

APPENDIX 2

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan

Decision Statement

1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination of the Plan, Camden Council recommends that the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to referendum subject to the modifications set out in Table 1 of this statement.
- 1.2 The Council concur with the Examiner's recommendation that the referendum area for the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (as modified) should be the approved Neighbourhood Area as set out in Map 1 of the Plan.
- 1.3 The Decision Statement, Examiner's Report and other documents can be inspected on the Council's website at www.camden.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning. Copies are also available for inspection in the libraries at 5 Pancras Square, London N1C 4AG (Opening hours: Mon – Sat 8am- 8pm, Sun 11am -5pm) and Keats Community Library, London NW3 2RR (Opening hours: Tue-Wed 10am-6pm, Thu-Fri 10am-7pm, Sat-Sun 12 noon-4pm).
- 1.4 The Neighbourhood Plan, if approved at referendum, will be used alongside Council plans when making decisions on planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area. In line with recent changes to the regulations, on being approved at referendum the Plan becomes part of the statutory development plan for the area.

2. Background

- 2.1 On 7 October 2014 Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum was approved as the qualifying body for the area and the boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan Area was designated by the Council, in accordance with Section 61G of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. The area comprises the core Hampstead village and most of the immediately surrounding areas and also includes South Hill Park, parts of the Heath itself, North End and the Vale of Health. It does not include Church Row and Perrin's Walk, where residents have established a separate neighbourhood forum.
- 2.2 The Neighbourhood Plan was published by Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum for Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation in March 2017.
- 2.3 Following the submission of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan to the Council in October 2017, the Plan was publicised and comments invited from the public and stakeholders. The consultation period ran from 1 November to 13 December 2017.
- 2.4 Camden Council, in consultation with the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum, appointed an independent examiner, Ms Jill Kingaby, to review whether the Plan met the basic conditions required by legislation and other legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 2.5 The Examiner considered that a public hearing into the Plan was not required. The Examiner's report concludes that, subject to making the modifications recommended in

his report, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in legislation and should proceed to a local referendum.

- 2.6 The Examiner's report recommends that the area for the referendum should be the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

3. Decision

- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline how it intends to respond to the recommendations of an examiner.
- 3.2 Having considered each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report, and the reasons for them, the Council has decided to make the modifications to the draft Plan set out in Table 1 of this Decision Statement. These changes are considered to be necessary to ensure that the draft Plan meets the basic conditions and legal requirements.
- 3.3 The modifications set in Table 1 produce no significant changes to the policy and strategy of the Neighbourhood Plan overall. Therefore a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulations Assessment is not required. Camden Council has undertaken an Equalities Impact Assessment of a draft version of the Plan.
- 3.4 Camden Council agrees:
- A) That the recommendations of the Examiner and the subsequent amendments proposed as set out in Table 1 be accepted.
- B) That the Examiner's recommendation that the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, proceed to referendum on the basis that the Plan meets the basic conditions, is compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights, complies with the statutory definition of a neighbourhood development plan and comprises provisions that can be made by such a document.
- C) That, in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, the referendum area be the Neighbourhood Area as designated by the Council on 9 May 2013.
- 3.5 Accordingly I confirm that the draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan as modified:
- i. Meets the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
 - ii. Is not considered to breach or otherwise be incompatible with any EU obligation or any of the Convention rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998); and
 - iii. Complies with the provisions made by or under 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Signed

Cllr Danny Beales Cabinet Member for Investing in Communities

Date

Table 1: Examiner's recommendations and Camden Council's response

| No | Policy in the Neighbourhood Plan submission draft | Examiner's report para. (modifications in full in Appendix 1 of the Examiner's Report) | Examiner's recommended modifications New text shown as <i>italics and bold</i> Deletions shown as strikethrough | Council's response and reason for change |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Policy DH1: Design | | <p>1. Development proposals must <i>should demonstrate how they</i> respond and contribute ...</p> <p>2.</p> <p>b. Incorporating and enhancing permeability in and around new developments <i>to secure safe and convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists, and</i> avoiding lockable gates and fencing</p> <p>e. Demonstrating how the proposal protects and enhances the views , key views and vistas as shown on Map 4.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to 2b. is to promote permeability around new developments for pedestrians and cyclists more positively in line with comments made by Transport for London.</p> <p>The amendments to parts 1 and e. are proposed to improve the clarity of the policy and ensure the approach is suitable for all planning applications.</p> <p>The changes ensure that the policy fully incorporates suggestions made by the Health Check Reporter.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 2 | | | | Paragraph 3.7 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Where applicable, the design and access statement.....</p> <p>a.Management Strategies and Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan;</p> <p>d. <i>Delete existing words and substitute: the scale and massing of the proposed development including elevational elements (doors, windows, etc,) and the relationship to neighbouring buildings;</i></p> <p>h. the reasons surrounding the building-proposed development ... between the building-development and the street</p> | <p>The proposed amendments were suggested by Camden Council to the examiner to improve clarity for decision-making.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 3 | | | <p>Paragraph 3.8</p> <p>Permeability (i.e. the ability for an area to be walked or cycled through) is a desirable ... to support safe and secure walking and, where feasible, cycling.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are intended to ensure that safe and secure cycling are referenced as well as walking. This responded to comments raised by Transport for London about the policy's conformity with the London Plan.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 4 | Policy DH2: Conservation areas and listed buildings | | <p>Paragraph 3.13</p> <p>Where there is evidence ofManagement Strategies), such the deteriorated state of such a building should not</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are intended to improve the clarity of the supporting text. The Examiner considered that "be human in scale" would be difficult to interpret.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>New buildings should relate to the scale All buildings should be human in scale and contribute positively to the public realm.</p> <p>...</p> | <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 5 | Policy DH3: The urban realm | | <p>Paragraph 3.22</p> <p>.... TfL's Streetscape Guidance 2015-2017 or any future updates provide guidelines</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The amendment is to ensure that TfL's latest Streetscape Guidance is referenced in line with comments made by Transport for London.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 6 | Policy NE1 : Local Green Spaces | | <p>Map 5: Open Spaces and Biodiversity Corridors Map</p> <p>LGS: Branch Hill House – amend the boundary of the site to exclude a small section of land adjoining the House.</p> <p>Delete LGS15 –Garden of Whitestone House</p> <p>Policy NE1: Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Re-order the sites shown in NE1(3) as follows:</p> <p>1) Branch Hill</p> <p>5) Oriel Place Gardens</p> <p>6) Hampstead Green</p> <p>7) Keats House and Garden</p> <p>8) Holly Hill Bank</p> <p>9) Fenton House Gardens</p> <p>10) Pedestrian walk – Admiral's Walk to Windmill Hill</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The re-ordering of the sites is proposed to ensure that the numbering corresponds with Map 5 and the Appendix 4 to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the mapped Branch Hill House LGS boundary would remove a small area of land that the Examiner considered did not meet the criteria for designation.</p> <p>The Examiner considered that the Garden at Whitestone House does not meet the criteria for LGS designation because its principal value is</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>11) Burgh House Gardens</p> <p>12) Gertrude Jekyll's Garden and Communal Gardens of Wells House</p> <p>13) Heath Hurst Gardens</p> <p>14) Garden of the Pryors</p> <p>Delete Garden of Whitestone House from list.</p> | <p>as a communal garden for a limited number of people.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 7 | Policy NE2: Trees | | <p>3. Where there are no existing trees on a site, unless it can be demonstrated as unfeasible or non-viable, development should allow space</p> <p>4. Planning proposals are requiredveteran trees are fully and strictly protected ... exceptional circumstances such as where canopy reduction is required to give access for construction machinery and it is demonstrated that there are no alternatives.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendments address comments made by Camden Council that the policy needed to address the practicality and viability of tree planting. Additional text will clarify what form "exceptional circumstances" in this policy.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 8 | Policy NE3: Biodiversity corridors | | <p>Add a new sentence at the end of paragraph 4.25:</p> <p>Those submitting development proposals may be required to carry out ecological appraisals and species surveys. Camden Planning Guidance – Biodiversity provides guidance as to when these should be undertaken and what they should comprise.</p> <p>Policy NE3: Biodiversity corridors</p> <p>4. Subject to their scale surveys. Proposals should seek to enhance biodiversity accordingly through the scheme design.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendments will ensure that the use of surveys will reflect Camden's planning guidance. It is also proposed to move criterion 5 to the Plan's basement chapter to make it easier to find for users of the Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Applicants should show in their proposals how they plan to enhance both biodiversity and habitats.</p> <p>Historic tree lines/veteran trees</p> <p>5.Basement developments-.....of both)-</p> | Agree to changes for reason above. |
| 9 | Policy NE4: Supporting biodiversity | | <p>Policy NE4: Supporting biodiversity</p> <p>1c. Increase where feasible the area of permeable surfaces, particularly those that incorporate biodiversity-enhancing features such as gravel turf (eg. Schotterrassen), having regard for ground conditions, effectiveness and viability.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendments recognise that the priority of this policy should be to secure “biodiversity-enhancing” features and that the practicality of introducing permeable surfaces is also contingent on ground conditions, effectiveness and viability.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 10 | Policy BA1: Local requirements for Basement Impact Assessments | | <p>Paragraph 5.10</p> <p>As a result ...neighbouring properties and require additional close investigations, above these as required by Policy A5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan and its supporting Camden Planning Guidance – Basements, to ensure that risks</p> <p>Policy BA1: Local requirements for Basement Impact Assessments</p> <p>1. All basementscreening stage, the Plan requires that attention should be given to the additional steps be taken as outlined in 5.12.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The Examiner proposed amendments would ensure that the policy can operate effectively in tandem with Policy A5 of the adopted Camden Local Plan. Cross-reference to Camden’s Planning Guidance on Basements is also proposed.</p> <p>The Examiner proposes an amendment to criterion 1 to</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>2. All proposals for basement development must aim for less than no higher than Burland Scale 1 , and under no circumstances should construction will not be allowed to proceed where</p> <p>3. Basement developments under gardens should leave a minimum distance of 15m from any veteran tree or from a boundary that is an historic tree line (see Map 5 for details of both), unless it can be demonstrated that any harm to the trees would not be significant or could be mitigated.</p> | <p>confirm that all the additional steps cannot be applied to every scheme.</p> <p>Reference to the Burland Scale is also to be amended to ensure conformity with the Camden Local Plan. The Council considered that the level in the Local Plan was the lowest it is possible to apply.</p> <p>Reference to the impact of basements on veteran trees and historic tree lines is to be added (the criterion being relocated from Policy NE3).</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 11 | | | <p>Paragraph 5.12</p> <p>As required above, When a basement impact assessment shows that additional steps need to be taken are, those proposing basement development are encouraged to consider the following, where appropriate:</p> <p>a. CPG- Basements and the Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study (paragraphs 285-294) should be studied whenever hydrological borehole ...carried out, soil samples, including those near boundaries with neighbours ...to a depth of several meters below the footing of the basement. And the The boreholes</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The Examiner proposed amendments confirm that this evidence is only likely to be necessary where a risk has been identified through the Council's BIA methodology. The amendments also acknowledge that not all of the criteria would apply to every basement scheme and requirements for soil sampling and monitoring and borehole</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>measurements may need to</i> be conducted seasons. (ref GPG4Hydrological Study):</p> <p>b. In some cases, Wwhen boreholes measurements show a groundwater risk, an automaticshould may need to be left activated</p> <p>c. An assessment should demonstrate</p> <p>e. If flooding and properties are required, Bboth the Landmarkcan provide such reports.</p> <p>f. Identification of The location and distance ofidentified as flood risk at risk of flooding is shown in</p> <p>g. Clarity over geology and groundwater conditions A cross section of ground geology should be reported and drawn can sometimes best be explained through comprehensive cross-sections, reports and graphs.</p> <p>h. Delete this criterion, and substitute:</p> <p><i>i. in order to protect against sewer flooding, Thames Water recommends the installation of a positive pumping device. This should be installed in each new basement development unless a strong case for alternative measures can be made.</i></p> | <p>measurements should be amended to ensure they appropriate for the size and nature of an individual basement scheme. The Examiner also considered it would not be necessary to require applicants to provide a cross-section of ground geology in all cases. Reference to a Schedule of Condition Survey should be removed because this cannot be required by a planning policy. Additional text is proposed in response to comments made by Thames Water about managing basement developments.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 12 | Policy BA2: Basement Construction Plans | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Basement Construction Plan should be submitted when demonstrated as necessary by the BIA with for all a basement proposals. 2. The Basement Construction Plan should include information, including drawings which illustrate how the construction will overcome any potential harm to neighbouring properties, the water environment, ground conditions and stability, the character and | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The proposed amendment removes an automatic requirement for Basement Construction Plans for all basement schemes to bring the policy into general</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>amenity of the building or wider area, the significance of heritage assets, or any other identified potential harm.</p> <p>3. Applicants must demonstrate</p> <p>4. Due to the potential Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>5. Unless there is Party Wall Notices.</p> <p>5.14 A basement construction planby the BIA <i>that its effects will be acceptable, but a particular construction methodology will need to be applied to ensure that there is no damage to the building, to neighbouring properties or the environment. To gain planning permission, developers need to demonstrate with appropriate evidence that the proposal would comply with Policy A5 of the Local Plan. Camden Planning Guidance – Basements provides detailed guidance on requirements for Basement Construction Plans. The implementation of Basement Construction Plans will be secured by planning obligations (Local Plan paragraph 6.127).</i></p> <p>5.15 The Basement ... 2009) Edition. <i>Development proposals close to London Underground tunnels or other infrastructure which might interact or conflict with them must be referred to Transport for London, with details of all construction proposals and methodology.</i></p> <p>5.16 Applicants are required <i>encouraged</i> to submit</p> <p>5.17 During considerationAll comments independent experts.</p> | <p>conformity with Camden’s adopted Local Plan. Proposed rewording of criterion 2 to confirm that criteria (a) to (i) in the draft Plan may not be relevant to all basement schemes.</p> <p>An amendment would also confirm that the Council cannot require that BCPs or their content can be “resolved” or required prior to a planning application is being determined. Rather, they would be secured through the Section 106 legal agreement and prepared once contractors have been appointed.</p> <p>Reference to the Party Wall Act is to be removed as this cannot be controlled through planning policy.</p> <p>Amendments to paragraph 5.14 would confirm the function and purpose of Basement Construction Plans.</p> <p>Additional text is proposed to set out that Transport for</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>London need to be consulted on proposals likely to impact on London Underground tunnels.</p> <p>The Examiner also considered that a requirement to consult with neighbours could not be required.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 13 | Policy BA3: Local Requirements for Construction Management Plans | | <p>Policy BA3: Local Requirements for Construction Management Plans (CMP)</p> <p>Proposals for basement approved. The CSM CMP should include</p> <p>See TT1 For further information..... Guidance 6.</p> <p><i>TfL's latest guidance on CMPs may be useful, with its spreadsheet tool for estimating the likely frequency of vehicle trips at various stages in a construction programme.</i></p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Amendments to correct typo and refer to guidance prepared by Transport for London.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 14 | Traffic and Transport: Introduction | | <p><i>6.4 The emerging new London Plan and Camden Local Plan make clear that a highly effective way of tackling these issues is the promotion of alternative sustainable and active modes of transport. New London Plan Policy T1 reflects an ambitious aim to reduce Londoners' dependency on cars in favour of walking, cycling and public transport use. This is described as the only long-term solution to the road congestion challenges that</i></p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Additional text proposed to expand on the links between active travel and managing the impacts of air pollution from vehicles and the context provided by the Camden Local Plan and draft London Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>threaten London’s status. Policy T1 of the Camden Local Plan encourages developments to prioritise sustainable travel modes. While it is important to note that the community’s ability to controlis limited especially in the short term, the National Planning</p> <p>6.6.b. Delete and rewrite as follows:</p> <p>Sites for large developments, schools and education institutions, medical and care facilities in the Plan Area should be selected with full regard for their accessibility and connectivity. Sites with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) score over 4 in the short-term to 2023, or 5 in the longer term, should be considered favourably, as could those which demonstrate good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>c. In the context ... managed. TfL Transport Assessment guidance is available at: https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/urban-planning-and-construction/transport-assessment-guidance.</p> <p>6.13 e. Where vehiclesfor pallets and machinery. TfL provides guidance on Deliveries and Servicing Plans, which is available at: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/delivery-and-servicing-plans.pdf.</p> | <p>The Examiner also considered that large developments, schools or education uses should be steered towards areas with favourable PTALs and that the policy should be introduced on a phased basis becoming more restrictive over time. This would ensure it would not act as a barrier to achieving of sustainable development.</p> <p>Reference to a borough average of 5.6 PTAL should be removed given the variations in PTALs between small areas.</p> <p>Additional text is proposed refer to guidance prepared by Transport for London on Transport Assessments and Deliveries and Servicing Plans in response to comments made by Transport for London.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|
| 15 | Policy TT1: Traffic Volumes and Vehicle Size | | <p>Policy TT1: Traffic Volumes & Vehicle Size</p> <p>Due to the critical</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning applications..... to result in a significant number of additional ... 2. 3. Planning applications..... to result in significant additional motor..... and levels of pollution, in addition to any noise, vibration, or obstruction to the highway. <p>6.19 Comprehensive guidance on Guidance 7 – Transport. Guidance on Transport Statements.....paragraph 16.Guidance on Air Quality Assessments can be found in Camden’s Local Plan. Developments expected to generate an additional 100 or more person trips a day (as referenced in paragraph 6.6c) are regarded as “significant” for the application of Policy TT1. Exceptionally, some developments which generate smaller numbers of additional trips may also be expected to provide assessments, because of their site specific circumstances.</p> <p>6.20 It should in question. Applicants should discuss, and agree, the need for and content or scope of these documents with the local planning authority at the pre-application stage. This helps to avoid abortive work by applicants and planning officers, and the need for later revisions to the documents or development proposals.</p> <p>6.24 It should be noted this paragraph 1 of this Policy will not apply. However, applicants should also have regard for the new draft London Plan’s Policy T6: Parking. This states that existing parking provision should be reduced ...</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>The Examiner considered that the threshold for requiring the information set out in criteria a. to c. should be “significant” additional motor vehicle journeys, which is to be explained further through additional proposed text in paragraph 6.19. ie. developments expected to generate an additional 100 or more person trips a day.</p> <p>The Examiner also considered that part 1. of the policy should refer to other planning impacts related to vehicle movements, namely noise, vibration and obstruction</p> <p>Reference to Camden’s Development Management Policies should be deleted as this document has been superseded by the Camden Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>More information to be provided about the preparation of Transport Assessments and Deliveries and Servicing Plans to ensure these documents are</p> |
|----|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>and not re-provided at previous levels where this would exceed the standards set out in this policy.</p> | <p>properly prepared. This responds to comments made by Transport for London.</p> <p>Cross-reference to be provided in the supporting text to the London Plan's draft parking Policy T6 to ensure parking provision is reduced where development is proposed.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 16 | Policy TT2: Pedestrian Environments | | <p>In the context ...</p> <p>5. Provide increased numbers of crossing-points, where necessary and viable, which are of good design, which have aesthetic appeal are pleasant shared space and hence be mindful of others be vigilant of other road users.</p> <p>7. Provide appropriate opportunities, where needed and viable, for on-street cycle</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Criteria 5 and 7 to be reworded to make allowance for the fact that additional crossing points or cycle facilities should only be sought where they are needed and viable. The phrases "aesthetic appeal" and "mindful of others" to be reworded for the sake of clarity.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 17 | Policy TT3: Public Transport | | <p>Map of PTAL scores on Page 62</p> <p>Add a title: Map 8 – PTAL scores</p> <p>Enhance the key (eg as in Maps 2 and 3)</p> <p>6.44 delete and replace with:</p> <p><i>Given the current conditions of traffic congestion and air quality, the Forum has concluded that new health and educational facilities (with heightened safeguarding needs and where a significant number of additional journeys will be generated) should be located in areas with a good PTAL score for existing or planned public transport connectivity. The Forum recognises that some transitional arrangements will be needed and therefore expects a PTAL score of 4 for the first 5 years of the Plan to 2023 and 5 for the remainder of the Plan’s lifespan.</i></p> <p><i>Due to the critical importance of promoting sustainable transport including public transport usage, the responsibility will lie with developers to justify any exception to this approach. For example, if it could be demonstrated that the travel patterns would not lead to increases in traffic at peak times, or that a Travel Plan could mitigate harmful effects of congestion and air pollution.</i></p> <p>Policy TT3: Public Transport</p> <p>Due to the traffic congestion</p> <p>1. The following types of development must be will be supported where they are located on sites which with a Transport for London PTAL score of 4 or over, up to 2023, and a score of 5 or over thereafter thereafter has been assigned:</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>PTAL Scores map to be labelled and the key enlarged to ensure it is readable.</p> <p>New text is proposed in paragraph 6.44 which is as a consequence of changes proposed to criterion 1. Developers would need to provide justification for any exceptions. The amendment would embed the Forum’s suggestion to the Examiner that these facilities should be steered towards areas with certain PTAL scores according to a phased approach.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to parts 1 and 2 to confirm that these uses will be steered to parts of the plan area with certain PTAL levels. The policy is also to be tightened following a phased approach. This is in line with comments made by the Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
|----|------------------------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>a.</p> <p>2. In circumstances less than 4 or 5, elevate the PTAL score to 4 or 5 or over from completion are secured, or a Travel Plan produced which would provide good accessibility to the new development with measures to mitigate harm from congestion and air pollution. Planning obligations should be used to secure these results.</p> | |
| 18 | Policy TT4: Cycle and Car ownership | | <p>Paragraph 6.51 Provisions for covered street to ensure that new apartments homes are as cycle-friendly ...</p> <p>Policy TT4: Cycle and car ownership</p> <p><i>In addition to the cycle parking requirements set out in the London Plan</i>, all residential developments which involve the provision of new apartments must include <i>with three or more bedrooms should include</i> in their design (and building) at least :</p> <p>a. One cycle</p> <p>b.</p> <p>c. three cycle parking spaces for each <i>or more. for long-stay use.</i></p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Proposed amendment to replace “apartments” with ‘homes’.</p> <p>Amendments to bring the policy into conformity with cycle parking standards set out in the adopted London Plan.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
| 19 | Policy EC1: Healthy retail mix | | <p>4. Where permission of use of businesses <i>space in Class A or B1a uses at first floor or higher</i> above shops ...</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Proposed amendment to clarify the purpose of the policy is to protect Class A or B1a uses at first floor level or above.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | Agree to change for reason above. |
| 20 | Policy HC1: Housing mix | | <p>1. In order particularly for social affordable and smaller dwellings,</p> <p>a. development that increases the provision of social affordable, intermediate and community-led housing in line with</p> <p>b.</p> <p>c. the inclusion of...</p> <p>d. Provision of small units as intermediate affordable housing.</p> <p>2. Except in exceptional circumstances,</p> <p>aThe following Housing proposals will not be supported development which would result in conversions.</p> <p>b development which wouldunits.</p> <p>8.8 The Forum supports Camden's However, exceptionally, as described in paragraph 3.132 of Camden Local Plan, older accommodation may not meet contemporary and future needs for living space. Exceptional circumstances must be clearly demonstrated with supporting evidence, and arrangements must be put in place to re-house all existing occupiers.</p> <p>Camden Planning Guidance on housing provides information as to what constitutes a small dwelling.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Proposed amendment to clarify that “affordable and smaller dwellings” includes ‘social intermediate and community-led housing’.</p> <p>Additional criterion proposed in support of new intermediate affordable housing.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to the policy and supporting text clarifying the exceptional circumstances in which the amalgamation of dwellings may be appropriate.</p> <p>Agree to changes for the reasons above.</p> |
| 21 | Policy HC2: Community Facilities | | <p>3.The Plan will resist provided locally, or firm evidence can be provided to demonstrate that the facilities are unviable or no longer required.</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Amendment proposed to ensure that viability and need</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>are included as considerations for proposals involving community facilities. This would bring the policy into general conformity with the adopted Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>Agree to change for reason above.</p> |
| 22 | Pages 54, 59, 64 and 80 | | <p>Paragraphs 6.14, 6.31, 6.48</p> <p>Delete reference to Camden draft Local Plan, and substitute Camden Local Plan</p> <p>Paragraph 8.7</p> <p>Delete “emerging” from final sentence and refer to Camden’s Local Plan Policy H7</p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>Factual updates to reflect the adoption of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reason above.</p> |
| 23 | Appendix 2, page 10 | | <p>Character Area C: 19th Century Expansion</p> <p>The Victorian-suburban ... (e.g Frognal, Keats Grove). <i>The Downshire Hill and Keats Grove area was the first to be developed from about 1815 with elegant Regency stucco villas and brick flat-fronted late Georgian terraced houses. This area is more spacious than the later higher density, mainly brick, Victorian areas.</i></p> | <p>Agree to modification.</p> <p>To provide additional information about the development of Devonshire Hill and Keats Grove area and for clarity. This responds to comments made by the Devonshire Hill Residents Association.</p> <p>Agree to change for reason above.</p> |
| 24 | Appendix 4 | | Local Green Space detailed maps | Agree to modification. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Add street names as follows:</p> <p>1 Branch Hill House Gardens etc: Firecrest Drive, Spedan Close, Heysham Lane, Oakhill Way, Branch Hill. (Also amend boundary for the LGS as in Map 5 – see PM6.)</p> <p>2 Oak Hill Park: Oakhill Way, Oakhill Park.</p> <p>3 South End Green etc: SEGMA Allotments, Parliament Hill, Nassington Road.</p> <p>4 World Peace Garden: As for 3, and add Hampstead Heath rail station, South Hill Park.</p> <p>5 Oriel Place Garden: Oriel Place, High Street and Heath Street.</p> <p>6 Hampstead Green: Haverstock Hill, Hampstead Green (the road), Roland Hill Street, Pond Street and Royal Free Hospital.</p> <p>7 Keats House and Garden: Keats Grove, Heath Hurst Road.</p> <p>8 Holly Hill Bank: Holly Hill, Mount Vernon, Holly Bush Hill.</p> <p>9 Fenton House Gardens:</p> | <p>The Examiner considered that adding street names would assist readers of the Plan and make the appendix easier to use in conjunction with Policy NE1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Agree to changes for reasons above.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Admiral's Walk, Windmill Hill, Hampstead Grove.</p> <p>10 Pedestrian Walk: As for 9 above.</p> <p>11 Burgh House Gardens: Well Walk, New End Square.</p> <p>12 Wells House Communal Gardens etc: Well Walk, New End, Christchurch Hill.</p> <p>13 Heath Hurst Gardens: Heath Hurst Road, Hampstead Hill Gardens.</p> <p>14 The Pryors Garden: Well Walk, East Heath Road.</p> <p>15 Delete Whitestone House Gardens.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|