



**HAMPSTEAD**  
NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

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

**(Draft) Hampstead**  
**Neighbourhood Plan**  
2017-2032

# 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.

<h2>Policy D1: Design</h2> <p>[introduction &amp; Context]</p>			
<h3>Basic Conditions</h3>			
<p>In line with national planning policy framework? (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF 7 – for example, para. “58. Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.”</p> <p>NPPF 12 – for example, paragraphs 135, 137 and 138, “Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.”</p> <p>NPPF 64 states: “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.”</p>		
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Conforms to Camden policies DP24, DP25 and Camden draft Local Plan D1, D2. Also Communities and Local Government Planning Policy 5: “Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use.”</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 as we are not specifying any particular area for development</p>		
<h3>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</h3>			
<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><a href="#">Camden Design and Access Statement requirements</a></u>, National Planning Policy Guidance: Paragraph: 029 Reference ID: 14-029-20140306, “What is a Design and Access Statement? <u><a href="#">Historic England “Understanding Place: Historic Area Assessments: Principles and Practice”</a></u>”</p>		
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>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.”</p>		
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>			
<p>Is more work needed?</p>			

<b>Policy D2: Conservation areas and listed buildings</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF 126, 130, 138 Communities and Local Government, Planning for the Historic Environment, Planning Policy 5,		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS14, DP24, DP25, Draft Local Plan D1, D2		
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?	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		
What does public consultation show?	Strongly supported by consultation. In our Vision consultation, more than 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?			
Is more work needed?			

<b>Policy D3: The urban realm</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF para. 9 “seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment,”		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS14, DP24, draft Local Plan D1. See Core Strategy Objective: 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.		
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?	Draft 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.”		
	“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.”		
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?			
Is more work needed?			



<b>Policy NE1: Open Spaces</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 76-78, NPPF 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS13, 15, see CS objective: “to improve and protect Camden’s Metropolitan Open Land, parks and open spaces, and promote and enhance the diversity of plant and animal species in the borough.” DP31. Draft Local Plan A2, A3.		
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 V, Part 1 and Part 2, Local Green Spaces		
	<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?	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”.		
	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> .		
Is there enough evidence?	Yes		

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

Is more work needed?	

<b>Policy NE2: Trees</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS 13, 15, DP31, draft Local Plan A3, CC2, CC3		
Contributes towards sustainable development?	<b>Yes</b>		
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 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		
	<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 Fitzjohns Avenue), London Plane (Fitzjohns 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		

	<p>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 Appendix ____;</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>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 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, Frognaal, 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>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>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	

<b>Policy N3: Ecological Networks</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS 13, 15, DP31, draft Local Plan A3, CC2, CC3		
Contributes towards sustainable development?	<b>Yes.</b>		
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		
	London Plan 2011: Green Infrastructure and Open Environments: The All London Green Grid		
	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.		
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?			
Is more work needed?			

**Policy N4: Biodiversity**

[Explanatory text here]

**Basic Conditions**

In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS 13, 15, DP31, draft Local Plan A3, CC2, CC3		
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?	<p><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</p>
	<p>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 &amp; 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>                  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.                   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.                   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>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>Is more work needed?</p>	

<b>Policy BA1: Basement development</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	<p><b>NPPF 53</b> (“Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.”). NPPF 120 (“To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location”)</p> <p>NPPF 66 (“Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community.”)</p>		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	<b>Draft Local Plan A5, Camden Planning Guidance 4 (Basements and Light wells)</b>		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<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		
	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><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><u>Arup report</u> #119 “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><b>Hampstead is the source of four of London’s rivers.</b></p> <p>See: Cranston J in <i>R (Eatherley) v Camden Council</i> [2016] EWHC 3108 (Admin) “A basement dug beneath an existing building within a terrace is one of the riskiest situations in which to construct a basement.”</p>
<p>What does public consultation show?</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>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>Is there enough evidence?</p>	
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	

<b>Policy B2: Complex basements</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	<p>NPPF 58 (Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area”).</p> <p>NPPF 71 “Local planning authorities should take a positive approach to ...identify and resolve key issues before applications are submitted.”</p> <p>NPPF 120 (“To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location”)NPPF 193”Local planning authorities should publish a list of their information requirements for applications, which should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposals...”</p>		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	<b>Draft Local Plan A5; DP 27,23;Camden Planning Guidance 4 (Basements and Light wells</b>		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<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>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</u> #119 “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>Please see the note drafted by Stephen Ainger, dated 9.10.2016 for more details of the precedent.</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>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	



<h2 style="color: green;">Policy B3: Construction impacts</h2> <p>[Explanatory text here]</p>			
<h3 style="color: green;">Basic Conditions</h3>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	<p><b>The Planning guidance</b> <a href="http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/">http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/</a> in paragraph 11 states that; “The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: preventing new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from .. noise pollution of land instability”.</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><b>NPPF #123 (“Planning policies and decisions should aim to: - avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development; - mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development including through the use of conditions” # 152 Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued”.</b></p>		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	<b>Draft Local Plan A5, Camden Planning Guidance 4 (Basements and Light wells)</b>		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>			
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	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		

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

	<p>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.</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	<p><b>Hampstead is a conservation area and noise was identified as by 67% of respondents in the Camden Survey of basement development - Evidence Report“ said that the impact of noise was unacceptable” ”Out of the four impacts noise received the most negative responses”</b>  <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>Is more work needed?</p>	

## Policy TT1: Traffic Volumes and Vehicle Size

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.

### Basic Conditions

<p>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF paragraph 35, NPPF Core Planning Principle 17                  NPPF paragraph 124                  NPPF paragraphs 15 and 16                  NPPF paragraph 152                  NPPF paragraph 193                  NPPF paragraph 189                  NPPF annex 2                  NPPF paragraph 154</p>
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Core Objective: to reduce congestion and pollution in the borough by encouraging more walking and cycling and less motor traffic, and to support and promote new and improved transport links, at King’s Cross, St Pancras, Euston, Tottenham Court Road, West Hampstead and elsewhere, CS11, CS16, DP16, Camden draft Local Plan T1</p> <p>CS11, CS16, DP17 and draft Local Plan T1 Section 10 of Camden’s draft 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 draft 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 draft 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 an annual basis, and the</p>

	Council will usually require submission of a monitoring report.”			
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>● 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 practitioner dental surgery set out in the British Dental Association Research Report – The State of General Dental Practice 2013 – Table 14.</li> <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</li> </ul>			

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 facilities 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 facilities occur involve an HGV”).</li> </ul>
<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>In our Vision consultation, more than 90% of respondents supported 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.” 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.”</p> <p>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>Is more work needed?</p>	

## Policy TT2: Pedestrian Environments

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.

### Basic Conditions

In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF Paragraph 35 NPPF Paragraph 69 NPPF Paragraph 7 NPPF Paragraphs 126 and 131 NPPF Paragraph 154		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	The requirements for pedestrian environments set out in Neighbourhood Plan Policy TT2 implement Camden’s draft Local Plan policy T1.		
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?	<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

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

	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?	
Is more work needed?	

## Policy TT3: Public Transport

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.

### Basic Conditions

<p>In line with national policy (NPPF)?</p>	<p>NPPF paragraph 17 (core planning principles) NPPF paragraphs 30, 34, 35 NPPF paragraph 58 NPPF paragraph 162</p>		
<p>In line with strategic policies of the local plan?</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan paragraphs 4.100, Draft Local Plan Policies T1 and C6 promote fair access for all by locating facilities at sites offering good public transport access. Draft 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.” Draft 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.”</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>		

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

<p>What evidence supports this policy/proposal?</p>	<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 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</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

	<p>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 draft 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> <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>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	

## Policy TT4: Cycle and Car Ownership

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.

### Basic Conditions

In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraphs 35, 39 and 40		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	Camden draft Local Plan Policy T1. Camden draft Local Plan paragraphs 3.1, 10,15 and 3.254 Camden Planning Guidance CPG7.		
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?	<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 document KS404EW - Car or van availability.</li> <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%.</li> </ul>
--	--

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

	16% of area households have more than one car. According to the Camden Retail Study 2013, demand for residential and public parking is high
What does public consultation show?	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.”
Is there enough evidence?	
Is more work needed?	

<b>Policy E1: Retailers: encouraging a healthy mix 1</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 23		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	CS7, DP10, Camden draft Local Plan TC5, Article 4 Direction Office to Residential Conversions <a href="#">Area 1C</a> (Hampstead) <a href="#">Area 3C</a> (Outer Hampstead)		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>			
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<p>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> <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>		

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

	<p>Draft 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><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>Is more work needed?</p>	

<b>Policy E2: Retail centre environment</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF paragraph 23,		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	London Plan Policy 4.7, 4.8, Camden Policy CS7, DP12, Camden draft Local Plan TC2		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<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		
	“The Changing Face of the High Street”, 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?			
Is more work needed?			



<b>Policy C1: Community Facilities</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	<b>NPPF paragraphs 50, 70</b>		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	<b>CS10, DP15, Camden draft Local Plan Policy C1, C2, C3, London Plan Policy 3.1, Camden Policy DP6, DP7, DP8, Camden draft Local Plan H4 and H8.</b>		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<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%.		

Draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan – Evidence Base Summary

<p>What does public consultation show?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.”</p>
<p>Is there enough evidence?</p>	
<p>Is more work needed?</p>	

<b>Policy C2: Promoting a mix of housing</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	<b>NPPF paragraph 50</b>		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	London Plan Policy 3.1, 3.8, 3.9, Camden Policy CS6, DP5, DP6, DP7, DP8, DP9, Camden draft Local Plan Policy H3, H4, H5		
Contributes towards sustainable development?			
Compatible with EU obligations (e.g. does it need a SEA?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<b>Is there a clear link between the policy and evidence</b>			
What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	<u><a href="#">GLA London Data Store, House Prices by Wards</a></u>		
	<u><a href="#">Telegraph article (Savill survey of house prices over 10 years)</a></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.		
	<b>Vision consultation: more than 90% of respondees 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.”</b>		
What does public consultation show?			
Is there enough evidence?			
Is more work needed?			



<b>Policy C3: Community 3</b>			
[Explanatory text here]			
<b>Basic Conditions</b>			
In line with national policy (NPPF)?	NPPF		
In line with strategic policies of the local plan?	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?)	<b>Does not require an SEA.</b>		
<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 respondents 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?			
Is more work needed?			