

Chapter 39

Contingencies and Risks

39.1 Contingencies and Risks

39.1.1 PPS12 requires Councils to show what alternative strategies have been prepared to handle any uncertainty about the delivery of the Core Strategy and what would trigger the need for alternatives.

Housing Provision

39.1.2 PPS3 states that local authorities should “*identify different delivery options, in the event that housing delivery does not occur at the rate expected*” (para 62). It adds that, as part of an implementation strategy, local authorities should identify possible risks and constraints to delivery and develop strategies to address any risks. The Council has tested its future housing growth assumptions exhaustively. However, in the event of any unusual circumstances, the Council has formulated contingency plans for three scenarios.

39.1.3 Monitoring will provide the basis on which the contingency plans within the Core Strategy would be triggered, and where necessary undertake an early review of the relevant part of the Core Strategy monitoring identifies.

39.1.4 Scenario 1 – There is a significant (more than 20%) shortfall in the actual delivery against the cumulative total. The Council will identify the reason for the shortfall and address any delivery constraint initially through considering amending policies on receipt of evidence and analysis, and encouraging land assembly. If this constraint cannot be overcome, the Council will return to the potential sites identified in the GLA SHLAA and Housing Capacity Study for assessment, and seek to identify further sites which would be suitable, available and achievable in light of changed circumstances.

39.1.5 Scenario 2 – There is a shortfall against the expected provision in a site or allocation. The Council will identify the reasons for this shortfall e.g. a delivery constraint or a false assumption made in the assessment. The Council will encourage land assembly, and consider amending policies on receipt of evidence and analysis, for example relaxing restrictions on office conversions to residential, if this is deemed appropriate from an employment perspective as well as a housing

perspective. If the shortfall is significant, and will impact on delivery against cumulative total as in Scenario 1, the Council will seek to identify further sites, again from the SHLAA, which would be suitable.

39.1.6 Scenario 3 – Failure to deliver the level of anticipated development. The Council will seek to identify the reasons for the non-delivery and seek to eliminate any constraint, for example by identifying specific sites and encouraging land assembly. Amending policies, as in Scenarios 1 and 2 will be considered, if deemed appropriate, in addition to the Scenario 1 option of identifying further sites. If this is not possible, the Council will review the spatial distribution of future housing sites and may need to give housing greater emphasis relative to other uses and the anticipated growth in the broad location will be encouraged in other parts of the Borough.

Infrastructure

39.1.7 Consultation with internal and external agencies responsible for delivering infrastructure has been undertaken throughout the compilation of the IDP. This will continue, and the IDP will be retained as a ‘live document’, with opportunities to update additional infrastructure requirements as they become known.

39.1.8 The infrastructure schedule (see Chapter 37), which identifies key infrastructure projects required to support the delivery of the Core Strategy, will be maintained by the Council. In preparing the IDP, the investment and operational plans and strategies of the relevant infrastructure providers have been consulted. These therefore recognise the resources required to support infrastructure delivery, and consideration has been given to providing a realistic assessment of requirements. Through working with partners, in particular with regular input from the KCP, the risk that infrastructure will not be forthcoming can be mitigated, or addressed at an early stage.

39.1.9 However, the Council recognises that there is a risk that infrastructure may not be provided. Contingency plans are in place where required, as set out in the following schedules. The only major infrastructure item which is considered to affect the quantum of development envisaged on the strategic sites is the non-delivery of a Crossrail station at Kensal. All other quanta of development are not anticipated to be affected by infrastructure not coming forward when envisaged. Monitoring of infrastructure provision and of the

IDP will ensure that the infrastructure items are both required and necessary, and based on the best available information. Where existing or planned infrastructure provision is not adequate to meet the needs generated by a proposal, the Council will secure provision by the use of planning obligations (see Policy C1). Where there remain capacity problems, or delivery of infrastructure cannot be overcome through securing appropriate planning obligations, the Council will require the developer to fund improvements prior to the development's occupation (or other relevant trigger).

39.1.10 Although there may be circumstances that the Council cannot foresee that may influence the Core Strategy policies, the assessment below demonstrates that each policy has been assessed in terms of the potential known risks and offers contingencies where appropriate.

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
STRATEGIC SITES													
1	Kensal: Cross Rail Station and significant volumes of development on all four of the Kensal sites	a) Regeneration linked to significant improvements in accessibility may be reduced	Yes	Risk (i) Crossrail unable to deliver a station at Kensal, either as a turn back or as a full station	High	High	Yes	Plan B: Improve local accessibility through bus-based improvements and off site rail improvements, and maintain relatively high development densities	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the Council to meet its Housing targets and deliver some local regeneration benefits using the strategy of Kensing sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue al be it with a slightly reduced density	n/a	The development potential would be limited by bus-based improvements. However, whilst less without a Crossrail Station, and the accessibility of the area as a whole may not be transformed as it would by a rail station, but would still be improved by bus-based improvements. Testing indicates that increasing the PTAL from 2.3 to 4 can be achieved by adding one extra bus route. Therefore this would still unlock development at a greater density.	Less development will result in less opportunity to fund works such as connecting links over the railway. It could disuade the Gas Site from coming forward as development value may not outweigh development costs. Therefore development would be based on the 7. The of the Sainsbury's and Ballymore sites. With the existing supermarket likely to expand irrespective of a Crossrail station, the developable land will be around 6. The allowing for an estimated maximum of 1030 dwellings and minimal office floorspace (due to the area failing to reach PTAL 4). Should National Grid retain the gasholders, the HSE

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													<p><u>Consultation Zone would further limit development by a further 150 dwellings (approximately).</u></p> <p><u>Less development is likely to come forward as the PTAL increase would be achieved using buses. Therefore road capacity issues would limit the amount of new dwellings.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1 would have an indicative residential capacity of between 1575 and 1820 new homes.</u></p> <p><u>The Southern Site (North Pole Depot) would still be able to come forward. Development here would be expected to deliver 1080 to</u></p>

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													1248 new dwellings at PTAL 4. Bridges could still be considered as part of Phase 2 of this scenario.
								Plan C: Accept the 'status quo' and not deliver any significant volume of development	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	n/a	This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	n/a	This option is only likely to stimulate development at PTAL 3 and on Phase 1. This would limit development to between 783 and 918 new dwellings which whilst contributing to the borough's housing targets, would not stimulate regeneration at a wide scale.
		b)The scale of development may be reduced if not all four sites are available	Yes	Risk (i) Gas works is retained as part of the gas infrastructure beyond 2016 and does not come forward for development, reducing development capacity and also impacting on the potential of adjacent site	Medium	High	Yes	Plan B: Reduced development on the sites as a whole. In addition, development on the adjacent site would need to take into account the HSE buffer zone which limits residential dwellings	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the strategy - of using the Kensal sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue, al be it with the site at a	n/a	The development potential would be less and thus the regeneration effect upon the area as a whole will be reduced	Less development will result in less opportunity to fund works such as connecting links over the railway. Therefore development would be based on the 7.1ha of the Sainsbury's and Ballymore sites. With the

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
				because of the safety cordon requirements						slightly reduced density			<p>existing supermarket likely to expand irrespective of a Crossrail station; the developable land will be around 6.1ha allowing for an estimated maximum of 1030 dwellings and minimal office floorspace (due to the area failing to reach PTAL-4);</p> <p>Should National Grid retain the gasholders, the HSE Consultation Zone would further limit development by a further 150 dwellings (approximately);</p> <p>.</p> <p>The prolonged presence of the gas holders will limit development on phase 1 to between 1215 and 1404 new dwellings at PTAL 4. The Southern Site (North Pole Depot) would still be able to come forward. AS</p>

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													<p>this is not effected by the Consultation Zone. development here would be expected to deliver 1080 to 1248 new dwellings at PTAL 4. This would indicate the likely capacity of the Strategic Site would be between 2215 and 2652 new dwellings including an enlarged Sainsburys store and other non-residential uses together with the reprovision of existing facilities will also be expected. Bridges would still be considered as part of Phase 2 of this scenario.</p>
								Plan C: increase development on remaining sites to compensate	This option was not explicitly explored as it is not a realistic option	n/a	It is unrealistic to suggest that, taking the safety zone into account, the remaining sites would	n/a	n/a

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
				Risk (ii) North Pole Depot end and National Grid Sites are not released for redevelopment	High	High	Yes	Plan B: Reduced development on the sites as a whole. In addition, the potential of bridge links across the railway, and running a bus-link along the southern side of the railway to connect to Hammersmith and Fulham would be removed	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the strategy - of using the Kensal sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue, al be it with the site at a slightly reduced density and less effective connections	achieve this objective n/a	The development potential would be less and thus the regeneration effect upon the area as a whole will be reduced	Significant transport downside due to no access over railway may significantly limit access to sites north of the railway line. <u>Development would be based exclusively primarily on the Phase 1 Sainsbury's and Ballymore sites.</u> However, <u>achieving PTAL 4 should still remain a probability via bus-based improvements.</u> <u>Developable land will be around 6. the allowing for an estimated maximum of 4030 dwellings will therefore limit residential development to between 1215 and 1404 new dwellings at enforcing the HSE consultation zones or 1575 and 1820 new dwellings should the gasholders be</u>

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
2	Worrington Green Estate renewal including the building of additional private homes for sale alongside the replacement social rented dwellings	a) The existing community will miss out on new homes and the opportunity to increase the Borough's housing stock will be missed	Yes	Risk (i) Funding is not forthcoming from the HCA	Low	High	Yes	Plan B. The project is delayed until alternative funding sources can be found	This was not explicitly considered as a separate option	This is the only alternative available that keeps the strategy for the project in tact	n/a	Benefits of redevelopment would be delayed	Other funding sources will have to be found elsewhere or the site will be delayed until another funding stream becomes available
				Risk (iii) Landowners choose to develop land separately and not in partnership	Low	Med	No	Plan C: increase development on remaining sites to compensate	This option was not explicitly explored as it is not a realistic option	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
								Plan C: increase development on remaining sites to compensate	This option was not explicitly explored as it is not a realistic option	n/a	It is unrealistic to suggest that, taking the safety zone into account, the remaining sites would achieve this objective	n/a	n/a
													decommissioned and the Consultation Zones removed. An enlarged Sainsburys store and other non-residential uses together with the re-provision of existing facilities will also be expected.

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
								Plan C. Further private housing is needed to fund any 'gap' which has serious implications in terms of the quality of the resultant scheme	This was considered as part of the process of preparing an SPD for the site, including examining the case for redevelopment through the OSC process	n/a	This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	n/a	n/a
								Plan D. The development fails to go ahead, and existing homes are retrofitted to decent homes	This was considered as part of the process of preparing an SPD for the site, including examining the case for redevelopment through the OSC process	n/a	This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	n/a	n/a
3	Land adjacent to Trellick Tower: redevelopment of vacant site to facilitate improvements to Trellick Tower	a) The maintenance of the adjacent Grade II* listed Trellick Tower will continue to run into disrepair and the full regeneration benefits will not be realised for this area	Yes	Risk (i) That the site doesn't generate enough additional revenue to keep up with the escalating maintenance costs of Trellick Tower	Medium	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	North Kensington Sports Centre: redevelopment for a new academy and refurbishment or replacement of the existing sports centre.	a) Continued poorer academic achievement with children being educated in neighbouring boroughs	Yes	Risk (i) That the funding for the academy is not available	Medium	High	Yes	Plan B: delay implementation until alternative funding sources can be found	This was not explicitly considered as a separate option	This is the only alternative available that keeps the strategy for the	n/a	Benefits of redevelopment would be delayed	Delivery would be delayed

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
										project in tact			
								Plan C. Not provide a school	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	n/a	This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	n/a	n/a
				Risk (ii) That an academy on the available site cannot be achieved without compromising wider regeneration objectives	Negligible	High	Yes	Potential layouts on the site for a school have been tested demonstrating that the risk to the wider regeneration is negligible, so no Plan B developed despite a 'high' impact score	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5	The Former Commonwealth Institute	a) The west end of Kensington High Street may not attract large numbers of visitors to the new cultural attraction. Parts of the vision for Kensington High Street will be difficult to achieve	Yes	Risk (i) A scheme which delivers the refurbishment and re-use of the Commonwealth Institute "tent building" cannot be agreed	Med	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	Warwick Road sites	a) Reduction in housing provision, and the possibility the Borough may not meet its housing targets	Yes	Risk (i) Primarily the recession	High	High	Yes	There are no Plan Bs that the Council can implement that would counter the international recession. We would have to accept that the	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
7	Earl's Court Exhibition Centre: mixed use redevelopment including an exhibition or convention use	a) The Earl's Court cultural/exhibition 'brand' is lost if no exhibition centre or convention use is included in the redevelopment.	Yes	Risk (i) The exhibition or convention uses require too high a cross-subsidy from the development, forcing up development volumes to unacceptable levels	Negligible	High	Yes	development may be delayed Whilst is the ambition of the Council to retain the possibility of an international convention or exhibition centre in Earl's Court. However, these facilities may be provided within the Kensington Olympia site, and therefore a cultural facility of at least national significance would address the Council's ambition to retain the cultural brand; centre may prove more difficult to achieve; it is clear that the current Earl's Court owners have every intention of building on the Earl's Court brand. Therefore no Plan B is resubmitted to the 'high' impact score	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications	
		b) The Earl's Court One-Way system does not receive sufficient investment to be returned to two-way working or sufficient support from TfL and thus remains in place	Yes	Risk (i) The comprehensive development including the decking over of rail tracks is so expensive that there is insufficient funding or support from TfL to return deliver the unravelling of the one-way system to two-way working.	Medium	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
8	Lots Road Power Station	a) Reduction in housing provision, and the possibility the Borough may not meet its housing targets	Yes	Risk (i) Primarily the recession Risk (ii) The different sites are not developed comprehensively but come forward in a piecemeal manner	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The risks have been assessed as low as pre-enabling works have begun and a formal start on site is expected shortly
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES														
Keeping Life Local														
9	Social and Community Uses (Policy CK1)	a) Lower residential quality of life	Yes	Risk (i) Loss of social and community uses to residential	Medium	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
10	Local Shopping Facilities (Policy CK2)	a) Lower residential quality of life	Yes	Risk (i) Closure of existing shopping facilities due to the recession thus increasing areas of deficiency	Low	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
11	Walkable Neighbourhoods (Policy CK3)	a) Lower residential quality of life	Yes	Risk (i) Changing of strategy by education and PCT which means they need to consolidate facilities	Low	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fostering Vitality													
12	Location of new shop uses (Policy CF1)	a) The viability and diversity of the Borough's accessible areas which contain the mix of uses need by residents and visitors to the Borough may decline. The vision to create a borough that contains a diverse mix of uses will be difficult to achieve if our town centres are not the driver for this. The Latimer and Kensal areas will not benefit from new centres which will serve the day-to-day needs of residents, with residents having to make do with existing provision in the area. These centres will only be required if the redevelopment of the areas occur	Yes	Risk (i) Policies unsuccessful in implementing the town centre first approach to new town centres. Large scale residential development in the Latimer and Kensal areas does not occur.	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
13	Retail Development within town centres (Policy CF2)	a) The town centres maintaining their distinct characters and functions will be difficult to achieve. The vision to create a borough that contains a diverse mix of uses will be difficult to achieve if our town centres are not the driver for this	Yes	Risk (i) Centres therefore decline relatively to our competitors	Low	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
14	Diversity of uses within town centres (Policy CF3)	a) The retail expenditure that cannot be accommodated within existing centres, or by the expansion of the existing centres, will "leak" to neighbouring borough's where it will not contribute to the borough's economy. This could result in the Boroughs town centres not being as large or as "successful" as they could be if all the "need" could be accommodated within them (be this by expansion or greater intensification)	Yes	Risk (i) We are unable to accommodate the additional retail floorspace "needed" within the borough because there are not enough suitable sites available	High	Mid	Yes	Although a Plan B is desirable, there are no other options to allow existing centres to grow because of built environment constraints and therefore a Plan B is not required	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
15	Street Markets (Policy CF4)	a) The character of the Borough's town centres which contain street markets will not be as vibrant and diverse.	Yes	Risk (i) There is no longer adequate demand from the stall holders to maintain the Borough's markets.	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
16	Location of Business Uses (Policy CF5)	a) Large scale offices will not be concentrated in town centres and other areas well served by public transport. This will harm the Council's	Yes	Risk (i) Permission is granted for large offices in the employment zones and other	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
		ambition to minimise traffic generation as well as the Council's ambitions to maintain a diverse mix of lower value uses within the employment zones		areas which are not well served by public transport									
17	Creative and Cultural Businesses (Policy CF6)	a) Low value land uses such as light industrial uses and small offices will be unable to compete with higher land value uses within the Employment Zones. Diversity of uses within the Employment Zones contributes to the drivers of uses sought by the Council, and articulated in the Fostering Vitality vision.	Yes	Risk (i) The gradual ingress of higher value land uses into the Employment Zones, causing the erosion of their function due to raising land values and remaining areas for low value business uses.	Medium	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18	Arts and Culture uses (Policy CF7)	a) The Borough sees its gradual degradation from an area which contributes to London as a world city and which makes the borough such an interesting place to live.	Yes	Risk (i) Arts and cultural uses are gradually replaced by higher value uses such as retail.	Negligible	High	Yes	With the work the Borough is undertaking on Exhibition Road, the risk of it occurring is negligible, so no Plan B has been prepared, even though the impact would be considerable.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19	Hotels (Policy CF8)	a) The Borough will see a decline in its hotel stock, and will therefore be able to play less of a contribution to London's role as a world city.	Yes	Risk (i) Loss of hotels to higher value residential accommodation.	Medium	Low	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	20																		
2. Policy	South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area (Policy CF9)																		
3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	None																		
4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	Yes																		
5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	None																		
6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	Low.																		
7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	Low																		
8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	No																		
9. Potential Alternatives	n/a																		
10. Source from which other options are drawn	n/a																		
11. Reason for selecting Plan B	n/a																		
12. Reason for rejecting other options	n/a																		
13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	n/a																		
14. Delivery Implications	n/a																		

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
Better Travel Choices													
21	Improving alternatives to car use (Policy CT1)	a) Lower reduction in car use.	Yes	Risk (i) Lack of public funding of alternatives; developers insisting for value reasons on including parking.	med	low	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
22	New Rail Infrastructure (Policy CT2)	a) Fail to achieve higher levels of accessibility and related regeneration	Yes	Risk (i) Crossrail unable to deliver a station at Kensal, either as a turn back or as a fill station.	High	High	Yes	See Kensal Plan B	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the strategy of using the Kensal sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue, albeit with the site at a slightly reduced density.	n/a	The development potential of the Kensal site would be less without a Crossrail Station, and the accessibility of the area as a whole may not be transformed by a rail station, but would still be improved by bus-based improvements.	Less development at Kensal will result in less opportunity to fund works such as connecting links over the railway. It could dissuade the Gas Site from coming forward as development value may not outweigh development costs.
An Engaging Public Realm													
23	Street Network (Policy CR1)	a) Fragmented and disjointed street network would remain in the borough.	Yes	Risk (i) That developments proposals for larger scale development may not come forward due to the recession.	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
24	Three Dimensional Street Form (Policy CR2)	a) New development will jar against the historic built fabric.	Yes	Risk (i) That developments proposals will be of lesser quality due to the recession,	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
				however, the Council can refuse such developments.									
25	Street and Outdoor Life (Policy CR3)	a) The level of street life will be less if this policy does not happen. Therefore this policy may impact on 'Fostering Vitality'.	Yes	Risk (i) That opportunities to create 'places' do not arise due to the recession.	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
26	Streetscape (Policy CR4)	a) We would fail to maintain the present very high streetscape standards	Yes	Risk (i) Developers refuse to contribute	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
27	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways (Policy CR5)	a) There would be a degradation in the quality of the waterway, parks, gardens and open space.	Yes	Risk (i) That proposals for development may not come forward due to the recession.	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
28	Trees and Landscape (Policy CR6)	a) Likelihood of a greater loss of trees in the borough.	Yes	Risk (i) Very little	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
29	Servicing (Policy CR6)	a) Likelihood of unsatisfactory servicing impacting negatively on busy town centre environments undermining their quality	Yes	Risk (i) Site constraints	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
Renewing the Legacy													
30	Context and Character (Policy CL1)	a) Development proposals fail to achieve high standards of design.	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Med	Medium	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
31	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings (Policy CL2)	a) Development proposals fail to achieve high standards of design.	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
33	Historic Environment (Policy CL3)	a) The identity of the Borough is undermined because of a failure to protect its historic fabric.	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
32	Historic Assets (Policy CL4)	a) The identity of the Borough is undermined because of a failure to protect its historic fabric.	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
33	Amenity (CL5)	a) The high quality residential life of the Borough is undermined because of a failure to protect amenity.	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
34	Smallscale Alterations and Additions (Policy CL6)	a) Small scale incremental changes leading to a degradation of the Borough's character	Yes	Risk (i) That in appealing the Inspectorate do not support the exceptional standards we are seeking	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Diversity of Housing													
35	Housing Targets (Policy CH1)	a) Much needed housing in the borough will not be provided	Yes	Risk (i) Recession.	High	Med	Yes	There are no Plan Bs that the borough can implement that would counteract international recession. We have to accept that development may be delayed.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
36	Housing Diversity (Policy CH2)	a) Housing in the borough will not be further diversified	Yes	Risk (i) Failure to achieve good affordable housing through viability assessments especially as part of the recession Risk (ii) Failure to provide for an appropriate mix of sizes of dwellings	Med	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37	Residential Amenity (Policy CH3)	a) Reduction in Quality of Life for new and existing residents	Yes	Risk (i) Increasing need for external living as part of climate change	High	Med	No	Policy as drafted provides sufficient controls	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
38	Estate Renewal (Policy CH4)	a) Regeneration of North Kensington	Yes	Risk (i) Recession and the failure to find alternative sources of funding. Risk (ii) Public opposition	High Med	High Med	Yes No	Plan B: Delay Plan C: Refurbishment	This was not explicitly considered as a separate option. Interim Issues and Options	This is the only alternative available that keeps the strategy for the project in tact n/a	n/a This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	Benefits of redevelopment would be delayed n/a	Delivery would be delayed n/a
Respecting Environmental Limits													
39	Climate Change (Policy CE1)	a) Although RBKC's individual contribution is small, taken with others, the importance of meeting national carbon targets to mitigate climate change is essential	Yes	Risk (i) Failure of Building Regs to be amended to require higher standards of CO ₂ reduction and lower use of water. Risk (ii) Viability assessments, especially during the recession, show the policy is not feasible.	Med Med	Med Med	No No	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a
40	Flooding (Policy CE2)	a) Development takes place in a way that is not flood adapted	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate and Environment Agency do not	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
				support this policy									
		a) Development takes place that does not reduce water runoff levels	Yes	Risk (ii) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate and Environment Agency do not support this policy	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41	Waste (Policy CE3)	a) Insufficient provision for waste management	Yes	Risk (i) Failure to find appropriate sites outside of the borough.	High	High	Yes	The risks with achieving a site specific solution are such that waste will be dealt with in a separate DPD, not in the Core Strategy.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
42	Biodiversity (Policy CE4)	a) Existing biodiversity is not protected efficiently and/or opportunities to attract biodiversity are lost.	Yes	Risk (i) Insufficient knowledge among both developers and planners to deliver the policy - regarded as a low priority.	Med	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
43	Air Quality (Policy CE5)	a) Continued increase in poor air quality	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support this policy	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
44	Noise (Policy CE6)	a) Degraded residential quality of life	Yes	Risk (i) That in appeals the Planning Inspectorate do not support this policy	Low	Med	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
STRATEGIC SITES													
1	Kensal: Cross Rail Station and significant volumes of development on all four of the Kensal sites	a) Regeneration linked to significant improvements in accessibility may be reduced	Yes	Risk (i) Crossrail unable to deliver a station at Kensal, either as a turn back or as a full station	High	High	Yes	Plan B: Improve local accessibility through bus-based improvements and off site rail improvements, and maintain relatively high development densities	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the Council to meet its Housing targets and deliver some local regeneration benefits using the strategy of Kensing sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue al be it with albert at a slightly reduced density	n/a	The development potential would be limited by bus-based improvements. However, whilst less without a Crossrail Station, and the accessibility of the area as a whole may not be transformed as it would by a rail station, but development would still be improved by bus-based improvements. Testing indicates that increasing the PTAL from 2-3 to 4 can be achieved by adding one extra bus route. Therefore this would still unlock development at a greater density.	Less development will result in less opportunity to fund works such as connecting links over the railway. It could disuade the Gas Site from coming forward as development value may not outweigh development costs. Therefore development would be based on the 7. The of the Sainsbury's and Ballymore sites. With the existing supermarket likely to expand irrespective of a Crossrail station, the developable land will be around 6. The allowing for an estimated maximum of 1030 dwellings and minimal office floorspace (due to the area failing to reach PTAL 4). Should National Grid retain the gasholders, the HSE

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													<p>Consultation Zone would further limit development by a further 150 dwellings (approximately).</p> <p>Less development is likely to come forward as the PTAL increase would be achieved using buses. Therefore road capacity issues would limit the amount of new dwellings.</p> <p>Phase 1 would have an indicative residential capacity of between 1575 and 1820 new homes.</p> <p>The Southern Site (North Pole Depot) would still be able to come forward. Development here would be expected to deliver 1080 to</p>

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													1248 new dwellings at PTAL 4. Bridges could still be considered as part of Phase 2 of this scenario.
								Plan C: Accept the 'status quo' and not deliver any significant volume of development	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	n/a	This has been rejected as it would fail to deliver the underpinning strategy	n/a	This option is only likely to stimulate development at PTAL 3 and on Phase 1. This would limit development to between 783 and 918 new dwellings which whilst contributing to the borough's housing targets, would not stimulate regeneration at a wide scale.
		b)The scale of development may be reduced if not all four sites are available	Yes	Risk (i) Gas works is retained as part of the gas infrastructure beyond 2016 and does not come forward for development, reducing development capacity and also impacting on the potential of adjacent site	Medium	High	Yes	Plan B: Reduced development on the sites as a whole. In addition, development on the adjacent site would need to take into account the HSE buffer zone which limits residential dwellings	North Kensington Area Action Plan Issues and Options draft February 2008	This would allow the strategy - of using the Kensal sites as a catalyst to regenerate the wider north Kensington area to continue, al be it with the site at a	n/a	The development potential would be less and thus the regeneration effect upon the area as a whole will be reduced	Less development will result in less opportunity to fund works such as connecting links over the railway. Therefore development would be based on the 7.1ha of the Sainsbury's and Ballymore sites. With the

SECTION 2D: MONITORING, RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
				because of the safety cordon requirements						slightly reduced density			<p>existing supermarket likely to expand irrespective of a Crossrail station; the developable land will be around 6.1ha allowing for an estimated maximum of 1030 dwellings and minimal office floorspace (due to the area failing to reach PTAL-4);</p> <p>Should National Grid retain the gasholders, the HSE Consultation Zone would further limit development by a further 150 dwellings (approximately);</p> <p>.</p> <p>The prolonged presence of the gas holders will limit development on phase 1 to between 1215 and 1404 new dwellings at PTAL 4. The Southern Site (North Pole Depot) would still be able to come forward. AS</p>

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
													<p>this is not effected by the Consultation Zone. development here would be expected to deliver 1080 to 1248 new dwellings at PTAL 4. This would indicate the likely capacity of the Strategic Site would be between 2215 and 2652 new dwellings including an enlarged Sainsburys store and other non-residential uses together with the reprovision of existing facilities will also be expected. Bridges would still be considered as part of Phase 2 of this scenario.</p>
								Plan C: increase development on remaining sites to compensate	This option was not explicitly explored as it is not a realistic option	n/a	It is unrealistic to suggest that, taking the safety zone into account, the remaining sites would	n/a	n/a

1. No:															
2. Policy															
3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?															
4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?															
5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?															
6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)															
7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)															
8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)															
9. Potential Alternatives															
10. Source from which other options are drawn															
11. Reason for selecting Plan B															
12. Reason for rejecting other options															
13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies															
14. Delivery Implications															

1. No:	2. Policy	3. Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result?	4. Central to the delivery of the strategy vision?	5. Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy?	6. Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High)	7. Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High)	8. Plan B Required? (Yes / No)	9. Potential Alternatives	10. Source from which other options are drawn	11. Reason for selecting Plan B	12. Reason for rejecting other options	13. Implications of Plan B on dependencies	14. Delivery Implications
2	Worrington Green Estate renewal including the building of additional private homes for sale alongside the replacement social rented dwellings	a) The existing community will miss out on new homes and the opportunity to increase the Borough's housing stock will be missed	Yes	Risk (i) Funding is not forthcoming from the HCA	Low	High	Yes	Plan B. The project is delayed until alternative funding sources can be found	This was not explicitly considered as a separate option	This is the only alternative available that keeps the strategy for the project in tact	n/a	Benefits of redevelopment would be delayed	Other funding sources will have to be found elsewhere or the site will be delayed until another funding stream becomes available
				Risk (iii) Landowners choose to develop land separately and not in partnership	Low	Med	No	Plan C: increase development on remaining sites to compensate	This option was not explicitly explored as it is not a realistic option	n/a	It is unrealistic to suggest that, taking the safety zone into account, the remaining sites would achieve this objective	n/a	n/a
													decommissioned and the Consultation Zones removed. An enlarged Sainsburys store and other non-residential uses together with the re-provision of existing facilities will also be expected.