

## BY EMAIL

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London)  
New London Plan  
GLA City Hall  
London Plan Team  
Post Point 18  
Freepost RTJC-XBZZ-GJKZ  
London  
SE1 2AA

Email: [LondonPlan@london.gov.uk](mailto:LondonPlan@london.gov.uk)

27900/A3/IF  
2 March 2018

Dear Mayor,

## NEW DRAFT LONDON PLAN - REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF STAMFORD NORFOLK LIMITED (SNL)

We have been instructed by our client SNL to submit representations to the draft London Plan.

SNL is the owner of land at 321-335 Kensal Road (Vacant Land), 337 Kensal Road and land adjacent to 338 Ladbroke Grove (known as '338 Ladbroke Grove') in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC). This site is currently (in whole or encompassing land in separate ownership) subject to the applications for planning permission summarised in Appendix 1. Each is referable to the Mayor of London. The relevant Mayor's Stage 1 Report(s) is/are due to be issued shortly.

### Recommendations

SNL suggests the following refinements to the draft London Plan will help address the '*housing crisis*':

- 1. The London Plan should contain a presumption in favour of all residential development** – There are concerns that housing need is underestimated, housing supply is overestimated and that housing delivery rates may be unachievable. The context for this is set out in Appendix 2.

Given the scale of London's housing crisis the draft London Plan must emphasise that the delivery of new homes should be afforded significant weight when determining planning applications. In this context, the presumption in favour of residential development from some (but not all) '*small sites*' should be universally extended to all sites.

A presumption is important because it will elevate this matter as a planning consideration for the decision-maker.

- 2. The delivery of 'genuinely affordable' housing should be afforded significant weight as a material consideration in favour of a planning application** – As set out at Appendix 2, there is significant identified need for affordable housing. In view of this, where planning applications deliver affordable housing (on or off-site or via a commuted payment) this should be



identified as a significant consideration that weighs in favour of a planning application. The draft London Plan does not currently advise this.

A presumption is again important because it will elevate this matter as a planning consideration for the decision-maker.

3. **RBKC's ten-year housing target at Table 4.1 should be revisited** - Table 4.1 of the draft London Plan identifies a 10 year target for net housing completions in RBKC of 488 homes per annum (a significant reduction from the adopted London Plan figure of 733 homes per annum). Please find commentary below.

### Ten Year Housing Target

RBKC's Local Plan Partial Review (RBKCLPPR) is undergoing examination in February and March 2018. Subject to the outcome of this examination, an updated Local Plan will be published. On 8 February 2018 we issued a Hearing Statement for the RBKCLPPR examination on behalf of SNL. This is provided at Appendix 3.

SNL's Hearing Statement to the RBKCLPPR addresses matters of housing need, supply and delivery. It reflects the 733 homes per annum target that the RBKCLPPR must aim to achieve. The Hearing Statement draws from the Council's figures from the RBKCLPPR examination documents, the Council's January 2018 Monitoring Report and the Mayor's London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 (November 2017). Numerical analysis is provided across three tables provided in Appendix 1 of the Hearing Statement.

- The first table identifies the Council's own figures as indicating 710 homes per annum can be delivered over a 15-year period. For the first 10-year period the figure is **772** homes per annum.
- The second table updates the Council's methodology with figures from the 2017 SHLAA. This involves updating the Council's previous 'small sites' assumption and removing allowance for vacant homes. The result is 678 homes per annum. For the first 10-year period the figure is **738** homes per annum.
- The third table updates the assumptions yet further to remove reference to two sites which SNL consider should not have been included. This is on the basis they are not yet allocated for development. The result is 663 homes per annum. For the first 10-year period the figure is **725** homes per annum.

In view of the objective to achieve the 733 homes per annum target, SNL's Hearing Statement advises that the RBKCLPPR should be revisited to include additional allocations. These allocations could include the land subject to the applications set out in Appendix 1, which SNL's planning applications indicate can comfortably accommodate at least 83 homes.

The overall outcome of the assessment undertaken for the Hearing Statement is that it demonstrates:

- the Council's figures outline that in excess of 488 homes per annum can be delivered over a 10-year period; and
- whilst the RBKCLPPR Hearing Statement indicates the degree to which these figures fall short of the 733 homes target, they still significantly exceed 488 homes per annum.

SNL advise that the Table 4.1 housing targets should be revisited to reflect the above.

### Conclusion

We trust that these representations will help the Mayor refine the next draft of the London Plan.

If there is anything that Officers would like to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact us at these offices.

Yours sincerely

**BARTON WILLMORE LLP  
ON BEHALF OF STAMFORD NORFOLK LIMITED**

**Appendices:**

- Appendix 1 – Planning Applications at 338 Ladbroke Grove
- Appendix 2 – Housing Need, Supply and Delivery (Barton Willmore)
- Appendix 3 – Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan Partial Review (RBKCLPPR)  
- Hearing Statement by Stamford Norfolk Limited

**APPENDIX 1 – PLANNING APPLICATIONS AT 338 LADBROKE GROVE**

<b>LPA ref</b>	<b>Description of development</b>	<b>Validation date</b>	<b>Target determination date</b>
PP/17/06291	Demolition of existing buildings and development of part six storey and part eight storey (plus lower ground and basement) mixed use building to provide up to 4,535sqm (GEA) of Class B1 office and 169sqm GEA of Class A1/A3 retail/restaurant use plus ancillary floorspace, and development of four storey (plus lower ground and basement) Class B1 office to provide up to 744sqm GEA of Class B1 office plus ancillary floorspace together with associated works.	24.11.17	23.02.18
PP/18/00026	Demolition of buildings and development of mixed use building for 83 affordable homes (Use Class C3), flexible Class A1/A2/B1/D1/D2 use and associated works (Major application).	22.12.17	23.03.18
PP/18/00333	Demolition of existing buildings and development of mixed use building for 50 Class C3 affordable homes, flexible Class A1/A2/B1/D1/D2 use; and associated works. (Major Application)	15.01.18	16.04.18

## APPENDIX 2 – HOUSING NEED, SUPPLY AND DELIVERY (BARTON WILLMORE)

### Summary

The analysis below sets out concerns that housing need is underestimated, housing supply is overestimated and that housing delivery rates may be unachievable.

### Housing Need and Housing Supply

Paragraph 2.3.3 of the draft London Plan advises both that:

- *'the GLA's new Strategic Housing Market Assessment shows that London has a need for approximately 66,000 additional homes a year'; and*
- *'the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment suggests that London has the capacity for around 65,000 additional homes a year and the housing targets in this Plan reflect this'.*

In terms of the latter, Table 4.1 of the draft London Plan (which sets out *'10 year targets for net housing completions (2019/20-2028/29)'*), adds up to 64,935 homes per annum. The draft London Plan does not set a target beyond 2028/29.

It is self-evident that 64,935 homes is less than *'approximately 66,000'*. The draft London Plan accordingly falls short of addressing identified need.

### Government Consultation

Moreover, in September 2017 the government held a consultation called *'Planning for the right homes in the right places'*. This proposed a standardised methodology for measuring housing need. Its methodology identifies London's need for the period 2016-2026 as 72,400 additional homes per year.

The Mayor of London's response to this consultation (9 November 2017) included the statement that *'we note that much of the difference between DCLG's figure of 72,000 and our own estimate of 66,000 is down to the longer time period used for the latter'*. This statement is hard to substantiate. The draft London Plan may address the period up to 2041 but it does not set a housing target any further than 2028/29 (the timescale provided in Table 4.1).

The Mayor of London's *'2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment'* (SHMA) (November 2017) provides more commentary on this point stating that:

*'The DCLG formula can however be applied to a longer timescale, as DCLG's 2014-based household projections are available up to 2039. When projected household growth over the full 2016-2039 period of DCLG projections is fed into the formula it produces an annualised figure of 68,455 homes for London, closer to the figure arrived at using the method in this SHMA' (paragraph 7.25).*

Whilst this 68,455 homes figure may be closer to the Table 4.1 figure (64,935) this still represents a difference of 3,520 homes per annum or 35,200 homes over a 10 year period. To put this figure into perspective, there are c.35,000 homes in Borehamwood or Billericay.

### Home Builders Federation's Analysis

The Home Builders Federation uses the government's analysis as the basis for a different conclusion on housing need. Its representations to the draft London Plan cite a rationale for why the Objectively Assessed Need for London should be the *'uncapped requirement'* of 92,000 homes per annum (rounded for *'the purposes of plan-making'*).

## **Summary of Housing Need**

All in all, taken on face value the draft London Plan does not identify sufficient supply to meet identified need. The government's proposed standardised methodology and analysis by the Homebuilders Federation both indicate that need is significantly higher.

### **Small Sites**

Interrogating the sources of supply cited also emphasises the scale of the challenge.

In particular, the draft London Plan relies on 24,573 homes per annum being brought forward at '*small sites*' (Table 4.2). This represents 38% of the projected total supply. The definition of '*small sites*' includes those measuring 0.25 ha or less and delivering 25 homes or fewer.

However, achieving this delivery rate represents a significant challenge. Table 6.3 of the Mayor of London's '*The London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2017*' (SHLAA) (November 2017) emphasises that the average number of completions across '*small sites*' has been 10,828 homes per year from 2004/05 to 2015/2016. Moreover, Figure 6.1 of the SHLAA indicates this figure has only exceeded 12,000 homes (i.e. roughly half the target) in 4 of these 12 years.

Draft London Plan paragraph 4.1.3 undersells the challenge with the following: '*To achieve these housing targets [24,573 homes] the overall average rate of housing delivery on both large and small sites will need to approximately double compared to current average completion rates*'.

Draft London Plan paragraph 4.1.3 continues to state that:

*'The Mayor recognises that development of this scale will require not just an increase in the number of homes approved but also a fundamental transformation in how new homes are delivered. The London Plan, London Housing Strategy and Mayor's Transport Strategy together provide a framework to help achieve this ambition but achieving this step change in delivery will require increased levels of funding to support the delivery of housing and infrastructure, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 11.'*

It is self-evident that the draft London Plan's own basis for achieving the '*small sites*' target relies on speculative inputs. This is significant given that so much reliance is placed on the delivery of homes at '*small sites*' to achieve the draft London Plan targets.

### **Are there other factors that influence whether Small Sites come forwards?**

Policy H2 sets a presumption in favour of the development of certain (but not all) '*small sites*'. The draft London Plan also identifies other initiatives intended to encourage housing delivery at '*small sites*' as cited above.

However, there remain very practical factors that discourage applicants bringing forward '*small sites*' for housing. From our experience as planning consultants these include:

- **Organisational knowledge or capacity** - Many sites are owned by landlords rather than developers. The English planning system is discretionary rather than code-based, meaning it is rarely black-and-white but that it operates in shades of grey. Many potential applicants do not have the organisational knowledge or capacity to engage with it. The upfront costs of securing professional expertise (e.g. architects or planning consultants) to provide initial advice may act as a disincentive.
- **Financing a development** – Pursuing development incurs expense and receipts (e.g. home sales or residential/commercial lettings) may be realised gradually over months and years. Unless they have funds available to be tied up in a project, developers will borrow money to

carry out development. The borrowing costs will typically be far higher for a smaller development than a larger development. They will typically be far higher for less established than more established developers. Smaller sites are disproportionately likely to be carried out by less established developers. All in all, financing conditions are likely to be much more challenging for those pursuing smaller sites.

- **Expenditure on application** – Our experience confirms to us that the relative cost of pursuing a planning application nearly always falls the larger the size of the development. Many planning policies are triggered by thresholds (e.g. London Plan policies which apply to 'major development' of 10 homes (or potentially even fewer, depending on floorspace or site area). Such policies may trigger a need for professional costs (for example, an air quality consultant producing an air quality assessment). Such expenditure is all at risk for an applicant who has no guarantee of securing planning permission. The draft London Plan in fact makes this worse by expecting a i) Circular Economy Statements ii) Urban Greening Factor assessments and iii) Fire Assessments for major development schemes. In many instances such requirements will be unduly onerous. This can discourage applicants from bringing smaller sites forwards.
- **Confidence in securing a profit sufficient to justify the cost and risk involved** – Development requires a willing developer. Simply put, an applicant will not bring forward a scheme unless they have confidence in the end outcome for them. In addition, not all landowners have any interest in pursuing development. Other applicants will not acquire a site (or a stake in it) unless the potential outcome justifies the overall acquisition costs. In this context, all factors that may reduce the end value of a development (including the variety of planning obligations that may be imposed) discourage planning applications being made.
- **Justifying pursuing a scheme against its existing or alternative use value** – Land has landlords and owners who attach a value to their asset. There are limited circumstances in which a landowner/developer has no option but to seek planning permission for new development. Opportunities will always be weighed up against other options. In doing so a landowner/developer will balance the risk against the return. The most appealing option, for the reasons set out above, will often be to do nothing. Developers are rarely compelled to develop. They will tend to shrink or divert their operations when circumstances are less appealing.
- **Complexity of the planning issues** – As all planning consultants will advise, there is no direct relationship between the challenges involved in seeking planning permission and the scale of a project. For example, smaller sites often have more intimate and sensitive boundaries with neighbours. The planning considerations may be more finely balanced. Overall, the level of uncertainty, relative cost and risk involved pursuing development at constrained urban sites will often be much greater than at larger development plots.
- **Legal and ownership matters** – Lastly, bringing forward development at many small sites may be held back by legal and ownership matters. This could include for example multiple ownerships or restrictive covenants. The assembly of larger sites will often see such matters overcome.

### ***Summary of Housing Supply***

Given our experience as summarised above we see no grounds for confidence in believing that the required 'step change' with respect to 'small sites' will take place to the extent sought in the draft London Plan.

As set out above, the draft London Plan relies upon 24,573 homes coming forwards from 'small sites'. It seems far more sensible to assume instead that the delivery rate continues at 10,828 homes per

year. In that scenario the draft London Plan's housing supply falls to 51,190 homes per annum, far short of need, whatever sum is used.

Taking a different approach, the Home Builders Federation in its representations to the draft London Plan suggests that overall housing capacity for London is 52,650 homes per year (rounded up to 53,000 homes per year). These figures are similarly far below the capacity identified in the draft London Plan.

## Housing Delivery

The current rate of housing delivery does not achieve the current (and lower) London Plan targets. The Mayor of London's most recent London Annual Monitoring Report 2015/16 (AMR no. 13) (July 2017) reveals the following.

- Table 2.6 identifies the total Number of Net Housing Completions by Borough 2015/16 as 38,533 homes against a target of 42,338 (91%).
  - The above figures includes a net contribution of 32,919 'conventional' homes and 4,564 'non-conventional' homes. Paragraph 3.29 confirms that this 'non-conventional' figure incorporates a net total of 5,259 student rooms. The AMR no. 13 counts these non-conventional rooms as homes on a 1:1 basis.
  - The draft London Plan suggests that student rooms should instead be counted on a 3:1 basis. Applying this approach to the figures presented in Table 2.6 would reduce the total Net Housing Completions figure to 35,047 (or 83% against target rather than 91%).
- Table 3.2 Net Housing Supply in London of the AMR no. 13 provides average delivery figures for 12 consecutive years. It identifies an average delivery rate across London of 31,125 additional homes per annum for this period (73% when compared against the current 42,338 home target). For clarity, if the 3:1 methodology described above was retrospectively applied (the figures are not available) then average annual delivery is likely to be even lower.
- In short, the above demonstrates that current delivery rates fall far below current targets. Moreover, current delivery rates across London are roughly **half** of the draft London Plan's 64,935 homes target.
- Focusing on affordable housing, Table 3.13 Affordable Housing Completions as Proportion of Total Net Conventional Supply advises that between 2013/2014 and 2015/2016 the average percentage of affordable homes delivered ranged from 20% to 26%. Table 4.3 of the draft London Plan reports that 65% of need for homes in London is for affordable homes (47% as low-cost rent and 18% as intermediate). Even without examining the figures on a year-by-year basis delivery self-evidently currently falls far short of meeting need.

The Home Builders Federation in its representations to the draft London Plan raises other relevant points. These include the sequence of the plan-making process, which sees a time lag between the London Plan resetting targets and local development plan documents identifying and allocating sites (and a scale of development at these) sufficient to meet the revised minimums. This means it may take time for delivery rates to build up from their current base. This makes it yet more challenging for minimum targets to be met in the shorter term (which in this instance can be described as up to 10 years).

All in all, delivering the minimum number of homes set out in the draft London Plan requires such a significant overall '*step change*' that it is difficult to see how it can be achieved without substantive changes to the approach set out in the current draft London Plan.



**APPENDIX 3 – ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA LOCAL PLAN  
PARTIAL REVIEW (RBKCLPPR) - HEARING STATEMENT BY STAMFORD NORFOLK  
LIMITED**

Andrea Copsey  
Examination Office  
Longcroft Cottage  
Bentley Road  
Clacton-on-Sea  
Essex  
CO16 9BX

**BY EMAIL**

27900/A3/IF  
8 February 2018

Dear Sir or Madam,

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW  
(RBKCLPPR)**

**HEARING STATEMENT BY STAMFORD NORFOLK LIMITED**

**ISSUE 3A: DIVERSITY OF HOUSING**

We have been instructed by our client Stamford Norfolk Limited to submit a Hearing Statement to the above Examination.

We have confirmed with the Programme Officer that participants making Hearing Statements are not required to participate in the Examination sessions. Stamford Norfolk Limited has chosen to not participate and to rely on this Statement only.

This Statement addresses the topics set out in '*Issue 3A: Diversity of Housing*' in the '*Matters, Issues and Questions*' document published to the Examination website on 9 January 2018. It specifically addresses questions 1 to 3 under that matter.

We accordingly request the Inspector refers to the contents of this Statement when Issue 3A undergoes examination.

**Context**

Stamford Norfolk Limited is the owner of land at 321-335 Kensal Road (Vacant Land), 337 Kensal Road and land adjacent to 338 Ladbrooke Grove (known as '338 Ladbrooke Grove'). This site is currently subject to the applications for planning permission summarised below in Table 1.



Table 1: Planning applications at 338 Ladbroke Grove

LPA ref	Description of development (LPA if amended)	Validation date	Target determination date
PP/17/06291	Demolition of existing buildings and development of part six storey and part eight storey (plus lower ground and basement) mixed use building to provide up to 4,535sqm (GEA) of Class B1 office and 169sqm GEA of Class A1/A3 retail/restaurant use plus ancillary floorspace, and development of four storey (plus lower ground and basement) Class B1 office to provide up to 744sqm GEA of Class B1 office plus ancillary floorspace together with associated works.	24.11.17	23.02.18
PP/18/00026	Demolition of buildings and development of mixed use building for 83 affordable homes (Use Class C3), flexible Class A1/A2/B1/D1/D2 use and associated works (Major application).	22.12.17	23.03.18
PP/18/00333	Demolition of existing buildings and development of mixed use building for 50 Class C3 affordable homes, flexible Class A1/A2/B1/D1/D2 use; and associated works. (Major Application)	15.01.18	16.04.18

The Planning Statements submitted with applications PP/18/00026 and PP/18/00333 are both supported by extended commentary on matters of housing need, supply and delivery in the Borough.

In both instances the Planning Statement refers to and identifies concerns with figures set out in the Council's 2016 Monitoring Report (Examination document SUB13). Indeed, the Executive Summary to both these Statements (the relevant text is the same) concludes that: *'The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year or 15 year housing land supply sufficient to satisfy its development plan targets (which average out as at least 733 homes per annum (across all tenures) across the 15 year period but which are frontloaded across the first 5 years).'*

Since the submission of the above applications the following have however been published. Neither of these documents have an Examination reference as yet.

- The Council has published a new 2017 Monitoring Report (January 2018) ('2017 AMR').
- The Mayor of London has published a new London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 (November 2017) ('2017 SHLAA').

We have reviewed the above documents. As a consequence, the figures cited below differ from those set out with applications PP/18/00026 and PP/18/00333. We however continue to have the same concerns.

### Review of Housing Supply Figures from the 2017 AMR

As per the above, these representations refer to:

- the latest housing supply figures set out in the 2017 AMR;
- the latest figures cited in the 2017 SHLAA; and

- our own assessment of these figures, set out in Appendix 1.

For the reasons set out below it remains our view that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year or 15 year housing land supply sufficient to satisfy its development plan targets. This means that RBKCLPPR cannot be considered sound on the basis it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. It is also not in general conformity with the London Plan.

As a very minor point, on three occasions (including at Appendix Q) the 2017 AMR identifies the Council's housing target as 10,995 homes across the 15 year period from 2017/2018. As Appendix 1 emphasises the relevant figures at Appendix Q of the 2017 AMR add up to 10,996. This leads to further, albeit very minor, discrepancies in the Council's figures.

### ***Lack of 5 Year Housing Land Supply***

NPPF Paragraph 47 states *'local planning authorities should... identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable [footnote 11] sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land'*.

The Council acknowledges at paragraph 9.12 of the 2017 AMR that it is required to account for a 20% buffer for its first 5 year period as *'there has been a record of persistent under-delivery against the borough's target'*. This equates to a target of 880 homes per annum for the first 5 years (or 4,400 homes in total).

*'Deliverable'* is defined in footnote 11 of the NPPF as follows: *'To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable...'*

Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states the following:

*'Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.'*

The 2017 AMR does not use the word windfall but paragraph 35.3.4 of the publication policies version of the RBKCLPPR (Examination document SUB5) refers to the housing trajectory having made *'assumptions on windfall from small sites and vacant buildings returning to use'*.

The *'small sites'* estimate referred to in the 2017 AMR is 152 homes per annum. The 2017 SHLAA however increases the *'small sites figure'* for Kensington and Chelsea to 169 homes per annum (Table 9.3). On the other hand, the 2017 SHLAA makes no allowance for *'vacant homes returning to use'* (paragraph 9.10). This detail is not explicitly stated in the 2017 SHLAA but the Inspector can confirm this point with the Mayor of London if required.

As Appendix 1 sets out, once the 2017 AMR figures are updated (with the *'small sites figure'* revised upwards but *'vacant units'* excluded), the Council's 5 year housing land supply adds up to 4,214 homes. This represents a shortfall of 186 homes against the Council's target of 4,400 homes.

Based on the above, the 2017 AMR accordingly identifies a housing supply of **4.79 years** against the adopted London Plan target (allowing for the 20% buffer). The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.

As set out above, application PP/18/00026 demonstrates 338 Ladbroke Grove has the capacity to accommodate 83 homes. The allocation of 338 Ladbroke Grove for this number of homes would reduce the shortfall identified above to 103 homes. It would also, in itself, increase the Council's 5 year housing land supply to **4.88 years** against the adopted London Plan target (allowing for the 20% buffer).

### ***Lack of 15 Year Housing Land Supply***

NPPF Paragraph 47 states *'local planning authorities should... identify a supply of specific, developable [footnote 12] sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15'*.

*'Developable'* is defined in footnote 12 of the NPPF as follows: *'To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.'*

The 2017 Monitoring Report acknowledges at paragraph 9.17 of the 2017 AMR that its figures indicate *'a 15 year supply of 10,651 against a target of 10,995 over the same period giving a deficit of 344 units'*. This represents a housing supply of **14.53 years** against the adopted London Plan target. The Council accordingly accepts it cannot evidence a 15 year housing land supply.

Our own assessment at Appendix 1 moreover identifies further concerns with the Council's calculations of its 15 year housing land supply in its 2017 AMR.

Firstly, making the revision to the small sites figure and excluding vacant homes as described above reduces the 15 year supply to 10,165 homes (a shortfall of 831 homes). This represents a housing supply of **13.87 years** against the adopted London Plan target.

Secondly, between years 6-15 the 2017 AMR includes estimates of projected delivery from two sites which are not allocated, not proposed to be allocated and not subject to planning permission:

- Holiday Inn Forum Hotel, 97 Cromwell Road – 175 homes; and
- 1-31 Elkstone Road – 50 homes.

The above represent neither specific, developable sites nor broad locations for growth. For these sites to be included in the Council's 15 year housing land supply figures then they ought to be allocated for development in the RBKCLPPR. As Appendix 1 emphasises, once these sites are excluded then, together with the revision to the small sites figure and the exclusion of vacant homes referred to above, the overall supply across the 15 year period falls to 9,940 homes (a shortfall of 1,056 homes). This represents a housing supply of **12.88 years** against the adopted London Plan target.

However, as set out above, application PP/18/00026 demonstrates 338 Ladbroke Grove has the capacity to accommodate 83 homes. The allocation of 338 Ladbroke Grove for this number of homes would reduce the shortfall identified above to 973 homes. In isolation it would increase the Council's 15 year housing land supply to **12.99 years** against the adopted London Plan target.

To reiterate, the Council cannot accordingly demonstrate a 15 year housing land supply.

### **Representations to Issue 3A Diversity of Housing**

With the conclusions made above we make the following specific responses.

### ***Housing Target (Policies CP1 and CH1)***

1. Has the RBKCLPPR been positively prepared and is it justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to its aim in Policies CP1 and CH1 to meet and exceed the London Plan target for new homes in the borough of a minimum of 733 net additional dwellings a year?

No.

The RBKCLPPR is **not positively prepared** as it is not *'based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements'* (NPPF paragraph 182) (including for the 5 or 15 year periods). It is currently the London Plan which establishes the objectively assessed need for housing.

The RBKCLPPR is likewise **not consistent with national planning policy** as the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 or 15 year housing land supply.

The RBKCLPPR is **not justified** as it is not the *'most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives'* (NPPF paragraph 182). The most appropriate strategy would see the Council positively engage with local landowners to establish whether there are additional allocations that could deliver additional housing to address the identified shortfall.

The RBKCLPPR is **not in general conformity** with the adopted London Plan as it does not demonstrate that its adopted minimum housing targets can be achieved. Whilst we are aware that the draft London Plan proposes to reduce the Council's targets, these amounts are subject to consultation. Stamford Norfolk Limited intends to make representations on this matter before this consultation ends on Friday 2 March 2018.

### ***Housing Supply (Policy CP1)***

2. In the light of the suspension of estate regeneration schemes put forward in the Further Proposed Modifications (CED004), is there an adequate supply of housing to meet the housing requirement identified in Policies CP1 and CH1 over the Plan period? If not, is this consistent with national policy and the London Plan and what steps are proposed to ensure the borough can effectively meet the London Plan target over the Plan period?

No. The Council cannot demonstrate an adequate supply of housing to meet the housing requirement identified in Policies CP1 and CH1 over the Plan period. Please see the comments above. Again, the RBKCLPPR is not sound.

3. Does the RBKCLPPR, as amended by the Further Proposed Modifications, demonstrate a robust 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites allowing for a suitable buffer to address past under delivery?

No. The Council cannot demonstrate a robust 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites allowing for a suitable buffer to address past under delivery. Please see the comments above. Again, the RBKCLPPR is not sound.

### **Summary**

Stamford Norfolk Limited's view is that the RBKCLPPR is not sound for the reasons outlined above.

Stamford Norfolk Limited considers that the RBKCLPPR could be made sound if the Council positively engaged with local landowners to establish whether there are additional allocations that could deliver additional housing to address the identified shortfall.

Such allocations could appropriately include 338 Ladbroke Grove which PP/18/00026 demonstrates has the capacity to accommodate 83 homes. This site in isolation can accordingly make a substantive contribution to addressing the shortfall in the Council's 5 and 15 year housing land supply.

Yours faithfully



**IAN FERGUSON**  
Associate

## APPENDIX 1 – ANALYSIS OF FIGURES PROVIDED IN 2017 AMR



