

**Proposed Submission Core Strategy for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea with a focus on North Kensington**

**Development Plan Document**

**Local Development Framework**

**Publication Stage Representation Form**

Please e-mail this form to: [planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk)

*Alternatively send this form to:*

Planning Services  
Policy Team  
Room 328  
The Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London  
W8 7NX

*For further information:*

Visit our website at: <http://ldf-consult.rbkc.gov.uk>

Phone the LDF hotline on: 020 7361 3879

**Responses must be received no later than midday Thursday 10 December 2009**

**Personal Details**

**Name:**...Mark Bedding.....

**Organisation:**...Savills (L&P) Limited.....

**Address:**...Lansdowne House, 57 Berkeley Square, London W1J 6ER.....

**Phone:** ...020 3320 8283.....

**E-mail:**...M.Bedding@savills.com.....

To be “sound” a core strategy should be JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE and consistent with NATIONAL POLICY.

“Justified” means that the document must be:

- founded on a robust and credible evidence base
- the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives

“Effective” means that the document must be:

- deliverable
- flexible
- able to be monitored

“Consistent with National Policy” means that it is consistent with government guidance contained within Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements

Do you consider the core strategy to be legally compliant?

Yes

No

Do you consider the core strategy to be Sound?

*Please tick the appropriate box*

**If you have selected YES and you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please be as precise as possible when setting out your comments below**

Please make it clear which Paragraph number, Vision box number, Policy box number or Objective box number you are commenting on.

**Please attach additional pages as required**

**If you have selected NO do you consider the core strategy to be unsound because it is not.**

**Justified**

**Effective**

**Consistent with national policy**

*Please tick the appropriate box*

Please give details of why you consider the core strategy to be unsound or not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible when setting out your comments below.

Please make it clear which Paragraph number, Vision box number, Policy box number or Objective box number you are commenting on.

Policy CH2 (i)

Please see additional pages.

**Please attach additional pages as required**

### **Do you Consider the Core Strategy to be Unsound?**

As acknowledged by the Authority's Submission Core Strategy, the Borough has acute housing affordability issues. However, it is not considered that the approach set out in Policy draft CH2 (i) relating to a lower affordable housing threshold of 800m<sup>2</sup> floorspace to address this identified shortage is supported by a credible and robust evidence base.

In order to justify draft Policy CH2 (i) which "*requires the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being at least 50% provision on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m<sup>2</sup>*", Appendix Two of the Submission Core Strategy states that "*in calculating the floor area equivalent to the affordable housing threshold, the UDP floorspace standards have been applied to the Council's preferred mix for nine market homes i.e. the number of homes that can be built without triggering affordable housing. This calculation has produced a threshold of 800m<sup>2</sup> (8,600ft<sup>2</sup>)*".

The Affordable Housing Viability Study Draft Report (September 2009) explains that this 800m<sup>2</sup> threshold corresponds to an average dwelling size of 860 sq ft. (approximately 80m<sup>2</sup>). It goes on to state that "*irrespective of the specific results of the viability analysis, the 800 sq m threshold could be said to be reasonable*". The viability analysis set out in the study looks at only four sites.

The LPA's evidence identified above is not considered to represent a robust justification.

In terms of GLA guidance on affordable policy thresholds, Policy 3A.11 of the consolidated London Plan (February 2008), states that "*Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site which has the capacity to provide 10 or more homes*". The recently released Draft Replacement London Plan (October 2009) takes the same stance. This adopted policy is the starting point for drafting local planning policy. Local Authorities will retain their ability to negotiate with developers on schemes which trigger the GLA's adopted 10-unit threshold to secure affordable housing on-site or as a result of off-site provision or financial contributions, subject to viability considerations. Any further restrictions to small or medium sized schemes providing some form of affordable housing provision, will simply result in stalled housing delivery and schemes not coming forward to meet housing need or a mix of housing type and tenure.

The evidence base does not demonstrate whether schemes above the threshold of 800 m<sup>2</sup> of additional residential floorspace and below the GLA's adopted "10-unit threshold", could deliver affordable housing without viability being affected. The LPA has not provided robust evidence to determine the level of increased supply which could be achieved by implementing such a threshold (taking account of viability factors). It has also not been demonstrated how it will impact on the delivery of smaller schemes and windfall sites within the District, which the Core Strategy is reliant upon to provide the necessary supply of housing land. This is contrary to the government guidance set out in PPS3 which states that "*local planning authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivering and creating mixed communities.*"

For the above reasons, it is considered that draft Core Strategy Policy CH2 (i) is not compliant with national and regional planning policy, not justified; and is therefore unsound.