



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to the London Borough of Islington

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

& C Masters MA (Hons) FRTPI

Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 5 July 2023

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

Section 20

Report on the Examination of the London Borough of Islington Local Plan, comprising of the Strategic and Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents

The Plan was submitted for examination on 12 February 2020

The examination hearings were held between 13 September and 1 October 2021

File Ref: PINS/V5570/429/11

Contents

Abbreviations used in this report	3
Non-Technical Summary	4
Introduction	5
Context of the Plan.....	7
Public Sector Equality Duty	7
Assessment of Duty to Co-operate	8
Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance	8
Assessment of Soundness	10
Issue 1 – The Housing Requirement	11
Issue 2 – Affordable Housing	12
Issue 3 – Other Housing Policies.....	17
Issue 4 – Job Growth and Employment.....	28
Issue 5 – Area Spatial Strategies.....	39
Issue 6 – Site Allocations	51
Issue 7 – Meeting Identified Housing Need and Five Year Supply	69
Issue 8 – Infrastructure	72
Issue 9 – Town Centres and Retail	74
Issue 10 – The Built and Natural Environment	78
Issue 11 – Social and Community Infrastructure	85
Issue 12 – Other Soundness Matters	86
Recommendation	87
Schedules of Main Modifications	
Strategic and Development Management Policies	Appendix 1
Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan	Appendix 2
Site Allocations	Appendix 3

Abbreviations used in this report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AAP	Area Action Plan
ASS	Area Spatial Strategy
BCAAP	Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan
BEIS	Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
CAZ	Central Activities Zone
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
dpa	Dwellings per annum
DPD	Development Plan Document
DtC	Duty to Cooperate
ELS	Employment Land Study
GLA	Greater London Authority
GTAA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
HMO	Houses in Multiple Occupation
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LP	Islington Local Plan
LSA	Local Shopping Area
LSIS	Locally Significant Industrial Sites
MM	Main Modification
PBSA	Purpose Built Student Accommodation
PEL	Priority Employment Location
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
PRS	Private Rented Sector
PSA	Primary Shopping Area
PTAL	Public Transport Accessibility Level
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SALP	Site Allocations Plan
SDMP	Strategic and Development Management Policies
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SIL	Strategic Industrial Location
SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
SME	Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SSA	Specialist Shopping Area
sqm	Square metres
TfL	Transport for London
The Framework	National Planning Policy Framework
UCO	Use Classes Order
VBC	Vacant Building Credit

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the London Borough of Islington Local Plan, which comprises of the Strategic and Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents, provides an appropriate basis for the Planning of the Borough, provided that a number of main modifications [MMs] are made to it. The London Borough of Islington has specifically requested (LBI07) that we recommend any MMs necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted.

Following the hearings, the Council prepared schedules of the proposed modifications and, where necessary, carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MMs were subject to public consultation for over six weeks. In some cases, we have amended their detailed wording and/or added consequential modifications where necessary. None of the amendments significantly alters the content of the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes. We have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment and all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The Main Modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Adjust the Plan period from 2035/36 to 2036/37 to ensure the Plan is justified and effective;
- Update all Policies and references throughout the Plan which are affected by the Government's change to the Use Classes Order (UCO);
- Update the housing trajectory as set out at appendix 10 of the Strategic and Development Management Policies (SDMP) to include the most up to date housing figures;
- Introduce greater flexibility to the Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS) to ensure the policy approach is justified and effective;
- Amendments to employment Policies B1 through to B5 of the SDMP to ensure they present a robust and justified approach to employment land over the Plan period;
- Modifications to a number of the Area Spatial Strategies (Policies SP1-SP8 inclusive) for effectiveness;
- Amendments to the design and heritage policies for effectiveness;
- Modifications to the approach to gypsy and traveller accommodation as set out at Policy H12 including a commitment to an immediate focused review to ensure the Policy is consistent with the London Plan and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS);

- Remove the references throughout the Plan which designate Archway as a cultural quarter as this is not justified by the evidence base;
- Modifications to a number of definitions contained within the glossaries attached to the DPDs to ensure the definitions are justified, effective and consistent with National Policy;
- Deletion of a number of site allocations which have either been completed or are no longer justified;
- Update the Policy requirements in relation to a number of site allocations to ensure the Policy wording is clear, precise and effective;
- A number of other modifications to ensure that the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy and contain up-to-date figures.

Introduction

1. This report contains our assessment of the London Borough of Islington Local Plan, which comprises of the Strategic and Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents (the Plan), in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate. It then considers whether the Plan is compliant with the legal requirements and whether it is sound. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (paragraph 35) (The Framework) makes it clear that in order to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound Plan. The London Borough of Islington Strategic and Development Management Policies (PD1), Site Allocations (PD2) and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan (PD3) Development Plan Documents, submitted in February 2020 are the basis for our examination. It is the same documents that were published for consultation in September and October 2019.

Main Modifications

3. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that we should recommend any main modifications **[MMs]** necessary to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and/or not legally compliant and thus incapable of

being adopted. Our report explains why the recommended MMs are necessary. As this report covers all three DPDs, the MMs are referenced **in bold** in the report as follows and are set in full on the attached appendices:

- **SDMM** – Strategic and Development Management Policies
 - **BCMM** – Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan
 - **SAMM** – Site Allocations
4. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and, where necessary, carried out a sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MM schedule was subject to public consultation for over six weeks. We have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to our conclusions in this report and in light of this, we have made some amendments to the detailed wording of the MM and added consequential modifications where these are necessary for consistency or clarity. None of the amendments significantly alters the content of the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal/habitats regulations assessment that has been undertaken. Where necessary we have highlighted these amendments in the report.

Policies Map

5. The Council must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted Development Plan. When submitting a Local Plan for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted Plan. In this case, the submission policies map is identified as 'Policies Map, Regulation 19 version' (PD5).
6. The policies map is not defined in statute as a development plan document and so we do not have the power to recommend main modifications to it. However, a number of the published MMs to the Plan's policies require further corresponding changes to be made to the policies map. These further changes to the policies map were published for consultation alongside the MMs, Examination Policies Map

modifications, June 2022. In this report we identify any amendments that are needed to those further changes in the light of the consultation responses.

7. When the Plan is adopted, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the Plan's policies, the Council will need to update the adopted policies map to include all the changes proposed in PD5 and PDO6 and the further changes published alongside the MMs contained within document PD5b.

Context of the Plan

8. The London Borough of Islington Local Plan, which comprises of the Strategic and Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents is proposed to replace the saved policies of the currently adopted Islington Core Strategy (2011), Development Management Policies (2013), Site Allocations (2013) and the Finsbury Local Plan, Area Action Plan for Bunhill & Clerkenwell (2013). The new Plan, along with the Mayor's London Plan 2021 as well as the North London Waste Plan (separately prepared) will constitute the full Development Plan for the Borough.
9. Islington is part of inner London and is less than six square miles in size, making it one of the smallest local planning authorities in the country. Islington is densely populated and has the second lowest amount of open space of any local authority in the country. Whilst the Borough accommodates relatively few environmental designations, there are a large number of Sites in Nature Conservation (SINC) and a significant number of heritage assets.

Public Sector Equality Duty

10. We have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included our consideration of several matters during the examination. This has included gypsy and traveller policies, specialist housing for older people, accessible and adaptable homes, protection of community assets, employment land promotion and sustainable forms of transport.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

11. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that we consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the Plan's preparation.
12. The Council has provided as part of its evidence a statement (SD31), which sets out how it considers the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) has been met. This sets out that the key strategic Planning matters to be considered were: housing (including affordable); employment; retail; leisure and other commercial development; infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.
13. The Council has identified in its statement (SD31) how it has met the DtC and what co-operation (including meetings) and agreements were made with the relevant parties during the Plan's preparation. We consider that the statement illustrates that the Council has made real efforts to engage with all relevant organisations and prescribed bodies during the Plan's preparation. It is evident that many of the changes made during the Plan's preparation prior to its submission have resulted from consultation with relevant parties, to address their concerns in a constructive and proactive manner.
14. We are satisfied that where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the Plan and that the duty to co-operate has therefore been met.

Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance

15. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme (SD3b).
16. Consultation on the Plan and the MMs was carried out in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. We consider that the Council through the Consultation Statement (PD7) has sufficiently considered and set out

their response to opposition to the proposals for the Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site, in accordance with Section 18(3) of the 2012 Regulations.

17. The Council carried out a Sustainability Appraisal (inc Strategic Environmental Assessment) (SA) of the Plan, prepared a report of the findings of the appraisal, and published the report along with the Plan and other submission documents under Regulation 19 (PD4). During the examination we raised concerns about a number of aspects of the SA (INS04 and INS05). This primarily related to the selection of reasonable alternatives, whether all effects had been suitably recorded and the robustness of the cumulative assessment. As a result, the Council prepared an addendum (PD4a) to the SA to address these concerns and to also undertake further SA of the pre-hearing modifications to the Plan. The SA was updated to assess the MMs (PD4b).
18. Concerns have been raised that an SA was not published alongside the Regulation 18 consultation of the Plan. However, there is no stated requirement in the 2012 Regulations for an SA to be undertaken at the Regulation 18 stage. Furthermore, the SEA directive sets out that a suitable assessment must be undertaken before adoption of the Plan. We acknowledge points raised about parties being able to have a suitable opportunity to express their opinion on the draft Plan and subsequent SA and the need for this to inform the preparation of the Plan. We accept the Council's view that the SA was prepared iteratively alongside the Regulation 19 Plan. Further, we are of the view that the period between the end of the Regulation 19 consultation finishing, and the submission of the Plan allowed a period where the consultation responses to the Plan and SA could be considered. This allowed such responses to inform the Plan preparation process, as the Council were under no obligation to submit the Plan for examination. Interested parties also had further opportunities during the examination process by being able to comment on the SA addendum (PD4a) and the MMs SA (PD4b).
19. We are of the view that it was unnecessary to include a reasonable alternative for Policies SP3, B2 and VR3 that allowed the retention of industrial floorspace only, as this would not be in conformity with the London Plan.
20. Overall, we consider that the SA is adequate and followed a process that meets all legal requirements.

21. The Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment Screening Report September 2019 (within the Integrated Impact Assessment (PD4)) sets out why an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is not necessary. We agree with this view and Natural England has not raised any concerns.
22. The Development Plan, taken as a whole, includes policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the local Planning authority's area.
23. The Development Plan, taken as a whole, includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. The Plan includes policies that ensure: sustainable design; reduction of carbon emissions; sustainable transport modes are prioritised; green infrastructure is protected and enhanced; and flood risk is appropriately managed.
24. Subject to the necessary MMs, the Plan is in general conformity with the spatial development strategy for the area (the London Plan).
25. The Plan complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

26. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, we have identified 12 main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. This report deals with these main issues. Where there are main issues which are relevant across all of the DPDs, the relevant policies have been dealt with collectively. Similarly, where there are main issues which are only relevant to one DPD then these have been identified accordingly. The report does not respond to every point or issue raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every Policy, Policy criterion or allocation within the Plan.

Issue 1 – Whether the housing requirement set out in the Strategic and Development Management DPD is justified

27. The London Plan identifies a 10-year (2019/20 to 2028/29) housing requirement of 7,750 homes or 775 dwellings per annum (dpa) for Islington. The Islington Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2017 (the SHMA) considered the objectively assessed need in Islington to be 1,150 dpa. However, the housing requirements set out in the London Plan for each Borough is based on an assessment of land supply set out in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2017 (the SHLAA). The Examining Inspectors of the London Plan found this approach to be sound.
28. The Plan period is longer than the 10-year housing requirement set out by the London Plan and the SDMP carries forwards the housing requirement of 775 dpa to establish a housing requirement for the 16-year Plan period of 12,400 new homes. The London Plan advises at paragraph 4.1.11 that if a housing target is needed beyond the 10 year period, Boroughs should draw on the 2017 SHLAA findings (which covers the period up to 2041) and any local evidence of identified capacity, in consultation with the Greater London Authority (GLA), and should take into account any additional capacity that could be delivered as a result of any committed transport infrastructure improvements, and roll forward the housing capacity assumptions applied in the London Plan for small sites.
29. Having regard to the SHLAA 2017 and the evidence provided by the Council, particularly the difficulty in identifying sufficient housing land supply, that will be discussed later on within the report, we are content that rolling forward the London Plan target to the end of the Plan period is a justified approach. Furthermore, whilst Crossrail is a committed transport infrastructure improvement that could provide additional capacity in the future, it is only likely to become operational towards the very end of the Plan period.
30. The Plan period currently runs to 2035/36. Due to delays for additional work during the examination, it is necessary to extend the Plan period by one year to ensure that it covers a 15-year period in accordance with paragraph 22 of the Framework. A modification is therefore required (**SDMM01**) to achieve this. This modification also requires a corresponding change in the form of **BCMM01** to the BCAAP as well as **SAMM01** and **SAMM07** of the SALP which also extend the Plan period.

31. The extension of the Plan period by a year also results in additional housing need and a change (**SDMM21**) to Policy H2 of the SDMP to set out the updated overall housing need figure required for the Plan to be positively prepared. A corresponding change is also needed to the SALP (**SAMM07**). These modifications are necessary for the Plan to be effective. We have amended the text of both modifications to make clear the overall housing need figure is a minimum to ensure the Plan is positively prepared.

Conclusion

32. The housing requirement in the SDMP is justified.

Issue 2 – Whether the approach to affordable housing is positively prepared, justified and consistent with National Policy

The need for affordable housing and whether such need will be met

33. There is a significant need for affordable housing in Islington of some 612 dpa, as established in the Council's SHMA. Given the justified housing requirement of 775 dpa and the aims of Policy H2 of the SDMP to achieve 50% affordable housing for developments of 10 dwellings or more and a contribution in lieu of smaller developments, it is clear that this need will not be met in full. The Council has an active house building programme that seeks to deliver affordable homes that will also contribute to meeting such needs over the Plan period. However, whilst we are content that the Council has done all it can to maximise the delivery of affordable homes, particularly given the land constraints in the Borough, there is likely to be some residents with affordable housing needs that will continue to be dependent on the private rented sector, in some cases supported by housing benefit.

The approach

34. Policy H3 of the SDMP sets out the Council's approach to affordable housing. This seeks an overall target of 50% affordable housing over the Plan period. We consider that based on the evidence in the viability assessments a 50% overall target is justified. This is also in line with that required by Policy H4 of the London Plan.

35. An overall 50% target is sought in the form of requiring 45% on-site affordable housing (without public subsidy) from sites in private or part public ownership and exhausting all potential options for maximising the delivery of on-site affordable housing to reach and exceed the overall 50% target, particularly through securing public subsidy. For sites in public ownership, the Policy requires 50% on-site affordable housing (without public subsidy) and again exhausting all potential options for maximising the delivery of on-site affordable housing to reach and exceed 50%, particularly through securing public subsidy. As currently drafted, it is not clear what 'exhausting all potential options' might entail and this could be overly onerous. It is therefore not effective. Alterations to the Policy and supporting text (**SDMM22**) are therefore necessary to make it clear what will be expected of future applicants. This will ensure the Policy is effective. Having regard to these changes and the significant need for affordable housing in Islington, we consider that the need for applicants to demonstrate that all options have been explored for additionality through public subsidy is justified and accords with the broad aims of the London Plan.
36. Policy H3 currently sets out in several places that developments must provide 'at least' or 'exceed' a certain amount of affordable housing that should be delivered. However, the viability assessment has not tested higher levels of affordable housing than the levels set out in the Policy. Therefore, modification **SDMM22** is necessary to remove such references throughout the Policy. This will ensure the Policy is justified and consistent with National Policy.
37. Policy H3 requires sites delivering fewer than 10 residential units (gross) and/or less than 1,000 sqm (GIA) of residential floorspace to provide a financial contribution to fund the development of affordable housing off-site. The level of contribution required is set out at £50,000 per net additional unit, except for the area south of Pentonville Road/City Road where the contribution required would be £60,000 per net additional unit. We acknowledge that National Policy sets out that affordable housing should not be sought from developments of less than 10 dwellings. However, the London Plan does allow Boroughs to consider seeking affordable housing from such schemes. Furthermore, the viability evidence identifies that in the vast majority of cases, schemes will be viable when such levels of financial contributions are sought. Such requirements should therefore not affect small sites from coming forward. Given these matters, we consider seeking affordable housing contributions from developments of fewer than 10 residential units (gross) and/or less than 1,000 sqm (GIA) of residential floorspace to be a justified approach.

38. Policy H3 does not follow the threshold approach to viability assessment set out in the London Plan at Policy H5. This, for example, allows a development on a private sector site providing 35% affordable housing without public subsidy to proceed via the fast tracked route, which does not require a site specific viability assessment. In Islington, development values are some of the highest in the country and the viability evidence demonstrates that in most cases delivering the levels of affordable housing should be viable. On this basis, we consider the approach of Policy H3 to be sound in this regard.
39. Part G of Policy H3 notes that site specific viability assessments, as part of Planning applications, would be allowed in exceptional circumstances. The Policy also sets out that the Council will determine what circumstances these would be. However, as currently drafted, there is limited information in this regard to allow future applicants to understand what circumstances might warrant a site specific viability assessment. This applies to developments of all sizes. **SDMM22** is therefore needed to set this out and this will ensure the Policy is effective. Modification SDMM22, as drafted suggests that the list of exceptional circumstances is limited to those set out in Part H (a) to (d). Whilst the supporting text at para 3.48 suggests there is some flexibility through the use of the word 'usually' this is not sufficiently clear. We have therefore amended Part H and para 3.48 to make clear that there could be other rare occasions where other factors result in exceptional circumstances. This ensures compliance with National Policy.
40. Policy H3 sets out that the tenure split of the affordable housing should be a split of 70% social rented housing and 30% intermediate housing. Policy H3 also sets out that the majority of intermediate units should be London Living Rent, and regard will be given to the priorities set out in the Council's Housing Strategy and other agreed evidence of housing need. The supporting text to Policy H3 also notes that there are a number of other forms of affordable housing (as defined by the Framework) which will not be acceptable in Islington, as they would simply be unaffordable to those whose needs they are intended to meet. This includes, discounted market sales, starter homes and affordable private rent.
41. Having regard to the clear local evidence on affordability in the Borough provided by the Council and the findings of the SHMA, we consider that the tenure split is justified and that the requirement for the majority of intermediate units to be London Living Rent, along with the Plan's stance on discounted market sales, starter homes and affordable private rent to be justified in this particular case.

42. The London Plan allows public sector landowners with agreements with the Mayor to deliver at least 50% affordable housing across their portfolio. This would allow some developments to deliver less than 50% (as low as 35%) if the deficit is made up from their other developments across London. Policy H3 and its supporting text does not allow such an approach and the Council is of the view that the pressing need for affordable housing in Islington should mean that all developments within the Borough should maximise affordable housing in line with Policy H3. However, we are mindful that there is an acute need for affordable housing across London and if other Boroughs took a similar approach, it could significantly undermine the intentions of Policy H4 of the London Plan. Therefore, to ensure conformity with the London Plan, **SDMM22** is necessary to allow the London Plan's portfolio approach within Islington.
43. Policy H3 does not allow off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu. Paragraph 63 of the Framework is clear that this should be allowed where it can be robustly demonstrated. We consider there may be some limited circumstances where it may be preferable to deliver the affordable housing off-site. A modification is therefore needed as outlined at **SDMM22** to Policy H3 to allow off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu where this can be justified by the applicant. This will ensure the Plan is consistent with National Policy.
44. Policy H3 at Part J seeks to disapply vacant building credit (VBC) unless there are exceptional reasons. This would run contrary to the Framework (paragraph 64) which notes that to support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount.
45. This matter was considered during the London Plan examination, where initially it encouraged Boroughs to disapply VBC. However, the Examining Inspectors found that *'Whilst the need for affordable housing is acute and the potential impact of the VBC significant, these circumstances are likely to apply to most large urban areas. Further, we find that there is insufficient evidence of the impact of disapplication of the VBC across London as a whole to justify a departure from National Policy'*. Encouragement to disapply VBC was consequently deleted. However, the Inspectors did note that if Boroughs wish to disapply the VBC, they can do that based on local evidence, which some Boroughs already have.

46. Turning to the specific circumstances of Islington, the Council has set out that all recent development has been on brownfield land, and there is no need for such an incentive. Further, the Housing Topic Paper (Exam Ref: SD19) at paragraph 4.135 states that there have been no instances of the VBC being utilised in Islington since its introduction. It is also clear from the viability assessments that land values are high in Islington and that most developments are viable with the affordable housing contributions sought. We accept that this indicates that the disapplication of VBC is unlikely to have meaningful effects on delivery in the Borough.
47. Given all of this and the demonstrably acute need for affordable housing in Islington, we are content that a departure from National Policy is justified in this instance.
48. Notwithstanding this, it is important to note that Part J does allow VBC to apply if there are exceptional reasons, which would still allow otherwise unviable development to come forward, which we consider strikes an appropriate balance in line with the aims of paragraph 64 of the Framework. Part J (v) seeks to ensure the building has not been made vacant for the sole purpose of redevelopment, evidenced by provision of marketing and vacancy evidence for a continuous period of five years. We consider this to be overly onerous and a vacancy period of at least 3 years with evidence of continuous marketing for residential or mixed use (including residential) for 24 months is a more proportionate timeframe. **SDMM22** is therefore needed to make this change, which will ensure the Policy is justified and effective.
49. The exceptional reasons do not currently include reference to the viability tested route associated with Policy H3, Part G. The Council is of the view that VBC should only be considered where a development does not meet the criteria for a site specific viability assessment, as this should be the starting point. We agree with this view and for the Policy to be effective, **SDMM22** is needed in this regard.
50. Criterion (iv) of Policy H3, Part J as submitted seeks to ensure that the proposal does not involve the loss of any capacity to meet other development needs from sites allocated for non-housing development. However, this requirement is not reflected in National Policy and there is no clear evidence to demonstrate that this is needed. As a result, **SDMM22** is needed to delete the criterion to ensure the Policy is justified. There is also some duplication within the criterion of Part J of

Policy H3 (now Part L as amended). Alterations (**SDMM22**) are consequently needed to address this and ensure the Policy is effective.

Conclusion

51. Subject to the above modifications, we consider that the approach to affordable housing is positively prepared, justified and consistent with National Policy.

Issue 3 – Whether the other housing policies of the Plan are soundly based

Conventional housing

52. Policy H1 sets out the strategic direction for delivering housing of all kinds in the Borough and is informed by the more detailed policies that follow it. To aid the reader and for effectiveness a modification is needed as set out at **SDMM20** to cross reference the other policies that are of relevance.

53. Table 3.2 that supports Policy H2 identifies the housing mix priorities for the Borough. This is informed by the Islington SHMA (EB1) (figure 90) which considers the housing mix needed by households in relation to the identified level of housing need. It is noted that as well as the SHMA, other considerations such as ensuring the best use of land and providing sustainable unit sizes that can be utilised by a range of occupiers in the future has also been considered. We accept that this is an important factor given the context of Islington as one of the fundamental issues facing the Borough is a constrained land supply. Overall, we are content that the housing mix priorities set out in table 3.2 are justified.

54. Policy H2 sets out that 1-bedroom bedsits and studios will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, which are where: they would constitute a very small proportion of the housing mix; the delivery of additional higher priority unit sizes and/or proposed higher priority units of an increased size is not possible; and provision of studios/bedsits would result in high quality dwellings. Table 3.2 also sets out that there is no priority need for such units. The supporting text clarifies that a very small proportion would constitute no more than 5% of overall units. Given the above, in terms of our acknowledgement of constrained land supply and the need to make best use of available land in the Borough, we consider this

approach to be justified. Policy H2 will still allow some 1-bedroom bedsits and studios to be delivered and we are mindful that such needs will also likely be met through house-shares and/or houses in multiple occupancy as an alternative to 1-bed accommodation.

55. To maintain a supply of family homes, Policy H2 also seeks to restrict the conversion of larger dwellings into a number of smaller ones, which given the clear need for family homes in the Borough we consider is justified. However, in order for Part G of Policy H2 to read correctly a modification is needed in the form of **SDMM21** to refer to a single dwelling rather than dwellings. This will ensure the Policy is effective.
56. Paragraph 3.29 of the supporting text to Policy H2 discusses the loss of existing dwellings. However, it contains criteria that go beyond what is said within Policy H2 and is therefore setting out Policy. **SDMM21** is needed to address this and include the criteria within the Policy itself.
57. Part H of Policy H2 seeks to ensure that all residential developments of 20 units and over, enter into a Section 106 legal agreement to ensure that all residential units will be occupied, to prevent wasted housing supply. Having regard to the tests for Planning obligations in the Framework, which reflect those of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 122, we are not satisfied that this is necessary to make such developments acceptable in planning terms. This is on the basis that the Council does not have any recent evidence to show that this is a significant issue facing the Borough. **SDMM21** is therefore needed to delete Part H of Policy H2 to ensure the Policy is justified and effective.
58. Policy H4 relates to delivering high quality housing. The Policy states that it relates to all C3 and C4 housing developments as well as housing subject to Policies H6 to H11 in the Plan. However, it is clear that some of the design requirements would not be relevant to purpose built student accommodation and houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) so a modification **SDMM23** is necessary to remove reference to Policies H6 and H10 to ensure that the Policy is effective.
59. Policy H4 also sets out that all new residential units should be dual aspect unless provision of dual aspect is demonstrated to be impossible or unfavourable. It is not clear what would need to be provided to demonstrate the provision of dual

aspect is impossible or unfavourable and therefore to ensure effectiveness **SDMM23** to the supporting text of Policy H4 is required to set this out.

Housing for older and disabled people

60. Islington is expected to experience growth in its older population. But despite Islington having a below average proportion of older people than in London and the UK, there is still likely to be a significant demand for further appropriate accommodation.
61. The principal way in which the Council are seeking to meet the future needs of older people is to require 90% of all new homes to be Category M4(2) 'Accessible and Adaptable', as required by Policy H4 of the Plan. Furthermore, Policy H4 requires the remaining 10% to be Category M4(3) 'Wheelchair user dwellings' standard. This is in accordance with Policy D7 of the London Plan. We are content that such requirements are justified, having regard to the evidence provided by the Council in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG¹) and can be delivered without unduly affecting the viability of schemes, as set out in the viability evidence in support of the Plan.
62. The London Plan notes at paragraph 3.7.4 that Standard M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings distinguish between 'wheelchair accessible' and 'wheelchair adaptable'. The PPG also states that Local Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should only be applied to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling, otherwise M4(3) dwellings should be wheelchair adaptable. To ensure consistency with National Policy and conformity with the London Plan, modification **SDMM23** is necessary to set this out in Policy H4 and the supporting text.
63. Part B (i) to (iii) of Policy H4 and its supporting text at paragraphs 3.73, 3.75 and 3.76 set out a number of additional requirements. The PPG is clear that where a local Planning authority adopts a Policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability, they should do so only by reference to Requirement M4(2) and/or M4(3) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations and should not impose any additional information requirements or seek to determine compliance with these requirements, which is the role of the Building Control Body. As a result, and to ensure compliance with National Policy, we consider that

¹ Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 56-007-20150327

modification **SDMM23** is needed to remove the additional requirements. Further, supporting text at paragraph 3.74 is setting out Policy on this matter and for the Policy to be effective, **SDMM23** is required to move this into the Policy itself. This requested change (INS14) had been missed in the MM schedule that was consulted upon. However, as the modification simply moves existing supporting text into the policy itself, we are not of the view that it would cause any prejudice and we have altered the MM schedule accordingly.

64. Policy H7 at Part A states that different levels of care may be delivered in conventional housing which means that there is no need for certain specialist forms of older peoples' housing, such as market extra care housing. Further, in our view, Policy H7 takes a relatively restrictive approach to the delivery of specialist C3 and non C3 older people's accommodation such as care homes and extra care facilities. However, we are mindful that the London Plan identifies a total potential demand in London across all tenures for just over 4,000 specialist older persons units a year and includes an indicative benchmark figure for all Boroughs in terms of overall need. For Islington this is 60 units per annum or 900 dwellings over the 15-year Plan period.
65. To ensure that Policy H7 is positively prepared and in conformity with the London Plan, we consider that the benchmark figure should be incorporated into the Policy and that where a proposal will help to meet such needs, it should be supported by Policy H7. **SDMM25** addresses this matter and provides greater flexibility for specialist C3 and non C3 older people's accommodation such as care homes and extra care facilities to be delivered. To reflect this SDMM25 also updates Part A of Policy H7. Further, a corresponding change to Part L of Policy H1 is needed for effectiveness and is secured by modification **SDMM20**.

Gypsy and traveller provision

66. Policy H12 of the SDMP sets out a need for 10 pitches over the Plan period to meet the identified needs for gypsies and travellers. This is based on the ethnic definition considered in the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2019) (GTAA). The ethnic definition was based on the one used in the draft London Plan. During the examination of the London Plan, the use of this definition was removed in favour of the one set out within the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, 2015 (PPTS). MMs to Policy H12 were subsequently consulted upon to base the identified need on the PPTS definition, which resulted in a reduction of 4 pitches. However, since the MM consultation took place, the

judgement *Smith v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities* [2022] EWCA Civ 1391 found that the PPTS definition was discriminatory. On this basis, we consider that the need identified of 10 pitches in accordance with the ethnic definition should remain in Policy H12. We consider that the methodology used and the findings of the GTAA are robust.

67. To meet the identified need for 10 pitches, Policy H12 sets out a number of mechanisms, that includes: (i) use of its own sites identified as part of the Council's ongoing housebuilding programme; and/or (ii) joint working with the GLA and other Boroughs to determine scope for accommodating need on a sub-regional basis; and/or (iii) a potential review of site allocations where need is not met through Part A(i) and/or (ii). However, Policy H12 did not seek to positively meet these needs through site allocations. At the hearings, the Council were asked to seek to meet such needs and undertook further site assessment work (Ref: SD83 and SD84). After an extensive search, this identified three sites that the Council considered could deliver gypsy and traveller pitches. The three sites were included in the MM consultation, as proposed allocations GT1, GT2 and GT3. Following the MM consultation responses and for the reasons set out in our previous letter (Ref: INS18) we are unable to find each of the proposed allocations sound. We have therefore removed them from the MM schedules as well as the associated text changes.
68. We wrote to the Council seeking their suggested way forward, who were of the view that an immediate focused review of all gypsy and traveller matters following the adoption of the Plan would be the most appropriate approach. Given the significant delays that have already occurred during the examination, we agree that this is the most pragmatic approach. Alterations to Policy H12 and its supporting text are therefore necessary (**SDMM28**) to secure the immediate focused review and to remove text that is no longer relevant. This will ensure that the Policy is justified, effective and positively prepared. It is important to note that given the age of the current GTAA, the review will also need to undertake a new assessment of need.
69. Policy H12 does also include criteria for any windfall development that might come forward. To ensure consistency with other policies, namely H4, and compliance with National Policy the requirement for such housing to be high quality is necessary. This is secured by **SDMM28**.

Purpose built student accommodation (PBSA)

70. The London Plan identifies an estimated need for 3,500 PBSA bed spaces to be provided annually over its Plan period. Further, London Metropolitan University has provided evidence that shows there is likely to be a need for further PBSA within Islington over the Plan period.
71. Policy H6 seeks to contribute to meeting such needs by allowing PBSA on sites allocated for such use and on sites with existing PBSA, subject to compliance with other Local Plan policies and additional impacts being acceptable. Given the limited site allocations for PBSA, we consider that this represents an overly restrictive approach.
72. We consider that there is another circumstance where PBSA should be considered acceptable. We are of the view that PBSA on existing university campuses, as part of redevelopment/ reconfiguration master planning should be considered acceptable, particularly as such land is unlikely to be available for other uses such as conventional housing. **SDMM24** makes this change. We are content that with this addition, which could in itself lead to significant delivery, the Plan will contribute positively to the future need for PBSA. It has been suggested that such development on existing university campuses should not be limited to a master planning approach and more piecemeal development should be allowed. Given, the dense urban nature of Islington and limited land supply, it is likely that PBSA would replace other educational floorspace within campuses, which should be carefully managed. We therefore consider the master planning approach to be an appropriate way forward.
73. We are also mindful that there is limited housing land supply in Islington and that conventional housing offers the most flexible accommodation over the long-term. Given this, the fact that Islington has the highest rates of student housing delivery in London over the past 10-15 years and that the rental market, including house shares and/or Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) can also contribute to housing for students, we consider that the prioritisation of conventional housing to be justified and Policy H6, as modified, strikes an appropriate balance.
74. Some concern has been raised that the Council are treating PBSA differently to conventional housing. The Council has noted that PBSA only counts at a rate of 2.5 bedspaces equivalent to one dwelling towards housing land supply, in accordance with the London Plan and is therefore a less optimal use of land. Whilst this is noted, we are mindful that PBSA by its nature can be much more

dense than conventional housing and therefore the contribution to overall housing land supply may not be significantly different. As a result, modification **SDMM24** is required to correct this within the supporting text to Policy H6. This ensures the Policy is justified.

75. The provision of new PBSA close to existing areas of such accommodation could lead to concentrations of PBSA within neighbourhoods. Therefore, to ensure such schemes do not unacceptably impact on mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods, an additional criterion is needed to Policy H6 (**SDMM24**). This addition will ensure that such matters are considered during a planning application and is needed to ensure compliance with National Policy.
76. The London Plan sets out that to enable providers of PBSA to maximise the delivery of affordable student accommodation by increasing the profitability of the development, Boroughs should consider allowing the temporary use of accommodation during vacation periods for ancillary uses. However, Policy H6 at Part B (vi) states that this should be prevented. We are of the view that there is no evidence to suggest that temporary uses such as visitor accommodation during vacation periods would result in any greater impacts or would adversely affect housing supply. Consequently, to ensure the Policy is justified and in conformity with the London Plan, an alteration as set out at **SDMM24** is required to allow temporary uses during vacation periods.
77. Policy H6 at Part B (ii) requires 10% of bedspaces to be wheelchair accessible. Detailed evidence has been provided by some PBSA providers that shows the likely need for such bedspaces is much lower. **SDMM24** is therefore required to reduce this to 5% to ensure the Policy is justified. We note that the GLA are of the view that Policy E10(H) of the London Plan is relevant which requires the provision of 10%. However, we are content that local evidence specific to Islington justifies a lower figure in this case.
78. Furthermore, Part B (ii) also sets out additional requirements, which the PPG specifically guides against, as set out above under older peoples housing. **SDMM24** is therefore also needed to remove these additional requirements to ensure compliance with National Policy.
79. Policy H6 at Part B (i) requires high quality accommodation and refers to Policy H4 of the Plan which sets out many criteria in this regard. However, it is clear

when reading Policy H4 that some aspects of it would not be relevant to the delivery of PBSA. Consequently, **SDMM24** is needed to Policy H6 and its supporting text to set out which elements of Policy H4 are of relevance. This will ensure the Policy is effective.

80. Part B (i) also requires good sized rooms and communal areas in line with relevant space standards. However, we accept that for PBSA providing rooms in accordance with space standards may not make the most efficient use of land and the Council accepted at the hearing sessions that its HMO guidance would be a more appropriate starting point for considering room sizes. **SDMM24** is therefore needed in this regard and this will ensure the Policy is justified and effective.
81. Policy H6 requires new PBSA developments to provide an ongoing financial contribution towards the provision of student bursaries for students leaving Council care and or other Islington students facing hardship who are attending a higher or further education establishment. We understand that the contribution would be used as part of a general student bursary 'pot'. Given that PBSA schemes would need to make provision for affordable units and that many universities themselves provide student bursaries, we are not of the view that such contributions are needed to make the development acceptable in Planning terms. Further, we are unable to conclude that such provision would be directly related to the development, given that further education students may not enter higher education and higher education students subject to the bursary are unlikely to stay in the PBSA that the specific development would deliver. We therefore conclude that this requirement does not meet the Planning obligations tests in the Framework or CIL Regulation 122. **SDMM20** and **SDMM24** are needed to delete this requirement from Policy H1 and Policy H6, along with its supporting text. A corresponding modification to the supporting text at paragraph 1.38 of the Plan is also necessary for consistency and this is covered by **SDMM03**. Subject to these modifications, this approach will ensure the Plan is justified.
82. We acknowledge that the Inspector who examined the Islington Core Strategy took a contrary view and found this requirement to meet CIL Regulation 122. However, this was a significant period of time ago and we have based our decision on the evidence before this examination.

83. It has been suggested that Policy H6 should protect the loss of existing PBSA. However, we do not consider this to be necessary, as Policy H6 allows sites with existing PBSA to be redeveloped or intensified for such use. In addition, it is likely that if a development came forward to redevelop a PBSA site for an alternative use, then it was no longer needed or viable to continue in PBSA use.

Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)

84. Policy H10 at Part A states that the provision of small-scale HMOs will be supported where they (amongst other things) do not result in the loss of existing larger family homes. However, bearing in mind permitted development rights that allows conventional self-contained housing (Use Class C3) to change to a HMO (Use Class C4), we do not consider this to be justified. **SDMM26** is therefore necessary to remove this criterion.

85. Part C of Policy H10 considers large scale HMOs. The Council confirmed at the hearing sessions that this Policy also relates to large-scale purpose-built shared living, which is subject to Policy H16 of the London Plan. However, this is not overly clear from Policy H10 and therefore **SDMM26** is necessary in this regard to ensure the Plan is effective.

86. Policy H10 seeks to limit the delivery of large HMOs/shared living. Given that such developments are likely to be most attractive to single people or couples and that the housing mix in the Plan identifies two and three bedroom dwellings to be of greatest priority, we consider that this is a justified approach. Further, the relatively limited identified needs of single people or couples (most likely 1-bedroom units) in Islington may also be met through other ways, such as: small HMOs; and the provision of studio/bedsits and one bedroom units in line with Policy H2.

87. However, we do acknowledge that there may be some instances where a large scale HMO may be appropriate. As a result, it is necessary to remove the wording within Policy H10 that states large scale HMOs will generally be refused. This is achieved through modification **SDMM26** and is necessary for the Policy to be justified. Further, it is necessary (**SDMM26**) to set out when large scale HMOs may be considered acceptable in the supporting text for effectiveness.

88. The Policy currently requires affordable housing as part of large-scale HMOs/shared living schemes to be provided in accordance with Policy H3. However, such requirements have not been viability tested. The London Plan at Policy H16 requires such developments to provide the equivalent to 35 per cent of the units as affordable, or 50 per cent where the development is on public sector land. In the absence of viability testing of Policy H10, we consider the Council's suggestion that the lower London Plan target be used for Policy H10 to be reasonable, and **SDMM26** is necessary in this regard. This will ensure the Policy is justified and effective.
89. In addition, Policy H10 sets out that development must provide for on-site affordable housing and cash in lieu payments will not be acceptable in any circumstances. However, Policy H16 of the London Plan seeks a cash in lieu contribution towards conventional C3 affordable housing and notes that this could be either an upfront cash in lieu payment to the local authority, or an in perpetuity annual payment to the local authority. We accept the Council view that it is generally more desirable to deliver on-site affordable housing where this is possible to help create mixed and sustainable communities. Consequently, a modification **SDMM26** is needed to allow cash in lieu payments where it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible to deliver the affordable housing on-site.

Purpose built private rented sector development

90. Policy H11 sets out that the Private Rented Sector (PRS) development model does not have a role to play in meeting housing need in the Borough. However, the Framework and the London Plan at Policy H11 'Build to Rent' is supportive of this form of development and given such development can deliver homes of varying sizes in line with the identified housing needs of the Borough, we consider that it does have a role to play. To ensure compliance with National Policy and conformity with the London Plan, **SDMM27** is required to offer a more positive approach to PRS development and its role in meeting housing need. A corresponding change to Policy H1, Part N is also needed to ensure the Policy is positively prepared. This is covered by **SDMM20** set out above.
91. Part A (ii) of Policy H11 refers to securing on-site affordable housing and states that affordable private rent is not considered to be an acceptable affordable housing tenure. However, affordable housing is dealt with comprehensively under Policy H3 and therefore, for effectiveness, **SDMM27** is necessary to simply cross reference Policy H3. PRS development was considered in the viability study

(EB17) and therefore we consider that a cross reference to Policy H3 is appropriate.

92. The Policy requires PRS units to be held under a covenant for the lifetime of the building for generally no less than 50 years. However, the London Plan only requires a period of 15 years. The Council were not able to provide any evidence to justify the requirement for a longer period than set out by the London Plan. Consequently, to ensure conformity with the London Plan, **SDMM27** is needed to reduce the covenant period to 15 years.
93. Part (vi) requires developments to have unified ownership and management during the covenant period. However, this does not make clear that ownership and management could be in the form of a partnership, particularly in relation to managing the affordable and market aspects of a scheme. **SDMM27** is consequently needed to address this matter and for effectiveness.
94. In relation to the clawback mechanism set out in Part A (v) of Policy H11, the London Plan at footnote 70 states that: '*A valuation of the market and affordable units must be included within the S106 agreement to enable the level of clawback to be calculated in the event that the covenant is broken*'. This is not reflected in the Policy or supporting text and to ensure conformity with the London Plan, a modification is required to include this text. This is addressed through **SDMM27**.
95. The London Plan sets out that there should be break clauses for renters, which allows the tenant to end the tenancy with a month's notice any time after the first six months. This is not reflected in Policy H11 of the Plan and therefore to ensure conformity, a modification (**SDMM27**) is needed to include this text in Part A (vii) of the Policy.

Conclusion

96. We consider that with the recommended modifications, the other housing policies of the Plan are soundly based.

Issue 4 – Whether the strategy for job growth and employment is sound.

Meeting the identified need

97. The Employment Land Study (ELS), 2016 identifies a need for 400,000 square metres (sqm) of additional office floorspace over the Plan period. There have been suggestions that the ELS which is now some 7 years old is out-of-date. Whilst the age of the ELS is acknowledged, the Council did review the findings of the ELS in the Employment Topic Paper (Exam Ref: SD16) in 2020. We consider the topic paper to be a thorough piece of work and even increased the identified need to some 443,000 sqm. When the ELS is considered alongside the topic paper we consider the evidence base in this regard to be sufficient and robust for all employment related uses. For the Plan to be positively prepared the increased need figure should be set out within Policy B1 and modification (**SDMM33**) addresses this matter. A corresponding change is also needed (**SDMM36**) to alter the supporting text to Policy B3 for the Plan to be effective.
98. Since the production of both the ELS and the Employment Topic Paper, the Covid-19 pandemic has affected working practices, namely, an increase in people working from home. It is still, however, difficult to tell what the long-term effects of the pandemic will mean for working practices and therefore, we consider that the Plan should continue to seek to meet the identified need of 443,000 sqm of additional office floorspace.
99. The Council has sought to meet this need namely through site allocations. Some of the site capacity assumptions require updating and these are addressed through modifications table 1.2 (**SAMM06**). This will ensure the Plan is positively prepared and effective. As amended, the site allocations collectively seek to deliver 337,900 sqm of office floorspace. Whilst there is some pipeline capacity, it is understood that much of this relates to the site allocations in any event. Consequently, there is a shortfall in the region of over 100,000 sqm.
100. The Council is seeking to rely on windfall to deliver the rest of the capacity and has provided evidence (Exam Ref: LBI03) of meaningful windfall delivery at 83,299 sqm over a 10-year period. Whilst there is clearly some uncertainty, if this rate was to be applied over the Plan period, the 100,000 sqm shortfall would be met. In addition, as explained below, we consider that the co-location of industrial use with office and/or research and development use should be

considered acceptable in Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS), which would also help to boost the delivery of such floorspace.

101. Overall, we are content that the Plan has done all it reasonably can to meet the identified need for additional office space, particularly given the evident land supply issues in the Borough.
102. The longer term effects of the relatively new Use Class E are still somewhat unknown, but it could feasibly result in the loss of office floorspace in the Borough. The Council will need to monitor the situation closely and review the Plan if necessary.

Strategic and Development Management Policies Plan

103. Policy B1 sets out the strategic direction for delivering business floorspace and is informed by the more detailed policies that follow it. To aid the reader and for effectiveness, a modification (**SDMM33**) is needed to cross reference the other more detailed policies that are of relevance.
104. Policy B1 seeks to ensure that proposals maximise the amount of new business floorspace and sets out that proposals will be refused where maximisation does not occur as it would be an inefficient use of land. However, the assessment of maximisation is not prescribed in the Policy or supporting text. Further, the Framework does not seek maximisation, but seeks the effective use of land, taking into account a number of factors. A modification (**SDMM33**) is therefore necessary to refer to making effective use of land rather than maximisation, in order to comply with National Policy.
105. Policy B2 identifies how the Plan will deliver new business floorspace, including industrial uses in the LSISs within the Borough. In relation to development in LSISs, the Policy currently sets out that office use may be permissible as part of a hybrid workspace scheme, but it must only constitute a small proportion of the increased floorspace. It also notes that the introduction of non-industrial uses would undermine the primary industrial economic function and compromise the future growth of LSISs and will therefore not be permitted unless they are clearly ancillary to a proposal.

106. The biggest LSIS in the Borough is the area covered by Policy SP3 at Vale Royal/Brewery Road. It is evident that this area already contains office uses alongside industrial uses that successfully co-exist. The ELS also sets out that Brewery Road/Vale Royal area provides space that is crucial to accommodate businesses servicing both the wider Borough and central London. It also notes that this is evidenced by the cluster of live events and music orientated businesses, and also the number of catering operations and also recommends that efforts should be made to intensify uses, whilst being flexible about what use classes are permitted in what space.
107. We are not of the view that there is sufficient evidence, with the exception of residential use, to support the Council's view that non-industrial uses would undermine the primary industrial economic function and compromise the future growth of LSISs.
108. On this basis, we consider that modifications to the Policy and supporting text (**SDMM34**) are required to set out that the co-location of industrial use with office and/or research and development uses will be permitted where there would be an intensification of industrial use on the site, and it can be demonstrated that the continued industrial function of the LSIS would remain. This will ensure the Policy is justified, consistent with National Policy and is in conformity with the London Plan. A similar alteration has been made to Policy SP3 (**SDMM08**), however, it clarified that intensification could be either through new floorspace or the redevelopment/modernisation of existing floorspace. For consistency, we consider that the modification should also include this text and we have amended **SDMM34** accordingly.
109. We acknowledge that several representors sought for the existing Planning Policy of no net loss of industrial floorspace to be carried forward. However, the London Plan is clear that Development Plans should be proactive and seek to provide additional industrial capacity. We consider that a no net loss Policy would not be in accordance with these aims.
110. We are of the view that the co-location of industrial use with office and/or research and development uses could also help to facilitate the intensification of industrial uses in the LSISs, as the office and/or research and development could act as enabling development. In addition, given the Council may need to rely on some windfall development to meet its employment floorspace needs,

allowing co-location could also assist in this regard. Overall, we consider as modified the Policy strikes the right balance.

111. There are some circumstances where the loss of industrial floorspace will be acceptable, in accordance with Policy B3. Subsequently, for the Policy to be effective a cross reference is required and is also addressed in **SDMM34**. Further, as a result of the above changes and for effectiveness, a consequential change is needed to Policy B1 (**SDMM33**).
112. Following the changes made to the Use Classes Order (UCO), the Council has sought a modification (**SDMM34**) to set out that it may use planning conditions, where it is deemed appropriate, to secure and protect new office (Class E(g)(i)), research and development (Class E(g)(ii)) and light industrial floorspace (Class E(g)(iii)). This would be in important areas, such as the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP area, CAZ fringe Spatial Strategy areas: Angel and Upper Street and King's Cross and Pentonville Road, Priority Employment Locations (PELs) and LSISs. Given the importance of such uses in the Borough and the need identified above for these uses, we are satisfied that in this instance this is a justified approach and required for the Plan to be positively prepared and justified. A corresponding change (**SDMM08**) to Policy SP3 is also needed in this regard.
113. Policy B2 contains several parts that relate to other policies in the SDMP. To ensure the Policy is effective, we consider that changes are required to cross-reference the other policies of relevance. This is achieved in modification **SDMM34**.
114. The start of Policy B2 sets out that proposals must maximise the provision of business floorspace in line with the priorities for each location before then going on to say that proposals which are not considered to maximise business floorspace will not be permitted. We consider this to be repetitive and negatively worded. For the Policy to be effective, a modification (**SDMM34**) is necessary to remove the repetition.
115. Part F of Policy B2 includes some design criteria. Not all of the criteria are appropriate for industrial uses and therefore a modification (**SDMM34**) is needed to make clear that the criteria relate to non-industrial uses. This ensures the Policy is justified. In addition, the supporting text of Policy B2

provides some further guidance on the design features for business floorspace. We consider that it is important to allow some flexibility as it may not always be possible to include all of the design requirements. **SDMM34** is therefore needed to insert the text 'wherever possible' and ensures the Policy is justified.

116. Industrial uses can have the potential to affect air quality. To ensure that such matters are suitably addressed a change is needed to Policy B2 (**SDMM34**) and the supporting text to set out that all development proposals within LSISs will need to prevent or mitigate impacts on air quality and promote sustainable transport. This ensures the Policy is justified and consistent with national policy.
117. As a result of the modifications set out above, changes are needed to Figure 4.1 Local Plan Business Designations. This is secured by modification **SDMM35** and ensures that the Plan is effective.
118. Policy B3 relates to the protection of existing business floorspace. Part C of the Policy currently sets out that there must be at least no net loss of industrial use as part of development proposals. However, the Policy then sets out several circumstances where such a loss will be accepted. **SDMM36** is therefore also needed to address this contradiction and ensures the Policy is effective.
119. Policy B3 requires a 24-month marketing period to demonstrate that there is no longer demand for the existing use. We consider this period of time to be appropriate. Notwithstanding this, the Policy requires a building to be both vacant and continuously marketed for at least 24 months. We consider that the requirement for the property to be vacant to be overly onerous. For example, there may be instances where an occupier is coming to the end of their lease and marketing could feasibly occur before it is vacant. We consider that a 24 month marketing period in itself is sufficient to establish whether or not there is a demand for the existing business floorspace. A modification is therefore needed as set out at **SDMM36** to address this matter and this will ensure the Policy is justified.
120. The Policy refers to Appendix 1, which sets out marketing and vacancy criteria and requires a detailed marketing report to be provided. Concerns have been raised that some of the requirements of the report are overly onerous. However, we consider that the requirements are reasonable and necessary to

show there is no demand for the existing business floorspace. Furthermore, it is clear when reading Appendix 1 that the examples are indicative and clearly there will be room for some agreement on the nature and extent of marketing and vacancy evidence required to support a development proposal.

121. Policy B3 does not currently allow the loss of business floorspace where it can be demonstrated that the existing building is no longer suitable for continued use. We consider that there may be circumstances where this could be relevant and therefore **SDMM36** addresses this by including this criterion in the Policy. This will ensure the Policy is justified.
122. As set out above under Policy B2, we consider it appropriate to use Planning conditions to secure specific sub-categories within Class E use. Subsequently, a modification is required to Policy B3 and the supporting text to set out Policy requirements for the loss of the conditioned Class E sub-category, including the marketing period, before full Class E flexibility can be gained. It is also necessary to set out requirements for the loss of Class E use more generally to other use classes. These are achieved through **SDMM36** that ensures the Policy is justified and effective.
123. We acknowledge that sports uses also fall within Class E. However, we do not consider it necessary to specifically refer to sports uses in Policy B3 or repeat National Policy, specifically paragraph 99 of the Framework.
124. The supporting text to Policy B3 notes that the London Plan identifies Islington as a Borough which must retain and intensify industrial floorspace capacity and follow a general principle of no net loss across designated LSISs. This does not accurately reflect the London Plan as adopted. A change (**SDMM36**) is therefore needed to alter the supporting text to address this matter.
125. Policy B4 seeks to secure affordable workspace as part of schemes involving business floorspace over certain thresholds in certain locations. Based on the evidence provided in the ELS (Exam Ref: EB4) and the Employment Topic Paper (Exam Ref: SD16), we are content that there is a clear need for additional affordable workspace in Islington. In addition, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that affordable workspace distorts the market or would reduce and/or disincentivise the amount of business space that comes forward in Islington.

126. The Policy currently relates to 'gross' additional floorspace rather than 'net'. We consider that this could disincentivise the delivery of redevelopments, particularly if the existing floorspace is let and income producing. A modification as outlined at **SDMM37** is therefore needed to refer to net rather than gross to ensure the Policy is justified.
127. Policy B4 includes various affordable workspace requirements depending on the location and scale of the proposed development. The appropriateness of these requirements based on the Viability Study (EB17), the Viability Topic Paper (SD29) and its update (EB18) were debated at the hearing sessions due to concerns by numerous representors. As a result of this, the Council was asked to undertake further viability analysis for affordable workspace. This was done through an Affordable Workspace Viability Addendum (Exam Ref: LB25) that considered a further 29 development typologies. As a result of this additional assessment work the Council put forward alterations to some of the thresholds by which developments in certain locations would need to provide for affordable workspace. This is further explained in the Council's note on the amended thresholds (LBI27).
128. These suggested alterations include, requiring:
- 10% affordable workspace to be leased to the Council at a peppercorn rent in perpetuity in the CAZ and its fringe locations rather than in areas of high land value across the Borough;
 - 10% affordable workspace to be leased to the Council at a peppercorn rate for 20 years for developments involving 3,000 sqm additional floorspace in a LSIS rather than 1,000 sqm in the submission Plan; and
 - 10% affordable workspace to be leased to the Council at a peppercorn rate for 20 years for developments involving 2,500 sqm additional floorspace in a PEL or Town Centre.
129. Based on the evidence provided in the above documents and additional assessment work, we consider the amended thresholds to be appropriate to ensure that most developments coming forward in the Borough will be viable in this regard. The changes are required to ensure the Plan is justified and

consistent with National Policy. This is addressed by modification **SDMM37** which makes these alterations to the Policy and supporting text.

130. Numerous concerns have been raised with regard to the assumptions used and the level of detail provided in the various viability reports, topic papers and additional work. We consider that the Viability Study (EB17), Affordable Workspace Viability Addendum (LB25), the Council's Note on the Affordable Workspace Viability Addendum Assumptions (LBI29) and the Council's reply (PD21b) to main modification representation MM056 provide a sufficient and proportionate level of detail.
131. We acknowledge that the Viability Study (EB17) was undertaken in 2018, which is some time ago. However, an Affordable Workspace Viability Addendum (Exam Ref: LB25) was undertaken in December 2021 and included updated data where necessary. We are mindful that some of the assumptions are necessarily based on professional judgement. There is no clear evidence before us to suggest that the Council's judgements are inappropriate.
132. We are mindful that Plan preparation is not a quick process and data and sources are constantly evolving. It is simply not possible to incorporate all of the latest evidence throughout Plan making and the examination process. We also consider that it is important to note that the role of the viability work is to give confidence that the majority of developments coming forward across the Borough as a whole would remain viable and it cannot by its nature ensure that all development proposals in all locations will be viable. Overall and in our view, the viability work to support Policy B4 is suitably proportionate, robust and the modified thresholds are justified.
133. Notwithstanding this conclusion, we do however acknowledge that there are likely to be some circumstances where the requirements of Policy B4 (as modified) may make the proposed development unviable. Policy B4 does not in itself allow the provision of site-specific viability appraisals, although it is noted that these may be considered in the supporting text. To comply with National Policy, **SDMM37** is required to set this out in Policy B4 rather than the supporting text.
134. The Framework at paragraph 58 sets out that *'It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability*

assessment at the application stage'. Modification **SDMM37**, as drafted during the MM consultation suggests that the list of exceptional circumstances is limited to those set out in Part G (a) to (c). We have therefore amended Part G of Policy B4 (**SDMM37**) to make clear that (a) to (c) are circumstances that might be considered to be exceptional, but they are not exhaustive. A consequential modification is also needed to the wording of Part H (ii) in this regard.

135. The additional flexibility in Policy B4 for developers to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to be able to provide site specific viability assessments at the planning application stage will help to ensure that developments can still come forward. It is clear that the exceptional circumstances set out in Part G include significant shifts in macro-economic conditions, so the potential future long term impacts of factors such as Brexit (which are somewhat still unknown) and recent inflation trends could be considered where appropriate. The Council will also need to review the Plan within 5 years of adoption.
136. Policy B4 does not in itself allow for financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision, but notes this may be considered in the supporting text. A modification is therefore needed to Policy B4 as set out at **SDMM37** to incorporate this into the Policy itself. This will ensure the Plan is justified and effective.
137. Supporting paragraph 4.50 sets out that a late stage review will be undertaken where a level of affordable workspace is below that expected in the Policy. It also goes on to say that any additional value arising over and above the projected position agreed by the Council at the Planning application stage would then be utilised to extend the peppercorn period as far as possible. However, this does not take into account a development where no affordable workspace was provided on the grounds of viability. A change is therefore needed as set out at **SDMM37** to explain that where on-site affordable workspace was not provided at the application-stage, any surplus arising from the late-stage review will be used to provide off-site financial contributions towards affordable workspace. This will ensure the Policy is justified and effective.
138. For mixed-use developments, it may be that both affordable housing and affordable workspace may be sought. The Council has sought to make clear that where the provision of affordable workspace would undermine the ability of the scheme to secure affordable housing compliant with Policy H3, the provision of

affordable housing will take priority. Given the acute need for affordable housing, we consider that this clarification as outlined at **SDMM37** is necessary for the Plan to be justified and effective.

139. The use of 'at least' appears in several locations in Policy B4. However, this is ambiguous and in many areas thresholds higher than those set out in the Policy have not been tested. Therefore, all reference to 'at least' needs to be deleted for the Policy to be justified. This is undertaken by modification (**SDMM37**).
140. Policy B4 sets out that the affordable workspace would be leased to the Council and then managed by an approved operator following a commissioning process (which could include the Council itself). Whilst acknowledging such an approach is different to many other Boroughs, we consider this to be an appropriate approach, which has already been established by the Council and see no reason why this would be an inappropriate conflict of interest or that the Council would not manage such processes appropriately in line with the aims of the Policy. Whilst paragraph 6.3.2 of the London Plan notes that affordable workspace can be delivered by a range of providers it does not seek to suggest that a range of providers must be included in Borough policies. However, in order for the Policy to be justified **SDMM37** is needed to set out more clearly the process that would be followed. This will ensure the Policy is effective.
141. The use of peppercorn rent has raised some concern. However, we are mindful that this is commonly used and based on the viability evidence, the majority of developments would be feasible. The use of peppercorn rent is therefore justified. The term peppercorn rent is, however, not defined in the Plan. In order for Policy B4 to be effective, we consider that a definition is added to the glossary. This is addressed through modification **SDMM91**.
142. Due to alterations to the supporting text from the above modifications, there is a need to delete footnote 25 in the Plan. This is undertaken by modification **SDMM38** and is necessary for the Plan to be effective.
143. Policy B5 sets out the approach to jobs and training opportunities. Part A and Part B of the Policy is repetitive and therefore for the Policy to be effective, a modification is required to combine them as set out at **SDMM41**. The Policy requires non-residential developments of 500 sqm or greater to provide for on-site job and training opportunities. However, there is no evidence to suggest

that developments of this scale would generate sufficient construction value or training opportunities to provide on-site construction opportunities. We consider that it should be changed to 1,000 sqm to reflect the evidence base, including the Council's current Planning Obligations (Section 106) SPD.

144. The Policy refers to financial contributions being sought as set out in the Planning obligations (Section 106) SPD. However, the SPD does not form part of the Development Plan and therefore modification **SDMM41** is necessary to address this and state that such requirements should instead have regard to the SPD or any successors. This will ensure the Plan is effective.
145. Part C of the Policy as originally drafted requires all developments to help support initiatives which tackle worklessness. However, National Policy is clear that Planning obligations should only be sought from major developments. A modification (**SDMM41**) is therefore needed to ensure compliance with National Policy.

Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan

146. In terms of the BCAAP, Policy BC1 outlines the area wide Policy to prioritising office use. This Policy is largely reflective of the fact that Bunhill and Clerkenwell comprise the majority of Islington's Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and the area provides an important economic and business function to the Borough. Policy BC1 seeks to support office floorspace as a priority land use and provides a criteria based approach to assessing new development proposals. **BCMM03** amends the wording at part D (iv) from wholly to predominantly residential parts of the AAP as this is more accurately reflective of the position regarding residential neighbourhoods within Bunhill and Clerkenwell. In addition to amend the Policy to reflect the new UCO, the modifications also add text to the supporting text to outline that the Council will use conditions to ensure that any new office use secured is restricted against a change to another Class E use as well as providing greater clarity regarding the application of Part C of the Policy. This approach is both necessary and justified in light of the economic function of

the area outlined above. Subject to the modification outlined, Policy BC1 presents a sound approach.

Conclusion

147. Having regard to the modification set out above, we conclude that the strategy for job growth and employment is sound.

Issue 5 Area Spatial Strategies: Is the Plan's overall spatial strategy in general conformity with the London Plan, is it positively prepared, based on robust evidence and is it justified and effective?

General approach

148. The London Plan at Policy D1, Part A sets out that '*Boroughs should undertake area assessments to define the characteristics, qualities and value of different places within the Plan area to develop an understanding of different areas' capacity for growth*'. Whilst the Council has not specifically undertaken a piece of work in this regard, we consider that the spatial area strategy policies are supported by an acceptable level of evidence that fulfil this requirement. This includes, the Integrated Impact Assessment, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the SHMA, the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, Employment Land Study, Retail and Leisure Study, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) Review, Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment, Tall Building Study, Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS Study and the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Urban Design Study.

149. The SALP sets out the likely housing and employment floorspace delivery in each of the defined spatial strategy areas. However, these are not set out in the overarching strategic policies. In order for the SALP to be positively prepared and effective, we consider that these figures should also be set out in the spatial area strategy policies themselves. Modifications (**SDMM06, SDMM08, SDMM10, SDMM12, SDMM14, SDMM16 and SDMM18**) are therefore needed to resolve this matter.

150. In many cases (Policies SP2, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7 and SP8), the approach to the delivery of housing, including whether windfall development will be supported, is not clear in the spatial area strategy policies. Modifications (**SDMM06, SDMM10, SDMM12, SDMM14, SDMM16, SDMM18**) are therefore needed to set out clearly in the spatial area strategy policies how the delivery of housing will be considered. This will ensure the policies are positively prepared, justified and effective.

Changes to the Use Classes Order

151. A number of changes came into effect on 1 September 2020 in relation to the UCO. These changes have implications for a number of policies contained within the Plan. In summary, the changes involve the following:

(i) Revocation of the current use classes A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments), A5 (hot food takeaways), B1 (business), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure);

(ii) Creation of new use classes E (commercial, business and service), F1 (learning and non-residential institutions) and F2 (local community); and

(iii) Redistribution of the uses within the former classes A, B1

152. These changes to the UCO principally impact on the Inclusive Economy section of the Plan, in particular the retail frontages policies which seek to ensure the vitality of town centres within the Borough. They also impact on a significant number of the site allocations within both the SALP as well as the BCAAP. In order to address these changes to the UCO, the Council have produced a number of MMs which apply to a number of policies and site allocations throughout the Plan. These modifications take into account the changes to the UCO, as well as ensuring the protection of the town centres and primary shopping frontages. All of these modifications are necessary to ensure that the Plan is effective and consistent with National Policy.

153. The modifications are listed as follows: **SDMM08, SDMM10, SDMM14, SDMM16, SDMM33, SDMM34, SDMM36, SDMM37, SDMM39, SDMM40, SDMM42, SDMM43, SDMM44, SDMM45, SDMM46, SDMM47, SDMM48,**

SDMM49, SDMM50, SDMM51, SDMM66, SDMM79, SDMM80, SDMM81, SDMM83, SDMM86, SDMM87, SDMM88, SDMM89, SDMM90, SDMM92, SDMM93, SDMM95, SDMM97, SDMM98, BCMM03, BCMM04, BCMM06, BCMM17, BCMM34, BCMM35, BCMM36, BCMM41, BCMM43, BCMM50, BCMM52, BCMM54, BCMM58, BCMM59, BCMM60, BCMM64, BCMM65, BCMM66, BCMM67, BCMM68, BCMM69, SAMM03, SAMM04, SAMM10, SAMM11, SAMM12, SAMM19, SAMM21, SAMM24, SAMM25, SAMM26, SAMM27, SAMM28, SAMM30, SAMM31, SAMM32, SAMM35, SAMM36, SAMM37, SAMM38, SAMM40, SAMM41, SAMM44, SAMM45, SAMM47, SAMM49, SAMM50, SAMM52, SAMM54, SAMM55, SAMM57, SAMM58, SAMM59, SAMM60, SAMM63, SAMM64, SAMM67, SAMM68, SAMM73, SAMM74, SAMM77, SAMM79, SAMM80, SAMM81, SAMM83, SAMM84, SAMM85, SAMM86, SAMM88, SAMM90, SAMM91, SAMM93, SAMM94, SAMM96, SAMM99, SAMM109, SAMM125, SAMM126, SAMM127, SAMM128, SAMM129, SAMM130, SAMM131, SAMM132.

Area Spatial Strategies – Policies SP1-SP8

Policy SP1 – Bunhill and Clerkenwell

154. Policy SP1 notes that the Bunhill and Clerkenwell area comprises six spatial strategy areas as identified at figure 2.2. Parts B and C of the Policy identified that the AAP will set out area wide policies focused on prioritising and delivering the office function of the area, as well as consolidating and enhancing the areas cultural, retail and leisure role. This approach is reflective of the concentration of the existing floorspace within Bunhill and Clerkenwell and is justified. The Policy notes that the area is expected to see the most significant level of growth within the Borough and the BCAAP provides the site allocations where this growth is expected to be delivered. **SDMM05** is necessary to add a new part D to the Policy which identifies the level of housing and office growth from the site allocations which this area is anticipated to deliver over the Plan period. This is necessary to ensure the Policy is effective.

Policy SP2 - King's Cross and Pentonville Road

155. Policy SP2 at Part B refers to the area around King's Cross being a 'Knowledge Quarter'. However, there is no defined boundary and the Council set out at the hearing sessions that there is not sufficient evidence to allow one to be drawn at the current time. On this basis, we are not of the view that reference to the 'Knowledge Quarter' is justified. **SDMM06** is needed to remove it from Policy SP2 and the supporting text. This modification means that figure 2.3 also needs to be updated and this is provided at **SDMM07**.
156. Part I of Policy SP2 considers proposals for residential moorings along the canal. However, the Policy does not set out how boater facilities such as mooring points, water and electrical supply and waste collection would be considered. A modification **SDMM06** is necessary to address these matters and to ensure that the Policy is effective. In addition, Part I does not require proposals to have regard to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Again, a modification **SDMM06** is needed to add this criterion to Part I of Policy SP2 to ensure the Policy is effective.
157. The King's Cross and Pentonville Road area includes Regent's Canal. This is used for residential and leisure moorings. The GTAA identified a need for 7 additional permanent moorings for boat dwellers by 2025. Whilst Policy SP2 of the SDMP refers to proposals for new residential moorings, it does not positively seek to make provision for this need. During the hearings, the Council set out that although it was not possible to allocate specific moorings to meet this need, it would work with the Canal and River Trust to identify opportunities for and convert, where appropriate, existing leisure moorings in the area as well as exploring other opportunities for moorings through a waterspace strategy. A statement of common ground (SoCG) was also signed between the Council and the Canal and River Trust to this effect (LB26). We consider this to be a pragmatic approach to meeting this need and therefore a modification (**SDMM06**) is needed to set this out in Policy SP2. However, given the Council were unable to allocate specific moorings, it will need to work actively with the Canal and River Trust to identify such opportunities. Given the identified need is for the beginning part of the Plan period, we consider that a focused early review should be undertaken should the 7 additional moorings not be delivered by the end of 2024. Modification **SDMM06** also includes this mechanism. These changes will ensure that the Plan is positively prepared.

158. Through the discussions on the additional moorings, it became clear that such development would need to be located on the south of the canal (off-side) and necessary supporting uses and facilities would need to be in place before the first use of any additional moorings. A change (**SDM006**) is therefore needed to guide future applicants and will ensure the Plan is effective.

Policy SP3 - Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site

159. Having regard to discussion on Policy B2 above and for those reasons, the Policy warrants a more positive approach to supporting non industrial uses here. As a result, **SDMM08** amends the Policy wording at criteria C to state that proposals for the co-location of industrial uses with office and/or research development use will be permitted, where there would be an intensification of industrial use on the site (either through new floorspace or the redevelopment/modernisation of existing floorspace) and it can be demonstrated that the continued industrial function of the LSIS would remain. This revised approach also needs to be reflected in the site allocations VR1-VR10 which are covered at issue 6 of our report.
160. In addition, parts E-G inclusive of the Policy, as currently drafted, place an overly restrictive approach on the height of any proposed new building, extension or redevelopment in this location. We are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to justify such an approach. Accordingly, the modification **SDMM08** deletes these parts from the Policy wording which is necessary for the Policy to be justified. Part H of the Policy also identifies the office floorspace which the site allocations within the SP3 area are expected to deliver. This part of the Policy does not represent a cap but merely reflects the site capacity assumptions within the Site Allocations document. This is a justified approach. The modification also covers a number of changes to the supporting text which provide greater clarity in relation to the Policy and its application which are necessary for the Policy to be effective.
161. The boundary to the Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS needs to be updated for the Policy to be effective in its application. As drafted, it includes residential sites on the edge of the boundary (LBI18). This change is brought about by **SDMM04** and **SDMM09**. However, as we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of this change.

Policy SP4 - Angel and Upper Street

162. The supporting text to Policy SP4 sets out that Crossrail 2 is not yet funded and will not be delivered until the end of the Plan period at the earliest. However, following the Transport for London (TfL) funding settlement in November 2020 the project is ready to be restarted. A modification set out at **SDMM10** is therefore required to reflect the most up-to-date position to ensure the Plan is effective. In light of the modification set out in **SDMM10**, figure 2.5 needs to be updated and this is addressed through **SDMM11**.
163. In relation to the other parts of the Policy, **SDMM10** is necessary to ensure the Policy provides adequate protection to the specialist retail function of Camden Passage and to include a cross reference to Policy R7 for effectiveness. Additional text also provides a reference to housing coming forward on allocated sites and upper floors and these changes are also necessary to ensure the policy is effective.

Policy SP5 - Nag's Head and Holloway

164. The Morrison's supermarket and its adjacent car park is the key opportunity site within the Nag's Head and Holloway spatial area. The Council has proposed alterations to Site Allocation NH1 to include residential use, in its attempts to boost the supply of housing (see matter 7). Modifications are therefore needed to Policy SP5, Part E and the supporting text to reflect this change. This is set out at **SDMM12**. This will ensure the Plan is positively prepared and effective.
165. Part I of Policy SP5 relates to the London Metropolitan University and states that additional accommodation for students will not be allowed other than on sites allocated for student accommodation in the Spatial Strategy area. However, this is not consistent with Policy H6 and how it is proposed to be modified, as set out above. To ensure the Plan is consistent and therefore effective, **SDMM12** is needed to address this matter.
166. The potential removal of the Isledon Road / Tollington Road gyratory system has raised concerns. Whilst Part K of Policy SP5 sets out that this will only be done if feasible in the long term, it is necessary to include a change (**SDMM12**) to set out that removal of the gyratory system will need to consider and mitigate any significant adverse impacts on existing residents and businesses. This will ensure the Policy is justified. In light of this modification and

modifications to site allocations in the area, figure 2.6 needs to be updated and this is addressed through **SDMM13**.

Policy SP6 - Finsbury Park

167. Policy SP6 identifies Finsbury Park as a potential CAZ satellite location for business uses, with the potential for small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) occupation. Finsbury Park station is well connected to the CAZ via the Piccadilly and Victoria line as well as the wider South East. We are also mindful that the ELS (Ref EB4) found that *'...generally, Finsbury Park is the most viable location for encouraging non-CAZ B-use employment generating development, thanks to its excellent transport links'*. The Council has also identified that the central area has seen significant increases in business floorspace in recent years with the delivery of the City North development scheme and that rents in Finsbury Park are generally lower than the CAZ making the ability for SME to establish in Finsbury Park more viable.
168. There is a significant need identified for additional business floorspace in the ELS and subsequent updated topic paper (Ref SD16) and it is clear that all of this floorspace cannot be delivered within the CAZ. Given the excellent transport links, we consider that Finsbury Park is well positioned to deliver further business floorspace over the Plan period.
169. It has been suggested that the local Finsbury Park office take up is slow and demand does not exist. However, we are mindful that over recent years the office market has been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic and it is still somewhat unclear what the long-term position will be.
170. Whilst there is a focus on the protection and intensification of business uses in Policy SP6, it does not rule out mixed use developments and would allow residential development on upper floors in the Town Centre. Consequently, the potential to deliver SME workspace and/or affordable workspace could potentially form part of larger mixed-use schemes. Whilst we note the concerns about only smaller parcels of land now being available in Finsbury Park, the Plan period is over the next 15 years and therefore there is the potential for larger sites to become available or redeveloped.
171. As discussed above, we consider that modifications are required to Policy B4 'affordable workspace' in terms of viability and site-specific assessments to

allow greater flexibility. This would allow for developments with genuine viability constraints to still be delivered.

172. Given all of the above, we are content that the spatial area strategy for Finsbury Park, in terms of strongly encouraging the intensification of business uses, including SMEs is justified. Although, the Council will clearly need to carefully monitor the take up of new office space and the delivery of SMEs and/or affordable workspace in Finsbury Park to inform any future reviews of the Plan. Policy SP6 notes that Finsbury Park has the potential to be a CAZ satellite location. However, the London Plan does not identify Finsbury Park as a potential CAZ satellite location and therefore modification **SDMM14** is necessary to remove this reference.
173. Policy SP6 seeks to protect and enhance the Fonthill Road specialist shopping area. We consider that this contributes significantly to the character and vitality of this area of Finsbury Park. The supporting text to Policy SP6 also notes that the Council will seek to work with traders and partners to re-invigorate manufacturing and workshop functions in Fonthill Road. There is no evidence to suggest that this aspiration is not feasible should there be an appetite from traders. We are mindful that such an aim would not, in any event, preclude other development that would protect and/or enhance the shopping area from being delivered in accordance with Part C of Policy SP6. Therefore, we consider the approach to Fonthill Road specialist shopping area to be justified. We note the representations regarding defining the specialist shopping area and the use of SSA as an acronym however this is not an acronym used within either Policy SP6 or supporting text so is not necessary for soundness.
174. Part M of Policy SP6 identifies heritage assets that contribute significantly to the character of the area. However, Finsbury Park lies close to the boundaries of the neighbouring authorities of the London Boroughs of Haringey and Hackney. Consequently, development within the area covered by Policy SP6, which includes the potential for tall buildings, could also affect heritage assets in the neighbouring authorities. **SDMM14** is therefore required to Part M of Policy SP6 to make clear that future proposals would need to consider impacts on heritage assets in the neighbouring Boroughs. In light of these modifications, figure 2.7 needs to be updated and this is addressed through **SDMM15**.
175. In order to ensure the policy approach is consistent with Policy SP4, **SDMM14** is necessary to ensure the Policy provides adequate protection to the specialist

retail function of the Fonthill Road. This modification also provides a reference to residential use coming forward on allocated sites and upper floors. These changes are also necessary to ensure the Policy is effective.

Policy SP7 - Archway

176. The Archway spatial area includes the district centre which is centred around Archway Underground Station and Navigation Square as well as the wider area extended to include Whittington Hospital as well as the Archway Campus. Policy SP7 includes a thirteen point criteria based approach to development which seeks, amongst other things, to maintain and enhance the town centre offer, support the growth of existing social infrastructure as well as new business floorspace.
177. The Plan as submitted included the designation of the Archway spatial area as a Cultural Quarter. However, this approach is not justified by the evidence base. In particular, the Retail & Leisure Study (EB7) and associated Topic Paper (SD22) establishes that the existing presence of cultural uses within Archway is comparable to both Finsbury Park and Nags Head. Furthermore, there is no clear concentration of activity within the spatial area, as set out within the Plan. Following the hearings, we wrote to the Council in relation to this issue and set out our views as to how the issues could be remedied (INS14). Accordingly, **SDMM16** is necessary to delete the reference to supporting the role of Archway as a Cultural Quarter within Policy SP7 as well as the associated supporting text. This is necessary for the Policy to be justified. In light of the modifications to Policy SP7, figure 2.8 needs to be updated to be effective and this is addressed through **SDMM17**.

Policy SP8 Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway

178. Due to the modifications required to Policy SP8 (**SDMM18**), as set out above (paragraphs 149 and 150), Figure 2.9 needs to be updated for effectiveness and this is addressed through **SDMM19**.

Bunhill and Clerkenwell Policies BC1 – BC8

179. In addition to Area Spatial Strategy (ASS) SP1 which covers the whole of the Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP, the BCAAP divides the Bunhill and Clerkenwell

Area into 5 spatial strategy areas. The extent of these are illustrated at figure 4.1 and are set out at table 4.1 within the Plan. **BCMM18** updates figure 4.1 to ensure that the site allocation boundaries are correctly drawn, which is necessary for the Policy to be effective. These policies set the parameters for development within the spatial strategy area, including identifying any key development considerations or sites which are likely to provide development opportunities throughout the Plan period. Where relevant, these individual sites are then covered by site allocations. The approach to site capacity assumptions is then set out within the Plan at page 56. The text explains how the assumptions have been calculated using an appraisal based on site size, allocated uses and site constraints. This has then been used to derive an indicative quantum of residential and office floorspace figures. We are satisfied that the approach to site capacity assumptions is a sound and effective one. As currently drafted, table 4.2 is not effective as it does not contain the most up to date information. **BCMM19** is necessary to address this.

Policy BC3 – City Fringe Opportunity Area

180. The City Fringe Opportunity Area includes parts of Old Street and City Road. The designation aims to provide a Policy focus for the growth of the tech sector and related businesses, as well as a variety of office development such as small stand alone offices as well as larger floorplates. The Policy notes the important role which the Moorfields Eye Hospital site will play in terms of the provision of business floorspace over the Plan period. **BCMM06** amends criteria G in relation to the Old Street roundabout to ensure that the Policy wording is positively prepared. Additional supporting text is set out at paragraph 3.18 to provide greater clarity in terms of the tall building sites identified. **BCMM07** also amends figure 3.2 which illustrates the City Fringe Opportunity Area Spatial Strategy diagram. Subject to the modifications, the Policy and figure 3.2 present a justified approach.

Policy BC4 – City Road

181. City Road is acknowledged within the Plan to provide an important link between the two business nodes at Kings Cross and the City Fringe Opportunity Area. It presents a linear route with opportunities for enhancing the business uses located in this area. In accordance with the Council's priority for the City Road commercial corridor, proposals for redevelopment must look to increase business floorspace provision as far as possible. Criteria G of the Policy relates

to supporting greater public access around the City Road Basin. This is an important and valued place for a number of reasons including its recreation and scenic value. The Policy provides a framework to balance the open space and biodiversity habitat with the enjoyment of the canal as a waterspace. **BCMM08** provides additional wording for clarity and effectiveness of the Policy, and a new criteria H with associated supporting text is also introduced to provide more detailed criteria based approach to proposals for residential moorings. This is necessary to make the Policy effective. Subject to this modification, BC4 presents a sound and justified approach.

Policy BC5 – Farringdon

182. The Farringdon area has a role as a major transport interchange. In land use terms, in addition to the office and employment focus, the area also includes the Farringdon Local Shopping Area as well as part of the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter where the development of cultural and night time economy uses will be supported. **BCMM09** amends the wording at criteria F, G, H and new text at I to ensure the Policy is positively prepared and that criteria I recognises the focus of the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter. In addition, **BCMM10** amends figure 3.4 which illustrates the Farringdon Spatial Strategy area to include the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter boundary. Subject to this modification, BC5 presents a sound and justified approach.

Policy BC6 – Mount Pleasant and Exmouth Market

183. Mount Pleasant and Exmouth Market includes both the Mount Pleasant sorting office, a major redevelopment site which spans both the Camden and Islington Borough boundaries, as well as Exmouth Market Local Shopping Area. The Policy outlines the importance of these two key features, as well as a number of other key locations such as the former Clerkenwell Fire Station. **BCMM11** is necessary for the Policy to be positively prepared, by removing the reference to harming local character or amenity within both criteria B as well as the supporting text. The modification also introduces new text at criteria G to acknowledge that the area includes part of the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter and includes an appropriate cross reference to Policy BC2. **BCMM12**

amends figure 3.5 which is the spatial strategy diagram for the Mount Pleasant and Exmouth Market area, by adding the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter boundary. It also includes the addition of the Skinner Street Open Space as a site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) for effectiveness (see **SDMM56** for details at paragraph 322). Subject to this modification, BC6 presents a sound and justified approach.

Policy BC7 – Central Finsbury

184. The Central Finsbury Area includes a number of housing estates, employment uses along Old Street and Goswell Road, the designated local shopping area of Whitecross Street as well as two significant sports and leisure facilities in the form of Finsbury Leisure Centre and Ironmonger Row baths. As currently drafted, the Policy is not effective as it fails to acknowledge the re-provision of the sports and leisure function of the Finsbury Leisure Centre as part of the redevelopment proposals. **BCMM13** rectifies this by providing additional wording at criteria F. The modification also adds a number of new criteria to include reference to the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter which covers part of the spatial strategy area (G), as well as new criteria I-L which moves what was supporting text relating to the design to the Policy wording for effectiveness. **BCMM14** amends figure 3.6 which is the spatial strategy diagram for the Central Finsbury, by adding the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter boundary. It also includes the addition of the Skinner Street Open Space as a SINC for effectiveness (see **SDMM56** for details at paragraph 322). Subject to this modification, BC7 presents a sound and justified approach.

Policy BC8 – Historic Clerkenwell

185. This spatial strategy area includes a number of heritage assets including designated conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings as well as strategic and local designated views. The area includes part of the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter. In order to ensure the Policy is consistent with National Policy, criteria A needs to be amended (**BCMM15**) from preserve and enhance to preserve or enhance. A corresponding change to appendix 1 of the BCAAP is also necessary and this is outlined at **BCMM63**. The last sentence of criteria A is also deleted for the Policy to be effective.

186. In order to ensure the Policy is effective and consistent with the approach to employment uses throughout the Plan, **BCMM15** provides a new criteria B. Further new criteria are also included at H and I to ensure that the Policy provides a positive approach to public realm and street improvements and a cross reference to Policy BC2 and the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter. The modification also amends the supporting text to correctly refer to the scheduled ancient monument of the Benedictine nunnery of St Mary, Clerkenwell.
187. A corresponding change is necessary in the form of **BCMM62** which amends appendix 1 and the list of Scheduled Monuments. **BCMM16** amends figure 3.7 which is the spatial strategy diagram for Historic Clerkenwell, by adding the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter boundary, as well as amending the reference to the pedestrian route so it aligns correctly with the Policy aspirations outlined at site allocation BC50 (see **BCMM59**). It also includes the addition of the Skinner Street Open Space as a SINC for effectiveness (see **SDMM56** for details at paragraph 322). Subject to this modification, BC8 presents a sound and justified approach.

Conclusion

188. We conclude that with the recommended modifications, the strategic spatial area policies are soundly based.

Issue 6 – Do the site allocations contained within the SALP and BCAAP present a sound approach? Are they justified, effective and consistent with National Policy?

Introduction

189. As outlined under issue 5 above, the SDMP allocates seven area spatial strategies. These spatial strategy areas form the basis for the allocations contained within the Site Allocations Plan. In addition, the BCAAP outlines the site allocations relative to the eight spatial strategy areas contained within the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area. To avoid excessive repetition within this section of our report, we have concluded in relation to the soundness of policies as a whole for each spatial strategy area rather than for each Policy conclusion.

190. Each of the site allocations follow set criteria, outlining key items such as development considerations, site designation and constraints and estimated timeframe for delivery. These Policy parameters have been informed by the Council's site appraisal work which included an assessment of Borough wide Policy considerations, suitability and deliverability as well as physical site constraints. This process also included the Council's assessment of the contribution the individual site(s) would make to delivering the spatial priorities for the area. The Council should be commended for the overall approach to these site allocations which is sufficiently detailed yet not overly complex.

Sites within the Islington Local Plan Site Allocations

191. The site allocations within each spatial strategy area which are covered within our report are set out below. In addition, it should be noted that the following site allocations are deleted through modifications **SAMM23, SAMM65, SAMM97, SAMM100, SAMM102** as the developments which the site allocations refer to have been completed and the policies are therefore no longer justified:

- VR6: The Fitzpatrick Building, 188 York Way (due to renumbering of the sites this allocation has become 4 Brandon Road)
- FP10: Former George Robey Public House, 240 Seven Sisters Road
- OIS9: Ladbrooke House, 62-66 Highbury Grove
- OIS12: 202-210 Fairbridge Road
- OIS13: Highbury Roundhouse Community Centre

192. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of the above changes.

193. In light of these changes, and to address the renumbering of a number of the site allocations for consistency across the SALP, table 1.1 at section 1 which lists the strategic and non strategic policies and site allocations requires

updating. This is addressed through **SAMM05**. This modification is necessary for the policy to be effective.

194. As a result of the modifications outlined below, corresponding changes are necessary to figures 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 9.1 for effectiveness and to reflect the modifications to the site allocations throughout the Plan as well as the Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS boundary. We recommend **SAMM02, SAMM09, SAMM17, SAMM29, SAMM42, SAMM56, SAMM71 and SAMM89** to address this.

King's Cross and Pentonville Road

195. There are seven site allocations contained within the Plan for this spatial strategy area. KC1 covers the Kings Cross Triangle site which is bounded by York Way, the East Coast mainline and the Channel Tunnel Rail link comprising disused former railway lands, temporary storage and car parking. The allocated use is reflective of the planning permission which is for a mixed use residential led development including leisure, community and retail uses as well as open space. **SAMM10** updates the protected viewing corridor reference as well as correctly referencing the concrete batching Plant under development considerations. This is necessary for the Policy to be effective.
196. KC2 covers 176-178 York Way and 57-65 Randell's Road. The allocation is identified for a business-led mixed use development and the intensification of business use is identified as a priority for this site. **SAMM11** is necessary to correct the planning history reference contained within the Policy for effectiveness and for the same reason as allocation KC1, to update and include a reference to the nearby concrete batching Plant.
197. KC3 relates to Regents Wharf (10,12,14,16 and 18 All Saints Street). The site is currently in office use however the allocation outlines how the site should provide for the retention and reprovision of business floorspace with the potential for intensification of business use. As drafted, the Policy wording includes 'limited' business use however this wording is neither necessary or justified as an uplift in commercial floorspace on the site has recently been permitted. **SAMM12** deletes this text, as well as updating the planning history to reflect this recent permission and site ownership details. In order to ensure the living conditions of nearby residents are adequately protected, the

modification also provides additional wording in this regard. The modification is necessary for the Policy to be effective.

198. We have taken site allocations KC6 and KC7 together as these allocations address sites at 8 All Saints Street and All Saints Triangle, Caledonian Road. Both sites are allocated for employment related uses, being located within the King's Cross Priority Employment Location. **SAMM13** is necessary to correctly reference the protected viewing corridor within KC6. **SAMM14** is necessary to add additional text to the development considerations of KC7 to ensure that the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties are protected. Both of these modifications are necessary for the allocations to be effective.
199. KC8 provides a new site allocation at the Bemerton Estate South. This modification is set out at **SAMM15** and is necessary for the Plan to meet overall housing need and to be positively prepared. The allocation identifies the site for infill residential development, including the re-provision of community space and the provision of new retail/commercial space along Caledonian Road. The modification also addresses the issue of green space through the development considerations by seeking to ensure that opportunities to improve urban greening and enhance green infrastructure be maximised. Overall, this is a justified and proportionate approach.
200. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the King's Cross and Pentonville Road site allocations is sound. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes.
201. As a result of these modifications, table 2.1 which sets out the site allocations within this area also needs to be updated and this is set out at **SAMM08**.

Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site

202. There are ten site allocations within this spatial strategy area. As a general point, the allocations here seek to ensure that adequate access and servicing arrangements in relation to business/industrial uses are incorporated into any proposals and that access for servicing and deliveries should be on site. In light of the approach outlined within Policy T5 of the SDMP concerning delivery and servicing, this is in our view a justified approach.

203. As submitted, site allocation VR1 relates to the wider site known as Fayers site, 202-228 York Way, 22-23 Tileyard Road, 196-200 York Way. However in reality two separate planning permissions exist for the site so it has been split accordingly as the allocation as it stands is no longer justified. **SAMM18** amends this by updating the Policy text to accurately reflect the developable site area and the Policy criteria. The modification will also necessitate a change to the site boundary as illustrated on the policies map. It will be for the Council to update the policies map in light of this change.
204. Located to the north of VR1, VR2 covers 230-238 York Way. In order to reflect the more positive Policy approach to the co-location of office and/or research and development use outlined at Policy B2, **SAMM19** is necessary. This modification provides an appropriate cross reference to policies B2-B4 and SP3 within the Policy and updates the reference to the protected viewing corridor for effectiveness.
205. Tileyard Studios are covered at site allocation VR3. This site relates to existing activities servicing the music industry including studios, writing rooms and offices. As drafted, the current/previous use section of the Policy is not justified as it does not accurately reflect the broad range of activities taking place at the site. We have considered the specific Policy wording following the evidence presented at the hearing, the written representations as well as the views expressed within the SoCG prepared by the Council and landowner on this matter (LBI28). In our view, **SAMM20** is necessary to amend the Policy wording and also updates the allocation and justification text to be more positively prepared and reflect the overarching Policy approach outlined at policies SP3 and B2. In this way, we consider that the allocation will appropriately support the growth of the existing Tileyard Cluster of businesses operating here. It provides an appropriate Policy response to the specific circumstances of the site within the context of policies SP3, B2 and the broader LSIS objectives. The proposed modification presents a justified and effective Policy approach to the site allocation. The reference to the protected viewing corridor is also updated for effectiveness and the development considerations are also updated to provide a more positive and flexible approach to servicing and deliveries at the site.
206. VR4 covers a relatively narrow site at 20 Tileyard. The site is currently used as a food production factory. In common with site VR2, the allocation and justification section as drafted is not positively prepared. **SAMM21** addresses

this by outlining how co-location of office and/or research and development uses would be appropriate. This modification provides an appropriate cross reference to policies B2-B4 and SP3 within the Policy and updates the reference to the protected viewing corridor for effectiveness.

207. As set out above, the submission Plan allocated VR5 at 4 Brandon Road. However, this allocation is updated through **SAMM22** to cover 22-23 Tileyard Road and part of 226-228 York Way. This allocation previously formed part of VR1 but has been allocated separately to reflect the separate planning permissions for each part of the site. The allocation reflects the extant planning permission for light industrial, flexible business use and an ancillary café, as well as supporting the principal of co-location of uses in line with policies B2-B4 and SP3. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes.
208. We recommend **SAMM24** for site allocation VR6 which allocates the former VR5 site at 4 Brandon Road as an appropriate site for co-location of office and/or research and development uses in line with the other VR site allocations. The modification also updates the timeframe for delivery for effectiveness and deletes text referring to a maximum building height which is not justified by the evidence base.
209. VR7, VR8 and VR9 relate to a number of properties on Brewery Road - 43-53, 55-61 and Rebond House at 98-124 Brewery Road respectively. Both VR7 and VR8 are privately owned. VR9 is under the ownership of the City of London. All three sites are able to contribute to the spatial strategy by providing additional employment floorspace. **SAMM25**, **SAMM26** and **SAMM27** amend a number of the development criteria for effectiveness, including the cross referencing to other relevant policies within the Plan, as well as correctly referencing the relevant Islington Local View Corridor.
210. The final site within the Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS is VR10. This site covers 34 Brandon Road. As submitted, the Policy is not positively prepared as it fails to recognise the contribution which the co-location of office and/or research and development use can make. **SAMM28** amends the Policy wording in this regard and also deletes wording which is not justified in relation to building heights. The modification also correctly references the Islington Local View protected viewing corridor. This modification is necessary for effectiveness.

211. As a result of these modifications, table 3.1 also needs to be updated as this sets out the site allocations within the area, this is reflected in **SAMM16**.
212. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Angel and Upper Street

213. There are sixteen site allocations across the Angel and Upper Street spatial strategy area. With the exception of AUS15, all of the sites are either located within the Angel Town Centre, the CAZ or both.
214. Site allocations AUS1, AUS6, AUS7, AUS10, AUS12, AUS13, AUS16 do not accurately reflect the correct protected viewing corridor. In order to ensure the policies are effective, this is rectified through modifications **SAMM30, SAMM33, SAMM34, SAMM37, SAMM38, SAMM39** and **SAMM41**.
215. AUS2 relates to Pride Court, 80-82 White Lion Street. This site which is currently in office and residential use, is located within the Angel Cultural Quarter, Angel Town Centre and CAZ. As drafted, the Policy is not justified as it fails to reflect the recent planning permission granted at the site. **SAMM31** addresses this by updating the relevant planning history and allocation and justification sections of the Policy.
216. AUS8 relates to the former cinema and bingo hall at 161-169 Essex Road. This is a grade II* listed property, located partly within the Canonbury Conservation Area and Angel Town Centre. As drafted, the allocation and justification section of the Policy is not effective as the uses proposed are not justified. **SAMM35** addresses this by providing greater clarity in relation to the mix of uses envisaged for the site. It also adds additional text to the development considerations section to confirm that marketing evidence as required by Policy R10 of the SDMP is not required for development proposals which are consistent with the site allocation.
217. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Angel and Upper Street site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Nag's Head and Holloway

218. There are a total of fourteen site allocations within this spatial strategy area.
219. Site allocations NH7 and NH10 do not accurately reflect the correct protected viewing corridor. In order to ensure the policies are effective, this is rectified through **SAMM48** and **SAMM51**. **SAMM48** also updates how allocation NH7 was identified to ensure the text is reflective of pre-application discussions which have taken place.
220. NH1 relates to the Morrisons supermarket and adjacent car park as well as 10 Hertslet Road and 8-32 Seven Sisters Road. As drafted, the Policy is unsound as it seeks to focus on a retail led mixed use development with residential use only permitted on the upper floors. The Policy also fails to cross reference Policy SC1 in relation to the existing snooker hall. In order to address this, **SAMM43** amends the allocation and justification text as well as the development considerations to provide a more flexible approach to residential use as well as a focus on the retention and improvement of the existing retail offer. The modification also adds additional text to cross reference to Policy SC1 as well as adding additional wording in relation to the existing operation of the food store during the construction phase. This modification is necessary for effectiveness. For the same reason, the modification also covers and updates the estimated timescale for delivery.
221. NH3 covers 443-453 Holloway Road. The site is currently in arts/cultural and business use and the allocation identifies the site as being suitable for intensification of business use and commercial uses. However, the existing arts/cultural uses should be retained. **SAMM45** is necessary to update the timescale for delivery, planning history and use classes in order to ensure the Policy is effective. NH4 covers the Territorial Army Centre at 65-69 Parkhurst Road. **SAMM46** updates the relevant planning history to reflect the most recent consent and is necessary for effectiveness.
222. NH11 covers the Mamma Roma site at 377 Holloway Road. This site is identified for the potential intensification for business use. The Policy requires modification through **SAMM52** to acknowledge the potential for site assembly with the neighbouring allocation at NH12 which is already reflected within allocation NH12 as well as providing clarity in relation to the primary shopping

area designation. This modification is necessary to ensure the Policy is effective. The adjoining site allocation is covered by NH12 which is 341-345 Holloway Road and 379-391 Camden Road. This site has been identified through the Tall Buildings Study as having scope to provide a local landmark building. **SAMM53** updates the development considerations to ensure that any development should respect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. This is necessary to ensure the Policy is effective in its application.

223. The final two allocations in Nag's Head and Holloway are covered by allocations NH13 and NH14. Both of these sites are owned by the London Metropolitan University. NH13 relates to 166-220 Holloway Road. A number of changes to the Policy text are necessary for effectiveness and are addressed through **SAMM54** to provide greater clarity in relation to the approach to the existing tall building, update the reference to the viewing corridor and acknowledge the acceptability of student accommodation in this location. NH14 also requires amendment through **SAMM55** to ensure the Policy is effective. This modification provides clarity to the Policy wording in relation to active frontages, the acceptability of student accommodation in this location and updates the UCO references as well as the reference to the viewing corridor.
224. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Nag's Head and Holloway site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Finsbury Park

225. There are a total of fifteen site allocations within this spatial strategy area. FP3 relates to the Finsbury Park Station and Island, Seven Sisters Road. This site represents one of the major strategic transport interchanges within the Borough. Redevelopment is expected to provide a mixed use commercial led scheme to include both offices and residential uses. **SAMM59** is necessary to correct an error in the site size and also amend the appropriate uses in light of the changes to the UCO.
226. FP4 refers to a site allocation fronting Fonthill Road and Goodwin Street. The site is allocated for a retail led mixed use redevelopment to complement the specialist shopping function of Fonthill Road. **SAMM60** is necessary to amend the allocation to reflect that an element of residential use may be acceptable, subject to the relevant affordable housing policies and also to update the

relevant planning history section. This modification is necessary to ensure the Policy is effective.

227. FP5 refers to a site at 1 Prah Road. The allocation and justification section of the Policy requires amendment to refer to residential development only as the remainder of the text is not necessary for effectiveness. This is addressed through **SAMM61**. FP7 refers to the Holloway Police station at 284 Hornsey Road. It is not a justified approach to require the justification of the loss of social infrastructure on this site and as a result, **SAMM62** is necessary. This modification also adds an appropriate reference to the viewing corridor. FP9 relates to 221-233 Seven Sisters Road. This site is located within Finsbury Park town centre and has been identified through the tall buildings study as an appropriate location for a local landmark building. **SAMM64** amends the Policy wording to provide a clearer commitment regarding the comprehensive development of the site and to amend the current and previous uses in light of the changes to the UCO. This modification is necessary for effectiveness.
228. Site allocations from FP11 onwards in the Submission Plan are renumbered as a result of the deletion of FP10. **SAMM67** is necessary to amend the relevant planning history, allocation, reference to the protected viewing corridor and current/previous use to ensure the policy is effective.
229. FP11 of the submission SALP is to be renumbered FP10 through **SAMM66** as a result of the deletion of the former allocation at FP10 (**SAMM65**). The modification also updates the planning history section. The modification is necessary for effectiveness. Site allocation FP13 addresses the Andover Estate. An additional reference within the site designations and constraints is necessary to reference the relevant viewing corridor. This is addressed through **SAMM69**. Finally, FP14 refers to 216-220 Seven Sisters Road. This allocation identifies the site for an office/business led development with retail at ground floor level. **SAMM70** amends the estimated timescale for delivery which is necessary for effectiveness.
230. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Finsbury Park site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Archway

231. There are a total of twelve site allocations within this spatial strategy area.
232. ARCH1 covers the Archway Bus Station site on Vorley Road. The site has been identified as having potential to accommodate a local landmark building through the Islington Tall Buildings Study. **SAMM72** is necessary to amend the allocation and justification section of the text to ensure that social and community infrastructure uses are recognised as appropriate here as well as introducing greater flexibility around the wording concerning business floorspace. The modification is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is effective.
233. ARCH3 relates to the Archway Central Methodist Hall within Archway town centre. The site is located within the primary shopping area as well as the St. John's Grove Conservation Area. **SAMM74** is necessary to amend the Policy wording to provide the correct address details, correctly identify the relevant planning history and amend the Policy wording in terms of the allocation and justification as well as development considerations. The modification is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is effective. Whilst we note representations to the effect that this allocation should be deleted as a result of the deletion of the cultural quarter designation, we do not consider that this would be necessary for soundness.
234. ARCH5 refers to the Archway Campus at Highgate Hill. As currently drafted, the Policy wording is not effective as it fails to provide flexibility in terms of the land uses identified. This is addressed through **SAMM76** which acknowledges the appropriateness of student accommodation and active frontages in this location. The modification also adds reference to the Islington Local View and additional text highlights the importance of recognising that any development should respect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, including properties on Lidyard Road. The modification is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is effective.
235. The former Job Centre at 1 Elthorne Road is covered by ARCH6. This allocation requires modification through **SAMM77** to recognise that the existing property is now vacant, update the current ownership, timescale for delivery and provide greater flexibility to the allocations and justification section. The modification is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is effective. ARCH7 and ARCH8 (formerly ARCH8 and ARCH9 in the submission Plan) are further allocations at Brookstone House and Holloway Road respectively. Both of the allocations

require modification through **SAMM79** and **SAMM80** respectively to ensure the policies are effective. These modifications amend the address and planning application details.

236. ARCH7 refers to 207A Junction Road. This site is to be deleted from the Plan through **SAMM78**. This is because the extensive representations received (including those of the existing leaseholder) at the MM consultation have demonstrated that the site would not be deliverable during the Plan period. This deletion from the Plan necessitates the renumbering of allocations ARCH7-ARCH12 inclusive which are covered by the MM outlined within our report. As a result of the deletion of the Archway Cultural Quarter which we have addressed under issue 5 above, there are corresponding changes to the relevant site allocations to delete this reference which are covered by **SAMM72, SAMM73, SAMM74, SAMM77, SAMM79, SAMM80, SAMM82, SAMM83**. In order for these policies to be effective, it will also be necessary for the corresponding removal of the cultural quarter from the policies map. However, as we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes.
237. ARCH9 relates to the existing community facility and sports pitches at the Elthorne Estate. **SAMM81** amends the allocation to ensure the development also secures a new community centre as well as providing additional text in terms of the planning permission and to reference a replacement ball court at Zoffany Park. The modification is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is effective.
238. ARCH10 covers Dwell House which was numbered as ARCH11 in the submission version of the Plan. **SAMM82** is necessary for effectiveness to ensure the site is correctly referenced as only being partly within the town centre boundary and also to acknowledge that development should respect the amenity of surrounding residential properties. In relation to ARCH11, this modification also updates the planning history which is necessary for effectiveness. The timescale for delivery of ARCH4 is amended through **SAMM75** which is necessary for effectiveness.
239. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Archway site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway

240. There are a total of six site allocations within this spatial strategy area. **SAMM87** amends the planning history section of allocation HC4 Dixon Clark Court which is necessary for effectiveness. In terms of allocation HC3 which relates to Highbury and Islington Station, Holloway Road, **SAMM86** is necessary for effectiveness to ensure that the development considerations section acknowledges that any decking scheme should be sensitively designed in relation to the amenity impacts on residents.
241. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway site allocations section of the Plan is sound.

Other important sites

242. There are a total of twenty six sites contained under the heading of 'other important sites'. These are generally dispersed throughout the Borough outside the designated spatial strategy areas. In common with the above allocations, **SAMM90, SAMM91, SAMM94, SAMM95, SAMM96, SAMM99, SAMM104, SAMM105, SAMM106 AND SAMM107** are necessary to site allocations OIS1, OIS2, OIS6, OIS7, OIS8, OIS15, OIS16, OIS18, OIS19 and OIS22 as the Policy wording as drafted does not reflect the most up to date changes made to the UCO and/or to update the relevant planning history sections where necessary which is required for effectiveness. **SAMM110** is necessary for Policy OIS24 in the submission Plan (renumbered to OIS23 through the modification) this modification also amends the site boundary and area. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of this change.
243. **SAMM107, SAMM109, SAMM111, SAMM112** are necessary to allocations OIS19, OIS24 and OIS25 to correctly reference the Islington Local View and/or the London View Management Framework viewing corridor, or both.
244. OIS4 originally included 1 Kingsland Passage. However, this part of the site has recently been subject to a comprehensive development. **SAMM92** is necessary to correctly reflect this and update the site area, ownership, timescale for delivery and address to ensure the Policy is effective. As we do not have the

ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of this change.

245. OIS5 relates to Bush industrial Estate, Station Road. In order to reflect the more flexible approach to co-location of office and/or research and development uses, the allocation and justification is amended through **SAMM93** for effectiveness. The modification also amends the site designation and constraints section as well as the development considerations to accurately reflect the site's locational characteristics in terms of it being adjacent to the Whittington Park SINC, residential uses as well as Yerbury Primary School. These changes are also necessary for effectiveness.
246. **SAMM98** introduces a new OIS9 which relates to the Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church. This allocates the site for re provision of the existing Church and community space alongside residential development, including affordable housing. The modification has been amended since the consultation on the MM to replace 'application' with 'permission' which is a more accurate reflection of the current position. The development considerations and estimated timescale are all necessary to ensure the Policy is effective.
247. OIS10 covers 500-502 Hornsey Road and Grenville Works, 2A Grenville Road. The planning history and allocations sections require modification through **SAMM99** to reflect a recent successful appeal on the site. This is necessary for the Policy to be effective.
248. **SAMM101** introduces a new allocation at OIS12 which was previously OIS32 and covers the New Orleans Estate. The allocation is necessary to adequately address the Boroughs housing needs over the Plan period. This Policy allocation focuses on the provision of new additional residential development including affordable housing, whilst also recognising the importance of the relocation and re-provision of the existing multi-use games area and community building as well as improvements to play space, amenity space and landscaping across the estate. The development considerations are justified and effective. The modification is necessary for the Policy to be effective.
249. OIS14 (renumbered as formerly OIS15) addresses Athenaeum Court, Highbury New Park. This site is allocated for infill residential development. **SAMM103** is necessary to update the development considerations section to ensure that

development respects the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, including residents of Orwell Court and also to ensure that trees are appropriately covered by any landscaping Plan. This modification is necessary for effectiveness.

250. OIS20 (renumbered as formerly OIS21) addresses the Former Railway Sidings adjacent to Caledonian Road Station. A number of changes to the development considerations section are necessary to ensure the on-site and nearby heritage assets are accurately covered by the Policy. This change is brought about by **SAMM108** and is necessary for effectiveness.
251. **SAMM113- SAMM118** cover modifications to allocations OIS26 – OIS31 (formerly OIS33) inclusive. These allocations were previously identified within the pre hearing modifications and cover a number of existing Housing Estates within the Borough which the Council have identified as appropriate for additional residential development including affordable housing. These modifications (including the renumbering of the policies) are necessary to meet overall housing needs over the Plan period and will ensure the Plan is positively prepared. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes.
252. Subject to the modifications set out above, the approach outlined throughout the Other Important Sites section of the SALP is sound.

Sites within the Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP

253. BC3 allocates the Islington Boat Club at 16-34 Graham Street for the provision of residential development as well as the refurbishment of the boat club facilities. **BCMM20** adds additional text to the development considerations for effectiveness to ensure that the community and sporting uses should be provided consistent with the requirements of Policy SC1 of the SDMP Plan. For the same reason, the modification also adds additional text in relation to any residential use proposed here to refer to the agent of change principle as set out at Policy DH5. Subject to this modification, the allocation at BC3 presents a sound and justified approach.
254. BC4 covers one of the larger site allocations within the BCAAP at Finsbury Leisure Centre. The site is allocated to provide leisure facilities, housing, energy

centre, nursery and public open space. As currently drafted, the Policy is not effective as it fails to adequately acknowledge the need to protect the amenity considerations of occupiers in the vicinity of the site. We have amended the modification wording in light of the representations made to ensure that the protection of the amenity of neighbouring properties is not only focused on Burnhill House, Norman Street as this will ensure the Policy is effective. As drafted, the Policy also fails to adequately acknowledge that the redevelopment should ensure the re-provision of the existing sports pitches and facilities which are a well used feature of the area. **BCMM21** amends the Policy text to address these two issues. Subject to this modification, Policy BC4 presents a sound approach.

255. BC5 relates to the London College of Fashion, Golden Lane. Whilst the sites current use is as a further education venue, the site is allocated for the refurbishment of the existing building for office use. **BCMM22** provides greater detail to the Policy wording which is necessary for effectiveness. The modification notes where additional extensions to the existing building maybe appropriate. Subject to this modification, Policy BC5 presents a sound approach.
256. Sites BC6 and BC7 cover the Redbrick Estate and Vibast Centre, garages and car park as well as 198-208 Old Street (Petrol Station site). BC6 is allocated for residential use and BC7 is allocated for redevelopment of the petrol station to provide retail/leisure uses at ground floor level with offices above. **BCMM23** adds the re-provision of the community centre and small scale retail use to the allocation, as well as acknowledging that the health care centre previously provided on the site has been re provided off site. **BCMM24** adds additional text to the allocation and justification section of BC7 to recognise the existing petrol filling station will continue prior to the site's redevelopment. Both of these modifications are necessary for the effectiveness of the policies and subject to these modifications, policies BC6 and BC7 present a sound approach.
257. Old Street roundabout is covered by Policy BC8. This site is allocated for a number of gyratory and highways improvements as well as enhanced retail provision and the provision of significant new public open space. In relation to the relevant planning history, **BCMM25** updates the text here to ensure the Policy is effective and accurately reflects TfL's wider role within the area. Under development constraints, additional text is also added to highlight that proposals should improve conditions and safety for cycling. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy BC8 is sound.

258. 254-262 Old Street is covered by allocation BC10. As drafted, the allocation sought to include the Golden Bee Public House at 262 Old Street and referred to any development should consider the retention of this public house. In light of the other Policies contained within the Plan to protect such uses, namely Policy R11, this approach is neither justified or effective. In order to rectify this, the inset map and Policy text is amended through **BCMM26** to remove the reference to the public house. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of this change. The modification also updates the ownership and address details which is necessary for the Policy to be effective. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy BC10 is sound.
259. Site allocations BC11 and BC12 cover Longbow House, 14-20 Chiswell Street and Cass Business School, 106 Bunhill Row. BC11 allocates the site for commercial office use whilst BC12 is allocated for limited intensification of the education use including increased teacher facilities. In order to ensure the policies are effective, **BCMM27** and **BCMM28** amend the development considerations parts of the policies and estimated delivery timeframe for BC11. Subject to these modifications, the approach outlined at Policy BC11 and BC12 is sound.
260. The Car Park at 11 Shire House, Whitbread Centre, Lambs Passage is covered by Policy BC13. In order to ensure the Policy is effective, the allocation and justification text needs to be updated. This is addressed through **BCMM29** which outlines appropriate uses as a mixed use development with residential and a significant amount of office floorspace. An element of hotel use is also identified as being acceptable in principle. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy BC13 is sound.
261. Site allocations BC15, BC16, BC17, BC18, BC19, BC20, BC22, BC25, BC26, BC27, BC29, BC32, BC34, BC35, BC46 require either the planning history section to be updated, the correct reference to the Islington Local View and/or the London View Management Framework viewing corridor to be included, or both. These modifications are brought about through the following modifications: **BCMM30, BCMM31, BCMM32, BCMM33, BCMM34, BCMM35, BCMM37, BCMM39, BCMM40, BCMM41, BCMM43, BCMM44, BCMM46, BCMM47 and BCMM56** respectively. Site allocation BC28 is amended through **BCMM42** as the Policy as drafted fails to acknowledge the heritage assets at 320-326 City Road within the development considerations section of the Policy.

BC33 covers the site allocation at Oliver House, 51-53 City Road. This allocation is modified through **BCMM45** for effectiveness so that the allocation and justification section of the Policy refers to commercial uses as well which provide an active frontage to the ground floor. In addition to correcting the references to the protected viewing corridors, **BCMM48** also amends the allocation and justification section of site allocation BC36 concerning the London Metropolitan Archives and Finsbury Business Centre. This modification ensures the intensification of business use reference is specific to the Finsbury Business Centre which is necessary for effectiveness. Subject to these modifications, the approach outlined at the aforementioned policies is a sound one.

262. In addition, a number of the site allocations require amendment to the Policy wording in relation to development considerations, current/previous use, estimated timescales and/or the relevant planning history sections. These modifications are necessary to ensure the policies are effective in their application. This applies to policies BC37, BC40, BC41, BC43, BC44, BC45, BC47, BC49, BC51 and these modifications are brought about by **BCMM49, BCMM51, BCMM52, BCMM53, BCMM54, BCMM55, BCMM57, BCMM58** and **BCMM60** respectively. Subject to the modifications outlined, the Policy approaches are sound.
263. BC21 relates to the site allocation at 4-10 Clerkenwell Road, 29-39 Goswell Road and 1-4 Great Sutton Street. As drafted, the Policy is not effective as it does not accurately reflect the proposed uses for the site. **BCMM36** rectifies this by updating the allocation and justification text to state hotel led mixed use development with retail and leisure uses. The modification also updates the planning history section for clarity and effectiveness. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy BC21 is sound.
264. BC24 covers the Clerkenwell Fire Station at 42-44 Rosebery Avenue. This allocation is highlighted as a key development opportunity within the spatial strategy area section at Part D of BC6: Mount Pleasant and Exmouth Market. The Policy as drafted is not effective as it fails to acknowledge the importance of securing active frontages at the ground floor for commercial, a small element of social infrastructure or community uses. **BCMM38** amends the Policy wording to address this. It also updates the references to the London View Management Framework to accurately reflect the correct references within the Policy. Subject to this modification, the approach adopted by Policy BC24 is a justified one.

265. Two of the most comprehensive development sites within the BCAAP are covered by BC38 – Moorfields Eye Hospital and BC50 – Queen Mary University, Charterhouse Square Campus. In terms of BC38, the existing Moorfields Eye Hospital site is located on the City Road and its redevelopment is acknowledged to provide a significant opportunity for expansion of tech businesses in this area. The site is located within the CAZ and the City Fringe Opportunity Area. **BCMM50** amends the reference to social infrastructure and also the public space reference for effectiveness. Following representations received at the main modifications consultation, we have also amended the allocation and justification section of the policy to include reference to research and development which is a justified approach to reflect the fact that research and development use previously formed part of the former B1 use class.
266. The Queen Mary University, Charterhouse Square Campus (BC50) is allocated for a variety of uses including higher education and medical research uses, office and research uses and student accommodation. We are mindful of the representations received regarding the potential security constraints in connection with providing a new pedestrian route through the site. As a result, the development considerations section of the Policy needs amending to demonstrate greater flexibility in this regard and this is carried out through **BCMM59**. Furthermore, the modification also provides more positive commentary regarding student accommodation on the site further to modification **SDMM24** and correctly references the London View Management Framework viewing corridor. Subject to these modifications, the approach outlined at both BC38 and BC50 is sound.

Conclusion

267. Subject to the modifications outlined, the Council's approach to the site allocations within both the SALP and BCAAP is sound. The approach is justified, effective and consistent with National Policy.

Issue 7 – Whether the Plan will meet the identified housing need and whether there is a reasonable prospect of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption

Meeting the housing need

268. The overall housing target for the Plan period (as modified) from 2020/21 to 2036/37 is 13,175 homes. Policy H2 of the Plan does not identify the overall housing need over the Plan period, and we consider this is necessary for the Plan to be positively prepared. Modification (**SDMM21**) addresses this matter. A corresponding change (**SAMM07**) is also needed to amend the overall housing target in the SALP. This will ensure effectiveness.
269. The Plan as submitted would not meet the overall need. Early in the examination we wrote to the Council to set out that it should seek to boost the supply of housing to meet the identified housing need. The Council chose to identify further site allocations, namely associated with their own housebuilding programme and revised the allocated uses on some site allocations. These were subject to a pre-hearing consultation to ensure that no party was prejudiced and could actively take part at the hearing sessions. Modifications (**SAMM15, SAMM35, SAMM43, SAMM98, SAMM99, SAMM101, SAMM113, SAMM114, SAMM115, SAMM116, SAMM117** and **SAMM118**) are therefore necessary to allocate the additional sites and alter the allocated uses on some sites. This will ensure the Plan is positively prepared. The Council will also need to ensure that such changes are reflected on the policies map when adopted.
270. The SDMP does not contain a housing trajectory, which is a requirement of the Framework. A modification (**SDMM100**) is therefore needed to add this as a new appendix. This will ensure compliance with National Policy. The Council's latest housing trajectory as set out in modification SDMM100 shows the Plan (as modified) would deliver 14,029 dwellings over the Plan period.
271. The Plan would provide a buffer of over 850 dwellings. We consider this to be a reasonable figure to take into account any potential non delivery of sites over the Plan period.
272. The Council has assumed a small site windfall allowance of 484 dpa and this figure has originated from Table 4.2 of the London Plan. There is no reason before us to consider that this is not an appropriate figure. Further, the Council has applied a large site windfall allowance of 62 dpa from 2025/26 onwards. We consider this to be a reasonable estimate based on past trends and there is compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply.

Five-year housing land supply

273. The housing requirement established in the Plan is 775 dpa. At the time of the examination hearings the Council accepted that it was a 20% buffer authority due to the housing delivery test results in 2019. However, the most recent housing delivery test results (14 January 2022) for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21, show that the Council delivered more homes than required (104%). We therefore agree with the Council (LBI33) that having regard to paragraph 74 of the Framework, Islington is a 5% buffer authority. As a result, we have altered the housing trajectory (**SDMM100**) to remove reference to a 20% buffer, by deleting this row of the table.
274. The Council has confirmed (LBI33) that during the first year of the Plan period (2020/21) completions were 657 homes. This creates a shortfall of 118 dwellings since the start of the Plan period. This should be taken into account in the five-year calculation. The Council had sought to move the base date of the Plan from 2020/21 to 2021/22. However, we are not of the view that there are any reasons for doing so to make the Plan sound.
275. At the time of the examination hearings the period for calculating the Council five year housing land supply was 2021/22 to 2025/26. We acknowledge that due to delays in the examination, things have moved on. However, we have examined the deliverability of the Council supply based on this time period and consider that the most pragmatic approach, to avoid further delays that would have significant consequences for the examination, is to still adopt this timeframe. Notwithstanding this, we consider that the most recent housing delivery test results should be taken into account as this is a factual matter. Based on the housing requirement of 775 dpa, the shortfall of 118 dwellings and a 5% buffer, we consider that the five-year requirement is 4,193 homes (839 dpa).
276. Turning to supply, the Framework requires sites within the five-year housing land supply calculation to be 'deliverable' as defined in Annex 2 of the Framework. There are a number of site allocations that do not currently have planning permission but are considered to be deliverable within the 5 year period. The Framework notes that where a site has been allocated in a development Plan it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear

evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years. The PPG² expands on this by setting out that this could include firm progress being made towards the submission of an application; firm progress with site assessment work; or clear relevant information about site viability, ownership constraints or infrastructure provision, such as successful participation in bids for large-scale infrastructure funding or other similar projects.

277. Based on the evidence provided by the Council, both within its hearing statements and provided orally at the hearing session, we are content that the Council's assumption on delivery from the site allocations without planning permission are robust and they should be considered deliverable.
278. We note that the Council has confirmed (LBI33) that actual completions for 2021/22 were 441 homes, lower than the 708 anticipated completions set out in the housing trajectory (**SDMM100**). However, given 2021/22 is the first year of the five year period, we consider it is reasonable to consider that the delayed 267 homes will still likely be delivered over the five year period.
279. The Council's housing trajectory (**SDMM100**) shows the delivery of 5,031 dwellings over the five year period. This equates to a supply of 6 years. Even if the 267 homes were excluded, the Council's supply would still remain at 5.68 years. We consider that the robustness of these figures are further increased by the lapse rates that have been applied to unimplemented permissions for all sites based on past trends.

Conclusion

280. We consider that with the recommended modifications, the Plan will meet the identified housing need and the Council will be able to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply on adoption of the Plan.

Issue 8 – Whether the Plan's approach to infrastructure is justified and consistent with National Policy

281. The Plan's approach to the provision of strategic infrastructure to support the delivery of the proposed development in the Plan is set out by Policies ST1 to ST4. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (EB12) (IDP) also supports the Plan in

² Paragraph: 007 (Reference ID: 68-007-20190722).

this regard. We consider that the IDP appropriately identifies the necessary infrastructure requirements and considers how they will be delivered and funded.

282. The supporting text to Policy ST1 refers to a Regulation 123 Infrastructure list. This is no longer maintained by the Council and therefore a modification as set out at **SDMM73** is required to remove this reference and replace with reference to the Council's obligation to produce an Infrastructure Funding Statement on an annual basis. It also adds a specific additional reference to the use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments for school place provision. Subject to this modification, the Policy will be effective.
283. During the pre-hearing modification consultation, the Council suggested a modification to the supporting text of Policy ST1 to set out that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively where it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects. However, we consider that there is no basis to require retrospective developer contributions and that this would be unlikely to meet the tests for Planning obligations in the Framework and CIL Regulation 122. Consequently, we have not recommended this modification.
284. Policy ST2 considers waste and sets out that the Hornsey Street Re-use and Recycling Centre will be safeguarded in order for Islington to continue to contribute to meeting aggregated waste Planning requirements. However, the submission policies map does not illustrate the safeguarded site. This will need to be shown on the policies map when it is adopted for Policy ST2 to be sound. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes. We consider that modification **SDMM74** is necessary to refer to the policies map within the Policy. This will ensure the Policy is effective.
285. Policy ST3 sets out the Council's approach to telecommunications, communications and utilities equipment. The Policy does not currently refer to the TfL Streets toolkit guidance, which is an important consideration. To ensure the Policy is effective, modification **SDMM75** is therefore required to address this matter.
286. The supporting text of Policy ST3 at paragraph 9.12 sets out that on-street location of telecommunications boxes and other utilities equipment should be

avoided, but where this is not possible, equipment must be designed and located to prevent street clutter and conflict with pedestrian movement and street furniture. Such equipment may also conflict with cyclists and for the Plan to be effective a change is needed through **SDMM75** to address this matter.

Conclusion

287. Subject to the above modifications, the Plan's approach to infrastructure is justified and consistent with National Policy.

Issue 9 –Town Centres and Retail: Whether the approach to town centres and retail development is justified, in general conformity with the London Plan and consistent with National Policy. Are the Plan policies based on a robust evidence base and are they justified and effective?

Meeting Retail needs over the Plan Period

288. The retail and leisure needs over the Plan period are outlined within the Council's retail evidence base (EB7). It outlines the future retail and leisure needs across the Borough until 2036. The study concludes that in order to meet identified need, the evidence base identified need for 6341sqm of convenience floorspace and 12247sqm of comparison floorspace to be provided by the end of the Plan period. **SDMM42** reflects these figures as an amendment to the supporting text which is necessary for the Plan to be effective. In addition to capacity, the study also includes health checks for the four town centres. This assessment follows the guidance contained within the PPG, and the evidence in relation to both need as well as the health checks undertaken presents a robust and proportionate approach to meeting retail needs over the plan period.

Strategic and Development Management Policies Plan

289. In order to meet this need, the Plans strategy will focus development towards designated town centres as outlined within the spatial strategy areas. Turning to the specific retail policies themselves, Policy R1 provides the overall approach towards retail, leisure and services as well as culture and visitor accommodation across the Borough. The Policy aims to support the town centres as the focal

point for commercial, cultural and civic activity within the Borough and goes on to outline the role and function which the Primary Shopping Areas (PSA) and Local Shopping Areas (LSA) will play in achieving this objective. **SDMM42** is necessary to ensure criteria F of the Policy accurately reflects the appropriateness of residential accommodation within town centres and local shopping centres, consistent with the approach outlined by the Framework. The modification also amends the text in relation to specialist shopping areas, cultural quarters and Primary Shopping Areas to ensure the Policy is effective and consistent with the remainder of the Plan. In addition, the modification also amends the supporting text for consistency and effectiveness with the Policy changes. Subject to this modification, the Policy is sound.

290. The PSAs are covered by Policy R2. This Policy seeks to maintain minimum percentage levels of retail uses across the designated centres. **SDMM43** amends the Policy wording to ensure that any new development at the ground floor level of a PSA contributes to the retail function of the PSA. This is necessary for the effectiveness of the Policy. In light of the changes to the UCO, new criteria are introduced to the Policy at D and E to introduce a marketing evidence requirement in relation to proposals which seek a change of use to another Class E use. Associated amendments to the supporting text are also made. This requirement is both necessary and justified in light of the changes to the UCO and for consistency with the requirement for marketing evidence across other policies contained within the Plan. Subject to this modification, the Policy presents a sound approach to dealing with the PSA.
291. As drafted, Policy R3 fails to acknowledge residential use as an appropriate use within town centres. A number of amendments are necessary to Policy R3 in the form of **SDMM44**. The Policy is renamed Islington's Retail Hierarchy instead of Islington's Town Centres through this modification as this more accurately reflects the purpose of the Policy. Sub headings are introduced throughout the Policy wording to ensure the Policy is effective in its application. The modification amends the detailed wording of part F of the Policy (now part C) to ensure the Policy is positively prepared. Parts G and H of the Policy as well as the supporting text are also amended to ensure that residential use is recognised as an appropriate town centre use, for consistency with National Policy and other policies contained within the Plan. The modification also adds additional text in relation to the role which impact assessments can play in relation to proposals outside of town centres. Subject to this modification, the Policy is justified.

292. LSAs are covered by Policy R4. The Policy outlines the overall approach to supporting town centres uses within the LSAs, including identifying the approach to proposals for a change of use. **SDMM45** is necessary to ensure the Policy cross references the policies map for effectiveness, removes the reference to residential uses being strongly resisted as this is neither justified or consistent with National Policy. In addition, the modification also introduces additional supporting text regarding marketing evidence requirements to ensure a consistent approach is adopted across all designated retail frontages. Subject to this modification, the Policy approach is sound.
293. The modification also provides new text at criteria C which states that development of main town centres uses over 200sqm must meet the requirements of Policy R3 Part E. Whilst we recognise that this approach goes beyond the requirements of National Policy in the case of Islington, LSA provide an important element of the retail offer with some 40 LSAs designated. This additional text will permit the Council to assess the impact of larger proposals on the character and function of the LSA and is considered a justified approach in this instance.
294. Policy R5 addresses dispersed retail and leisure uses within the Borough. The Policy outlines how the Council will support and protect retail uses located outside designated town centres and LSAs. This Policy recognises the role and function which dispersed retail and leisure uses can play to the local community and particularly those with mobility difficulties. As a result, the Policy sets out a criteria based approach. **SDMM46** deletes the references to dispersed A3 uses which is no longer justified in light of the changes to the UCO and adds additional text for clarity and effectiveness regarding new retail development proposals which may come forward. Subject to this modification, the Policy presents a sound approach.
295. Policies R6 and R7 deal with the special retail character of Islington including markets and specialist shopping areas. These policies are necessary as the Borough has a relatively unique concentration of small specialist shops, well established markets such as Chapel, Exmouth and Whitecross Street, Camden Passage and Archway as well as specialist shopping locations such as Camden Passage and Fonthill Road. All of these add to the unique local character of the areas concerned, and the policies aim to support the role and function of these areas across the Borough.

296. **SDMM47** outlines modifications to Policy R6 to introduce the wording and/or for clarity and effectiveness of the Policy, as well as clarifying that the supporting text relates to active frontages. **SDMM48** modifies Policy R7 to add additional text to recognise the contribution which residential use can play which is necessary for consistency with other policies contained within the Plan. The addresses of the specialist shopping areas covered by Policy R7 have been added to ensure the Policy is effective in its application. The modification also clarifies that individual or cumulative impacts on vitality, viability character, vibrancy and predominantly retail function should be prevented and/or mitigated. Subject to these modifications outlined, policies R6 and R7 present a sound approach. We note the concerns expressed regarding the use of SSA as an acronym and the extent to which the specialist shopping areas are defined within the Plan. However, an address schedule is provided within the Policy itself and where SSA is used as an acronym, it is preceded by the address reference. We are therefore of the view that this presents a sound approach.
297. Policy R10 addresses culture and the night time economy. This Policy provides a criteria based approach to the location of new cultural uses as well as separate criteria applicable to proposals involving the redevelopment and re-provision of existing cultural uses, the loss and/or change of use of these facilities as well as proposals for new night time economy uses. **SDMM51** amends the Policy to replace 'must' with 'should' to ensure the Policy is positively prepared. The modification also provides greater clarity to the Policy wording in terms of criteria B and the re-provision of new cultural uses, including in locations outside of the CAZ and town centres, as well as the requirements for marketing for town centre uses. The modification also deletes text which is no longer justified in terms of residential uses and the cultural quarters. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined by Policy R10 is sound.
298. Public houses are addressed by Policy R11. Public Houses are acknowledged to form an integral part of the urban fabric of the Borough. The Policy outlines how the Council will resist the redevelopment, demolition and change of use of public houses which meet identified criterion. **SDMM52** is necessary to add the emphasis of and/or in relation to the assessment criteria, as well as referencing the marketing and vacancy requirements outlined at appendix 1 of the Plan. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined by Policy R11 is sound.
299. Appendix 1 of the Plan sets out the marketing and vacancy criteria which will apply to the retail policies as well as Policy B3 and SC1. As currently drafted, it

is not clear from the appendix how the different marketing and vacancy criteria are applied across the policies of the Plan. **SDMM78** addresses this through a new table A1.1 which clearly sets out the marketing and vacancy periods applicable. This is necessary for the policy to be effective.

Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan

300. Policy BC2 of the BCAAP outlines the overall approach to culture, retail and leisure uses within the area. The Policy recognises the importance of these uses to the functioning of the AAP area and support the primary economic function of the area. **BCMM05** amends the wording of Policy BC2 to ensure the Policy wording is positively prepared in relation to retail and leisure uses and deletes the reference at part B to the application of the sequential test (as well as the associated supporting text) as this is not justified. The modification also adds clarity to the application of part C of the Policy. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined by Policy BC2 is sound.

Conclusion

301. To conclude and subject to the above modifications, the Plan's approach to Town Centres and Retail development is justified, in general conformity with the London Plan and consistent with National Policy.

Issue 10 – The Built and Natural Environment: Are the Plan's policies for the environment, including green infrastructure, transport and biodiversity justified, effective and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Sustainable Design

302. The Council identifies how sustainable design will be delivered through Policy S1. This Policy and the Sustainable Design chapter of the Plan set out how development should maximise energy efficiency and minimise greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy. The approach has been informed by the evidence base (EB9) including the energy report and associated addendum. This evidence sets out a number of key Policy recommendations necessary for the Council to be in a position to achieve Islington's 2050 net zero carbon aim. Accordingly, policies S1-S10 inclusive provide this broad Policy

framework. We are satisfied that the evidence supports this broad objective and the policies outlined within the Plan will provide the Council with the Policy framework to achieve this target within the timeframe identified.

303. Policy S1 as submitted includes a reference within the supporting text to Islington's gas combined heat and power network however this text needs deleting as this is no longer considered to be a low carbon option. **SDMM58** addresses this and is necessary for the Policy to be justified. The modification also introduces additional text at paragraph 6.10 to recognise the role which heat networks provide. The Policy provides a clear and robust framework for prioritising renewable and low carbon heat and energy which is consistent with the London Plan.
304. Policy S2 addresses Sustainable Design and Construction. It outlines how development proposals will be required to submit a Sustainable Design and Construction Statement identifying how proposals will meet the relevant sustainable design policies. **SDMM59** amends criteria D (iii) to ensure that the payment of a monitoring fee would be secured through a legal agreement – this is necessary for the Policy to be effective. The modification also includes additional supporting text to outline how the monitoring is expected to be carried out. Subject to this modification, Policy S2 presents a sound approach.
305. In the context of energy infrastructure, Policy S5 outlines appropriate heat sources in accordance with the heating hierarchy. **SDMM60** provides for a number of updates to the Policy which are necessary for effectiveness. Firstly, to include the correct dataset reference in the form of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) energy projections, to provide additional text to the Policy at parts C and D to clarify the Policy approach to larger minor new build developments as well as those with individual heating systems as well as deleting the references to gas boilers to reflect the most recent Future Homes Standards. Corresponding changes are required to the supporting text for consistency and also to update the references to air source heat pump systems. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined within Policy S5 is sound.
306. Policy S7 outlines the approach to improving air quality, outlines how all developments should mitigate or prevent adverse impacts on air quality and assess reasonable opportunities to improve air quality. In order to ensure the Policy is effective, **SDMM61** amends the size threshold at part D from 200 to 150 dwellings to be in accordance with the London Plan. Additional text to part

F is also necessary to reference where off site provision of a sufficient standard cannot be provided, a financial off setting contribution may be acceptable, secured through a legal agreement. The supporting text is amended for consistency with additional text regarding overshadowing of solar panels in the vicinity of canals. This modification will ensure the Policy is justified.

307. Flood Risk Management is covered by Policy S8. In order to ensure the Policy is effective and consistent with National Policy, additional text is necessary to reference the exception test, update the references to Annex 3 of the Framework and to ensure the flood risk vulnerability classifications are consistent with National Policy. These changes are set out at **SDMM62** and **SDMM63**. Subject to these modifications, the Policy approach is sound.
308. Finally, Policy S9 addresses Integrated Water Management and Sustainable Drainage. This is a seventeen-part Policy which outlines the approach in relation to surface water runoff, sustainable drainage, water quality, biodiversity and water efficiency. **SDMM64** is necessary to ensure that part C of the Policy references both direct and cumulative flood risk, amends part G of the Policy for effectiveness and part O and the reference to contaminated land with an associated amendment to the supporting text to state that preliminary rather than full details of any proposed decontamination will be necessary. Subject to the modification, Policy S9 presents a sound Policy in relation to water management and sustainable drainage.

Design and Heritage

309. The SDMP provides for a number of policies to support the approach to design and heritage throughout the Plan.
310. The overarching approach is set out within Policy DH1 concerning innovation and conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The Policy covers a number of strategic matters including but not limited to the protection of views, the approach to Islington's Heritage Assets and tall buildings as well as basement developments. As submitted, the Policy fails to make a clear distinction between views and local views as defined through the London View Management Framework and Local Landmarks. **SDMM69** addresses this by separating the two into different criteria. The modification also deletes part of the supporting text which relates to the historic environment as this is not

consistent with the Framework. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy DH1 is sound.

311. Policy DH2 addresses heritage assets. **SDMM70** is necessary to ensure the Policy wording is consistent with the Framework and also makes the distinction clear between the London View Management Framework, Local Views Framework and Local Landmarks. It also updates the text regarding scheduled monuments within the Borough which is necessary for accuracy. Subject to this modification, the approach outlined at Policy DH2 is sound.
312. The approach to tall buildings has been informed by both the London Plan and the Tall Buildings Study (EB14) and the overall approach outlined within the subsequent Topic Paper. As advocated by the London Plan, the Tall Buildings Study identifies a number of locations across the Borough as suitable for tall buildings. The approach within the study follows the methodology advocated within Policy D9 of the London Plan. The study outlines a spatial overview of the Borough, followed by a search for potential tall building locations. It then identifies eight tall building principles which set the objectives and define criteria to identify suitable appropriate locations. The sifting exercise comprised a strategic search and then local search. The local search focused on the following areas: Archway, Finsbury Park, Holloway Road/Caledonian Road/Emirates Stadium, Highbury Corner, Dalston Fringe, Kings Cross Fringe/Pentonville Road and the Central Activity Zone/City Fringe. As part of this local search, the study took into account a number of factors not limited to but including character, the existing prevailing building heights and important townscape features and local views, as well as the identification of opportunity sites for tall buildings which has fed into the site allocations part of the Plan. We are content that the evidence base is sufficiently robust to direct development towards suitable locations to accommodate tall buildings. Overall, we are satisfied that the approach adopted is consistent with the approach advocated by the London Plan.
313. Policy DH3 provides a criteria based approach to the location of tall buildings within the Borough. **SDMM71** is necessary to clearly define what constitutes a tall building, and also amend criteria C so that it is clearly related to the maximum building heights identified within the site allocations. The modification also deletes criteria's D,E and F from the submission version of the Plan as they are not consistent with the London Plan. A new criteria cross references to Policy PLAN1 of the SDMP, and provides greater clarity and effectiveness to the

factors which need to be taken into account in terms of the visual and functional impact of the tall building concerned. An additional criteria at F is also included through the modification which identifies how buildings which are not classified as tall buildings but would still be prominent within their surrounding context should be addressed. These changes also mean that a number of the corresponding supporting text paragraphs have been amended for overall consistency with the Policy. It sets out clearly the definition of what constitutes a tall building, as well as defining clearly where tall buildings will be supported. Following the main modifications consultation, it was highlighted that the definition for tall buildings within the appendix does not match the policy text and this should be amended for consistency. A further modification is therefore necessary in the form of **SDMM101**. Subject to these modifications, the Policy presents a sound approach to the location of tall buildings within the Borough.

314. Policy DH5 outlines the approach to agent of change as well as noise and vibration. This Policy relies on the premise that proposals for new development in close proximity to an existing use which may be adversely impacted by a new use will require the change to be managed by the person or organisation responsible, if necessary, any identified impacts must be fully mitigated. **SDMM72** provides greater clarity to the wording at part D (ii) of the Policy, subject to this modification, the Policy approach is sound.

Public Realm and Transport

315. Policy T1 outlines how the Borough will aim to achieve enhancing public realm and sustainable transport. Its overarching aim, amongst other things, is to prioritise practical, safe and convenient access to development through the design process as well as the use of suitable modes of transport. **SDMM65** amends part B of the Policy to acknowledge accessible parking provision and the requirements of blue badge holders. This is necessary for the Policy to be justified and effective. Additional supporting text is also included within the modification to reflect the fact that the Council has adopted its Transport Strategy since the Regulation 19 consultation took place. We have amended the wording of this paragraph to refer specifically to people walking and cycling in light of representations made to the main modifications consultation. The modification also introduces the concept of low traffic neighbourhoods within the Plan. We consider it is necessary to define this term within the glossary. Accordingly, **SDMM96** addresses this. Taking into account the modifications outlined, Policy T1 presents a sound approach.

316. Sustainable transport choices are addressed through Policy T2. The wording at part A is amended through **SDMM66** to acknowledge both existing and planned improvements to sustainable transport infrastructure and update the supporting text to ensure it includes the correct London Cycling Design standards, the Mayors Transport Strategy and TfL's Healthy Street Indicators. Subject to the modification, the Policy presents a sound approach.
317. Car Free development is addressed through Policy T3. In order to ensure the Policy is positively prepared, criteria B, C, F and G are amended through **SDMM67** to ensure that the Policy appropriately acknowledges that vehicle parking for essential drop off and accessible parking will be permitted. Furthermore, additional text to recognise that a financial contribution towards investment in other accessible or sustainable transport initiatives should be possible if a development is unable to deliver designated spaces on street. **SDMM99** adds to the glossary contained at appendix 9 to provide a definition for the term 'non-motorised forms of transport' which was omitted from the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
318. Policy T5 deals with delivery, servicing and construction. It identifies criteria against which proposed servicing and delivery arrangements will be assessed. **SDMM68** provides a greater emphasis on the delivery of clean, safe and efficient delivery and servicing arrangements. Subject to this modification, the overall approach presented at policy T5 is a sound one.
319. Appendix 4 of the Plan sets out cycle parking standards. **SDMM82** is necessary to provide additional supporting text and **SDMM83** amends a number of thresholds used within the table for clarity. Subject to these modifications, the approach to cycle parking standards within the Plan is sound.

Green Infrastructure

320. Policy G1 provides the overarching Policy for Green Infrastructure within the Borough. It identifies how green infrastructure provision should be assessed as part of development proposals, as well as identifying the requirements in terms of the Urban Greening Factor assessment outlined within the London Plan. **SDMM53** strengthens the Policy wording at part E of the Policy in relation to how the Urban Greening Factor assessment applies to general industry and as well as storage and distribution uses. This is necessary for the Policy to be effective. Subject to this modification, the Policy presents a sound approach.

321. The approach to protecting open space is outlined by Policy G2. In order to ensure the Policy is positively prepared, **SDMM54** amends the wording of criteria A and D and clarifies how the Policy will apply in relation to development associated with the canal as the definition of green infrastructure in Islington includes both green and blue infrastructure. The modification also includes additional supporting text to provide clarity regarding the definition of significant private open space within the Borough. The submission version of the Plan provides no definition within the glossary of significant private open space. We consider this needs to be addressed and accordingly **SDMM94** provides a definition through the glossary. Subject to these modifications, the Policy presents a suitable and robust approach to the protection of open space within the Borough.
322. Policy G4 deals with Biodiversity, landscape design and trees and outlines how developments should protect, enhance and contribute to the landscape, biodiversity value and growing conditions of the development site and surrounding area. The Policy as currently drafted is not positively prepared. **SDMM55** provides a positive Policy approach and greater clarity in relation to part B of the Policy and outlines the mitigation hierarchy applicable to SINCs. It also amends part H of the Policy to outline the hierarchy applicable to replacement tree provision. In addition, there was an error on the policies map concerning the SINC boundary at 351 Caledonian Road and the residential gardens at Gifford Street. A number of MMs are necessary to address this boundary as well as amend the boundary around the buildings and to the western boundary where it has been extended to adjoin the railway line. The MM also shows the Skinner Street Open Space as a SINC which was not included within the Regulation 19 Plan in error. These changes are rectified at **SDMM56** in relation to figure 5.2 within the Plan, **BCMM02** as a change to figure 1.4 as well as **SDMM85** which covers appendix 7. These changes will also necessitate an update to the policies map. As we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of these changes.
323. Finally, Policy G5 addresses green roofs and vertical greening. The Policy outlines how development proposals should utilise roof space to incorporate biodiversity based green roofs. The Policy also outlines a number of design criteria applicable to the green roof. However, **SDMM57** amends the supporting text to provide greater clarity regarding the issue of green roofs. Subject to this modification, the Policy is justified and effective

Conclusion

324. Subject to the above modifications, the Plan's approach to the built and natural environment is justified and consistent with National Policy.

Issue 11 – Social and Community Infrastructure: Are the Plan's policies in relation to Social and Community Infrastructure justified, effective and in general conformity with the London Plan and National Policy?

325. Policy SC1 sets out a detailed Policy which deals with both the protection of existing social and community infrastructure as well as providing a criteria-based approach to the provision of new and/or extended facilities within the Borough. The supporting text highlights the importance of these facilities to delivering sustainable communities and creating a sense of place and community for Islington's residents. We concur that this is an approach which is supported by the Framework, and in particular paragraph 93.
326. A number of amendments are necessary to Policy SC1 and the supporting text in order to ensure the Policy is sound. **SDMM29** amends criteria A to reference a need assessment by the Council, adds an additional criterion at C regarding the provision of new facilities to mitigate the impacts of existing or proposed development and also modifies the Policy wording at part H for effectiveness. In addition, the modification also addresses part H of the Policy as submitted to cross reference Approved Document M, Volume 2. New supporting text within the modification also sets out that following the changes made to the UCO, the Council may use Planning conditions where it is deemed appropriate to restrict the uses. Given the specific nature of social and community infrastructure within the Borough, we are satisfied that in this instance this is a justified approach. Subject to the modification, Policy SC1 is justified.
327. Policy SC2 addresses Play Space provision within the Borough, seeking to resist its loss unless replacement facilities are provided. As currently drafted, the Policy is not effective as there is no commitment within the Policy to a mechanism to secure replacement facilities. **SDMM30** rectifies this through the introduction of additional text at part A to reference a Section 106 Agreement. **SDMM30** also amends criteria C to ensure that appropriate reference to the ongoing management and maintenance of any play space is also referenced

within the Policy. Subject to this modification, the approach to Play Space provision within the Borough is sound.

328. Health Impact Assessment (HIA) are addressed through Policy SC3. Part A requires all major developments, and developments where potential health issues are likely to arise, to complete a screening assessment to determine if a full HIA is required. The objective of the Policy is to identify all the potential health impacts of the proposed development and recommend measures to enhance positive impacts and mitigate adverse impacts. **SDMM31** adds a new section to part D which identifies that where a health impact assessment is carried out and specific measures are identified to mitigate health impact or enhanced health benefits, they will be secured through a legal agreement and/or condition as appropriate. Subject to this modification which is necessary to make the Policy effective in its application, Policy SC3 is sound.
329. The submitted Plan also includes a Policy on promoting Social Value at SC4. However, this Policy duplicates much of the overall objectives of PLAN1 of the SDMP. Whilst we commend the overall objective of embedding the approach to social value in the Planning process, the Topic Paper (SD25) does not provide sufficient evidence to justify this Policy. The wording is also ambiguous meaning that it is not clear how a decision maker should react to development proposals. As a result, **SDMM32** is necessary to delete Policy SC4 from the Plan and its associated supporting text. As a result of this modification, appendix 5 which sets out the social value self assessment is no longer necessary, and this is deleted through **SDMM84**. Further, a consequential change is needed to remove part V. of Policy H1 and this has been added to **SDMM20**.

Conclusion

330. In conclusion, subject to the modifications set out above the Plan's policies and overall approach in relation to social and community infrastructure is justified, effective and in general conformity with the London Plan and National Policy.

Issue 12 – General Matters

331. As currently drafted, the SDMP only refers to monitoring through the text at paragraph 10.1-10.7 inclusive. We consider that this is not a justified approach. In order to address this, **SDMM76** sets out a table which identifies key indicators, target milestones and the relevant policies. This will ensure the

Policy is effective in this regard. **SDMM77** adds additional supporting text to this section of the Plan to explain the overall approach. In a similar manner, **BCMM61** is also necessary to introduce new text and table 10.1 which will clearly identify BCAAP monitoring indicators for policies BC1 and BC2 which are necessary for the policies to be effective.

332. In order to update the site allocation monitoring indicators, the text referring to monitoring within the supporting text at page 177 is updated through **SAMM124** to include a reference to indicator monitoring of individual site allocations and to delete text within this paragraph which is no longer necessary. **BCMM61** updates the references to the monitoring indicators of the BCAAP for effectiveness and consistency with other policies contained within the Plan.
333. It is also necessary to update the Schedule Monuments section of Appendix 1 of the BCAAP as there have been a number of changes to this list made by Historic England. This modification is provided through **BCMM62** for effectiveness. There will be a corresponding change necessary to the policies map as a result of this modification. However, as we do not have the ability to amend the policies map, it will be for the Council to make the necessary amendments to the policies map in light of this change.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

334. The Council has requested that we recommend MMs to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant and capable of adoption. We conclude that the duty to cooperate has been met and that with the recommended MMs set out in the Appendices the Islington Strategic and Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents satisfy the requirements referred to in Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and are sound.

Jonathan Manning and C Masters

INSPECTORS

This report is accompanied by appendices containing the Main Modifications.