**Waltham Forest Local Plan LP1**

**Examination Hearing Day 6 – Matter 7**

Thursday 24 March 2022 starting at 9.30am

**Agenda**

|  |
| --- |
| Please Note:* All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the Hearing Statements (and any relevant evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
* The Matters, Issues and Questions are attached for ease of reference. The areas for discussion relate to points on which the Inspectors require further information or clarification.
* The morning hearing session will finish no later than 1pm, including a mid-morning break.
 |

1. **Inspectors’ Welcome and Introductions (5-10 minutes)**
2. **Matter 7: Health, Wellbeing, and Infrastructure to Support Communities and the New Development Proposed in the Plan**

**Key Documents**

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (KD12)

Cultural Infrastructure Study (LPE12)

Sustainability Appraisal Report (KD4.2)

Strategic Transport Review (EB10.1)

Transport Topic Paper (EB10.2)

Modifications Table (LPE5)

**Issue 1 - Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to the delivery of infrastructure to support communities and the growth strategy (Policy 96)**

*Key areas for discussion:*

* The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Question 153)
* Infrastructure and Developer Contributions (Question 154)

**Issue 2 - Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to community infrastructure and utilities (Policies 36, 37 and 48 – 55)**

*Key areas for discussion:*

* Culture and creativity (Focus on Questions 156, 158, 159, 160)
* Social and Community Infrastructure including Education (Questions 161 & 162)
* Health and wellbeing (Questions 163, 165, 166, 167)
1. **Issue 3 – Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy, and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to transport and achieving a modal shift towards active and sustainable travel (Policies 62 – 69)**

*Key areas for discussion:*

* The impact of planned growth on strategic routes (Question 168)
* Achieving reductions in road transport and emissions and the impact of the Ultra Low Emissions Zone (Questions 169 & 170)
* Public transport (Question 171)
* Transport Assessments and Construction Logistic Plans (Questions 172 & 173)
* Car free development (Questions 174 & 175)
* Electric vehicles and infrastructure (Question 176)
* Modal shift and active and sustainable travel (Questions 177 & 178)
1. **Review of Matter 7 main modifications necessary for the soundness of the plan**
2. **Close**

**MATTERS ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

|  |
| --- |
| **MATTER 7: HEALTH, WELLBEING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT COMMUNITIES AND THE NEW DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED IN THE PLAN** |

**Issue 1 – Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to the delivery of infrastructure to support communities and the growth strategy**

Q153 Does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan [KD12] contain the full range of infrastructure necessary to support the development proposed in the Plan and how will the Infrastructure Delivery Plan respond to changing circumstances?

*Policy 96 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions*

Q154 Is Policy 96 justified and effective in terms of the contributions that will be sought towards new and improved infrastructure to support development proposed in the Plan?

1. What is the role of the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document in this regard and has that document been published?
2. Is the policy sufficiently clear about the circumstances in which developer contributions will be sought beyond monies collected from the Community Infrastructure Levies (Borough and Mayoral)?

**Issue 2 – Whether the Plan is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to community infrastructure and utilities (Policies 36, 37 and 48 – 55)**

*Policy 36 – Promoting Culture and Creativity*

Q155 Is the policy justified?

Q156 What evidence justifies the requirement in criterion F. for schemes over 100 units or 10,000sqm to contribute to cultural enhancement projects?

1. Has this requirement been subject to viability testing and is the policy sufficiently flexible in this regard?
2. Is there an up-to-date and published Cultural Strategy?

*Policy 37 – Protecting Public Houses (Pubs)*

Q157 Is Policy 37 justified and how would it be implemented in practice?

Q158 Is criterion A.ii. sufficiently clear?

Q159 Is the policy in general conformity with the London Plan in requiring a marketing period of 12 months at criterion B.iii.?

Q160 How does the policy relate to Policy 48 (social and community infrastructure)? Is the 12 months marketing period consistent with the requirement of 12-18 months in Policy 48 D.iii?

*Policy 48 – Social and Community Infrastructure*

Q161 Will Policy 48 criterion C be effective in ‘expecting’ new development to contribute to new infrastructure and are there any implications for the Public Sector Equality Duty in relation to the requirements set out in criterion A (iv and v)?

*Policy 49 – Education and Childcare Facilities*

Q162 Is Policy 49 criterion B justified in requiring new education/childcare facilities to be in locations with good public transport in addition to being accessible by walking and cycling

*Policy 50 – Promoting Health and Wellbeing*

*Policy 51 – Health Impact Assessment*

Q163 Is Policy 50 justified in encouraging the use of health impact assessments in all major applications?

1. Would this be effective and how would it relate in practice to Policy 51?
2. Are Policies 50 and 51 consistent with each other?
3. Is it sufficiently clear what would be required and in what circumstances a full HIA would be required?

Q164 Should Policy 50 criterion H include access to waterways?

*Policy 52 – Making Safer Places*

Q165 Is the policy justified? How will it be used in practice in relation to Policy 60 (Designing out Crime), which appears to cover the same criteria?

*Policy 53 - Noise, Vibration and Light Pollution*

Q166 Is the policy justified and positively prepared in requiring ‘no increase’ in background noise levels in criterion D? Should mitigation measures in criterion C relate to vibration in addition to noise?

*Policy 54 – Hot Food Takeaways*

*Policy 55 – Betting Shops and Payday Loan Shops*

Q167 Are Policies 54 and 55 justified, sufficiently flexible, and will they be effective in supporting healthy choices and lifestyles?

1. Is it sufficiently clear how criterion A of Policy 54 and criterion B of Policy 55 would be implemented in practice for assessing planning applications?
2. What evidence is there to support criteria B and C of Policy 54 and is the incorporated restriction on commercial restaurant activity justified and consistent with national policy?
3. How will criterion B of Policy 54 be assessed – is the 400m a radius, a walking distance, or something else? Is ‘the boundary’ suitably clear?
4. Would Policy 54 effectively amount to a blanket ban on restaurants with an element of hot food takeaway within 400m of child and youth facilities?
5. Should Policy 54 apply to premises operating within use class E?

**Issue 3 – Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy, and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to transport and achieving a modal shift towards active and sustainable travel (Policies 62 – 69)**

Q168 The Strategic Transport Review [EB10.1] (page 35) indicates that several key routes to the north of the Borough in Epping Forest District are operating severely over capacity.

1. Will the housing and employment development in Waltham Forest have an impact on these routes and if so, what are the implications?
2. Have the transport impacts of the Plan been tested, and if so, how?

Q169 How will the Plan’s policies help to deliver a 30% reduction in road transport and a reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions?

Q170 What are the implications of the proposed expansion of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) for the Borough’s travel patterns and parking strategy?

Q171 What implications, if any, does the scale of housing and employment growth proposed in the Plan have for public transport services in adjoining Boroughs? Does the Plan seek to improve accessibility between Waltham Forest and destinations in adjoining Boroughs and, if so, how?

*Policy 65 – Development and Transport Impacts*

Q172 Is Policy 65 clear and effective in relation to the scale of development that would trigger the need for a Transport Assessment? What evidence will be required to assess the need for a Transport Assessment?

*Policy 67 – Construction Logistic Plans*

Q173 For effectiveness, should Policy 67 make clear the scale of development that will trigger the need for a Construction Logistic Plan?

*Policy 68 – Managing Vehicle Traffic*

Q174 What evidence justifies Policy 68 in requiring all new residential development to be car free?

Q175 Will the policy be effective and how will it be implemented for individual planning applications?

1. Is it clear when a Transport Assessment will be required?
2. Can car free development be achieved in areas outside Controlled Parking Zones and if so, how?

*Policy 69 – Electric Vehicles (EV)*

Q176 How will Policy 69 secure ‘electric vehicles only’ at new residential developments?

Q177 Will the Plan be effective in securing new travel and transport infrastructure and improvements to existing infrastructure to support communities and new growth?

Q178 Overall, are the Plan’s travel and transport policies justified, will they be effective in achieving a modal shift towards active and sustainable travel and are they consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Q179 Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?