



**HAMPSTEAD**  
NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

**Appendix 1**  
**Evidence Base Summary**

**Hampstead**  
**Neighbourhood Plan**  
**2018-2033**

# Foreword

Appendix 1 summarises the evidence supporting each of our policies. The evidence demonstrates how each of our policies is supported by local consultation and meets the five basic conditions relevant to neighbourhood planning. A neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions if:

1. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
2. the 'making' of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
3. the 'making' of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)
4. the 'making' of the neighbourhood plan does not breach , and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations
5. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

Our complete evidence files supporting each policy can be found online at [www.hampsteadforum.org](http://www.hampsteadforum.org).

Following examination, the examiner's report will set out the extent to which the draft plan proposal meets the basic conditions above and what modifications (if any) are needed to ensure it meets the basic conditions.

In the consultation on the draft Plan, April-May 2017, all six policy sections received overwhelming support. Only 1% (Design and Heritage) to 7% (Traffic and Transport) of respondents raised objections. Responses to comments we received can be found in the Consultation Statement.

<p><b>Policy DH1: Design</b></p> <p>Development proposal must respond and contribute positively to the character areas identified by ensuring the design relates to existing forms, character, permeability and views. Requires proposals to produce a Design and Access Statement. Poor quality development will not be supported.</p>	
<p><b>Basic Conditions</b></p>	
<p>In line with national planning policy framework? (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF Chapter 7, paragraphs 58, 61, 64                      NPPF Chapter 12, paragraphs 126, 135, 137 and 138                      NPPF paragraph 126 regarding the historic environment states “....Local planning authorities should take into account... the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to character and local distinctiveness.” Whilst para 59 notes”.... Design policies.... Should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.”                      NPPF paragraphs 9, 17,</p>
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Camden Local Plan 2017 SO1, SO7, SO12; Policy D1, D2.</p>
	<p>London Plan SO 3, SO 4 Policy 2.9, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.11</p>
<p>Contributes towards sustainable development?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)</p>	<p>Camden has determined that no policies in our draft Plan would require an SEA.</p>
<p><b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b></p>	
<p>What evidence supports this policy/proposal?</p>	<p>The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement, the Mansfield Conservation Area Statement, the Fitzjohn’s Netherhall Conservation Area Statement, the Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide, <u>Camden Design and Access Statement requirements</u>, National Planning Policy Guidance: Paragraph: 029 Reference ID: 14-029-20140306, “What is a Design and Access Statement?” <u>Historic England “Understanding Place: Historic Area Assessments: Principles and Practice”</u></p>

What does public consultation show?	In our Vision consultation, over 90% of respondents supported Objective to “safeguard the qualities that make Hampstead a conservation area including pursuing high quality new design and rejecting poor design.”
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

**Policy DH2: Conservation areas and listed buildings**

Development proposals must have regard to guidelines in relevant Conservation Area Appraisals. Harm to designated assets will not normally be permitted. Opportunities to enhance the conservation area should be incorporated in the proposal.

**Basic Conditions**

In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 17, Chapter 12, paragraphs 126, 130, 132,133, 137,138,
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO7; Policy D1, D2
	London Plan SO3, SO4, Policy 7.8
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.

**Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence**

What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement, the Mansfield Conservation Area Statement, The Fitzjohn’s Netherhall Conservation Area Statement, ,
	The Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide
	Camden Planning Guidance 1: Design
	Strongly supported by consultation. In our Vision consultation, more than 90% of respondents

What does public consultation show?	supported objective to “safeguard the qualities that make Hampstead a conservation area including pursuing high quality new design and rejecting poor design”.
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

<b>Policy DH3: The urban realm</b>	
Development should comply with relevant streetscape design guidance. Advertisements on street furniture that contribute to visual clutter will be resisted.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 9, 35, Chapter 7, paragraphs 57, 58, 61, 67, 69.
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO7; Policy D1, D4
	London Plan Policy 7.4, 7.5
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	Local Plan D1, Camden Streetscape Design Manual, “Street for All” (English Heritage), Streetscape Guidance 2009 (TfL)
	Camden Core Strategy: “to promote high quality, sustainable design and physical works to improve our places and streets and preserve and enhance the unique character of Camden and the distinctiveness of our many conservation areas and our other historic and valued buildings, spaces and places.”
	“ <u>Who put that there?</u> ” RNIB survey, 2015. RNIB is calling on local authorities to “review their policies in relation to the six most common obstacles (parking on pavements, a-boards, inaccessible crossings, bins and recycling boxes on pavements, street furniture, and developments that include shared space) facing blind and partially sighted people.”
What does public consultation show?	Over 90% of respondents agreed with Objective B. in our Vision consultation: “Conserve and foster the charm, human scale and sometimes quirky connectivity of Hampstead’s buildings and spaces”
Is there enough evidence?	Yes

Is more work needed?	No
----------------------	----

<b>Policy NE1: Open Spaces</b>	
Identifies Local Green Spaces.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 17, 69, 75-78, NPPF Chapter 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO 10, 11, 12; Policy A1, A2, A3, C1, C2
	London Plan Policy 7.18, 7.17, 7.19
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	See Appendix IV Local Green Spaces (Maps) and Appendix V (Justification)
	<a href="#">Camden Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (Atkins 2014)</a>
	Hampstead Heath a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and designated as Metropolitan Open Land, makes up 46% of all open space in Camden.
	'Hampstead Ridge Corridor', 'Nash Ramblers Link Corridor' and 'North London Line Link Corridor'. See: "Green Infrastructure and Open Environments: The All London Green Grid, Supplementary Planning Guidance, March 2012,
	London Plan 2011, Implementation Framework"
	<a href="#">Camden Open Spaces, Local Development Framework Policies Map, 2016</a>
What does public consultation show?	Some proposed LGSs serve Frognal & Fitzohn's Ward, the ward identified by Camden as the most deficient in green spaces in the borough.
	In our Vision consultation, 95% of respondents supported the aim of "protecting and enhancing Hampstead's landscape, from the Heath to its tree-lined streets, gardens and network of green spaces". More than 90% supported the objective to "Identify Hampstead's network of green spaces and establish rigorous guidelines for enhancing their character".



	<p>In urban areas people are more likely to rate their health as good if there is a safe and pleasant green space in their neighbourhood. Parks and green space are increasingly seen as important components of urban regeneration and neighbourhood renewal schemes. In a survey of 5928 respondents, 97% agreed with the statement: “Trees and open spaces can improve the appearance of the town” <i>Design Council (2014)'The Value of Green Space'</i>.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<b>Policy NE2: Trees</b>	
Development proposals will protect trees important to local character, streetscape, biodiversity and the landscape. Justification for removal must provide justification and mitigation measures. Room for future trees must be provided. Veteran trees to be strictly protected according to guidance.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 58, 99, Chapter 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment, paragraphs 109, 117, 118.
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO10, SO12; Policy A3,CC2, CC3
	London Plan Policy 7.21,7.19, 5.10
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	LB Camden: Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, 2014; Floods in Camden: Report of the Floods Scrutiny Panel, 2003; Green Infrastructure and Open Environments: The all London Green Grid, Supplementary Planning Guidance, March 2012, London Plan 2011, Implementation Framework
	<b>Veteran trees:</b> See <a href="#">Forest Research</a> for importance and definition of Veteran Trees; veteran trees are marked on the <a href="#">1866 OS</a> map (London Sheet 27.1) and are at least 250 years old, many older; see also David Sullivan’s “The Westminster Corridor”, Newton’s 1814 map of Hampstead, and the 17 <sup>th</sup> and 18 <sup>th</sup> century Manorial maps of Hampstead
	<b>Groves:</b> Hampstead has a history of planting lines or groves of trees (A History of the County of Middlesex: Vo. 9. Victoria County History, 1989.). In 1700 100 trees were planted either side of Well Walk, John Turner planted a line of firs near the Spaniard's Inn from the 1730s, and William Hone in his <i>Table Book of 1827</i> called Hampstead 'the place of groves'. There are still enough fine old lime trees along Hampstead Grove to justify its name. Spencer Maryon Wilson's insistence on a treelined boulevard with large houses for Fitzjohn's Avenue proved to be justified. It was compared with Paris and was described by <i>Harpers</i> magazine in 1883 as 'one of the noblest

	<p>streets in the world'. The red-flowered horse chestnut trees did not fare well however, and were replaced at the turn of the century by London planes. Many of these grand trees with majestic canopies remain to this day</p>
	<p><b>Trees for water balance:</b> Hampstead's trees were also planted for another practical purpose. The many springs and seeps in Hampstead mean that gardens can be wet and boggy. The Victorians had the foresight to plant water-thirsty trees in the region of seeps and along the spring lines and stream courses: willows (Willow and Willoughby Roads), lombardy poplars and limes (Well Walk), black poplar (along the Shepherd stream's course on the east side of Fitzjohn's Avenue), London Plane (Fitzjohn's Avenue) etc., as well as retaining some hedgerow oaks (Oakhill Park). Contrary to the beliefs and practice of many insurance companies, Hampstead's trees actually tend to reduce the building subsidence activity of the local hydrogeology and leaking drains. Their reduction of water flow will somewhat lessen the wash-out of fine grained silt within all Hampstead's sandy or clayey soil, and it is clear that severely reducing their canopies or removing them rarely improves matters.</p>
	<p><b>Trees as habitat:</b> see 'Camden Biodiversity Action Plan 2013-18', <a href="http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/download/asset?asset_id=3132995">http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/download/asset?asset_id=3132995</a></p>
	<p><b>Loss of large trees:</b> Historic Google Earth pictures demonstrate that Hampstead front and rear gardens, like those of Kensington and Chelsea, are cleared of large trees when development or basement extensions occur, and these are not replaced. See Google Earth maps, page 16-23 of <i>Camden Local Plan Evidence Report, Survey of basement development February 2016</i></p>
	<p>Mitigation of climate change: Trees absorb carbon dioxide which is a major greenhouse gas, lower summer heat by evaporating water from their leaves, cool buildings with their shade in summer and raise local temperatures in winter.</p>
	<p>It is worth remembering too that by combining trees with other SuDS components, the volume of rainwater interception and attenuation can be significantly increased. The London i-Tree eco project, for instance, demonstrated that the combined canopy cover of London produces an avoided runoff of 3.4 million cubic metres per year. <a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/sustainable-urban-drainage-november-2016.pdf">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/sustainable-urban-drainage-november-2016.pdf</a> 'SuDS in London - a guide' Mayor of London November 2016</p>
	<p>Loss of front and rear gardens: Historic Google Earth pictures demonstrate that Hampstead front and rear gardens, like those of Kensington and Chelsea, are cleared of large trees when speculative development or basement extensions occur, and these are not replaced.</p>
	<p>Veteran trees: A veteran tree, according to Forest Research, is not precisely defined but is a tree that is important because of its relative age or biological, aesthetic or cultural interest. Most in the</p>

	<p>Forum area were once part of hedges and were regularly pollarded for their timber, for firewood and fodder. They and their deadwood support a particular range of invertebrates, fungi and other species that are unique to veteran trees. These are therefore very vulnerable to being isolated when other veterans in the area are removed.</p>
	<p>Historic hedges and boundaries: In the Forum areas, these include West Heath Road, Firecrest, Frogna, Hampstead Way and Oak Hill Park. They are clearly marked as significant on the 1866 OS map which is highly accurate for significant trees, and indicates that they must be at least 250 years old, many considerably older. For the historic hedgerows see also David Sullivan’s “The Westminster Corridor”, Newton’s 1814 map of Hampstead, and the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century Manorial maps of Hampstead.</p>
	<p>15m buffer zone: <a href="https://new.shropshire.gov.uk/media/2504/2016-trees-development-guidance-note.pdf">https://new.shropshire.gov.uk/media/2504/2016-trees-development-guidance-note.pdf</a></p> <p>4.5.3 The chief below ground constraint is represented by the Root Protection Area (RPA). BS 5837: 2012 defines the RPA as a layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.</p> <p>4.5.4 For single stem trees the RPA should be calculated as an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter. Other calculations are used for multi-stemmed trees, based on an average of their stem sizes. For all trees, the RPA is capped at a maximum size of 707m<sup>2</sup>, with a nominal circular radius of 15m, for stems of 1,250mm diameter or above (see section 4.6 of BS 5837: 2012).</p> <p>4.5.5 Note, however, that there may be occasions when an RPA other than as recommended under the British Standard is appropriate; for example, ancient and veteran trees are heavily reliant on intimate associations between their fine roots and soil microflora and thus particularly susceptible to disturbance of the root zone. A growing body of expert opinion suggests that the RPA for such trees should be increased beyond the 15m radius recommended in the British Standard.</p>
	<p>David Lonsdale 'Ancient and other veteran trees: further guidance on management' pub Tree Council 2013.</p> <p>page 46</p> <p>Protect young and mature trees where they are the potential successors of the current generations of ancient and other veteran trees.</p> <p><b>“Root Protection Areas (RPAs) for veteran trees: comparison with other guidance</b></p>

	<p>Guidance for establishing and enforcing RPAs for trees on construction sites, as opposed to agricultural land, is given in British Standard 5837:2012). This represents a compromise, as construction would generally not be practicable if the entire rooting area of every tree were to be protected. Some degree of compromise is often unavoidable also in areas where veteran trees co-exist with economic use of land, such as commercial farming. There is, however, often scope for providing a larger RPA than would normally be provided under BS 5837. A radius of 15 times the stem diameter at breast height, or five metres beyond the edge of the tree's canopy, whichever is the greater, is recommended in the present book (in relation to ploughing and grazing). On the other hand, it can sometimes be sufficient for the RPA to be a zone of very low-intensity use, rather than one of total exclusion of farming or other activities.”</p> <p><b>“3.6 CONSTRUCTION SITES</b></p> <p>Every effort should be made (in the planning process) to avoid the situation described in 3.5.2.1 in relation to the risk that is created by bringing new buildings, and hence people, closer to veteran trees, since all the values associated with the trees can thus be compromised or lost entirely (Ancient Tree Forum (2007) Ancient Tree Guide No. 3: Trees and development pp7). Also, at every stage of the planning and construction process, full account should be taken of the full range of the potential effects of development on woodlands or wood pasture (Corney et al, 2008).</p> <p>The boundaries of an RPA for one or more veteran trees on a construction site should be decided according to the principle of erring on the side of caution. The rationale is that veteran trees have special value and are particularly vulnerable to the disturbance that inevitably results from a fundamental change of land use, such as construction.</p> <p>Thus, the minimum extent of the RPA should be formulated as stated in Section 3.1, subject to modification, if appropriate, on the basis of a thorough and expert investigation of the extent of the root system and of the soil conditions (BSI, 2012).”</p> <p>David Lonsdale thus does not give a specific minimum figure for veteran tree RPAs but indicates that it should be generous for veteran trees compared to BS 5837 and allow for 15 times the trunk diameter rather than 12 times. Since this means that veteran trees with only 1 metre diameter trunks would require an RPA of 15 metres, this lends further support to our policy.</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>Vision consultation: more than 90% of respondents supported Objective B to increase biodiversity and reduce surface water run-off by encouraging soft landscaping and discouraging extensively paved gardens and public open spaces.</p>

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

<b>Policy NE3: Biodiversity corridors</b>	
Identifies biodiversity corridors, historic tree lines and veteran trees and specifies measures to protect veteran trees and ability of biodiversity corridors to provide habitat and the free movement of wildlife.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 99, Chapter 11, paragraphs 109, 117, 118
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan SO10, SO12; Policy A3, CC2, CC3
	London Plan 7.19, 7.21,5.10
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes.
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	Natural Environment White Paper: 'Making Space for Nature' (2011), ancient hedgerows as identified in the 1866 OS map
	Many of the trees typically found in the Plan area are tall forest-type trees: London Plane, lime, poplar - black poplar and lombardy - oak and ash trees. These are the trees that originally populated the historic tree lines. In order to comply with BS 5837: 2012 root protection zones of 12 times the diameter of the trunk at breast height should be retained, so if trees with diameters up to 1.25 metres (quite within the trunk sizes found within the Plan area) are to be retained in the future, a distance of 15 metres from basement edge to boundary edge should be retained. Historic tree lines are also where our veterans of the future are likely to be found.
	<b>Helen Read (2000) 'Veteran Trees - A Guide to Good Management' pub English Nature.</b> "The urban habitat can be a hostile environment for veteran trees, which can suffer from: . . . Severing of roots caused by the digging of trenches for cables etc. Excavation work should not be carried out within a separation distance, extending away from the tree for 15 times the diameter of the trunk at breast height (ie 30m for a tree of 2m). This should be regarded as minimum..." page 67 (6.4).

	<p>London Plan 2011: Green Infrastructure and Open Environments: The All London Green Grid</p> <p>Some historic hedgerow lines are now the boundaries between rear gardens such as those between Downshire Hill and Pilgrims Lane. While in this case the line no longer contains veteran trees, nevertheless the tall forest trees that have replaced the original trees are an important green corridor for the movement of invertebrates and other wildlife from Hampstead Heath, and from the Heath fringes into the village. In places these historic hedgerow lines also cross into Redington Frogna! Neighbourhood Forum area.</p>
What does public consultation show?	Vision consultation: more than 90% of respondents supported the objective to “Identify Hampstead’s network of green spaces and establish rigorous guidelines for enhancing their character”.
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No



<b>Policy NE4: Biodiversity</b>	
Development proposals encouraged to use restrained lighting, increase tree canopy in garden schemes and use permeable surfaces. Proposals should seek to protect or enhance biodiversity.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 99, Chapter 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment, paragraph 109, 117, 118
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO10; Policy A3, CC2, CC3
	London Plan Policy 7.19
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes.
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<b>Camden Biodiversity Action Plan, Camden Sites of Nature Conservation Importance</b> , Green Infrastructure and Open Environments: The all London Green Grid, Supplementary Planning Guidance, March 2012, London Plan 2011, Implementation Framework
	Evidence of harm posed by blue lighting: <b>Bat Conservation Trust</b> . 'Artificial lighting and wildlife. Interim Guidance: Recommendations to help minimise the impact of artificial lighting.' <a href="http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html">http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html</a> <b>Miles, James</b> (2016) 'What sort of harmful effects are your lighting designs potentially having on bats? Lighting Journal April 2016 pp28-30. <a href="https://issuu.com/matrixprint/docs/lighting_journal_april_2016">https://issuu.com/matrixprint/docs/lighting_journal_april_2016</a> <b>Edet, D. I, Oladele, A. T and Bekom R</b> (2012) The impact of coloured lights on night-time colony management of the African honey bee ( <i>Apis mellifera adansonii</i> ) Agriculture & Biol J N Am 3(12): 506-509. African honey bees were shown to be more active at night when disturbed in the presence of blue and white light compared to red or green. <b>International Dark-Sky Association</b> : 'Visibility, Environmental, and Astronomical Issues Associated with Blue-Rich White Outdoor Lighting' May 4, 2010. <a href="http://www.ida.darksky.org/assets/documents/Reports/IDA-Blue-Rich-Light-White-Paper.pdf">http://www.ida.darksky.org/assets/documents/Reports/IDA-Blue-Rich-Light-White-Paper.pdf</a>

	<p>Conclusions: There is a suite of known and likely detrimental effects to the ecosystem, to the enjoyment of the night sky, to astronomical research, and possibly to human health from blue-rich white outdoor lighting.</p> <p>The science of photobiology indicates that blue-rich light at night is more likely to alter circadian rhythm and photoperiod, the evidence being widely scattered across the animal kingdom. The ecological differences between light rich in blue and light devoid of blue can be several-fold for some critical species.</p> <p>The advantages of blue light in the daytime are diminished and overwhelmed by the disadvantages accrued at night, including glare, delayed dark adaptation, pupil constriction, and factors associated with the aging eye.</p> <p>The blue portion of the spectrum is known to interfere most strongly with the human endocrine system mediated by photoperiod, leading to reduction in the production of melatonin, a hormone shown to suppress breast cancer growth and development.</p> <p>Dark-adapted eyes observing a sky contaminated with artificial sky glow are more sensitive to blue-rich light; this light will appear 3–5x as bright when observed from nearby. Blue-rich light will greatly exacerbate visible sky glow close to the light source and retain greater impacts to very large distances.</p> <p>Evidence supporting use of permeable surfaces: Hampstead is the source of 4 of London's rivers. It is responsible for quite significant downstream surface flooding from its run-off, and has particular sub-soil conditions that require special consideration. Part of the Plan Area is on Bagshot Sand, part on Claygate Beds which are capable of transmitting considerably more water than bands C, B and A of the London Clay Formation. Thus, unlike areas of London south of Hampstead, retaining or creating permeable surfaces has a far greater impact and the water transmissibility of the ground volume below a permeable surface should also be considered, particularly if the proposed development plans to remove a significant part of this volume or to block the flow of groundwater:</p> <p><a href="http://www.groundwateruk.org/PrintView.aspx?i=110">http://www.groundwateruk.org/PrintView.aspx?i=110</a> 'Importance of groundwater conditions in the design of SuDS' by Rachel Dearden and Simon Price of the British Geological Survey: "The permeability of underlying deposits will dictate whether or not the ground is likely to accept the anticipated quantity of stormwater."</p> <p>CIRIA Report C753 SUDs Manual 2015</p>
--	--

	<p>"An important issue to note is the crucial influence of soil type on runoff volume. In practice, this indicates that developments on sandy soils create significant extra runoff volume compared to the pre-development condition, ... while developments on clays generate relatively small amounts of extra runoff (where infiltration design is less likely to be appropriate)."</p> <p><a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/sustainable-urban-drainage-november-2016.pdf">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/sustainable-urban-drainage-november-2016.pdf</a>  'SuDS in London - a guide' Mayor of London November 2016.  "SuDS should be designed according to the geology and soils of the area."</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>Vision consultation: more than 90% of respondents supported the objective to “Increase biodiversity and reduce water run-off by encouraging soft landscaping and discouraging extensively paved private gardens and public open spaces”.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p><b>Policy BA1: Local Requirements for Basement Impact Assessments</b></p> <p>Sets forth additional steps for the basement impact assessment. Planning applications required to submit a Schedule of Conditions survey of nearby properties, unless neighbours refuse access.</p>	
<p><b>Basic Conditions</b></p>	
<p>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF paragraphs 58,109,120,121, 193                  David Vickery, Inspector for the Planning Inspectorate wrote on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014 in its report on the RBKC’s Basement Planning Policy ( <a href="#">Planning Inspectorate -Basement Policy- RBKC</a> ): “Whilst the London Plan is in favour of growth and sustainable development, this is subject to the need to respect legitimate planning and environmental constraints. In this it reflects Government policy in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which says, for instance, that “sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life” (NPPF paragraph 9).” This is fully relevant to our Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan</p>
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Camden Local Plan 2017 Policy A5</p> <p>London Plan Policy 7.6</p>
<p>Contributes towards sustainable development?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)</p>	<p>Does not require an SEA.</p>
<p><b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b></p>	
<p>What evidence supports this policy/proposal?</p>	<p><u>Camden Local Plan Evidence Report, Survey of Basement Development 2016</u></p> <p>“Hampstead and Highgate Report”, a Geological and Hydrological Study by First Steps Ltd, July 2012</p>

	<p>URS, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – July 2014, prepared for: London Borough of Camden – Appendix B: Flood Risk Mapping Figures 3 iii – 3v historical surface water flooding data recorded by LBC. Also refer to Figures on Flood risk events: 3 vii, viii, ix, x. Also refer to affected streets spread sheet derived from the above. Basement dwellings are classified in the NPPF as “Highly Vulnerable development and therefore should be discouraged within areas at risk of surface water or groundwater flooding”.</p> <p><b>See Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study, Figures 11, 16 and 17.</b></p> <p>Photographic evidences demonstrate a high recurrence of damages inflicted on properties as a result of the combination of bagshot and claygate soil, clay and/or steep topography.</p> <p>The presence of sink holes in Hampstead is also well documented in the press.  <u>Arup report #119</u> “The Claygate Member of the London Clay in Hampstead can be vulnerable to slope instability due to the high moisture content associated with the sandier layers ...” # 213: “Sites surrounding Hampstead Heath may also be considered as possible areas for potential instability since development may re-direct or alter the groundwater flow and surface water flow, which in turn may affect the ground stability”</p> <p>In the appeal of a basement application for 9 Downshire Hill (Appeal APP/X5210/E/10/2129689 AND /2129688), the inspector required that the detailed construction plan had to include “a copy of the Party wall Awards in respect of the Development covering the buildings located at numbers 8 and 10 Downshire Hill together with any condition surveys undertaken by the Owner in relation to 7 and 11 Downshire Hill.” The s106 goes on to state that the Construction Plan had to be sent to the Council for approval before the implementation date and that “<i>the Owner acknowledges that the Council will not approve the Detailed Construction Plan unless it demonstrates to the council’s reasonable satisfaction that the Development can be constructed safely in light of the ground conditions and will not cause any structural problems with the neighbouring properties nor the development itself</i>”.</p> <p>For more details, please see the note by Stephen Ainger, dated 9.10.2016 in our Evidence Base, Basements.</p> <p>There are already precedents to our policies compliant to the NPPF: e.g., please see <a href="#">RBKC Basements SPD April 2016</a> ) pages 27 and 29.</p>
--	--

<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>Mitigation of the impact of basement developments on the environment and neighbours was raised as a write-in objective by more than 20 individuals. It was also a concern voiced strongly at all three of our consultation events. One new objective that arose out of our 2014 Vision consultation is to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours from the impact of basement developments.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<b>BA2: Basement Construction Plans</b>	
Basement construction plans should be advanced to the Detailed Proposals Stage and neighbours given ample time to comment before determination. All issues related to the BIA must be resolved as much as possible prior to determination. The Sec 106 agreement must include a requirement that the basement construction plan will not be approved by the Council without attached Party Wall agreements.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 58, 120, 121, 193 and 203 See “David Vickery”, above.
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO 1; Policy A1, A5
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<u>Camden Local Plan Evidence Report, Survey of Basement Development 2016</u>
	“Hampstead and Highgate Report”, a Geological and Hydrological Study by First Steps Ltd, July 2012

	<p>URS, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – July 2014, prepared for: London Borough of Camden – Appendix B: Flood Risk Mapping Figures 3 iii – 3v historical surface water flooding data recorded by LBC. Also refer to Figures on Flood risk events: 3 vii, viii, ix, x. Also refer to affected streets spread sheet derived from the above. Basement dwellings are classified in the NPPF as “Highly Vulnerable development and therefore should be discouraged within areas at risk of surface water or groundwater flooding”.</p> <p><b>See Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study, Figures 11, 16 and 17.</b></p> <p>Approximately 200 photographic evidences are included in the appendix that illustrates the very instable soil conditions in the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum. This only an example of conditions in some streets and similar unstable conditions exist throughout Hampstead.</p> <p>Photographic evidences demonstrate a high recurrence of damages inflicted on properties as a result of the combination of bagshot and claygate soil, clay and/or steep topography.</p> <p>The presence of sink holes in Hampstead is also well documented in the press.  <u>Arup report #119</u> “The Claygate Member of the London Clay in Hampstead can be vulnerable to slope instability due to the high moisture content associated with the sandier layers ...” # 213: “Sites surrounding Hampstead Heath may also be considered as possible areas for potential instability since development may re-direct or alter the groundwater flow and surface water flow, which in turn may affect the ground stability”</p> <p>There are already precedents to our policies compliant to the NPPF: e.g. <a href="#">RBKC Basements SPD April 2016</a> ) pages 27 and 29.</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>Mitigation of the impact of basement developments on the environment and neighbours was raised as a write-in objective by more than 20 individuals. It was also a concern voiced strongly at all three of our consultation events.</p> <p>One new objective that arose out of our 2014 Vision consultation is to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours from the impact of basement developments.</p>



Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

<p><b>BA3: Construction Management Plans</b></p> <p>CMP must demonstrate how the construction will minimise the impact on neighbours and the area.</p>	
<p><b>Basic Conditions</b></p>	
<p>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF paragraphs 109, 120, 123, 152, 193 See “David Vickery”, above.</p> <p>In <a href="http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/noise/noise-guidance/">http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/noise/noise-guidance/</a> “, it is stated: “In line with the Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England, this would include identifying whether the overall effect of the noise exposure (including the impact during the construction phase wherever applicable) is, or would be, above or below the <u>significant observed adverse effect level</u> and the lowest observed adverse effect level for the given situation”</p>
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Camden Local Plan 2017 Policy A1, A5</p>
<p>Contributes towards sustainable development?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)</p>	<p>Does not require an SEA.</p>
<p><b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b></p>	
<p>What evidence supports this policy/proposal?</p>	<p>Page 93, paragraph 10, of the Basements Supplementary Planning Documents of April 2016 by RBKC, link: <a href="#">RBKC SPD April 2016</a> , already incorporates working noise restrictions identical or stricter than the one in our policy.</p> <p>In page 40 of the same document, RBKC stipulates:</p> <p>“Planning application stage - Details of the mitigation measures in relation to noise, vibration and dust should be submitted with the planning application, using the checklist provided in Appendix 5.”</p>

	<p>Hampstead is a conservation area and noise was identified as by 67% of respondents in the Camden Survey of basement development published in February 2016 - Evidence Report“ said that the impact of noise was unacceptable” ”Out of the four impacts noise received the most negative responses”</p> <p><a href="https://camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3436105">https://camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3436105</a></p> <p>While trees in Hampstead benefit from the extensive ground water that flows through the area (see Geology section x), they are also at risk of drowning if basement excavation breaks into water flowing under pressure in a sand parting, or from excessive and ponding ground water caused by the constraint of ground water by one or several new basements. Such constrained groundwater flow causes wash-out of fine silt leading to ground volume loss, now resulting in an increase in local roadway collapses, however there is an additional problem for trees: current insurance company practice for the resulting subsidence of buildings is to remove all trees in the area. Tree vitality and viability can also be affected when its previous ground water sources are dammed up by a large basement.</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>Mitigation of the impact of basement developments on the environment and neighbours was raised as a write-in objective by more than 20 individuals. It was also a concern voiced strongly at all three of our consultation events. In an interview with an adviser to our Committee who is blind, we were told that the blind take in the majority of their sensory input through sound and feel loud noise “as pain”. He recommended that high input works not be permitted on Saturdays to give the blind a chance of respite. Notes of the full interview can be found in our Evidence Base.</p> <p>One new objective that arose out of our 2014 Vision consultation is to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours from the impact of basement developments.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p><b>Policy TT1: Traffic Volumes and Vehicle Size</b></p> <p>This policy seeks to promote sustainable development by providing clear policies showing how development can contribute to a reduction in vehicle congestion and pollution in the Plan area while ensuring that transport impacts of development which may affect the economic, social or environmental health of the community are given due consideration at an early stage.</p>	
<p><b>Basic Conditions</b></p>	
<p><b>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</b></p>	<p>NPPF Core Planning Principle 17                      NPPF paragraphs 15,16, 35, 36, 109, 124, 152, 154,189, 193                      NPPF annex 2</p>
<p><b>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</b></p>	<p>Camden Local Plan SO 8; Policy T1, T4</p> <p>Section 10 of Camden’s Local Plan seeks to reduce the overall volume of traffic on grounds of Health &amp; Wellbeing, Air Quality and the development of Sustainable Communities. The Local Plan makes clear that new development should be car free and that development as a whole should contribute towards improvements to the bus network.</p> <p>Both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan are based on Camden’s Clean Air Action Plan 2013-2015.</p> <p>The use of Transport Assessments, Travel Plans, Construction &amp; Management Plans and Delivery &amp; Servicing Plans, together with stipulation of “person trips per day” as the key measure of the transport impact of development follows the detailed provisions of Camden’s Planning Guidance CPG7.</p> <p>The use of Section 106 agreements with regular monitoring is consistent with clause 3.6 of Camden’s Planning Guidance CPG7, which states “Where a Travel Plan is necessary in terms of policy DP16 or because elements of the transport system have no additional capacity, submissions in connection will generally be secured by S106 agreement. This is because the applicant will rarely be the final occupier of the scheme, and furthermore a Travel Plan will require ongoing development subsequent to the initial occupation. Travel Plans will require monitoring on at least</p>

	an annual basis, and the Council will usually require submission of a monitoring report.”
	London Plan SO6 Policy 6.1, 6.3
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camden’s 2013 Air Quality Progress Report showed NO<sub>2</sub> pollution levels for 2008 to 2012 in Fitzjohn’s Avenue to be consistently 50% above target levels.</li> <li>• The impact on traffic of local schools is referred to in Camden Local Plan Evidence Report - Car Free Development 2016 paragraph 5.32.</li> <li>• Deterrence to active travel – TfL’s “Attitudes to Cycling 2014” report sets out the disincentive which traffic and associated safety concerns represent for cycling.</li> <li>• Service and Construction vehicles – Camden’s 2013 Air Quality Progress Report and Clean Air Action Plan 2013-2015 report on the contribution to NO<sub>2</sub> pollution made by service and construction vehicles.</li> <li>• Further evidence on the impact of inappropriately sized service and construction vehicles is summarised in HNF’s document "Service and Construction Vehciles - Impact Assessment"</li> <li>• Camden’s Clean Air Action Plan 2013-2015 indicated that over 40% of NO<sub>2</sub> pollution arose from traffic.</li> <li>• Further supporting data is derived from Camden’s Air Quality Action Plan 2016-2018</li> <li>• Please also refer to HNF’s own Pollution Studies, 2015-16, referred to separately.</li> <li>• The definition of a Heavy Goods Vehicle is based on Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 – paragraph 2.5</li> <li>• The use of a 300M<sup>2</sup> measure for large developments is based on the Nationally Described Space Standard 2015 – Table 1.</li> <li>• The use of a 50 person trip measure for developments having a transport impact is based on the average number of visitors to a single practioner dental surgery set out in the British</li> </ul>

	<p>Dental Association Research Report – The State of General Dental Practice 2013 – Table 14.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to Policy TT3 for further details on public transport measures.</li> <li>• Further information on the road network hierarchy is contained in Camden Transport Strategy 2011 – Figure 2.12.</li> <li>• Further information on Living Environment Deprivation is contained in Camden Hampstead Area Profile November 2015 Page 28.</li> <li>• Further details on Transport Assessment data can be found in Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 Figure 1.</li> <li>• Further information on the use of Transport Statements can be found in Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 Paragraph 2.5.</li> <li>• Further information on the use of Delivery &amp; Servicing Management plans can be found in Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 Section 4 which refers to Camden Development Policies 2010 paragraph 16.</li> <li>• Census data: More than 3,000 children go to school in the Forum area (we have just one secondary school) yet just 1,325 children aged between 5 and 15 are residents</li> <li>• K &amp; M Traffic Surveys for Camden Council for vehicles travelling northbound and south bound on Fitzjohns Avenue for weeks commencing the 7th and 14th of June 2010 (169,802 cars) and the holiday periods of 19th and 26th of July 2010 (145,286 cars) i.e. the impact of the schools on Fitzjohns Avenue in June 2010 was more than 1,200 cars per day</li> <li>• Mortality rates: Air Quality Strategy, v3, 2010, london.gov.uk and PHE10: Estimating Local Mortality Burdens associated with Particulate Air Pollution, 2.2.3</li> <li>• In Camden in 2010, NO2 pollution was responsible for 8% of all mortality, and an estimated 11-12 years loss of lifespan for residents, according to Air Quality Strategy, v3, 2010, London.gov.uk and PHE10: Estimating Local Mortality Burdens associated with Particulate Air Pollution, 2.2.3. For perspective, the Great Smog of 1952, which prompted the Clean Air Act 1956, had an estimated one-time mortality of 4,000.</li> <li>• <a href="#">ROSPA Road Safety Information 2014</a> (HGVs “present a particular danger for cyclists, especially in London where around 20% of cyclist fatalities occur involve an HGV”).</li> <li>• <a href="#">ROSPA Road Safety Information 2014</a> (HGVs “present a particular danger for cyclists, especially in London where around 20% of cyclist fatalities occur involve an HGV”).</li> <li>• See Evidence Base, Traffic and Transport, Impact of Construction and Delivery Vehicles for photographic evidence of the impact that large vehicles can have in the Plan area.</li> </ul>
	<p>In our Vision consultation, more than 90% of respondents supported aim to “Reinforce Hampstead</p>

<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>as a safe and walkable neighbourhood with access to amenities and good public transport, where residents have convenient alternatives to private car travel, while recognising the need for cars.”                  Nearly 90% supported the objective: “Where appropriate, priorities the needs and demands of pedestrians cyclists, the young and the elderly over general vehicular traffic, balancing the needs of all travellers.”                  Community engagement - HNF’s documents “Vision questionnaire - detailed review of the community’s response to the proposed aims and objectives” 2014, and “Autumn 2014 public survey on vision document: summary of written comments” indicate the high level of community concern regarding traffic.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<b>Policy TT2: Pedestrian Environments</b>	
This policy seeks to promote sustainable development by providing clear statements of the community’s priorities for its street environments and an indication of those improvements for pedestrians which can contribute to the economic health of the Area’s neighbourhood centres.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF Paragraphs 7, 35, 58, 69, 126, 131, 154
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO8; Policy T1, T3
	London Plan Policy 6.1 and 6.10
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments of the impact of pedestrian volumes on town centre economies can be found in Camden Local Plan Evidence Report – Car Free Development 2016, Appendix L.</li> <li>• Department for Transport statistics showing the lower incidence of serious accidents at shared (zebra) crossings can be found in the table “RAS30027 Reported pedestrian casualties by location, age, road crossing type and severity, Great Britain, from source document DfT STATS19 last updated: 24 September 2015.</li> <li>• Transport for London equivalent statistics can be found in the spreadsheet “Collision Levels in Greater London” Issue 14, published in June 2015.</li> <li>• Further information on the importance of pedestrian environments for business centres is supported in Camden’s Local Plan Evidence Report – Car Free Development.</li> <li>• The benefits of Camden’s Naked Streets Principle are summarised in its Transport Strategy 2011, paragraphs 5.235ff</li> <li>• The use of shared use or shared space road schemes are described in Camden Transport Strategy 2011, paragraph 5.293</li> </ul>



What does public consultation show?	Community engagement - HNF's documents "Vision questionnaire - detailed review of the community's response to the proposed aims and objectives" 2014, and "Autumn 2014 public survey on vision document: summary of written comments" indicate the high level of community concern regarding traffic and include various suggestions, including the provision of additional crossing points.
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

<b>Policy TT3: Public Transport</b>	
This policy seeks to promote sustainable development by ensuring that sites requiring high standards of public accessibility are located appropriately and that development of necessary transport infrastructure keeps pace with planning needs.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 17 (core planning principles), 30, 34, 35, 58, 162
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 paragraphs 4.100, SO8; Policies T1, T3 and C6 Local Plan Policy T1 states “In order to safeguard and promote the provision of public transport in the borough we will seek to ensure that development contributes towards improvements to the bus network including access to bus stops, shelters, passenger seating, waiting areas, signage and timetable information.” Local Plan paragraph 10.12 “In partnership with Transport for London, which manages the bus network across London, the Council will ensure that Camden’s growth is matched by improvements to bus services, where required. This will include contributions to the provision of new bus facilities (for example, bus stops and improved bus services) where appropriate.”
	Public Transport London Plan Policy 6.1,6.3,6.4
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) information is sourced from TfL’s analysis by borough and ward, available from TfL’s website.</li> <li>PTAL mapping is sourced from TfL’s Webcat service at <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/urban-planning-and-construction/planning-with-webcat/webcat">https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/urban-planning-and-construction/planning-with-webcat/webcat</a></li> <li>Camden Core Strategy: Camden Core Strategy 2010-2015, stated “All of Camden’s centres</li> </ul>

	<p>are considered to be highly accessible with the exception of Hampstead town centre, where the level of public transport accessibility is not considered to be sufficient for it to be a suitable location for development that significantly increase the demand for travel” and “to reduce the environmental impact of transport in the borough and make Camden a better place to walk and cycle.” (Paragraph 4.7 Camden Core Strategy 2010-2015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further information on the use of PTAL as a planning consideration can be found in Camden Transport Strategy 2011, paragraph 3.91 and Camden Local Plan Evidence Report – Car Free Development, paragraphs 1.5 and 3.11.</li> <li>• The adoption of a measure of PTAL5 when assessing the transport needs of sites used by the public is based on TfL’s PTAL Assessment Guide April 2015 : “As part of the policy to designate certain areas for high-intensity land use, the London Plan also monitors the proportion of business and commercial activities which are in areas with PTAL five or above. The plan includes a key performance indicator to maintain a high proportion of workplaces in areas of high PTAL.”</li> <li>• For sites with PTAL 5 or above, zero parking is supported by the London Plan (March 2016). Camden’s Local Plan Policy T2 enforces zero parking for all new developments in the Plan area.</li> <li>• Passenger volumes at Hampstead Heath station are reported in the Office of Rail and Road document “Estimates of Station Usage 2014-2015” dated 15<sup>th</sup> December 2015.</li> <li>• Passenger volumes at Hampstead Underground station are reported in TfL’s document “Multi-year entry and exist figures 2015”.</li> <li>• The analysis of bus provision is based on TfL’s Northwest London Bus Map 2017 and timetable information.</li> </ul>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue of bus provision was highlighted in the Community Conversation meeting held on 20th November 2014.</li> <li>• Written responses to the Vision consultation and responses during the Community Conversation meeting show a high level of support for measures which will reduce dependence on motor vehicles and promote public and sustainable transport choices.</li> <li>• The transport impact of the schools located in the Plan area was raised as an issue of particular concern in community consultation and was an important issue raised by the community in relation to the application in 2015 to convert Hampstead Old Police Station to educational use.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half of those making written comments on the issue of traffic congestion related the problem directly to the school run. Typical comment from those submitted during consultation <i>“Because of the number of schools] the streets are so congested making it unpleasant and for other residents and pedestrians. No planning consent should be given for expansion of schools (except a state secondary)”</i></li> </ul>
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

<p><b>Policy TT4: Cycle and Car Ownership</b></p> <p>This policy seeks to promote sustainable development by ensuring that new apartments have appropriate provision for convenient cycle storage at a quality which will encourage further cycle adoption, and support further increases in cycle use as improvements in the street environment take effect.</p>	
<p><b>Basic Conditions</b></p>	
<p>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF paragraphs 35, 39, 40, 162</p>
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Camden Local Plan 2017 SO8; Policy T1, paragraphs 3.1, 10, 15 and 3.254.</p> <p>London Plan 6.1, 6.9</p>
<p>Contributes towards sustainable development?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)</p>	<p>Does not require an SEA.</p>
<p><b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b></p>	
<p>What evidence supports this policy/proposal?</p>	<p><u>Cycle Parking</u></p> <p>The association of improving street environments with increased cycle usage is outlined in TfL’s Attitudes to Cycling Survey 2014 Page 64.</p> <p>Policy 6.9 of the London Plan sets out minimum cycle parking standards across the capital, but also includes a target to increase the % of trips made by bicycle from 2% in 2009 to 5% in 2016. The Plan takes account of the urban nature of the Plan Area and the improvements in street environment which will result from adoption of the Local and Neighbourhood plans. As a result, it is reasonable to assume that the average minimum provision appropriate for the capital as a whole and set out in the London Plan will be exceeded in the Plan area.</p> <p><u>Vehicle ownership and Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statistics of car ownership are derived from ONS Nomis Official Labour Market Statistics</li> </ul>

	<p>document KS404EW - Car or van availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative figures on the reduction in car ownership by ward are sourced from Camden’s Annual Parking Report 2014.</li> <li>• Statistics on methods of travel to work are sourced from ONS Nomis QS701EW - Method of travel to work.</li> <li>• According to census data, 41% of area households have no car, up from 39% in 2001. In Camden, the figure is 61%, and in England 26%. 43% of area households have one car, almost the same as the national average of 42%. 16% of area households have more than one car. According to the Camden Retail Study 2013, demand for residential and public parking is high</li> </ul>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>In our Vision consultation, more than 90% of respondents supported the aim to “Reinforce Hampstead as a safe and walkable neighbourhood with access to amenities and good public transport, where residents have convenient alternatives to private car travel, while recognising the need for cars.”</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>

<b>Policy EC1: Retailers: encouraging a healthy mix 1</b>	
The Plan supports the retention of business premises, including small retail premises, and resists the change of use from A1 to A2.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 23
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO4, SO5; Policy TC5 Article 4 Direction Office to Residential Conversions <a href="#">Area 1C</a> (Hampstead) <a href="#">Area 3C</a> (Outer Hampstead) Camden has also made an <a href="#">Article 4 Direction</a> to withdraw permitted development rights for A1 to A2 conversions (shops to financial services) and B1c to C3 (light industrial to residential). The notification period is currently underway.
	London Plan 4.8
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	Policy DP10 – “Helping and promoting small and independent shops The Council will encourage the provision of small shop premises suitable for small and independent businesses by: a) expecting large retail developments to include a proportion of smaller units; b) attaching conditions to planning permissions for retail developments to remove their ability to combine units into larger premises, where appropriate; c) encouraging the occupation of shops by independent businesses and the provision of affordable premises. The Council will seek to protect shops outside centres by only granting planning permission for development that involves a net loss of shop floorspace outside designated centres provided that: d) alternative provision is available within 5-10 minutes’ walking distance; e) there is clear evidence that the current use is not viable; and f) within the Central London Area, the development positively contributes to local character, function, viability and amenity.”

	<p>CPG5 limits the frontages that can be given over to non-retail use: Camden will resist proposal that would result in more than 2 consecutive premises within the Core Frontages and more than 3 consecutive premises in non-retail use within Secondary Frontages. Camden classifies South End Green (1-65 South End Green (west side) and 37 Pond Street) as a Neighbourhood Centre, and therefore would resist schemes that result in less than 50% of ground floor premises being in retail use and more than 3 consecutive premises being in non-retail use. “Neighbourhood Centres will be considered suitable locations for food and drink uses of a small scale (generally less than 100m2) that serve a local catchment, provided they do not harm</p> <p>Camden Local Plan, page 227, “supports the development of housing within centres and Central London including above shops where it does not prejudice the ability of the ground floor unit to be used for town centre uses.”</p> <p>See Evidence Base, Economy, Primary and Secondary Frontages, for analysis of current shopfront usage and current usage of the floors above shops</p> <p><a href="#">Office to Residential Permitted Development Impact Study 2014</a></p> <p>“Who put that there?” RNIB survey, 2015. RNIB is calling on local authorities to “review their policies in relation to the six most common obstacles (parking on pavements, a-boards, inaccessible crossings, bins and recycling boxes on pavements, street furniture, and developments that include shared space) facing blind and partially sighted people.”</p> <p>LB Camden Retail and Town Centre Study 2013, appendix 1, page 39</p> <p>Camden’s Employment Land Review</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>In our Vision consultation, more than 90% of respondents supported objective to “Maintain and enhance the distinct character of Hampstead’s two village centres – South End Green and Hampstead Town – and encourage a broad retail mix to better serve the needs of local residents.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	<p>No</p>



<b>Policy EC2: Retail centre environment</b>	
Requires shop fronts to contribute positively to retail environment by setting forth requirements.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 23, 126
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO4, SO5; Policy TC2, London Plan Policy 4.7, 4.8,
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	Hampstead Conservation Area Statement, CPG5, CPG1, Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide
	<u>“The Changing Face of the High Street”</u> , English Heritage, and the GLA’s guide to <u>“Smartening shop fronts”</u>
What does public consultation show?	In our Vision consultation, over 90% supported the aim to “Create a lively and prosperous Hampstead economy that supports visitors as well as residents’ needs, with support for neighbourhood shops, small enterprises, markets, and local job opportunities.” More than 80% supported objective to “Recognise the tourist appeal of Hampstead and the Heath and ensure local shops, businesses and amenities better serve the needs of visitors.”
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No





<b>Policy HC1: A mix of housing</b>	
Resists the loss of small non-social housing units and supports the development of larger 3 and 4 bedroom units for social affordable dwellings in line with the Local Plan.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 50
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO2, SO3; Policy H2,H3, H4, H5, H6, H7
	London Plan 3.1, 3.8, 3.9, 3.11
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<u>GLA London Data Store, House Prices by Wards</u>
	<u>Telegraph article (Savill survey of house prices over 10 years)</u> Guide to social housing availability in Camden, 2013 - Hampstead has 32% of its accommodation in houses, up from 29% in 2001; but the rest of the Borough is 15% in houses and 85% in flats.
What does public consultation show?	Vision consultation: more than 90% of respondents supported the objective to “ensure a balance of dwelling types to meet the needs of Hampstead’s diverse community of professionals, families and older residents.”
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No



<b>Policy HC2: Community Facilities</b>	
Resists the loss of identified community facilities.	
<b>Basic Conditions</b>	
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 70
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO 12; Policy C1, C2, C3, C4
	London Plan 3.1, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	In CPG8, Camden defines “community facilities” to “include childcare, education and training, healthcare, police stations, fire stations, youth provision, libraries, community halls, meeting spaces, places of worship, public conveniences and other similar uses that provide a service to the local community. Leisure facilities include cinemas, music venues, theatres, leisure centres, indoor and outdoor sports facilities and other similar uses.”
	Existing primary and secondary schools: primary Christ Church Primary School, voluntary aided school; Devonshire House Preparatory School, other independent school; primary Fitzjohn’s Primary School, community school; Hampstead Hill School, other independent school, primary; Hampstead Parochial C of E Primary School, voluntary aided school; Heathside Preparatory School, other independent school, primary; New End Primary School, community school; Northbridge House Senior School, other independent school; St Anthony’s Preparatory School, other independent school, primary; The Academy School, other independent school, primary; University College School, Junior School, other independent school, primary
	Forum survey on CIL priorities, January 2016. Support for community facilities such as Keats Library, Burgh House and Henderson Court was very strong in the survey – coming in at number 1,

	2 and 6 respectively.
	Census data showing a number of older people is increasing: In 2011, the over 60's accounted for 22% of the local population (versus 19% in 2001). Those over 75, rose from 23% in the same period while only 15% of area residents are aged from 16-29, declined 21%.
What does public consultation show?	In our Vision consultation, over 90% supported the objective to “Protect and enhance amenities, such as health centres, churches and pubs, for the community now and for the future by making the best use of existing facilities”. See also “Living Hampstead” – topics raised in first three consultation exercises.
	90% supported the objective: “Ensure a balance of dwelling types to meet the needs of Hampstead’s diverse community of professionals, families and older residents.”
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No

### Policy HC3: Community 3

Supports development that creates accessible, well lit, welcoming public spaces. Expects buildings that frame these spaces to encourage ease of movement and potential for public use.

#### Basic Conditions

In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF 57,58,69
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden Local Plan 2017 SO7; Policy D1, T1, as above.
	London Local Plan, Policy 7.5 Public Realm, <a href="#">See 7.16</a>
Contributes towards sustainable development?	Yes

Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	Does not require an SEA.
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>	
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	London Plan, Policy 7.5: “7.16 The quality of the public realm has a significant influence on quality of life because it affects people’s sense of place, security and belonging, as well as having an influence on a range of health and social factors. For this reason, public and private open spaces, <b>and the buildings that frame those spaces</b> , should contribute to the highest standards of comfort, security and ease of movement possible.”
What does public consultation show?	More than 90% of respondees to our Vision consultation supported the objective to identify Hampstead’s network of green spaces and establish rigorous guidelines for enhancing their character.
Is there enough evidence?	Yes
Is more work needed?	No