



OPDC Local Plan

Schedule considering supporting study options as Reasonable Alternatives for the purposes of the Integrated Impact Assessment

27 June 2019

1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1. This document has been prepared in response to a request by the Planning Inspector to provide a schedule of instances where Local Plan supporting studies consider options and whether these should be considered as Reasonable Alternatives and subject to additional assessment for the purposes of the Integrated Impact Assessment in accordance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.
- 1.2. Determining if an alternative is reasonable is a matter of evaluative and qualitative assessment by the planning authority, i.e. it is a matter of planning judgment. SEA Guidance states that “only reasonable, realistic and relevant alternatives need to be put forward”. The SEA Directive and associated legislation do not define what constitutes a reasonable alternative, or how many alternatives must be considered. Reasonableness in the context of considering "reasonable alternatives" is informed by the objectives sought to be achieved by the Local Plan. An option which does not achieve the objectives, even if it can properly be called an "alternative" to the preferred plan is not a "reasonable alternative" (case of R (on the application of Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland Ltd) v Welsh Ministers [2015] EWHC 776 (Admin)). Table 1 assists in demonstrating OPDC’s planning judgement in this context by demonstrating that alternative options were considered as part of the underlying work undertaken to prepare the Local Plan and that the options considered within the Integrated Impact Assessment are the only reasonable alternatives available to be assessed.
- 1.3. Table 1 sets out the following information:
 - Supporting study – the title of supporting study available [here](#).
 - Overview of supporting study and any options – sets out the scope of any options or confirms if the supporting study does not include options. Where options are identified not to be included the scope of the supporting study is summarised.
 - Option summary – sets out the preferred option or alternative option. Where options aren’t included N/A is shown.
 - Is the Option a reasonable alternative? – confirms if the option should be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative for the purposes of the Integrated Impact Assessment. Responses to this comprise:
 - N/A – where an option is not presented or has been already been subject to assessment or where the Local Plan policies are drafted to be flexible to accommodate all options;
 - No – where an option is presented but was not included within the Integrated Impact Assessment for assessment as it did not meet the objectives of the Local Plan; Objectives for the Local Plan comprise the Spatial Vision Narratives, Strategic Policies ‘Our Proposed Outcomes’ and Place Visions.
 - Location of options – provides a reference to where within supporting studies any options are defined.

Table 1: Consideration of supporting studies options as reasonable alternatives

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
SD1	Duty to Cooperate Statement	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out information demonstrating how OPDC has met the Duty to Cooperate.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD2	Integrated Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD3	Socio-Economic Baseline Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides a baseline of socio-economic and demographic indicators against which to measure the impacts of the Old Oak and Park Royal regeneration project over time.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD4	Statement of Community Involvement	This document did not include an options analysis. Explains how OPDC involves the community in deciding planning applications and preparing planning policy for the area	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD5	Old Oak North Development Framework Principles	Delivery of either a viaduct or retention of the embankment for the Hythe Road Station.	Preferred option: Delivery of a viaduct	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 3.2.6
			Alternative option: Retention of embankment	No. Delivering an embankment would not enable development capacity to be optimised and would restrict accessibility across the area, as such it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP7 Proposed outcome: Delivering a highly connected, high quality and efficient transport network, that enhances local and strategic transport accessibility and supports the Mayor's ambition for 80% of journeys in London to be made by walking, cycling or public transport. 	Section 3.2.6

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	
SD6	Park Royal Development Framework Principles	Options analysis for amendments to the Park Royal Neighbourhood Centre boundary	Preferred option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area C)	N/A as this preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA	Appendix 2
			Preferred option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area D)	N/A as this preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA	Appendix 2
			Alternative option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area A)	<p>No. Area A is would not support the vitality of the centre and impact on opportunities to meet demand for industrial development. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of 	Appendix 2

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>active destinations for locals and Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably. 	
			<p>Alternative option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area B)</p>	<p>No. Area B would not support the timely delivery of development or the vitality of the centre. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and 	<p>Appendix 2</p>

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably. 	
			<p>Alternative option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area E)</p>	<p>No. Area E would not support the vitality of the centre and impact on opportunities to meet demand for industrial development. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment 	<p>Appendix 2</p>

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably. 	
			<p>Alternative option: Extend the neighbourhood boundary (Area F)</p>	<p>No. Area F has reduced ability to support future development and mitigate conflicts with SIL and would not support the vitality of the centre. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to 	<p>Appendix 2</p>

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably. 	
SD7	Scrubs Lane Development Framework Principles	Two height options for each tall building within each cluster.	<p>Preferred option: A single tall building in each cluster with height determined by relevant development plan policies and material considerations.</p>	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Page 49 onwards
			<p>Alternative option: A lower height of 10 storeys for each tall building in each cluster.</p>	<p>No. Delivering a lower height for each of the tall buildings would not enable development capacity to be optimised and would not support local wayfinding to key routes into Old Oak North. As such, this option is considered to not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP7 Proposed outcome: Delivering a highly connected, high quality and efficient transport network, that enhances local and strategic transport accessibility and supports the Mayor's ambition for 80% of journeys in London to be made by walking, cycling or public transport. 	Page 49 onwards

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	
SD8	Victoria Road and Old Oak Lane Development Framework Principles	This study did not include an options analysis. The study provides a local vision, principles and site specific guidance.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD9	Character Areas Study	This study did not include an options analysis. The study carried out a baseline analysis to define character areas and the existing physical character of each area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD10	Grand Union Canal Massing and Enclosure Statement	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out different proposed building heights in relation to the width of the canal at three specific locations and adjacent spaces to achieve a 1:1.5 height and width ratio considered to be appropriate for the canal.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD11	Heritage Strategy	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides a comprehensive review of historic themes, existing and potential heritage designations and define character areas.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD12	Old Oak Outline Historic Area Assessment and Addendum	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides a summary of historical development and identifies existing and potential heritage assets.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD13	Tall Buildings Statement	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides a definition of tall buildings and defines the methodology used and the resultant appropriate locations for tall buildings in principle.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD14	Views Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It identifies important views and provides recommendations and guidelines in terms of future development.	N/A	N/A	N/A

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
SD15	Air quality study	This study did not include an options analysis. It set out recommendations for mitigation and measures to ensure the highest possible air quality is achieved for future residents and workers.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD16	Circular and Sharing Economy Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out principles to be implemented, case studies and supporting information to enable the Circular and Sharing Economy to be implemented in the OPDC area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD17	Decontamination study	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out the approach to, and guidance for developers on, dealing with land contamination and remediation.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD18	Energy, Daylight and Overheating in Tall Buildings Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out information to understand the viability and technical feasibility of meeting and surpassing the draft new London Plan aspirational targets for passive energy performance in tall developments and high density areas.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD19	Environmental Modelling Framework Study.	<p>This study did not include an options analysis. It establishes a suite of environmental metrics and assessment tools to be used to assess development proposals including daylight levels in buildings, sunlight levels in areas of open space, wind analysis, and solar gain and overheating of buildings.</p> <p>The Environmental Modelling Framework considered a sample portion of the former masterplan within Old Oak South. Within this, 4 options for 3 individual blocks were considered. It did not consider alternative options to the former masterplan. The four options were used to consider alternative massing arrangements which could be</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options		
		<p>considered at the development management and/or SPD stages. The Local Plan policies allow a flexible approach to accommodate different massing options.</p> <p>This work is being progressed through the Passive Energy Performance, Daylight and Overheating in High Density Development SPD.</p>					
SD20	Environmental standards study	Options for energy infrastructure	Old Oak Standard Practice	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered to deliver local smart energy grids.	Appendix B.1		
			Old Oak Best Practice		Appendix B.1		
			Old Oak Pioneering Practice		Appendix B.1		
			Park Royal Standard Practice		Appendix B.1		
			Park Royal Best Practice		Appendix B.1		
		Options for waste management	Old Oak Business as usual	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered subject to according with the London Waste Recycling Board's (LWARB) guidance on recycling and storage. SPD guidance is being developed to supplement the Local Plan policy.	Appendix B.2		
			Old Oak Low Waste		Appendix B.2		
			Old Oak Zero Waste		Appendix B.2		
			Park Royal Business as usual		Appendix B.2		
			Park Royal Low Waste		Appendix B.2		
		Options for carbon emissions	Old Oak Business as Usual	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered subject to meeting or exceeding the on-site carbon emission targets set out in the London Plan energy hierarchy.	Appendix B.3		
			Old Oak Best Practice		Appendix B.3		
			Old Oak Pioneering Practice		Appendix B.3		
			Park Royal Business as Usual		Appendix B.3		
			Park Royal Best Practice		Appendix B.3		
			Park Royal Pioneering Practice		Appendix B.3		
		SD21	Integrated Water Management Study	Options for stormwater management	Green source control features	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered in accordance with the water	Section 6.1
					Streetscape strategic SuDS network		

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			Discharge of attenuated stormwater into the Grand Union Canal	management hierarchy defined within the Local Plan.	
			Residual attenuation provided underground		
			Residual attenuation provided above ground		
		Options for water recycling options.	Building scale greywater recycling	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered in accordance with the water management hierarchy defined within the Local Plan.	
			Strategic scale wastewater recycling		
			Strategic scale storm water recycling		
SD22	North Acton District Energy Study	Options for supply of heat to North Acton.	Preferred option: Business as Usual: A business as usual case representing each of the developer's own proposed energy strategies was assembled to compare against the heat network scenarios	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Pages 22 and 23
			Alternative option: Gas CHP scheme	No. A Gas CHP scheme was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as the delivery of a single large source of heat is not available for North Acton given the progressed status of developments in the area. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Pages 22 and 23
			Alternative option: CHP with small Aqua Heat Pump scheme	No. A Gas CHP scheme was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as the delivery of a single large source of heat is not available for North Acton given the progressed status of developments in the area. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective:	Pages 22 and 23

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	
			Alternative option: CHP with large Aqua Heat Pump scheme	No. A Gas CHP scheme was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as the delivery of a single large source of heat is not available for North Acton given the progressed status of developments in the area. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Pages 22 and 23
			Alternative option: Heat pump only scheme:	No. A heat pump only scheme was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as the delivery of a single large source of heat is not available for North Acton given the progressed status of developments in the area. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Pages 22 and 23
SD23	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation Statement	This study did not include an options analysis. It summarises status of existing SINC designations within the OPDC area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD24	Smart strategy	This study did not include an options analysis. The study reviewed contemporary and emerging technologies that can shape the development within the OPDC area across a suite of themes including transport, public realm, utilities and climate mitigation.	N/A	N/A	N/A

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
		The ideas do not form options but are a long list of possible technologies that should be further considered when bringing forward plans for investment in infrastructure, monitoring and other elements of the plan.			
SD25	Utilities study	Options for electricity supply infrastructure.	Preferred Option: A Combined approach involving: Large Developer Engagement / Introduction of an IDNO / Investment ahead of need	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 3.3.11.17
			Alternative Option: No intervention	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver sufficient infrastructure to meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 3.3.11.17
		Options for decentralised energy strategy	Preferred Option: Public sector-led network delivery	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 3.4.12
			Alternative Option: OPDC encourages improved market response	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not sufficiently guarantee that infrastructure would meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 3.4.12

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			Alternative Option: Leave to the market	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver sufficient infrastructure to meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 3.4.12
		Options for gas supply infrastructure.	Preferred Option: OPDC fund reinforcement work	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 3.5.6
			Alternative Option: Allow National Grid (Gas) to Progressively Expand the Network	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not sufficiently guarantee that infrastructure would meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 3.5.6
			Alternative Option: OPDC safeguard land for medium pressure gas networks and Pressure Reducing Stations	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not sufficiently guarantee that infrastructure would meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 3.5.6
		Options for potable water infrastructure. (short term)	Preferred Option: OPDC enter into a Cost Sharing Agreement with Thames Water to Deliver Increased Water Supply Capacity Ahead of Need	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 4.8.1

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			Alternative Option: Thames Water Proactively Extend the Potable Water Supply Network	No. The no intervention option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not sufficiently guarantee that infrastructure would meet the demands of development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 4.8.1
		Options for potable water infrastructure. (long term)	Preferred Option: OPDC Update their Local Plan Policy to Promote the use of Water Recycling Systems	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 4.8.2
			Alternative Option: Rely on current London Plan Policy	No. This option was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objective: SP10 Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land.	Section 4.8.2
		Options for Foul & Surface Water Drainage infrastructure.	Preferred Option: SuDS provided within areas of public open space to act as Site Control Features / Discharge surface water to the Grand Union Canal	N/A. Both the preferred options and the alternative option were included in Local Plan policies as approaches to manage potential flooding.	Section 5.7
	Alternative Option: SuDS Provided on Plot to act as Source Control Features	Section 5.7			
SD26	Waste Apportionment Study	Options for safeguarding waste capacity in the OPDC area	Preferred option: Safeguard the Powerday site and those in WLWP	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 3

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>Alternative option: Safeguard EMR site</p>	<p>No. This option would sterilise land and prevent the delivery of key infrastructure needed to support development. Therefore, safeguarding the EMR site is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 2: Old Oak will become a major new London centre providing high-density mixed use development, that will shape west London and support London’s continued growth. • Spatial Vision Narrative 13: New development will connect local existing and new communities and neighbourhoods in the surrounding areas through high quality walking, cycling, public transport and vehicular links. • SP4 Proposed outcome: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP7 Proposed outcome: Delivering a highly connected, high quality and efficient transport network, that enhances local and strategic transport accessibility and supports the Mayor’s ambition for 80% of 	Section 3

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>journeys in London to be made by walking, cycling or public transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP9 Proposed Outcome: Delivering a well-designed, high quality and resilient built environment, that supports the creation of a new high density part of London, positively shaped by local context, character and heritage. • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. • P2 Vision: New connections will unlock Old Oak North to support the early delivery of a high density residential led place. Neighbourhoods within Old Oak North will contain a diverse mix of homes alongside new employment spaces, cultural uses, social infrastructure, town centre uses and the Grand Union Canal food and beverage quarter. These uses, publicly accessible open spaces and the area's heritage, including the Grand Union Canal and the Rolls Royce Building, will ensure Old Oak North is a vibrant new place, that people will want to live in, work in and visit. 	
SD27	Waste in tall buildings	This study did not include an options analysis. It identifies the issues and challenges of meeting the Mayor's waste recycling standards in dense urban development. Based on this information, provide recommendations for policy within the Local Plan and guidance within SPDs.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD28	Waste management strategy	Options for operational phase waste storage, collection and transfer within buildings	Manual	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered subject to accord with the London Waste Recycling Board's (LWARB) guidance on recycling and	Table 8
			Manual + Facilities management		Table 8
			Facilities management		Table 8
			Waste chutes		Table 8

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			Automated Waste Collection System	storage. SPD guidance is being developed to supplement the Local Plan policy.	Table 8
		Options for construction phase resource recovery technologies	Construction waste materials recovery facility	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered subject to according with the London Waste Recycling Board's (LWARB) guidance on recycling and storage. SPD guidance is being developed to supplement the Local Plan policy.	Table 9
	Aggregate screening and crushing		Table 9		
	Wood chipping		Table 9		
	Metals recovery		Table 9		
		Options for operational phase resource recovery technologies	Materials recovery facility	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Policy allows flexibility for all options to be considered subject to according with the London Waste Recycling Board's (LWARB) guidance on recycling and storage. SPD guidance is being developed to supplement the Local Plan policy.	Table 10
	Mechanical biological treatment		Table 10		
	Mechanical heat treatment		Table 10		
	Aerobic composting		Table 10		
	Anaerobic digestion		Table 10		
	Moving grate incineration		Table 10		
	Fluidised bed incineration		Table 10		
	Rotary kiln incineration		Table 10		
	Pyrolysis		Table 10		
	Gasification		Table 10		
		Plasma gasification	Table 10		
SD29	Waste Technical Paper	This study did not include an options analysis. Identifies waste management capacity in the Western Riverside area and models whether there is enough capacity to meet the borough apportionment targets and other waste arisings.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD30	Wormwood Scrubs Survey	This study did not include an options analysis. It sets out findings of a survey aimed to determine user priorities for any potential improvements Wormwood Scrubs.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD31	A40 Study	Options for improving the A40.	A40 Tunnel(s): 1. 2 lane 2 way tunnel between Hanger Lane & Savoy Circus	N/A – No preferred option is recommended. Policy allows flexibility for improvements to the A40.	Page 2

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>2. 2 lane outbound only tunnel between Hanger Lane & Savoy Circus</p> <p>3. 2 lane 2 way tunnel between Hanger Lane & Edgware Road</p> <p>4. 2 lane 2 way tunnel between Savoy Circus & Edgware Road</p> <p>Flyunders / short tunnel: A package of more localised grade separated schemes was assessed incorporating flyunders at Gypsy Corner and Savoy Circus plus a short tunnel at Hanger Lane for the A40/A406(N) interchange.</p> <p>At Grade Option: A package of potential at-grade junction enhancement schemes was also assessed. The schemes included introducing 2-way working at Hanger Lane and bus and cycle only links to Old Oak Common at Gypsy Corner and Savoy Circus.</p>		<p>Page 2</p> <p>Page 3</p>
SD32	Bus Strategy Update	Options for phase 3 and beyond (HS2 Station, GWR, Elizabeth Line opening (2026+)), further options are set-out but no preferred option is identified.	<p>Phase 3 options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension of route 283 to WJ station Old Oak North entrance (required to connect WJ and HS2 in the absence 	N/A - No preferred option is recommended. Neither option would be deliverable in light of the walking/cycling modes bridge proposed for the connection between Old Oak North and Harlesden.	Page 11

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>of a rail connection). +2-3 vehicles, £0.75m p.a.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Save at least £1.25m (-5 vehicles) compared to the above and unlock land by removing the need for any standing at WJ if a bus enabled bridge were built between Old Oak North and WJ over the WCML. It would allow routes 220 and 302 to provide high frequency and quicker journey times connections between OOC/HS2 and Harlesden/WJ spreading the benefits of regeneration north. 		
SD33	Car Parking Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides a review of the proposed parking policy in the Local Plan from a market and viability perspective.	N/A	N/A	
SD34	Construction and Logistics Strategy	Two approaches for best practice construction activity: A) Best practice Construction Logistics Plans B) Other recommended strategy measures	<p>A) Best practice Construction Logistics Plans</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management arrangements 2. Vehicle volumes & planned measures 3. Vehicle safety standards & protecting VRUs 4. Routing & site access 5. Delivery management system 	N/A – No preferred option is recommended. All approaches are considered appropriate construction logistics measures and are all included in the Local Plan.	Page 15

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>Communication & collaboration</p> <p>B) Other recommended strategy measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigate central concrete batching plant 2. Encourage re-timing of deliveries 3. Promote use of larger vehicles 4. Utilising consolidation centres & holding areas 5. Maximise use of rail & water logistics 		Page 15
SD35	North Acton Station Feasibility Study – Summary of Latest Findings	Options to provide step-free access and capacity improvements to North Acton London Underground station, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a base case approach • providing unpaid and paid link to the north • a fully integrated single entrance upper ticker hall with unpaid and paid link to the north. 	<p>Preferred option:</p> <p>Base case approach, enhancing capacity and introducing step-free access whilst minimising non-compliances that cannot be removed due to existing dimensional constraints. No direct connection to the HS2 sword site to the north.</p>	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Page 10
			<p>Alternative option:</p> <p>An unpaid and paid link to the north, fully integrated into the station, with the link 'landing' within the centre of the HS2 sword site to the north.</p>	<p>No. This option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as, in light of further development design work required for Acton Wells West, could negatively impact the optimisation of development capacity of Acton Wells West. This would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	Page 11

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>Alternative option: A fully integrated single entrance upper level ticket hall with unpaid, but fully integrated link to the north of the railway cutting.</p>	<p>No. This option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would likely require a lengthy construction programme, which would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP1 Proposed outcome: A world-class transport super-hub at Old Oak Common, supporting the creation of a new part of London that acts as a catalyst for growth at national, regional and local levels. • SP2 Proposed outcome: Delivering a new part of London, that supports best practice and innovative approaches to achieving high density, high quality development across the environmental, social and economic strands of sustainability. • SP7 Proposed outcome: Delivering a highly connected, high quality and efficient transport network, that enhances local and strategic transport accessibility and supports the Mayor's ambition for 80% of journeys in London to be made by walking, cycling or public transport. • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development 	Page 12
SD36	Old Oak Strategic Transport Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It identifies the transport interventions required to mitigate impacts of planned future growth	A long-list of potential transport interventions have been identified across seven categories.	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Local Plan policies allow for flexibility relevant interventions appropriate to the Local Plan, to be delivered to mitigate impacts of planned future growth.	Pages 93-118
SD37	Park Royal Transport Strategy	A series of transport interventions have been developed to meet the increased demand for travel in Park Royal's constrained transport network.	A long-list of 30 potential transport interventions have been identified across four categories.	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Local Plan policies allow for flexibility relevant interventions appropriate to the Local Plan, to be delivered to improve transport within Park Royal.	Page 55
SD38	Public Realm, Walking and Cycling Strategy	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides 10 key recommendations to improve walking, cycling, streets and public realm in Old	N/A	N/A	

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
		Oak and Park Royal. The strategy does not identify alternative options.			
SD39	Willesden Junction Station Feasibility Study	Identifies options for improvements to the station and environs.	Option 1: Central	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. The Willesden Junction Station Feasibility Study represents the GRIP 2 stage for a Network Rail study. The following GRIP3 stage will involve selecting a preferred option. As such, the policy allows for a flexible approach to enable any or a combination of options to be delivered.	Section 5.0
			Option 2: Dual		Section 6.0
			Option 3: Offset		Section 7.0
SD40	Absorption Rate Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It assesses typical residential and office accommodation delivery rates to recommend absorption rates for the OPDC area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD41	Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA)	Delivery of different affordable housing tenure mixes including social rent/London Affordable Rent and intermediate housing	Preferred option: 30% social rent/London Affordable Rent and 70% Intermediate housing	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA. The Regulation 18 IIA considered four strategic options relating to affordable housing which are unrelated to the options set out in the AHVA.	Page 10
			Alternative option: 70% social rent/London Affordable Rent and 30% Intermediate housing	No. This option would not contribute to local or strategic needs to deliver 50% affordable housing as required in the draft new London Plan, so would not deliver the following plan objectives:	Page 10
			Alternative option: 43% social rent/London Affordable Rent and 57% Intermediate housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP4: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community. SP10: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	Page 10

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
		Delivery of different bed size mixes	<p>Preferred option: 25% family housing including Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) bed requirements for social rent/London Affordable Rent</p>	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Page 10 and 11
			<p>Alternative option: SHMA bed requirements for social rent/London Affordable Rent, market mix for intermediate and private</p>	<p>No. This option would not meet the local needs for family sized affordable homes so it would not deliver the following plan objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP4: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community. 	Page 10 and 11
			<p>Alternative option: Market mix all tenures</p>		Page 10 and 11
DS42	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and Addendum	Delivery of Gypsy and Traveller pitches	<p>Preferred option: No allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches</p>	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Section 7 GTANA
			<p>Alternative option: Allocation of additional pitches to help meet the needs identified in Joint RBKC and LBH&F GTANA. These include expanding the existing site and other new sites</p>	<p>No. This option would not be appropriate because of the nature of the land being an Opportunity Area with the capacity to deliver 25,500 homes, Strategic Industrial Location or Metropolitan Open Land. As such they would not deliver the following plan objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP4: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community. SP5: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses 	Section 1 GTANA Addendum

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP9: Delivering a well-designed, high quality and resilient built environment, that supports the creation of a new high density part of London, positively shaped by local context, character and heritage 	
SD43	Housing Evidence Base Statement	This study did not include an options analysis. It pulls together OPDC's housing policy evidence into one statement.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD44	Strategic Housing Market Assessment	This study did not include an options analysis. It defines the current and future housing requirements across the relevant housing market area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD45	Future Employment Growth Sectors Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It functions mainly as a baseline document providing an assessment of trends in employment growth and sectors.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD46	Industrial Estates Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It functions mainly as a baseline document, gathering information about industrial estates to understand their characteristics, success factors and how the Park Royal industrial area is performing against these.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD47	Industrial Land Review and Industrial Land Addendum	Options for changes to the SIL boundary and land use/development priorities in Old Oak and Park Royal	<p>Preferred option: Park Royal HS2 construction sites - sites could be promoted for a mix of SIL appropriate uses including Industrial Business Park uses.</p>	<p>N/A. The policy allows for a flexible approach by supporting a range of industrial uses, including those considered to be PIL and/or IBP type uses. This flexibility is in line with the draft new London Plan. The policy included within Local Plan policy has been assessed within the IIA.</p>	Para 9.8-9.9
			<p>Alternative option: Return Park Royal HS2 construction sites to SIL</p>		Para 7.35-7.51

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			<p>– these sites should be redeveloped as Preferred Industrial Land (PIL)</p> <p>Alternative option: Return Park Royal HS2 construction sites to SIL – Redevelopment as a higher density Industrial Business Park (IBP)</p>		
SD48	Park Royal Atlas	This study did not include an options analysis. It provides baseline information relating to businesses in Park Royal.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD49	Park Royal Intensification Study	Identifies potentially suitable sites and viable options to intensify industrial land	N/A	N/A. No preferred option is recommended. Case study sites potentially suitable for intensification were identified but policy allows flexibility for all sites to be intensified in Park Royal. Site Allocations were selected based on those which meet site allocation criteria. The Local Plan policy was assessed within the IIA.	Appendix C
SD50	Catalyst Uses Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It assesses a variety of potential catalyst use types which may come forward in Old Oak but does not set these out as options to be prioritised.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD51	Cultural Principles	This study did not include an options analysis. The study sets out a series of recommendations for how the OPDC area can contribute to the local area's and to London's cultural offer and position as the world's preeminent tourist destination.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD52	Healthy Town Centres Study	Restrictions of hot food takeaways	<p>Preferred option: Restriction of hot food takeaways in walking distance of existing or permitted schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within 200m of primary schools; and • within 400m of secondary schools. 	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Pages 25/26

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			Alternative option: Restriction of hot food takeaways within 400m of all existing or permitted schools (primary and secondary).	No. A 400m restriction around both primary and secondary schools would exclude almost all of the OPDC area, including the whole planned Old Oak major town centre and Old Oak Street and so would not deliver the following plan objectives: SP6 proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and Londoners, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets the needs of occupants and surrounding centres.	Pages 25/26
SD53	Retail Leisure Needs Study and Addendum	The study identifies the quantitative need for retail and leisure uses in the OPDC area and makes recommendations for qualitative measures.	Preferred option: Major town centre to encompass the whole of the core Old Oak area.	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA. This policy option was also assessed as Regulation 18 stage, against reasonable alternatives, and identified as the preferred option.	Page 72
			Alternative option: District centre plus Neighbourhood/Local centres across the core Old Oak area.	Yes. This policy option was assessed as a reasonable alternative as part of the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan against the preferred policy option.	Page 72
SD54	Social Infrastructure Needs Study (SINS)	The study assess social infrastructure needs of new development in the OPDC area and presents options or models for how need may be addressed.	Preferred option: Separate primary and secondary schools.	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Appendix D
			Alternative option A: All through schools for ages 3-19.	No. The option would not enable the phased delivery of education infrastructure to meet the needs of the development and so would not delivery the following Local Plan Objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 – Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	Appendix D
			Alternative option B:	No. The option would not enable the phased delivery of education infrastructure to meet the	Appendix D

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
			A combination of separate primary and secondary schools and all-through schools.	needs of the development and so would not delivery the following Local Plan Objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 – Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	
			Preferred option: One centrally located health facility to serve the OPDC Development Area (circa 50,000 patient list size).	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Appendix D
			Alternative option: Two health facilities, one to serve Old Oak North and one to serve Old Oak South (circa 25,000 – 30,000 patient list size each)	No. The option is not supported by the relevant service provider (CCGs) and so would not deliver the following plan objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 – Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. <p>Notwithstanding the above, Local Plan Policy TCC4 c) allows flexibility for different models to come forward where this is agreed by OPDC and relevant service providers. While the preferred option is reflected in the Local Plan and IDP, it is clarified that this is based on current modelling, and that any changes in current modelling will be captured in future updates to the IDP.</p>	Appendix D
			Alternative option: Smaller scale health facilities delivered at a neighbourhood level as the development builds-out (circa 7-10,000 patient list size each)	No. The option is not supported by the relevant service provider (CCGs) and so would not deliver the following plan objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP10 – Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised 	Appendix D

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>approach to development, making the best use of land.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Local Plan Policy TCC4 c) allows flexibility for different models to come forward where this is agreed by OPDC and relevant service providers. While the preferred option is reflected in the Local Plan and IDP, it is clarified that this is based on current modelling, and that any changes in current modelling will be captured in future updates to the IDP.</p>	
			<p>Alternative option: Phased health facility opening to match the population build-up over time or short-term use of meanwhile floorspace while the population builds-up and sites for facilities become available.</p>	<p>No. The option is not supported by the relevant service provider (CCGs) and so would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP10 – Proposed Outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. <p>Notwithstanding the above, Local Plan Policy TCC4 c) allows flexibility for different models to come forward where this is agreed by OPDC and relevant service providers. While the preferred option is reflected in the Local Plan and IDP, it is clarified that this is based on current modelling, and that any changes in current modelling will be captured in future updates to the IDP.</p>	Appendix D
SD55	Sports Courts and Swimming Pools Study	This study did not include an options analysis. The study provides an overview of the current public access sports halls and swimming pools provision within and around the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) and the likely need arising from future growth	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD56	Development Capacity Study	This study did not include an options analysis. It assessed the development potential of sites in accordance with the National Planning Practice Guidance having been informed by supporting studies, relevant existing London	N/A	N/A	N/A

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
		development scheme precedents and OPDC permitted schemes to define a densities and development capacities for each site.			
SD57	Development Infrastructure Funding Study	Historic testing of different development scenarios	Scenario 1: including a stadium	N/A. Stadiums are considered to be a catalyst use which are managed through policy TCC8. This Local Plan policy was assessed within the IIA.	Section 29
			Scenario 2: Powerday stays in operation	N/A. Powerday (aka Old Oak Sidings) waste management site is safeguarded for continued use during the plan period through policy P2. This Local Plan policy was assessed within the IIA.	
			Scenario 3: the depot site comes forward in 2026, not 2041	N/A. The Elizabeth Line Depot is identified in the Regulation 19(2) Local Plan to be developed after the plan period within policy SP10. This Local Plan policy was assessed within the IIA.	
			Scenario 4: the depot site stays as a depot, and is not developed	N/A. For the purposes of the Local Plan and plan period, the Elizabeth Line Depot is identified in the Regulation 19(2) Local Plan to be developed after the plan period within policy SP10. This Local Plan policy was assessed within the IIA.	
SD58	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	This study did not include an options analysis. Identifies the infrastructure required to support the regeneration of the area, including social, transport, utility and green infrastructure.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD59	The Land at Abbey Road Development Options Appraisal Report	Assesses different potential land uses and development options for the land at Abbey Road site	Preferred option: Industrial uses	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	Chapter 6 and 9
			Alternative option: Residential use (including consideration of hotel and student accommodation)	No. The residential development options appraised were shown not to be viable within the report so they would not support timely delivery or policy compliant amounts of affordable housing or help meet demand for industrial development. Therefore, this option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would not deliver the following plan objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial 	Chapter 5 and 9

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP4 Proposed outcome: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably. 	
			<p>Alternative option: Business Park/Offices</p>	<p>No. The business park/office use development option appraised were not viable so they would not support timely delivery or help meet demand for industrial development. Therefore, this option is not</p>	<p>Chapter 7 and 9</p>

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				<p>considered to be a reasonable alternative as they would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and 	

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably.	
			Alternative option: Hotel retail or car showroom	<p>No. Hotel, retail or car showroom uses were not considered to be a reasonable alternative it would not help meet demand for industrial development. As such they would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP6 Proposed outcome: Creating a range of locally distinctive places that celebrate local context and provide a range of active destinations for locals and Londoner's, including catalyst uses, meanwhile uses and a new town centre hierarchy that meets needs and complements surrounding centres <p>P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's competitive</p>	Paragraph 9.3

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				position, and helping businesses to grow sustainably.	
			Alternative option: Extant consent	<p>No. The extant consent is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as due to a lack of demand, difficulties in obtaining casino licence, high levels of competition from the neighbouring Park Royal leisure park and better located hotels and that it would not help meet demand for industrial development. As such, it would not deliver the following plan objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Vision Narrative 7: Park Royal will continue to be London's largest and most successful industrial area reflecting its designation as a Strategic Industrial Location to support London's economy with opportunities for intensification and innovative growth. • SP5 Proposed outcome: A strong, resilient and diverse economy, that allows existing businesses to thrive and grow and supports the introduction of new businesses to the area. A fair economy across the OPDC area will provide opportunities for locals and Londoners to access a range of employment opportunities across a range of sectors and skill levels. • SP10 Proposed outcome: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. • P4 Vision: Park Royal West will continue to be London's leading location for large, medium and small industrial businesses. The protection and intensification of industrial space, along with a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure investment and delivery will improve its functionality and environment; strengthening Park Royal's 	Chapter 8

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
				competitive position and helping businesses to grow sustainably.	
SD60	Whole Plan Viability Study (WPVS)	Delivery of 0 to 50% affordable housing and other planning contributions and sustainability options	Preferred option: 50% affordable housing plus planning contributions plus sustainability options where this is viable	N/A. This preferred option was included within Local Plan policy which was assessed within the IIA.	
			Alternative option: Less than 50% affordable housing plus planning contributions plus sustainability options	No. This option would not contribute to local or strategic needs to deliver 50% affordable housing as required in the draft new London Plan, so it would not deliver the following plan objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP4: Creating sustainable communities by providing a range of housing types and affordabilities, that meet local needs and that contributes to strategic needs. This will be supported by a range of high quality social infrastructure facilities that serve the current and future community • SP10: Delivering development in a comprehensive, timely and coordinated manner, supported by a range of infrastructure that enables an optimised approach to development, making the best use of land. 	
SD61	Post Occupancy Evaluation Study	This study did not include an options analysis. The purpose of the study was to set out the case for post occupancy evaluations, develop a scope for post occupancy evaluations, explore best practice in collecting data, establish draft templates for energy and water data capture and for qualitative surveys of residents to get feedback, and provide advise on how the policy could be developed.	N/A	N/A	N/A

SD ref	Supporting study	Overview of supporting study and any options	Option summary	Should the option be assessed as an additional reasonable alternative?	Location of options
SD62	Precedents Study	This study did not include an options analysis.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD63	Quantitative Tracking Survey	This study did not include an options analysis.	N/A	N/A	N/A