

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
1	Sports England	Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the NPPF in encouraging sport and encouraging social interaction, creating healthy, inclusive communities.
2	Environment Agency	Based on the environmental constraints within the area, no detailed comments are made in relation to the Plan at this stage.
3	Natural England	Raise a number of suggestions as to where the wording of the Vision and Policies could be amended to strengthen the consideration of biodiversity and the natural environment throughout the document.
4	Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)	Express concern regarding the lack of policies relating to the loss of public houses in the Plan. A model policy is suggested for inclusion, that they feel is in line with the themes of the Camden Core Strategy CS10 (f) and DP15 and reflects NPPF para 70.
5	Highways Agency	Confirm no comments to make
6	<p>Abt Architecture & Planning On behalf</p> <p>Hampstead Asset Management Ltd & Builders depot 14 Blackburn Road</p>	<p>Believes the Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to referendum in its current form as it fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Main reasons include the failure to properly consider all aspects of viability and deliverability in the Neighbourhood Plan making process, including Policy 4 for the Growth Area including the failure to take into account para 173 of the NPPF..</p> <p>The listed points for consideration for 14 Blackburn Road have increased from previous versions and appear to take no account of being “tested against evidence of the likely ability of the market to deliver” them so as to be “realistic” and provide “high level assurance” of viability in terms of likely values and “cumulative” costs. Nor is any account taken of the extant planning permission for the site including S106 contributions already paid.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
6 (cont)	<p>Abt Architecture & Planning On behalf</p> <p>Hampstead Asset Management ltd & Builders depot 14 Blackburn Road</p>	<p>Other viability considerations relate to Building heights and basements. The thrust of policy 2 appears to discourage tall buildings on the basis of local aspirations rather than other policy considerations. There is no distinction between the growth area and the wider area or the need to understand or appreciate context, by means of more detailed assessment of the parts of the area No assessment of the key sites on which delivery of the plan has been undertaken</p> <p>Policy 2 iii) viability considerations apply to the presumption against basement development of more than one storey. And note that the SEA confirms that use of basements in the area has the potential to take cars off street, but make no mention of the benefits of significant economic and environmental benefits of basement servicing or storage, which should be considered.</p> <p>The Basic Conditions statement fails to make reference to the “Viability and Plan making” (reference ID: 10-005 to 015- 20140306) in the evidence base</p> <p>Objection is also raised on the grounds that the submitted statement of basic conditions fails to refer to "having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State"</p> <p>Due regard has not been given to this in the preparation of the plan and must fundamentally affect the appropriateness of making an order</p>
7	The Theatres Trust	<p>Supports the inclusion in Part 04, Section C – Other Sites: C10. ENO Rehearsal Rooms and proposed retention of a performance or cultural space on the site should it be redeveloped.</p> <p>The Trust supports the intent of Section E to protect and enhance local community facilities but makes suggestions for overarching wording rather than listing individual sites.</p>
8	Transport for London	<p>TfL welcome the final draft although note a number of outstanding comments remain in relation to:</p> <p>D5, D6, D8 and Policy 6 - no objections but would like to see additional wording included.</p> <p>D8 and Policy 6, object to the recommendation of measures to prevent empty buses using Mill Lane</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
8 (cont)	Transport for London	<p>D9 - Buses - object to the loss of any standing spaces at West End Green Policy 7 - expect any changes from a study to improve West End Lane to not adversely affect rail stations, infrastructure or bus operations.</p> <p>Delivery Plan - Use of the Borough CIL is seen as an important contribution to delivery of key infrastructure in the borough and the NDF share of Borough CIL could assist in improvement of transport infrastructure. Further discussions with the Borough and NDF on this matter are requested.</p>
9	Mary Murphy	Fully supports the plan and hopes it will be implemented.
10	Petition signed by 550 people as of 30th October	The petition seeks to keep the reference to Peoples Centre for Change, 96-98 Shoot Up Hill in section E5 and in community facilities to be protected of the Plan
11	Gondar and Agamemnon Residents' Association (GARA)	<p>Supports Section C2 and Policy 5 in relation to Gondar Garden reservoir site, particularly the need to retain as much open space as possible, noting the open space deficiency for the area identified in the Camden Core Strategy.</p> <p>Clarification of the allocated area is sought as different areas are identified on Map 5 and Map 8 and they consider C2 to apply to the area as shown on Map 8.</p> <p>Support Policy 15 in relation to this site, with Gondar Gardens being the Borough sole habitat for slow worms.</p> <p>Support the Plan at sections C3 (policies Station) and C5 (play centre)</p> <p>Support Policy 13 and sections F12 and F13 in relation to local shopping areas</p>
12	HS1 ltd	Confirm no comments to make

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
13	Mark Hutton, Geoff Berridge, Mike Katz and Phil Turner	<p>Concerned that the considerations and related obligations relating to the proposal for a school led development at Liddell Road in section C2, do not have regard to para 173 of the NPPF on viability and thus do not have regard to the Basic Conditions as set out in Planning legislation.</p> <p>General treatment of viability; the inclusion of section B4 is not considered to comply with para 173 and associated guidance which requires viability for key sites to be addressed in plan making. No reference is made in the Statement of Basic Conditions to para 173 of NPPF</p> <p>Concern is raised regarding the Neighbourhood Plan and changing priorities in other documents i.e. London Plan and Camden Core Strategy</p>
14	Helene Baker	<p>Supports the People Centre for Change, 96 - 98 Shoot Up hill in section E5 of the Neighbourhood Plan as wants community members with support needs to be able to access the local services provided by the People Centre for Change. It is important to them to have local resources available that make transport easier and cheaper and offers opportunities for the community to come together.</p>
15	<p>Nathanial Litchfield & Partners</p> <p>on behalf of</p> <p>Linden Wates (west Hampstead) Ltd</p> <p>Owners of Gondar Gardens Site</p>	<p>Further amendments and corrections are needed to the plan to make it sound and appropriately justified.</p> <p>The Housing targets within the Plan should reference the Camden wide targets and London Plan (including further alteration targets) not just the Growth Area targets as these have implications for the wider area of the Neighbourhood Plan and reference should be made in the Vision and Objectives. (Section 2 and 3)</p> <p>There should be some flexibility and reference to viability in Para 3.2.6 with regards to development protecting and enhancing or providing or contributing to new open space.</p> <p>Policy 1 and para A16 Zero carbon new homes reference conflicts with the Camden and London Plan policy position. Insufficient evidence has been provided to justify the requirement for new homes to meet the zero carbon target before 2017 and as worded does not provide necessary flexibility.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
15 (cont)	<p>Nathanial Litchfield & Partners</p> <p>on behalf of</p> <p>Linden Wates (west Hampstead) Ltd</p> <p>Owners of Gondar Gardens Site</p>	<p>Para A24 with regards to potential new Conservation Areas, additional wording is suggested to ensure any proposal is subject to the necessary statutory and policy guidance tests and undertaken in accordance with English Heritage guidance and a comprehensive public consultation process.</p> <p>Policy 3 i) does not accord with Planning and Listed Building Act wording and should state preserve OR enhances, including their distinct character</p> <p>Other Sites: Gondar Gardens as a development site is supported, although there are some inaccuracies that should be corrected. Notably Map 5 is inaccurate and only shows the frontage area not the whole reservoir site. The text fails to accurately reflect the planning decisions made to date and the plan tries to protect views across the site to the east towards Hampstead, which does not fit with previous planning appeals. Suggested wording changes are provided</p> <p>Policy 5 – ‘ Other Sites’ Should be clear that the guidance set out for these sites is indicative only and will be applied flexibly. All the policies set out in 5 are considered sound with the exception of the reference to green / open space. Suggested word changes.</p> <p>Policy 15 - Inclusion of Gondar Gardens in the proposed Local Green space designations conflicts with the inclusion of this site in 'other sites' section. Suggest changes to the wording relating to d) Gondar Gardens to reflect the previously approved developments</p> <p>Policy 16 protecting open space from significant damage or loss through development , if GG is approved as Local Green Space then this protects it from development and so conflicts with Section C</p>
16	<p>Boyer Planning on behalf of</p> <p>Loftus Family Property Owners of Asher House</p>	<p>Supportive of the principle of a Neighbourhood Plan for West Hampstead but have concerns regarding a number of aspects and overall is not considered as currently drafted to be sound. In particular it fails to conform to the Development Plan, London Plan and part 7 and para 60 of the NPPF. It fails to make a distinction between what is or may be appropriate for the West Hampstead growth area now or in the future and other parts of the Plan area.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
16 (cont)	<p data-bbox="338 300 683 363">Boyer Planning on behalf of</p> <p data-bbox="338 419 654 491">Loftus Family Property Owners of Asher House</p>	<p data-bbox="710 260 2047 355">The strategic importance of the Growth Area in providing developable land for London's housing supply must be of paramount importance in considering the appropriateness of the any policies that might limit the development potential of that land. Any limitation on height and density should be discouraged.</p> <p data-bbox="710 411 2047 544">Policy 2 - Design & Character - appears to apply to all sites and as such places undue constraints on the sites in the growth area Para B5 is considered inappropriate as is should not try to cap the number of houses as up to 1000 homes as this is contrary to the London Plan and Camden Core strategy position. Para B5 also tries to impose a presumption against additional height in the Growth Area.</p> <p data-bbox="710 600 2029 695">The text in relation to Asher House states any new building should be lower in height than the student block is prejudicial to the possible outcomes of a robust townscape analysis, which could demonstrate that a building taller than the student block could be appropriate.</p> <p data-bbox="710 751 2024 884">The growth area meets many of the criteria as set out in the London Plan policy 7.7 relating to tall buildings and any attempt to cap heights in the growth area would be prejudicial and inconsistent with this policy. The text in policy 2 does not reflect the current context of the Growth Area with Ballymore scheme providing between 10 -12 storeys and the student block on Blackburn road being 9 storeys.</p> <p data-bbox="710 940 2024 1038">Policy 2 vi) relates to the need to have regard to the impact of development on the setting of the two immediately adjacent conservation areas. The potential for impact on these two conservation areas is considered to be negligible as they are separated by extensive network of railway lines.</p> <p data-bbox="710 1094 2058 1217">The overall tone of the policy is felt to do little to embrace the opportunity for development in the growth area and as such is not in accordance with Core Strategy CS1 or the aspirations of the London Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="710 1233 2058 1332">The survey evidence referred to in para 2.6 is questioned as to whether people were referring to general views on heights of development in the residential areas rather than in the growth area also or whether people were aware of the Growth Areas designation.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
16 (cont)	Boyer Planning on behalf of Loftus Family Property Owners of Asher House	<p>Para 3.2 - which relates to a presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the area as well as views across it, does not allow for any differentiation between the different areas within the NDP area and does not recognise the Growth Area. There is also no assessment of whether there are different areas of 'distinct character'. This approach is considered incompatible with Core Strategy C2 and leads to a presumption against high, higher or tall buildings that does not reflect the areas designation as a growth area in the London Plan.</p> <p>Policy 1 - Housing; whilst welcome the aspirations, as no two sites are the same in the growth area and each will present it individual opportunities and constraints. Policies must be flexible in order to ensure they development is viable.</p> <p>Policy 4 It should be noted that discussions are currently taking place to relocate the tube station entrance to the west of West End Lane and this would reduce pedestrian traffic on the east side and would open up the possibility of redeveloping Blackburn road as a street with emphasis on pedestrian movement with retail, resident and community facilities.</p> <p>Policy 11 - Business, commercial and employment sites and premises; whilst they welcome the aspiration the design of the employment floor space must not be overly constrained. Blackburn Road is not considered a location where employment floor space is desired by the end user or where additional floor space should be provided in the future</p>
17	Natasha Brown	<p>Please keep the People Centre for Change in section E5 as part of the community facilities to be protected from any further change.</p> <p>The centre offers a local and inclusive service to adults with severe learning disabilities and autism, and the small scale nature of the community resource offering a range of individually tailored programmes and activities is highly valued.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
18	<p>Dron and Wright Property consultants</p> <p>On behalf of</p> <p>London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)</p>	<p>West Hampstead Fire station is identified as an 'Other site' under C4 and Policy 5. The LFEPA have no plans to change the use of or alter the main building at the front of the site, however the listed cottages to the rear of the site are separate from the fire station and have been identified as surplus to requirements.</p> <p>Support Policy 5 statement that their preferred use is as independent residential dwellings as this will best preserve the heritage value. They suggest some wording change to allow for any change to the overall structure of these.</p> <p>Some flexibility should be introduced with regards to the potential to create an access to the cottages from Mill Lane open space as it is not clear whether this is possible and so should include a reference to 'where feasible'.</p> <p>Policy E10 - the fire station should not be included in E8 as a public and community facility, as whilst it provides significant local benefit, the location of any station in an area is dependent on the strategic planning oversight of the LFEPA who look at London as wholes needs.</p>
19	<p>Savills</p> <p>On behalf of Stadium Capital Holdings</p> <p>Promoters of the redevelopment at ' Land at Midland</p>	<p>Their site benefits from extant planning consents (PWX002163 and 2008/4958/P) Acknowledgment of the site for mainly student housing is noted but as it is not yet developed, they feel it would be more appropriate to allocate the site for student housing and / or other residential commercial uses.</p>
19 (cont)	<p>Savills</p> <p>On behalf of Stadium Capital Holdings</p> <p>Promoters of the redevelopment at ' Land at Midland</p>	<p>The site also appears to be identified as Parks and Natural areas which is not in conformity with the development plan policies which designates the site for commercial development.</p> <p>In preparing the Council's Core Strategy the site was proposed as open space, however the inspector found that the designation was unsound due to the land not being publically accessible, having no active open space use and low potential for wildlife.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
20	Cllr Lorna Russell Camden Council	<p>The people centre for change should be listed as a community facility under E5 and protected under Policy 10 vii as it is a much loved community facility.</p> <p>They appreciate that it is only one user of the site in Shoot up Hill and therefore suggest rather than removing it from the list, New Shoots day centre is added to the list as well</p>
21	West Hampstead Amenity & Transport (WHAT)	<p>Welcome the many useful proposals but are concerned that the treatment of viability and deliverability for a small number of important large developments does not have sufficient regard to the NPPF or the Basic Conditions requirements.</p> <p>They acknowledge the concerns about large new developments being too high but on the other hand there is a need to finance much needed social benefits, such as school buildings, affordable housing, employment space, access to transport and open space. An important part of the trade-off is between the amount of market housing and social benefits is determined under viability and deliverability tests in s173 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Para B4 and 4C, does not apply the viability tests operationally for large developments and the draft should seek to apply viability test to key developments particularly to ones close to fruition. For other large developments at the very least priorities could be set between different social benefits and between heights and social benefits.</p> <p>They are not arguing for ever more higher buildings but are concerned that unless it is amended to take more account of viability it risks raising expectations which cannot be delivered.</p>
22	GL Hearn on behalf of Land Securities Owners of the 02 site	<p>Comments relate to the 02 centre car park and general development management policies and their link to deliverability, due to the complex and constrained nature of the 02 car park site. If the planning policies are overly restrictive, the sites allocation will be undeliverable due to a lack of feasibility or viability.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
22 (cont)	<p>GL Hearn on behalf of Land Securities</p> <p>Owners of the 02 site</p>	<p>Height - whilst the plan indicates that consultation has clarified a broad requirement to limit heights, it is felt that the consideration for establishing an appropriate height should be site specific and it is important to recognise certain sites with the Plan area that may be suitable for taller buildings.</p> <p>The 02 is considered to be one that can accommodate height above 6 storeys, whilst recognising that it needs to be sensitive to the character of nearby Conservation Areas, any potential impact will be required to be subject to Townscape and Visual Impact analysis, as part of the normal planning process. Suggested word changes are included for para A4.</p> <p>Infrastructure - B9 2nd Para and B9 j). Until the Camden CIL is adopted in 2015, development is only liable for Mayoral CIL and S106, subject the legal tests of reasonableness. Whilst welcoming the statement in para B4, regarding viability of development, they still have concerns with regards to the explicit identification of any potential requirement for development at the 02 to deliver any platform over the railway lines adjoining the site. This would be a major piece of infrastructure and falls outside the development site boundary. its cost would be high and regulatory complexity would be disproportionate cost in relation to the scale of any future development at the car park.</p> <p>They suggest subject to the adoption of a Camden CIL, a footbridge could be included in the regulation 123 list, but should be removed from para B9 and B9j. Or if not removed, the text should clarify that a footbridge feasibility study and / or its delivery will not be directly tied to the future development.</p> <p>B9 (e) improvements to the station should be addressed by CIL or s106, if the legal tests are satisfied and should be removed from the NDP</p> <p>B9(g) whilst it is recognised that community health facilities are required in the north west of the borough, it is felt inappropriate to identify the 02 for providing such a facility without a thorough review of all other sites in the area. Moreover the Plan fails to recognise that the future development of the site will be constrained by the exiting 02 centre and delivery of primary care facility has a realistic potential to undermine the ability to feasibly and viably deliver the residential site allocation. Suggested word changes.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
22 (cont)	GL Hearn on behalf of Land Securities Owners of the 02 site	Blackburn Road; Policy 4 – recommendation to consult on future proposals for Blackburn Road changes; whilst they support the principle of improved permeability for pedestrians and cyclists they feel it overlooks the critical importance of vehicular access to the 02 centre. Suggested word changes are included.
23	West Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum	<p>The Forum wish to emphasise the detailed engagement and consultation that has gone into the plan, including 7 drafts.</p> <p>They highlight the challenges faced in drawing up the first neighbourhood plan for a complex and fast growing urban area, working hard to engage residents, businesses, landowners, public bodies and other stakeholders, while taking a positive approach to sustainable development and the need for new housing, jobs, and infrastructure.</p> <p>A number of comments are raised with regards to Camden Councils comments.</p> <p>Precise wording modifications are requested in order that they can review and indicate where they agree.</p> <p>A number of the comments appear to be general observations and statement of Council non planning policy. How do these relate to the basic conditions and strategic planning policies?</p> <p>The reference in Policy 17 iv) should be to G12 not G11</p>
24	Ines Ferreira & Paul Nicholson	<p>Supports the People Centre for Change being included in the list of community facilities in section E5 of the plan.</p> <p>The consequences of closure, as well as financial cuts for the social, economic and psychological wellbeing of people with severe learning disabilities/ autism/ complex needs and their families are devastating.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
24 (cont)	Ines Ferreira & Paul Nicholson	Believes the Council's plans for a mega centre model does not meet the support needed for users of the People Centre for Change.
25	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	<p>Thames Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the whole district.</p> <p>Para A14 - is supported but should also reference sewer flooding as well as surface water flooding.</p> <p>All developments should also seek to ensure that suitable devices are installed to prevent surcharge from the public sewer entering the premises basement. This is often achieved by positive pumped devices and such measures are required to complex with para 103 of the NPPF which highlights the need to avoid flooding.</p> <p>Para E9 - is supported and its reference to water and waste supply and capacity. Suggested word changes are provided to fully cover the issue.</p> <p>Para G12 - whilst they recognise the environmental benefits of trees and encourages the planting of them, the species and location of trees and street furniture should be carefully considered to avoid damage to below ground infrastructure and top ensure this equipment remains easily accessible.</p>
26	English Heritage	<p>Pleased to note that the Plan recognises the high quality of Fortune Green and West Hampstead historic townscape as a key quality to be protected and enhanced, but offer a number of observations and suggestions in respect of clarifying compliance with the NPPF and local policy</p> <p>Section 2: Area - They would normally advocate that Neighbourhood Plans respect the predefined conservation area boundaries as clearly defined character area and to ensure consistency of historic environment policies and guidance, although they recognise that there may be advantages wider than the historic environment in incorporating elements of an adjacent conservation area.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
26 (cont)	English Heritage	<p>The Plan should therefore be explicit about the reasons for including only part of the South Hampstead Conservation Area and the mechanisms that will be incorporated to ensure consistent application of heritage policies. This could be incorporated into Section 4 policies, Housing and Design and Character.</p> <p>Policies A, Housing Design and Character - Para A5 regarding views would benefit from some additional work. All views need to be more clearly defined and could be numbered on Map 2, cross referencing them with photographs held in a supplementary document. This would assist in the protection of the views as the NPPF states greater weight is given where greater evidence is provided.</p> <p>Except the railway corridors, the view points are all located with the Conservation Area. Would any views outside for example over Hampstead Centre benefit from inclusion? The view corridors would also benefit from better definition.</p> <p>Policy 2 - suggested word changes to strengthen the policy</p> <p>Para A25 - should refer to 'designated' heritage assets and should either list all the listed buildings in the area or revise to identify why the selected few are highlighted, i.e. are they of particular townscape merit?</p> <p>Policy 3 - suggested wording changes including recommendation iii) to better reflect the policies in the NPPF and question whether this should also apply to South Hampstead Conservation Area</p> <p>Suggested word changes to policies and paras within the West Hampstead Growth Area, Transport policies and Natural Environment. Delivery Plan - suggested changes to Table 1 and 2 and The Conservation Area Appraisal management plans should be added to the other plans.</p>
27	Lewis Sullivan	<p>The Vision and Objectives section on Economy should include mention of alternative business structures such as co-operatives, not for profit etc.</p> <p>Section 4 - Policies - A6 should define what affordable housing is and would suggest reducing this to 50% of market rents in this area</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
27 (cont)	Lewis Sullivan	<p>A16, A20 - Suggest including a requirement for BREEAM, code for Sustainable Homes, LEED or other environmental standard for new buildings / refurbishment or a good read on not to use them. This could also include targets for zero waste to landfill</p> <p>D13 - is fully supported though wording could be stronger as a full cycle lane is needed on West End Lane</p> <p>D14 - suggest making West End Lane pedestrianized (perhaps at certain times) or reduced to one way using the additional space for cycling or walking. Or alternatively raise the road surface around the stations and paint with zebra crossings.</p> <p>Basic conditions statement - para 2.8 does not define 'sustainable growth' and suggest changing growth to development or similar as most academic sources would suggest that growth and sustainability are mutually exclusive.</p> <p>If there are no links to objective 13 then would suggest that the plan does not fulfil its sustainability aims.</p>
28	Camden Council	<p>A number of suggestions are made to improve the layout of the document to aid clarity and understanding about which parts are planning policies, supporting text and which are the non-statutory parts of the document.</p> <p>A number of the points raised relate to ensuring that considerations of viability and deliverability of development is taken into account. Para B4 attempts to address this point but is not considered sufficient and this para should apply to all planning policies, not just the Growth Area and Other sites to ensure consistency with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy 2 – need to ensure that the wording around heights allows flexibility for the delivery of the growth. Clarification regarding A4 and 2 vi) is needed. Evidence also needs to be provided to support the presumption against basement development more than 1 storey (para A14 and 2viii).</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
		<p>Policy 4 and para B5 requires all developments to provide or contribute unconditionally towards a range of measures without clarifying how these should be provided or without specific reference to viability. Amendments are needed to address the issue of deliverability and consistency with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy 5 - Site specific comments are provided in relation to a number of sites identified in the Growth Area and Other sites section, including from a landowners perspective on 156 West End Lane at para B8 and Liddell Road site C1.</p> <p>The impact of viability is not explicit in the policy 5 and not all criteria will be relevant to all proposals. The consistency with Policy 11 is questioned in terms of employment space and in particular in relation to buildings rather than sites.</p> <p>The definition of windfall sites at C11 needs to be clarified as it is ambiguous as to when Policy 5 would apply.</p> <p>Policy 6 - Need to be clear as to 'whether making appropriate provision for / and or contribute towards' is via S106 (i.e. only site specific requirements will be permissible in the future) or CIL contributions as it is not possible to seek requirements from both sources. Table 3 – Delivery Plan includes public transport improvements in Category A and therefore suggests this should be delivered through CIL (although the nature/scale of these capacity improvements would be dependent on prioritisation and availability of other funding outside of the CIL and within the remit of TfL)</p> <p>Policy 7 and 8 - will all criteria be relevant for all proposals?</p> <p>Policy 10 – evidence should be provided to the examiner to support this policy position.</p> <p>The inclusion of vii) - protection for the facilities listed in E5 and E6 from damage or loss is of concern as it ambiguous and includes named users of sites rather than the use of the site.</p> <p>Specific concerns raised from a landowner perspective with regards to the inclusion of the People's Centre for Change, given that this one user of a site, and the site is subject to a wider council strategy.</p> <p>Policy 12 – clarification is sought over the nature of contributions to the public realm. Evidence should be provided to support the statement there is no demand for late licenses.</p>

Submission No.	Respondent	Summary of Comments
		<p>Policy 15 - Clarification is sought regarding the proposed Local Green space designations in relation to a number of sites as mapping is unclear.</p> <p>Mapping clarifications on Map 2 regarding the views to be included and Map 8 regarding the site boundaries. Also corrections needed for Local Green spaces and clarification of 'natural areas'.</p> <p>Delivery Plan - There needs to be clarity throughout the document when referring to CIL or S106 priorities about whether they are priorities for CIL or for S106, whilst recognising that the scope for potential s106 requirements will diminish after April 2015. This could be addressed by adding the words "as appropriate and permissible under relevant regulations."</p> <p>There could be greater clarity throughout the document where it requests that development 'contributes' and 'provides' something as to whether the contribution or provision is physical, in kind or financial. Suggest include the caveat: "as appropriate and permissible under relevant regulations."</p> <p>Policy 18 - The policy is labelled "Community Infrastructure Levy Priorities" and Table 3 is labelled "Priorities for CIL spending", but the policy also refers to "...s106 funding, and/or other such schemes..." which lacks the necessary clarity in view of the way that s106 requirements will change once the CIL is in operation. By "...other such schemes..." if this refers to other projects being funded for example by Transport for London or Network Rail, then again this could be made clearer.</p> <p>The identification of CIL priorities is welcomed. This could be more effective if the plan described priority projects in more detail, for example by naming specific locations for pedestrian improvements and what form those improvements might take.</p>