

Title of Report: Addendum to Agenda Item 7 - Local Plan Modifications:
Summary of comments of the Planning Committee

Meeting date: 22 June 2022

Report to: Board

Report of: Emma Williamson, Director of Planning

For Noting

This report will be considered in public

1 Role of this addendum

1.1 This addendum report provides a summary of the Planning Committee's comments relating to the proposed adoption of OPDC's Local Plan made at 16 June 2022 Planning Committee. These discussions led to the Committee unanimously agreeing to the following proposal set out by officers:

1. **Note and consider the report of the Planning Inspector appointed to examine the draft OPDC Local Plan (Appendix 1).**
2. **Recommend that OPDC Board agree to the proposed Main Modifications (set out in both Appendices 1 and 2) recommended as necessary by the Planning Inspector to make the draft OPDC Local Plan capable of being found sound.**
3. **Recommend that OPDC Board agree to the proposed Minor Modifications to the draft OPDC Local Plan and supporting studies (Appendix 3)**
4. **Recommend that OPDC Board agree to the proposed modifications to figures (Appendix 4) including the draft OPDC Local Plan Policies Map (Appendix 5).**
5. **Recommend that OPDC Board adopt the OPDC Local Plan (Appendix 6) incorporating the draft Local Plan submitted for examination with modifications set out in Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7**
6. **Recommend that OPDC Board agree to delegate to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, the making of any further necessary final minor modifications to text and figures for the published Local Plan and supporting studies**

7. **Recommend that OPDC Board note that the existing Borough Development Plan Documents relevant to the OPDC area are superseded on adoption of the OPDC Local Plan.**
8. **Recommend that OPDC Board note the modified Channel Gate Development Framework Principles (Appendix 8).**
9. **Recommend that OPDC Board note the Integrated Impact Assessment Adoption Statement (Appendix 9).**

2 Summary of comments

- 2.1 Officers presented their recommendations to OPDC's Planning Committee seeking approval to recommend that the OPDC Board adopt OPDC's Local Plan. The recommendations are set out in the Planning Committee's [Local Plan Adoption report and reproduced above](#).
- 2.2 Officers took the Planning Committee through each of the summarised modifications recommended in the Planning Inspector's Report and a summary of modifications recommended by the inspector following the Main Modifications public consultation (May-June 2021) (appendix 1). These were considered alongside comments raised by Henry Peterson, advisor to the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum in a letter submitted to the Planning Committee on 11 June 2022 (appendix 2). The Committee has received a briefing note from officers on the letter ahead of the meeting (appendix 3) A summary of Planning Committee's comments is set out in table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of comments and officer response summary

	Member stating comment	Comment summary	Officer response summary
	Cllr Hitesh Tailor	Rationale for reduction in number of jobs created.	This results from a greater amount of industrial floorspace (lower employment per sq m than other uses) being delivered than in the submission Local Plan. There remains further employment floorspace and jobs to be delivered outside of the plan period from long-term complex development sites. The GLA has approved the updated jobs plan period target of 36,350 new jobs.
	Cllr Hitesh Tailor	Whether tall building locations need to be shown on the Policies Map and how users could locate the map.	London Plan policy D9 requires tall building locations to be identified within Local Plans. Figure 3.15 sets out tall building locations within OPDC's Local Plan. Figure 3.15 is located adjacent to Policy SP9 in the Local Plan which provides the strategic policy for tall buildings and the design of the built environment.
	Cllrs Hitesh Tailor & Wesley Harcourt	The minor modifications made to the Channel Gate Development Framework Principles.	These were made in response to comments provided by landowners and are set out in a Statement of Common Ground. They comprise two minor modifications relating to amenity ensuring tall building proposals respond to surrounding sensitive locations. The substantive Channel Gate Development Framework

			Principles was consulted on through the Main Modifications Consultation.
	Cllr Wesley Harcourt	Whether the changes to development sites and capacities result in an increase in tall buildings and higher density development.	Locations have been identified for tall buildings; however, officers consider that the proposals for Channel Gate result in less dense development than that proposed for Old Oak North in the submission Local Plan. Officers note some sites have had their capacities increased to help meet the London Plan housing target. Officers also noted that it was not an option to renegotiate the London Plan target as OPDC's approach to defining development capacities to meet the London Plan target is justified.
	Steve Quartermain	The need to ensure whether comments raised by Henry Peterson have been already considered by the Inspector and clarification that Planning Committee needs to consider the Inspector's recommendations.	Officers took Planning Committee through each of the summarised modifications set out in the Planning Inspector's Report and the modifications made following the Main Modifications Consultation in turn. These were considered alongside comments raised by Henry Peterson, advisor to the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum. There were no matters raised by Henry Peterson that had not been considered by the Inspector.
	William Hill	Removal of the Post Occupancy Monitoring policy requirement and alternative approaches to secure this requirement through the development management process.	Officers confirmed this would be able to be secured through conditions placed on planning permissions.
	William Hill	Whether Cllr Natalia Perez was supportive of the modifications to the affordable housing policies given her interest in this area.	Officers noted Cllr Natalia Perez's support for the modifications.
	Cllrs Wesley Harcourt and Natalia Perez, Steve Quartermain	Approach to defining tall building heights and whether this was considered as new information requiring additional consultation.	<p>Following the close of the Main Modifications consultation, the Inspector considered responses and determined a hearing was required to discuss the approach to showing locations of tall buildings within the Local Plan and whether the Local Plan should set out tall building heights to be in general conformity with London Plan policy D9.</p> <p>The hearing took place in January 2022. The Inspector agreed with the Local Plan's approach for showing tall building locations.</p> <p>Following discussions with stakeholders and officers, the Inspector directed officers that ranges of tall building heights be included in the supporting text to the Local Plan Place policies,</p>

			<p>based on the development capacities of sites already set out in the Local Plan. The Inspector confirmed this was a clarification and not a substantive modification and therefore did not require further consultation.</p> <p>TfL legal officers confirmed that Planning Inspectorate guidance directs Planning Inspectors to consider whether consultation is required on modifications in light of whether people could be prejudiced. The Inspector did not determine consultation was required.</p>
	Cllr Hitesh Tailor	What would comprise any further necessary final minor modifications to text and figures for the published Local Plan and supporting studies as set out in recommendation 2.6	Officers confirmed these would relate to addressing any final typo errors.
	Cllr Hitesh Tailor, William Hill	<p>Whether there would be a comms plan following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Whether engagement on the proposed Old Oak West SPD would enable the community to influence the design of the area.</p>	<p>Officers confirmed that a comms plan has been developed.</p> <p>Should Board adopt the Local Plan, there will be a series of notifications issued to stakeholders in addition to the statutory requirements.</p> <p>OPDC will be developing an Old Oak West Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and will be engaging with stakeholders in its development. This will include design charettes and engagement with Councillors. It will enable local people to influence the look and feel of the area within the parameters of the Local Plan site allocations.</p> <p>The boundary of the SPD has yet to be finalised but would likely include Channel Gate, Acton Wells East (Shield site), Acton Wells West (Victoria Road Box site) and the Old Oak Common Station Adjacent Station Development Site site allocations.</p>
	Gordon Adams	Recognition of the length of time taken in developing the Local Plan, challenges faced by officers in its production and the comprehensive stakeholder engagement	Officers noted this statement.

		undertaken resulting in a high quality plan.	
	Cllr Wesley Harcourt	Whether the amount of modifications is lawful and noted the comparison with other borough Local Plan modifications set out in Henry Peterson's correspondence.	<p>Officers referred to paragraph 33 in the Inspector's Report which states:</p> <p><i>"There is no limit placed on the extent of the modifications which I may be obliged to recommend in order to comply with my duty under Section 20(7C) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As explained in Examination Document ID-43a, placed on the examination website, there is a court judgement⁵ which confirms that "there is no limitation in the statutory language preventing a "rewrite" of the local plan (whatever that language might mean, when any change is a rewrite)" and so, I do not take the view that the extent of the Modifications renders the Plan unlawful."</i></p> <p>Officers noted that the need for the Local Plan to be modified to respond to the Interim Findings, the 2021 London Plan and changes to the Use Class Order has impacted on the number of changes proposed.</p>
	Cllr Wesley Harcourt	Proposed planning reforms and impact on the Local Plan review	Officers confirmed that there aren't firm timescales for the implementation of the planning reforms but expect these to be in place in one or two years time.
	Steve Quartermain	Noted the Secretary of State correspondence sent to the Mayor relating to the need for the London Plan to be reviewed to increase housing delivery and the potential for future increased housing targets. Agreeing to recommend adopting the Local Plan would enable OPDC to manage changes to its London Plan housing target more effectively.	Officers noted this statement.
	Cllr Wesley Harcourt	Whether 5-7 Park Royal Road and Coronation Road South identified by Henry Peterson were consulted on as being tall building locations.	Officers identified the sites on a map noting they were subject to the Main Modifications consultation as being tall building locations.
	William Hill	Noted the role of OPDC as a Mayoral Development	Officers noted this statement.

		<p>Corporation to deliver a new district of London, the scale of work required to produce the Local Plan and thanked stakeholders who have been involved in the development of the Plan.</p> <p>Noted the Local Plan is only the start in the development of the area with the need for OPDC to listen, learn and engage with the community as proposals come forward.</p>	
--	--	--	--

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Presentation slides of summarised modifications recommended in the Planning Inspector's Report and a summary of modifications recommended by the inspector following the Main Modifications public consultation (May-June 2021).

Appendix 2 – Letter submitted to the Planning Committee on 11 June 2022 by Henry Peterson, advisor to the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum.

Appendix 3 – Briefing note from officers on the points raised in Henry Peterson's letter.

Inspector's Report modifications

- Ensuring an Ordnance Survey base to the policies map and to figures within the Plan;
- Identifying superseded Plans and policies;
- Updating housing and jobs targets;
- Ensuring a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of non-designated heritage assets;
- Substituting substantive requirements for process requirements;
- Producing a revised spatial strategy consequent on the deletion of a major unviable site;
- Reviewing social infrastructure requirements consequent on the revised spatial strategy;
- Resolving internal inconsistencies and omissions;
- Moving policy from supporting text into policies;

Inspector's Report modifications

- Ensuring consistency with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan;
- Ensuring that policies of industrial intensification would be effective;
- Revising the Drainage Strategy to be effective;
- Clarifying the location of the proposed Wormwood Scrubs Street;
- Updating terminology in relation to affordable housing;
- Clarifying policy in relation to public houses;
- Removing monitoring burdens from development;
- Updating the Plan consequent on the publication of the London Plan 2021 and on changes to the Use Classes Order; and
- A number of other modifications to ensure that the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Modifications since September 2021

- Referencing indicative building heights for each place policy in supporting text
- Meanwhile employment uses
- Waste allocations and compensatory provision
- West London Orbital
- Post occupancy surveys



OLD OAK NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

William Hill
Chair of the OPDC Planning Committee
(by email)
Copies to members of the committee

June 11th 2022

Dear Mr Hill,

OPDC Local Plan and report to the OPDC Planning Committee 16th June 2022

Following our letter of 8th June to Liz Peace (copied to yourself) we are circulating this further letter to members of the OPDC Planning Committee in advance of the meeting next Thursday.

The Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum met on 7th June. We are very aware that the modified OPDC Local Plan is on its way to adoption by the Board on June 22nd. Having reviewed the documentation on the agenda of your committee, we feel we must alert committee members to the continuing concerns of our members on

- the process of plan preparation and examination
- the substance of parts of the heavily modified final version of a local plan for the Old Oak area.

We have argued on several occasions in previous submissions to you and your committee that the Planning Committee has had insufficient input to the Local Plan. We do not know of occasions when there have been private briefings and discussions behind the scenes. We note that your committee has not met since 20th January (nearly 6 months). Since that date critical late modifications have been made to the Draft Plan, and the Inspector has concluded the Examination and issued his final report.

We wrote to Liz Peace on April 12th suggesting specific steps, involving the Planning Committee, which could be taken to ensure some degree public consultation in the final stages of adoption of the local plan. These steps would have given reassurance that Planning Committee members were aware of, and supported, the modifications on Tall Buildings in document OPDC-51. You have been copied into her response, and our further reply to her of 8th June.

Copies of this earlier correspondence are being circulated with this letter to Planning Committee members. We have no other means of establishing whether the Planning Committee is aware of the strength of local feelings on the Local Plan. We hope also that Planning Committee members are taking account of the significant statements by the Secretary of State on housing targets at the Second Reading of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill.

In particular Michael Gove's comment that Government is *"taking steps to ensure that the Planning Inspectorate, when it is reviewing a local plan and deciding whether it is sound, does not impose on*

local communities an obligation to meet figures on housing need that cannot be met given the environmental and other constraints in particular communities". We feel strongly that this scenario has arisen at Old Oak and have argued since 2015 that an under-researched housing target of 25,000 new homes should have been set aside several years ago.

Concerns over the process of local plan preparation

Before June 22nd we will be reminding OPDC Board members (as the body due to adopt the Local Plan) of our main concerns over the process of preparation of the plan. These were raised with OPDC and with the Inspector during the 2018-22 Examination stage. In summary these are

- Knowingly submitting a local plan prematurely (contrary to the PCPA 2004)
- Merging of preparation and examination stages leading to an unlawful hybrid process
- Lack of consultation on significant late modifications
- Failure of the Local Plan to conform with London Plan Policy D9 on Tall Buildings

The extent of major modifications

The process of plan preparation and examination, extended over four and half years, we see as having contributed to a flawed plan. We have suggested a fresh start on several occasions. The report from the Director of Planning recommends inclusion of all the major modifications. Most of these have been drafted by OPDC officers, with some imposed by the Inspector. They total **464** in number.

By way of comparison, modifications found to be necessary to ensure soundness of other recent local plans in London are as below.

Brent Local Plan 2022	133 major modifications
Westminster 2021 City Plan	55 major modifications
Lambeth 2021 Local Plan	254 major modifications
Southwark Local Plan 2021	171 major modifications
Tower Hamlets 2020 Local Plan	31 major modifications
Hackney Local Plan 2020	50 major modifications
Redbridge Local Plan 2018	75 major modifications
LBHF 2016 Local Plan 2018	25 major modifications

The Inspector's report describes the Examination as 'protracted' and gives this as one of the reasons why he chose not to require a further round of consultation on OPDC's last minute proposals for 'appropriate heights' and 'suitable locations' for tall buildings. We think this latter decision was unwise.

The number and scope of major modifications are relevant to questions on whether a local plan has become a revised or replacement local plan (for which the 2004 PCPA does not allow). Planning Inspector Paul Clark argues at paragraph 33 of his Report that the extent of modifications is lawful in this instance. We do not agree.

Local residents continue to see major flaws in the final local plan recommended for adoption. These are not recognised or referred to in the officer report on your agenda. Some of these issues have been flagged up by the Planning Committee itself in the past but remain unresolved. All remain as obvious concerns for those living or working in the area, or who might be considering relocating to Old Oak.

Lack of transport connectivity

As modification piled on modification during the examination period, key elements on infrastructure and transport disappeared from the draft local plan.

- The OOC station has no vehicular access from the east (North Hammersmith, North Kensington, central London). This is a concern raised many months ago by the Planning Committee, but no solution has been found.
- The quality of proposed pedestrian/cycle access from Scrubs Lane and from Old Oak Common Lane has been strongly criticised by LBHF transport engineers.
- Unfunded and unprogrammed proposals for a new Overground station at Old Oak Common Lane are labelled as a 'potential' station on some maps in the Local Plan but without this qualifier on others. **This is misleading** for those thinking of moving to the area and trying to understand their future public transport options when moving to what in most cases will be 'car-free' developments. Lack of prior understanding that residents cannot use a car has led to real problems amongst new tenants and leaseholders at Oaklands Rise (the 605 unit development on Old Oak Common Lane).

Inadequate Policies Map

The Policies Map is a key element of any local plan. It is often the first part of a Plan that the public look at, when trying to gain an overview of proposals. The OPDC Local Plan includes a multi-layered Policy Map – necessary to cover all the various categories of information involved. This has been published as document 0.75 Appendix 5 on the agenda for June 16th.

This document includes the following note:

"Given the context of the OPDC area and level of changes planned across the plan period, some spatial policies within the Local Plan are not based on site specific boundaries. This includes:

- *Boundary of future town centres;*
- *Areas appropriate in principle for tall buildings.*

These boundaries have not been included within the Policies map, but are identified in the area wide figures accompanying the relevant Local Plan policies".

These two subjects, which are *not* covered by the Policies Map, are amongst those of greatest importance to those living in, or thinking of moving to, Old Oak. For site specific boundaries not to be shown on the Policies Map makes a nonsense of NPPF requirements for clarity in local plans. It is also contrary to London Plan Policy D9 on Tall Buildings.

Current and incoming members of the public need to know 'where will my town centre be?' and 'what sort of townscape will surround me'. After five years of gestation, the Local Plan response is 'we are not sure about the best location for your town centre' and 'we will tell you as little as possible about locations and heights for tall buildings'.

A set of place-specific and diagrammatic maps feature as 'Replacement Figures' in the version of the plan recommended for adoption. These show an amorphous area running from Channel Gate to North Acton as a 'major town centre'. These more detailed maps fail to identify locations deemed suitable for tall buildings, or information on 'appropriate heights'. Why is this so?

One of the 'Replacement Figures' (excluded from the Policies Map) at page 26 of Appendix 4 on the committee's agenda shows some specific locations along with some large areas defined as 'appropriate' for tall buildings. In most cases the specific locations (shown by the asterisk) simply retro-fit within the local plan a site where a planning consent has already been granted in 2015-22.

The failure of the Plan to conform adequately with Part B of London Plan Policy D9 on Tall Buildings remains one of the major concerns of residents at Old Oak. The context is covered in detail in our letter to Liz Peace of 8th June and is not rehearsed again in this letter.

Channel Gate Development Framework Principles

Your committee is asked to 'note' this document. Presumably the Board will be asked to approve it? This new 'supporting study' has been published in June 2022. It was not available during the Examination stage and has never been the subject of public consultation. As far as we are aware it has not been seen or assessed by the Planning Inspector (it does not appear in the Examination Library).

The Director of Planning's covering report gives no explanation of why this document is on the agenda, after the Examination has concluded. No attempt has been made to notify or consult on it with the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum. This is despite the fact that Channel Gate borders on the neighbourhood area designated by OPDC in 2017, and that the Forum applied in 2021 to extend the neighbourhood boundary to include these sites (a proposal refused by OPDC).

This 'Development Principles' document includes large scale diagrams which do not show the boundary of the Old Oak neighbourhood area as designated. This same applies to the boundary of the Harlesden neighbourhood area, missing on Policy Maps. These are statutory designations which property owners and applicants need to be aware of (in the same way as for the conservation areas at Old Oak, the boundaries of which *are* shown in the Policies Map). How are applicants meant to know of these designations if not shown in the adopted Local Plan?

We have commented during the 2021 consultation on the Modifications in respect of Channel Gate and will not repeat these views here. Principle 9e in this new document avoids clarity on 'appropriate heights' and repeats the familiar opaque wording used by OPDC in providing for *'tall buildings at appropriate locations throughout Channel Gate, including key junctions and spaces, where they assist with legibility and place making'*.

As with other OPDC 'Development Principles' documents' the status of this 'supporting study' is not clear. It is cited as *'a supporting study to inform OPDC's Draft Local Plan, and other relevant planning guidance'*. But it has not been through the consultation process necessary for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document and has appeared two months after the Inspector completed his report on the Examination.

As we read and digest this final set of local plan documentation, we may find other matters of concern. We are grateful that OPDC has at least published a tracked and full version of the local plan material.

An early review of the OPDC Local Plan?

Finally, we ask the Planning Committee to recommend to the OPDC Board that this Local Plan requires early review, and that work on this should start immediately after adoption.

The Inspector has not made such a recommendation. But he has noted at paragraph 169 of his report that *'In a Statement of Common Ground, the Mayor and the OPDC have agreed that figures for appropriate tall building heights will be introduced into the Plan at its first review'*.

There are several reasons why this review should happen sooner rather than later:

- London's property market remains in a state of flux, as demand for commercial and residential floorspace reacts to post pandemic conditions and a fragile UK economy.

- This first version of the Local Plan has been found to be ‘sound’ only after 464 major modifications and an Inspector’s report which has helped it over the line.
- Applications involving tall buildings will continue to be challenged by local forums and amenity groups. Because OPDC attempted at only the last minute to achieve compliance with London Plan D9, with extra modifications not consulted on, consents granted by OPDC when based on local plan policies will be more vulnerable to challenge than would normally be the case.
- Government’s direction of travel is towards local plans which are shorter, more comprehensible to the public, include national development management policies, and demonstrate that *‘we democratise and digitise the planning system’*. Michael Gove wishes to see that Government *‘makes sure that the Planning Inspectorate ensures not that every plan fits a procrustean bed, but that every plan reflects what local communities believe in’*.
- Government is increasingly acknowledging that simplistic housing targets, at national, regional and local level are not a good way forward if these lead to development unsupported by local communities.

RB Kensington and Chelsea was required by the Planning Inspector to start work on a new Local Plan immediately after the adoption of its 2019 version. This followed the Council’s removal of its housing policies from its Draft Plan in order that these could be reviewed in light of the Grenfell tragedy. By mid 2022 the Council has already prepared and received public feedback on a new Draft Plan, with the Regulation 19 consultation due this autumn. **A second and improved local plan for Old Oak need not (and should not) wait five years.**

Government is legislating for local plans to be prepared in 30 months (half the timescale taken by OPDC). Old Oak needs a plan that is better than the current product, and one supported fully by all three Boroughs and those living and working in the area.

The Planning Committee, rather than the Board, is the OPDC body with the most knowledge of the planning system. We ask you to consider carefully what should happen next and to advise the Board accordingly.

Regards,

Henry Peterson, adviser to the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum

cc Stephen Cowan LBHF, Peter Mason LBE, Muhammed Butt LB Brent

OPDC Planning Committee members Gordon Adams, Gary Rice, Steve Quartermain, Councillor Matt Kelcher LBB, Councillor Wesley Harcourt LBHF, Councillor Natalia Perez LBHF, Councillor Hitesh Tailor LBE.

Liz Peace CBE Chair of OPDC

David Lunts OPDC, Emma Williamson OPDC, Tom Cardis OPDC

Sent by email

Dear Planning Committee members

You will have received correspondence from Henry Peterson, on behalf of the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum, in relation to Local Plan adoption item on this week's planning committee agenda. I attach these again for reference.

I thought it would be helpful if I set out a brief response to each of his points which is set out below.

If you would like to discuss further please feel free to contact me and I can set up a call at your convenience. Alternatively Tom, Pete and I will be available from 4.45 pm in the meeting room if you want to discuss.

Introduction

- The letter alleges that the Planning Committee has not been kept abreast of the progression of the Local Plan. We have continually updated the Committee on the progression of the Local Plan in public meetings where decisions of recommendations have been required, and also in private briefings. This has included public papers at the Planning Committee meetings in March and September 2021 and private briefings to members at each of the monthly meetings.
- The letter quotes Michael Gove's comments that under the new planning reforms, that steps will be taken to ensure the Planning Inspectorate does not impose an obligation for figures to meet housing need and Henry's letter then goes on to quote OPDC's 25,000 homes target as an example of this not being adhered to. It should be noted that OPDC's housing need figure, evidenced in its Strategic Housing Market Assessment is 99,000 homes over the Local Plan period. OPDC's Local Plan target is for under 20,000 homes, significantly under the London Plan target for 25,500 homes.

Extent of Major Modifications

- The extent of modifications to the Local Plan is a matter that has been raised by Henry on several occasions to both OPDC and the Planning Inspectorate.
- The scope and extent of modifications that can be made at this stage is ultimately a matter for the Planning Inspectorate.
- The Planning Inspectorate has responded several times to Henry confirming that it considers the scale of modifications that have been made during the examination to be acceptable and lawful.
- Both OPDC and the Planning Inspectorate have sought legal/counsel advice on the scale of modifications and in both cases, the advice has been that the scale of modifications are within the discretion of the inspectorate.
- The majority of modifications were publicly consulted on during the main modifications consultation.
- Modifications proposed by the inspector following the January 2022 hearings were within the discretion of the inspector to make, without the need for further public consultation. Paragraph 6.12 of the Planning Inspectorate's [Procedural Guidance for Local Plans](#) allows for inspectors to make such changes where "*he or she is satisfied*

that no party would be prejudiced as a result. For example, the consultation already undertaken on the MMs might have adequately addressed the point, or the amendment might be a very minor one.” OPDC’s planning inspector satisfied himself that the above criteria applied to all the modifications made following these hearings.

Lack of transport connectivity

- The impact of the inspector’s interim findings for Old Oak North and the change in infrastructure requirements has been discussed at length with OPDC’s Planning Committee and Board. The modified Local Plan was recommended to be approved by the Planning Committee and then subsequently approved by the Board for submission to the inspector in March 2021 incorporating the revised infrastructure network, including the revisions to the eastern access arrangements for Old Oak Common station. The modified Local Plan is supported by a Bus Strategy which delivers a high quality network of new and enhanced bus routes which will ensure that the Old Oak Common station is appropriately connected by bus into surrounding communities and to other nearby transport hubs.
- All infrastructure is qualified appropriately within the Local Plan.
- In particular, the Local Plan para 4.128 provides information regarding the delivery status of the Old Oak Common Lane Overground station:

4.128. The potential Old Oak Common Lane Station is a TfL transport requirement, to provide an appropriate interchange between services within Old Oak Common Station and other local services. The Station will need to be designed to support this role. The station is not currently considered to be needed to support the quantum of development envisaged in this plan; however, it is identified in the London Plan as a scheme that Local Plans should support and, to support strategic transport needs, development should safeguard for and if appropriate, contribute to and / or deliver the station. Particularly given the station’s important strategic function for wider transport connectivity and its strong business case, OPDC strongly supports the delivery of this rail station and will be working proactively with TfL, Network Rail and other relevant stakeholders to secure its delivery

Inadequate Policies Map

- Inspector’s Report para 9 confirms the Policies Map and figures in the Local Plan comply with Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012.
- In respect of tall buildings, the Local Plan is not contrary to London Plan policy D9. Policy D9(B)(2) requires locations to be identified “on maps in Development Plans”. The Policies Map is not part of OPDC’s Development Plan so it is therefore in fact, more critical that these locations are depicted within the Local Plan rather than in the policies map. Figure 3.15 is within the Local Plan. Therefore, it is within OPDC’s Development Plan.
- The methodology for identifying tall building locations is set out within the Tall Buildings Statement Update. Tall building locations are informed by various supporting studies and justified.
- In the case of the town centres boundary, as this town centre is yet to be delivered and the exact alignment of key routes is yet to be fixed, it is appropriate that the exact town centre boundary is not depicted on an OS base in the policies map. A similar approach has been taken by other LPAs where exact boundaries are not known, most notably the LLDC when defining boundaries for some of their new town centres. As routes become more fixed and the town centre starts to be delivered we

will ensure that future iterations of the policies map more clearly depict the exact boundary for the new town centre.

Channel Gate Development Framework Principles

- The updates to the Channel Gate DFP are set out in the [Table of Further Minor Modifications](#) which was published in November 2021 following approval by OPDC's Board.
- The modifications were minor and inserted text relating to ensuring tall buildings respond to sensitive locations.
- The minor modifications result from a Statement of Common Ground also published as part of the above table of modifications.
- The table of modifications and Statement of Common Ground were submitted to the Inspector.
- The original Channel Gate DFP was available in the consultation period.
- Neighbourhood Area boundaries are published on our [webpages](#). The final Local Plan webpage will include links to other existing and future development plan documents. This would include the Old Oak Neighbourhood Plan.
- Its status is clear as a supporting study. It is not stated to be a Supplementary Planning Document. However, we do plan to commence work on an Old Oak West SPD which will look to incorporate some of the more detailed guidance from the Channel Gate Development Framework Principles document. We plan for this SPD to undergo public consultation early within its production in autumn 2022.

Early review of the Local Plan

- We do commit to an early review of the Local Plan within it and the government now requires review within 5 years.
- We do not consider it appropriate to start this review immediately however as the government is in the process of introducing new legislation for the production of Local Plans. We do not want to commence work which could potentially prove abortive and waste public sector money. We think it prudent to await the introduction of this new legislation before commencing a review.
- In the immediate term, we will be looking to progress with the implementation of the Plan and working on supplementary planning documents for particular policy themes (eg. industry and public realm) and locations (Old Oak West).

Response to the main points in the recent letter to Liz Peace, Chair of Board

- Screenshots from the digital model were in the presentations given to Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum and during the consultation on the modifications which gave an indication of heights.
- Discussion on the inclusion of indicative heights for each 'place' in the plan was the subject of extensive discussion with the Inspector at Hearing 2 of the Local Plan examination in January 2022, at which Henry Peterson was a participant.
- The approach to inclusion of heights within the Plan originally put forward by OPDC was for the plan to be reviewed early and heights included through this process. Our reasoning for this being that the context of much of our area (particularly around the HS2 station) is emerging and that we wanted to carry out further masterplanning work to establish heights. This approach had been agreed with the GLA. Hence this is why we did not pursue this until instructed by the Inspector in January 2022.
- The Inspector decided, in response to Henry Peterson's representation, that it was reasonable that local people should have a clear understanding of what may come

forward, and for that reason that these heights should be placed in supporting text prior to adoption.

- The Inspector was very clear at the hearing that given that these heights were expressing what was already in the plan that he had the discretion to introduce these at this point with no need for consultation.
- Henry Peterson himself suggested that OPDC should be able to deduce these from a digital model and seemed to indicate he was broadly supportive of this approach.
- The two sites Henry Peterson mentions at 5-7 Park Royal Road and Coronation Road South were included as tall building locations in the modifications consultation.
- The SCI says that we may hold stakeholder workshops at pre-application stage for significant development proposals which are of strategic importance. As explained to Henry previously we did not hold one at 1 Portal Way because we had thought at that stage that we would delegate the application to Ealing. We will be holding one for 5-7 Park Royal Road when we have a scheme that we are happy with as officers.
- OPDC has recently engaged with OONF and others in relation to its recently published community engagement strategy and we will be consulting on the forthcoming review of the SCI scheduled for the autumn.

Regards

Emma Williamson

Emma Williamson

Director of Planning

Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation
Brent Civic Centre
32 Engineers Way
Wembley
HA9 0FJ

[Website](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#) | [e-newsletters](#) | [Blogs, Events & Activities](#)

My pronouns are: she/her

