions, along with the Council's responses, are available to view on the Examination web site.
2. References to the Core Strategy in this document refer to the consolidated version – i.e. the 'Proposed Submission Document' (June 2009) as amended by the 'Proposed Pre-examination Changes' (December 2009). Copies of the consolidated version were issued at the Pre-Hearing Meeting and are available from the Programme Officer.

Matter 1: Overall Strategy and General Housing Provision

Issue 1: Are the Core Strategy's proposals for sustainable growth and the provision of new housing deliverable, clear, sufficiently justified and consistent with the London Plan and national policy in PPS 3?

- 1.1 Are the Core Strategy's proposals to deliver sustainable growth clearly articulated and adequately justified? Specifically:
 - a) Has the identification of particular locations for growth been adequately justified?
 - b) Should any additional locations be identified (or proposed locations deleted)?
 - c) Does the Core Strategy clearly and consistently set out what amount of development will take place in the growth locations?
 - d) Where specific figures for housing numbers or employment floorspace have been identified in growth locations, are these supported by the evidence base?

- e) Is the precision of the stated figures (for example in policies 1 to 5) supported by the evidence base?
 - f) Does the Core Strategy clearly explain how specific proposals in growth locations will be carried forward in future development plan documents?
- 1.2 Does the Council's evidence base, as updated by its housing paper dated 23 April 2010, identify a sufficient level of housing supply to meet and exceed London Plan targets? Specifically:
- a) Is it clear from the evidence base how the housing land supply figures have been broken down into their specific components:
 - completions
 - outstanding planning permissions
 - existing development plan allocations that have not yet been built and remain available (excluding those with outstanding permissions)
 - housing supply anticipated to come from sites to be allocated in future DPDs (excluding those with outstanding permissions)
 - housing supply anticipated to come from sites that have not been specifically identified as available through the local planning process ("windfall sites").

Inspector's Note: Paragraph 7.1 of the Council's housing paper dated 23 April 2010 states that Table 11 has been sorted and sub-totalled as I previously requested. However, this is not apparent from the document that has been submitted. Can a clearer summary table be provided?

In addition, table 7 (and the supporting text at para 8.1) is incomplete. Can these figures be provided?

- b) Where appropriate, has sufficient evidence been provided in respect of the developability and deliverability of the respective housing supply components?
 - c) Are the housing supply figures in table 7.1 consistent with the housing figures proposed for specific locations elsewhere in the Core Strategy? If not, what can now be changed?
- 1.3 Is the Core Strategy's reliance on windfall developments robustly justified, in line with the requirements of PPS 3 para. 59? Specifically,
- a) Table 10 of the Council's housing paper dated 23 April 2010 lists some 160 sites that were excluded from the London SHLAA. The table provides only summary reasons for the sites' exclusion. These include "high value development" and "other" – the last of these categories accounting for sites potentially accommodating over 2000 dwellings on the Council's assessment.

Do these summary reasons provide the robust justification required by PPS 3? If not, can more detailed evidence be provided?

- b) A number of sites that *have* been identified in the SHLAA have been included in the Council's windfall total. Bearing in mind the stated intention to consider these sites in more detail in subsequent DPDs, have these sites been appropriately excluded from the list of potential site allocations? What is the potential contribution from these sites?

Matter 2: Housing Needs, Affordability and Density

Issue 2: Is the Core Strategy effective in meeting local housing needs, including the provision of an appropriate mix of housing and the delivery of affordable housing?

- 2.1 Does the Core Strategy support an adequate mix of housing sizes and types? Specifically:
- a) Should explicit provision be made for the creation of larger houses to meet the particular needs of the area's diverse population groups?
 - b) Does the Core Strategy make adequate provision for family housing?
 - c) Is the Core Strategy's approach to housing density, including its encouragement for car-free housing, sufficiently justified?
- 2.2 Is the Core Strategy's approach to affordable housing sufficiently justified? Specifically:
- a) Have its provisions for affordable housing been subject to adequate viability testing?
 - b) Is the intended tenure split justified, given the present status of the replacement London Plan?
 - c) Does the Core Strategy provide sufficient guidance on the application of viability testing on a site-by-site basis?
 - d) Is it appropriate to secure the delivery of affordable housing from mixed use developments?
 - e) Is sufficient clarity provided about how affordable housing policies will be carried forward into other development plan documents?
- 2.3 Does the Core Strategy provide satisfactorily for the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? Specifically:
- a) Does the Core Strategy provide sufficient clarity about how, and in which development plan document, specific site allocations will be carried forward?
 - b) Are the criteria for new sites set out in policy 23 consistent with national policy (notably in ODPM Circular 01/2006) – namely, are they fair, reasonable, realistic and effective in delivering sites?

Matter 3: Employment and Town Centre Uses

Issue 3: Is the Core Strategy's approach to economic development, town centre uses and the protection of employment land clearly articulated, sufficiently justified and in line with national and regional policy?

- 3.1 Is the Core Strategy's stance on employment land protection (set out in policy 18) clearly defined and adequately justified? Specifically:
- a) Has the assessment required by policy EC1.3(d) of PPS 4 been carried out in respect of the existing and future supply of land available for economic development – including a reassessment of existing site allocations?
 - b) Do the employment designations on the submission Proposals Map relate specifically to Core Strategy policies, and are these designations (and the changes that have been proposed to them) sufficiently explained and justified in the Core Strategy's text?
 - c) What is the overall effect, in area terms, of the changes that are proposed in respect of employment designations? Specifically, do the Core Strategy's proposed designations represent an increase or a decrease in the area of land allocated for employment purposes – and by how much?
 - d) Is it clear which areas/policy designations are subject to the protection that is afforded by policy 18?
- 3.2 Do the Core Strategy's employment policies provide clear guidance about what uses will be acceptable in designated areas (i.e. Priority Employment Areas, Strategic Industrial Locations, Locally Significant Industrial Sites, Other Industrial Sites and the Central Activities Zone)? Specifically:
- a) Does the Core Strategy provide clear guidance on the acceptability (or otherwise) of housing development within Priority Employment Areas? If not, how could this be clarified?
 - b) In the last paragraph of policy 17, what is the meaning of the requirements for development to “make positive contributions to [the area's] dynamics” and to “contribute to the Delivering Sustainable Growth chapter”? Could these requirements be expressed more clearly?
- 3.3 Are the policy approaches for these designated areas adequately justified and in line with the London Plan and national policy in PPS 4? Specifically:
- a) Does the support for town centre uses in Priority Employment Areas (policy 17) accord with the London Plan and with the sequential approach required by policy EC5.2 of PPS 4?

- b) Are the Core Strategy's proposals for Hackney Wick consistent with other planning policies for that area? For example, does the support for education and training facilities at Hackney Wick conflict with the identified Strategic Industrial Location (SIL)? Is the Core Strategy (for example at paragraph 4.33) sufficiently clear about what changes are now proposed to this SIL?
- 3.4 Are the specific locations and boundaries of those areas that are designated on the submission Proposals Map adequately justified?

Inspector's Note: In responding to question 3.4, the Council should explicitly address the site-specific objections to such designations (notably in respect of PEAs) that have been raised by respondents.

Matter 4: Shoreditch and the Night-time Economy

Issue 4: Does the Core Strategy provide clear policy guidance in respect of potentially conflicting objectives in Shoreditch?

- 4.1 Does the Core Strategy clearly explain how policy objectives in respect of Shoreditch will be balanced? Specifically:
- a) Given the presence of a Special Policy Area, is Shoreditch a suitable location for the 'managed expansion' of the evening and night-time economy (as set out in policy 15)?
 - b) Does the Core Strategy provide clear guidance on how the impact of the evening economy will be managed in Shoreditch?
 - c) Is the geographical extent of the part of Shoreditch covered by policy 15 clearly defined?

Matter 5: Environment

Issue 5: Does the Core Strategy take adequate account of the effects of development on the built and natural environment? Are its proposed measures to tackle climate change effective, justified and in line with national policy in PPS 1's Climate Change Supplement?

- 5.1 Does the Core Strategy present a clear and justified approach to developments involving tall buildings?
- 5.2 Does policy 25 accord with national policy (PPS 5) and relevant legislation in respect of conservation areas and listed buildings?
- 5.3 Does the policy approach for specific growth locations pay adequate attention to any potential effects on the historic environment?

- 5.4 Has adequate justification been provided to support the changes that are proposed to open space designations, including boundary changes, on the submission Proposals Map?
- 5.5 Does the Core Strategy make sufficient reference to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment?
- 5.6 Are the Core Strategy's climate change measures clear, effective and adequately justified (with reference to relevant national policy – notably para 33 of PPS 1's supplement *Planning & Climate Change*)? Specifically:
- a) Should the Core Strategy set specific targets, for example in respect of sustainable building requirements?
 - b) Has adequate justification been provided to support policy 30's proposals for district heating networks – for example in respect of scheme viability and impact on other planning objectives (such as housing delivery)?
 - c) Is clear guidance given about how the proposed district heating networks would be implemented – for example whether, and by what mechanism, contributions would be sought from developers?

Matter 6: Infrastructure and Monitoring

Issue 6: Does the Core Strategy provide satisfactorily for the delivery of development and enable adequate monitoring of its effectiveness?

- 6.1 In respect of infrastructure requirements, has an appropriate balance been struck between the amount of detail set out in the Core Strategy and supporting documentation?
- 6.2 Are the Core Strategy's infrastructure requirements, including those relating to Crossrail and other transportation infrastructure, clearly expressed, adequately justified and consistent with national policy on the use of planning obligations?
- 6.3 Do the Core Strategy's infrastructure requirements take appropriate account of the potential effects on development viability?
- 6.4 Are the Core Strategy's monitoring targets clearly expressed and adequately justified?

Matter 7: Other Matters

Proposals Map

- 7.1 Is it sufficiently clear what changes are being made to the Proposals Map?

Inspector's Note: The Council's response (dated 25 March 2010) to my further queries (dated 19 March 2010) indicates that an addendum could be prepared setting out further detail of deletions and the level of proposed changes. Can this be provided?

- 7.2 Do all of the designations shown on the submission Proposals Map relate to specific policies in the Core Strategy? If not, what is the basis for proposing these designations?
- 7.3 Is the terminology of the Proposals Map's legend consistent with that of the Core Strategy's text?
- 7.4 Does the Proposals Map treat insets clearly and in accordance with relevant regulations?

Other Matters

- 7.5 Does the Core Strategy clearly acknowledge the role of the Olympics – both in respect of specific legacy proposals and more general regeneration effects? Is clear guidance provided about the future of the Olympic site?
- 7.6 Does the Core Strategy provide clear policy guidance on transport proposals and safeguards? Specifically, should the Crossrail 2 safeguards (for example, those referred to in paragraphs 4.12 and 4.46) be set out in a policy as well as the reasoned justification?
- 7.7 Is the Core Strategy's hierarchy of town centres sufficiently justified by the submitted evidence base? Is there any justification for adding further centres to the hierarchy (for example Shoreditch and Hackney Wick have been mentioned by representors)?
- 7.8 Does the Core Strategy provide a clear policy context in respect of waste and minerals? Specifically, does it provide clear guidance on where new waste facilities will be located? If not, is it clear which future development plan document will address this matter?
- 7.9 Does the Core Strategy make adequate reference to flood risk – specifically with respect to sewer flooding?
- 7.10 Does the Core Strategy contain adequate provision and clear policy guidance in respect of places of worship and faith-based development?
- 7.11 Does the Core Strategy contain adequate provision and clear policy guidance in respect of other community facilities – notably primary care provision, policing and higher education?

Michael J Hetherington
Inspector for the Hackney Core Strategy Examination
3 June 2010