

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES LOCAL  
DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**Examination of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan**

**LIST OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION**

<b>1. GENERAL ISSUES RELATING TO THE PREPARATION AND CONTENT OF THE AREA ACTION PLAN</b>
--

**Strategic Matters**

1. Is the Plan in general conformity with the Spatial Development Strategy? If not, what changes are required and practicable? [Soundness test 4]
2. Would the Plan's adoption prejudice the proper consideration of alternatives for the Council's Core Strategy? [4]

**Consideration of Alternatives**

1. Has there been sufficient consideration of alternatives at the strategic level (for example, overall growth levels)? [3, 7]
2. Has there been sufficient consideration of alternatives at the site specific level (for example alternative uses on particular sites)? [3, 7]
3. If inadequate in either of these respects, what can now be done to make up for this?

**Community Strategy**

1. Has proper regard been had to the Community Strategy? Does the Plan's strategy reflect other strategies and proposals of other service providers' requirements? If not, what changes can now be made? [5]

**Implementation and Monitoring**

1. Does the Plan provide a sound basis for implementation and monitoring? [8]
2. Are the Plan's mechanisms for the delivery of specific proposals sufficiently clear? [8]

**Site Allocation Proposals (General)**

1. Is the policy approach in respect of Site Allocation Proposals too prescriptive? Has consistent wording been used in respect of the Proposals' requirements? [6, 9]

## 2. SPECIFIC POLICY ISSUES

### **Shopping (Policy K1)**

1. Has adequate assessment been made of the effect of the Plan's proposals on other existing shopping centres? [6, 7]
2. Should specific provision be made for additional comparison shopping floorspace between 2016 and 2020? [7]
3. Should the Plan make provision for an expansion of convenience shopping in Kingston Town Centre? [7]
4. What is the justification for the expansion of the Primary Shopping Area? Were alternative locations considered for the expansion of the Primary Shopping Area? Why was the selected area chosen? [7]

### **Employment (Policy K4)**

1. What is the justification for the policy approach to the (net) retention of class B1 floorspace (with reference to the supply and demand for such floorspace)? Is this approach consistent with relevant national policy? [4, 7]

### **Housing (Policy K7)**

1. How does the proposed provision of 1000 new homes relate to the Council's strategy for housing provision in the Borough as a whole? [6]
2. Does the figure of 1000 new homes represent a ceiling on housing numbers within the Plan area? If so, is it a reasonable limit or should additional housing be provided? If housing provision were to be increased, which sites should be considered? Have the environmental effects of any such additional housing been adequately explored (for example, in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessment under Regulation 48(1) of the Habitat Regulations)? [3, 6, 7, 9]
3. How realistic is the suggested approach for the delivery of affordable housing in the Plan area? Should the Plan contain additional policies or proposals for the provision of affordable housing? [7]
4. Is the Plan's approach to the provision of student accommodation sufficiently clear, robust and deliverable? [7, 8]

### **Environment (Objectives 3 and 4)**

1. Do the Plan's policies and proposals adequately reflect the statutory test for development in a Conservation Area? [4, 7]
2. Is adequate control provided for developments in Conservation Areas other than the Old Town Conservation Area? [4, 6]

3. Are specific controls required in respect of the height of new development proposals? [7]

### **Transport (Objective 6)**

1. Does the Plan sufficiently explain what transport improvements are necessary in order to support the level of additional development that is now proposed? What safeguards are in place to ensure that these improvements take place? What are the implications of a failure to deliver such improvements? [7, 8, 9]
2. To what extent is the park and ride proposal necessary to facilitate the additional development now proposed? If it is necessary, can its implementation be adequately secured? [7, 8]
3. What is the justification behind the overall parking numbers proposed in policy K20? Would a potential increase in town centre parking spaces be consistent with the strategy of demand restraint adopted in the RBK Local Implementation Plan? [4, 7]
4. Are the Plan's proposed parking standards consistent with the London Plan and national policy, as set out in PPG 13? [4]

### **Infrastructure (Policies K22 & K23)**

1. Are the Plan's provisions for the provision of necessary infrastructure sufficiently clear and deliverable? [8]

### **Flooding (Policy K24)**

1. Is the Plan's policy approach to flood risk consistent with national policy in PPS 25? In particular, does the Plan provide adequate safeguards to ensure that development in the functional flood plain (zone 3b) is restricted to water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure (as required by PPS 25)? [4, 7]

### 3. ISSUES RELATING TO SITE ALLOCATION PROPOSALS

#### **Eden Quarter (P1 to P5)**

1. Are the suggested designations of these sites the most appropriate in all the circumstances? In particular, should greater provision be made for new housing in these proposals? [7]
2. Are these proposals consistent with national policy in flood risk, as set out in PPS 25? [4]

#### **Kingfisher Leisure Centre etc (P6)**

1. Is this proposal consistent with the Plan's conservation policies and the statutory requirements for development in a Conservation Area? [4, 6]

#### **107-163 Clarence Street (P8)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? In particular, is student housing realistically deliverable? [7]

#### **Kingston Station (P10)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? In particular, should general housing be included in any redevelopment? Is student housing realistically deliverable? [7]

#### **Quebec House (P11)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? In particular, is student housing realistically deliverable? [7]

#### **Northern Riverfront (P12)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? Does this proposal accurately reflect current developments and extant planning permissions? [7]
2. Is this proposal consistent with national policy in flood risk, as set out in PPS 25? [4, 6]
3. Should the plan restrict the height of new buildings in this location? [7]

### **Bishops Palace House & 11-31 Thames St (P13)**

1. Is this proposal consistent with the Plan's conservation policies and the statutory requirements for development in a Conservation Area? [4, 6]
2. Should the plan restrict the height of new buildings in this location? [7]
3. Is this proposal consistent with national policy in flood risk, as set out in PPS 25? [4]

### **Guildhall, County Court etc (P14)**

1. Is this proposal consistent with the Plan's conservation policies and the statutory requirements for development in a Conservation Area? [4, 6]

### **Former Power Station etc (P17)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? [7]
2. Is this proposal consistent with national policy in flood risk, as set out in PPS 25? [4]
2. Should the plan restrict the height of new buildings in this location? [7]

### **Kingston College & Adjoining Sites (P19)**

1. Is the suggested designation of this site the most appropriate in all the circumstances? In particular, are the proposed uses for sites P19a & P19b compatible with safety concerns raised by the HSE? Is student housing realistically deliverable? [6, 7]