

WANDSWORTH

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist

Local Plan Submission Version
April 2025



PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 4: LOCAL PLAN SOUNDNESS & QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Why you should use this part of the toolkit

The purpose of this assessment is to provide a ‘mock’ examination - as far as that is possible - of the drafts of your local plan policies update. It is intended to be particularly helpful for use as part of the development of your emerging local plan policies update and as a final check prior to publication of your Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan policies update. It will help you to identify areas for improvement and understand potential risks to the soundness of the plan or its usability.

How to use this part of the toolkit

There are 50 ‘key questions’ in the assessment matrix below which might seem a lot to get through. But thinking through these questions now could save time and expense further down the line. If you are undertaking a partial plan policies update not all of the content will be relevant to you.

If you are completing this assessment or peer reviewing it for a colleague within or from another authority, you should put yourself into the mind of a Planning Inspector assessing the soundness of the draft local plan policies update by keeping in mind the ‘tests’ as follows. Is the draft local plan update:

- **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

For some elements, particularly those concerning clarity, you will also need to consider yourself as an end user of the Local Plan policies update.

Provide a brief answer to each question [cross referring to evidence](#) that has informed or supports the local plan policies update in order to justify your reasoning and the score you have attributed. Identify any likely implications of not changing your approach or ways in which you may potentially improve the score either through changes to the plan policies update, evidence or further engagement with developers or infrastructure providers recorded in your statement of common ground. But remember that the local plan policies update doesn't need to be supported by reams of evidence. Evidence needs to be proportionate, clear and robust in line with [PAS advice on proportionate evidence](#).

If you find it helpful, you can score your local plan policies update on the degree to which you meet requirements underpinning the question. You can then add up the scores to calculate your confidence in the local plan policies update (on a scale from -100 to +100) and use this as a benchmark for future improvements. Where a particular question is not applicable to your circumstances, please score +2.

How to use the results of this part of the toolkit

You can use the results of this tool throughout the plan making process to assess the extent to which your plan addresses key soundness requirements. There is no requirement to publish or submit this table to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the independent examination, but you may find the assessment (or some elements) helpful to inform changes to your plan or supporting documents.

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>
	Growth Strategy	
A	In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area	The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. The adopted Plan contains seven 'place-based' and two overarching Area Strategies covering each of the borough's town centres and regeneration areas. These were considered to provide a sound framework for how new development should be designed and planned for to meet the Local Plan's vision and Objectives. The Partial Review does not seek to amend the overall growth strategy of the Local Plan which was examined and found to be sound prior to its adoption in 2023.
B	In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) identify the key factors which informed the distribution of development in the local plan policies update	The distribution of development in local plan policies is informed by an assessment of the local context and character and the availability of sites and is set out in Policy SDS1 (Spatial Development Strategy 2023-2028) which was examined and adopted in 2023. The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. The Partial Review does not seek to amend the approach to the distribution of development in the Local Plan which was examined and considered to be sound prior to its adoption in 2023.
C	List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key infrastructure needed to support delivery	The Adopted Local Plan sets out detailed planning guidance for seven Area Strategies: Wandsworth Town (including the Wandle Delta sub-area); Nine Elms; Clapham Junction and York Road/Winstanley Regeneration Area; Putney; Tooting; the Roehampton and Alton Estate Regeneration Area; and Balham. The Local Plan is not reliant on any single site allocation, nor on the provision of specific infrastructure required to support the delivery of the growth it plans for. The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to demonstrate soundness of the growth areas and strategic sites set out in the whole local plan which was examined and considered to be sound prior to its adoption in 2023.

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
1.	Overall does the local plan policies update clearly articulate the strategy for <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> sustainable development will be delivered and that this is 'an appropriate strategy' within the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The six updated policies relating to the delivery of affordable housing and other housing are clearly articulated. The updated policies are not directly spatial in nature and are therefore not likely to have a significant bearing on where sustainable development will take place, but rather they provide a robust and direct approach to setting out how proposals for affordable housing and other housing will be expected to achieve sustainable development objectives. The updated policies performed positively in the sustainability appraisal and complement the local plan vision and objectives.				
		The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing. The Local Plan Partial Review does not seek to amend the overall plan strategy for sustainable development which was examined and considered to be sound prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2023.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
2.	Is it clear how the amount of development identified for any growth areas or major site allocations has been determined – and that the level proposed is deliverable and justified?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The amount of development that has been identified within the Local Plan is set out for the growth areas (Part B of SDS1) but not for individual sites. These capacities were informed by a design-led approach as set out in the Urban Design Study for the adopted Local Plan (2023).				
		The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing, and the policy updates do not propose to amend any of the growth areas or major site allocations. The Local Plan Partial Review does not seek to amend the amount of development proposed for growth areas or major site allocations, which was examined and considered to be sound prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2023.				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
3.	<p>Is it clear that the local plan policies update provides for the most appropriate level of housing growth using the standard methodology as a starting point? Can you clearly articulate why planned growth levels should not be higher or lower?</p> <p>If you are proposing any material change away from the level of housing indicated by the standard method, can you clearly justify this through evidence?</p> <p>Does the level of housing provide for an appropriate and justified buffer?</p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The adopted Local Plan uses the London Plan target, in accordance with the London Plan. Housing figures were examined and found to be sound prior to the adoption of the 2023 Local Plan. This demonstrates that sufficient capacity exists to meet (and exceed) the housing requirement with an appropriate and justified buffer. This approach accords with the transitional arrangements included in the December 2024 version of the NPPF. The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. These updates do not result in amendments to the total housing requirement, in line with transitional arrangements, which were examined and considered to be sound prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2023.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
4.	Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release and can you demonstrate that alternatives to Green Belt release have been fully considered? Can you demonstrate	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Wandsworth does not have any land designated as Green Belt.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release?	Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
5.	Is it clear how sites have been selected and have site allocations been made on a consistent basis having regard to the evidence base, including housing and employment land availability assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. These updates do not result in any amendments to the site allocations which were examined and found to be sound prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2023.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
6.	Does the local plan policies update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Council designated the Tooting Bec and Broadway Neighbourhood Area and Forum on 4 th April 2017. To date, no neighbourhood plan has been progressed by the Forum, and whilst the neighbourhood area designation remains, the Forum's designation has now expired given this was established over 5 years ago and no application for renewal has been received.				
		The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing, and no proposals relating to amendments of housing requirements in designated neighbourhood areas are being made.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
7.	Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. These updates do not result in any amendments to the site allocations which were examined and found to be sound prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2023. Changes proposed to policies which are non-specific to any single site allocation may have a bearing on the mix and quantum of development proposed. These are addressed in separate question points within this document.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
D	What targets have you set for non-residential floorspace or employment land and, if relevant, the number of jobs to be created over the plan period?	The limited scope of the Local Plan Partial review means the existing targets for non-residential floorspace/employment land will remain as set out in the adopted Local Plan and their accompanying evidence bases which were found to be relevant and robust following their examination.				
	List these targets and the evidence source for this 'need' target?					
8.	Where and how are the targets referred to above to be delivered? Do the sites and indicative capacities that you have identified demonstrate that these targets are achievable? If you are not allocating sites to meet needs identified, can you justify and explain how those needs will be met?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: As above, the limited scope of the Local Plan Partial Review means these targets are not subject to proposed updates at this time. The six reviewed policies relate to the delivery of affordable housing and other housing in the Borough, and have no direct bearing on overall targets for housing, employment land, non-residential floorspace or site allocations in the Local Plan. The targets set out in the adopted Local Plan remain relevant and are considered to be robust following their examination and subsequent adoption in 2023.				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
9.	Does the local plan policies update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this infrastructure?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review does not propose any amendment to policy which would require specific large-scale infrastructure, and so it is not considered that this is relevant to the Partial Review.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
10.	Can you demonstrate that the transport and other infrastructure needed to support <u>each</u> growth area or strategic site identified in the local plan policies update: (i) can be funded and delivered; and (ii) is supported by the relevant providers/ delivery agents in terms of funding and timescales indicated?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
	Have you identified the extent of any funding gap? If so, are you able to explain why you are confident that any gap can be addressed?	Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review does not propose any amendment to policy which would impact on transport or other infrastructure within identified growth areas or strategic sites. Therefore, it is not considered that this is relevant to the Partial Review.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				

Wandsworth Local Plan Partial Review 2021/23

October 2021

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment					
		Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.					
	Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3)						
E	What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these.	These matters are set out in detail in the Duty to Co-operate Statement (April 2025) and the forthcoming Statements of Common Ground with Wandsworth’s neighbouring authorities and other bodies. The latest versions will be included as part of the documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.					
11.	Does your Duty to Cooperate Statement(s) of Common Ground: (i) identify these issues; (ii) identify the bodies you have engaged with or continue to engage with; and (iii) clearly set out not just the process, but the outcomes of this engagement highlighting areas of agreement and of difference?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement	
		Reason for score: These matters are set out in detail in the Duty to Co-operate Statement (April 2025) and the forthcoming Statements of Common Ground with Wandsworth’s neighbouring authorities and other bodies. The latest versions will be included as part of the documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.					
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a					
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Should unexpected issues arise, these can be addressed through Statements of Common Ground as part of the examination process.					
		Reviewer Comments:					
F	Are there any aspects of the local plan policies update not in conformity with national policy (or where you will be relying on transitional provisions)? Please set these out and provide justification with reference to evidence for these. Are you satisfied you can robustly defend this on the basis of local evidence?	The proposed changes to the policies include updates to require developer contributions towards affordable housing on sites that are not major developments – the updated policy proposes to seek contributions from sites of 9 units and less. The Council has prepared evidence in the Housing Needs Assessment and Whole Plan Viability Assessment that demonstrates that the updates are required, reasonable and justified based on local circumstances, as has been found in other London-based Local Plans. The latest versions will be included as part of the documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.					

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	For instance, are you seeking to require affordable housing on sites which are below the threshold of major development as defined by national planning policy?					
12.	Are there any specific policies in the local plan policies update where there are differences to any policy approach set out in a relevant strategic planning framework (e.g. the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement).	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The proposed amendments to affordable housing policy in the Local Plan Partial Review work within the framework set by the London Plan, specifically the Fast Track Route and requirements of policy H6, but introduce an alternative local threshold. The Council has discussed this approach with the GLA at regular meetings under the Duty to Co-operate. The Council considers its approach to be locally justified and sound, as informed by a range of evidence including the Housing Needs Assessment, Whole Plan Viability Assessment and Housing Background Paper. The Council will continue to collaborate with the GLA to understand how the Council's proposed local approach, in light of its evidence, can complement the requirements of the existing London Plan and the forthcoming London Plan Review.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Continued engagement with the GLA around the draft policy				
		Reviewer Comments:				
	Is the local plan policies update:	-2	-1	0	+1	+2

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in conformity with any 'higher level' plans prepared by the Council; and properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan? 	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Partial Review of the six local plan policies as they relate to affordable housing is extremely limited in scope, and so it is considered that the 2023 Adopted Local Plan section 'Links with the Council Vision and other Key Strategies' (p.16) remains largely relevant. There are no made neighbourhood plans within the borough.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
14.	Does your Consultation Statement demonstrate how you have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date [you should revisit and update this following the publication of your Regulation 19 local plan policies update]?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Consultation Statement (April 2025) sets out how the Council have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations (2012) and sets out a detailed appendix with officer responses to the representations made at the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stage consultations. All consultation has been delivered in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The Consultation Report in support of the consultation undertaken on the Local Plan, and addressing how this consultation has met all relevant regulations, will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the submission of the Local Plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
15.	Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?	Reason for score: The Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan Partial Review sets out a clear framework for the assessment of the six policies reviewed as part of the Partial Review of the Local Plan and the delivery of sustainable development and assesses the six policies under this framework. No objections to the Sustainability Appraisal were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
16.	Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the Sustainability Appraisal assesses the likely significant effects of the six policies amended as part of the Local Plan Partial Review. No objections to the Sustainability Appraisal were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
17.		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the local plan policies update including how any policies or site allocations have been amended as a result and does it show (and conclude) that the local plan policies update is an appropriate strategy?	<p>Reason for score: Yes - The Sustainability Appraisal states that “The development and appraisal of plan policies is an iterative process, with the policies being refined to take account of appraisal and consultation. The policies within the Partial Review have been subject to [Sustainability Appraisal] to ensure that they are the most appropriate”. A column in the Sustainability Appraisal ‘mitigation’ also sets out further changes that could improve the policies in relation to the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal also assesses the policies and reasonable alternatives (including a ‘status quo’ approach), ensuring that the most sustainable policy option has been chosen.</p> <p>No objections to the Sustainability Appraisal were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.</p> <p>Implications of taking no further action: n/a</p> <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
18.	Is it clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has influenced the local plan policies update?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p>Reason for score: An Equalities Impacts and Needs Assessment was produced to accompany both the Regulation 18 (2023) and Regulation 19 (2025) versions of the Local Plan Partial Review. These assessments appraised any positive and negative equality impacts arising from the six policies included in the Local Plan Partial Review.</p> <p>Implications of taking no further action: n/a</p> <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
19.	Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects?	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report was produced to accompany the Regulation 18 (2023) and Regulation 19 (2025) version of the Local Plan Partial Review. This assessed the Local Plan policies both for their impact alone and in combination with other plans/projects (e.g neighbouring authorities' Local Plans/Screening Assessments of these documents), whilst also taking into account of other documents (such as the London Plan HRA). The screening assessment did not identify any likely significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site, and the Council have undertaken engagement with Natural England through the Duty to Co-operate process on the screening report to secure a robust outcome.				
		No objections to the HRA were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
20.	If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through 'Appropriate Assessment' that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan policies update adequately identify the measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them?	Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The HRA screening assessment does not identify any likely significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site and mitigation measures are therefore not identified.				
		No objections to the HRA were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				

Wandsworth Local Plan Partial Review 2021/23		October 2021				
	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Reviewer Comments:				
21.	Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan policies update?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes - paragraph 3.4 of the HRA states that “The assessment of the Local Plan Partial Review, under the Habitats Regulations, was undertaken during the preparation of the Local Plan Partial Review, so that the assessment could influence the development of policies and their effects”. Meanwhile, because the screening assessment did not identify any likely significant effects or impacts on the integrity of any European Site, there were no implications arising from the HRA for the six updated policies and so no changes were required at the end of this process.				
		No objections to the HRA were received as part of the Regulation 19 stage consultation, including from statutory consultees.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
	Housing Strategy					
22.	Can you demonstrate that the policies and proposed allocations in your local plan policies update meet your housing requirement in full and that this can be achieved as a minimum? If not [for instance, because another local authority has agreed	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. The proposed amendments to the policies included in the Partial Review do not have any implication on the overall housing requirement for the Borough which would remain as was examined and found to be sound as part of the Local Plan adopted in 2023. This is consistent with the transitional				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	to plan for your unmet need], can you explain and robustly justify why?	arrangements set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF. Further analysis and justification is set out in the Housing Background Paper. Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
G	Is there any unmet need in neighbouring areas that you have been formally asked to accommodate? If yes, then list the amount by each local authority area.	Although not relevant to the Local Plan Partial Review, in a Duty to Cooperate meeting on 1 st October 2024 with the Royal Borough of Kingston (RBK), it was raised that RBK may have an unmet housing need. It was stated that in due course, RBK will be inviting Wandsworth to collaborate on a Statement of Common Ground to agree key matters for cross-boundary considerations.				
23.	Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably do so?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: N/a				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
24.	Is there a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery and ensures the maintenance of a 5-year supply during the plan period?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. The proposed amendments to the policies included in the Partial Review do not have any implication on the housing trajectory for the Borough. This is consistent with the transitional arrangements set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF. Further analysis of housing supply matters and justification is set out in the Housing Background Paper.				
	Is your strategy for delivery and implementation clearly articulated and justified to support the trajectory?					

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
25.	Can you confirm: (i) that the local plan policies update will provide for a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites on adoption; and (ii) that beyond this 5 year period sites are developable and (iii) if relevant, you have included a 5 or 20 percent buffer to deal with under-delivery.	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. The proposed amendments to the policies included in the partial review do not have any implication on the 5-year housing land supply, and the site allocations as adopted in the 2023 Local Plan remain in place. This is consistent with the transitional arrangements set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF. Further analysis of housing supply matters and justification is set out in the Housing Background Paper.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
26.	Does the level of supply provide any 'head room' (that is additional supply above that required) to enable you to react quickly to any unforeseen changes in circumstances and to ensure that the full requirement will be met during the plan period?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: N/A – It is not considered this is relevant to the Local Plan Partial Review.				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A Reviewer Comments:				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
27.	Is the Council reliant on the delivery of any 'windfall' sites (sites not specifically identified in the development plan) during the plan period and if so, how many and when? Is there compelling evidence to confirm that such sites will continue to come forward?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: N/A – It is not considered this is relevant to the Local Plan Partial Review.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
28.	Does the local plan policies update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Policy LP24 Housing Mix has been reviewed as part of the Partial Review of the Local Plan. Policy LP24 sets out the requirement for the dwelling size/tenure mix that should be created by development proposals, including with respect to market and affordable housing. This has been informed by the Local Housing Needs Assessment (2024). As such, the Council are confident the reviewed policy makes clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required and is generally effective and justified.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
29.	Does the local plan policies update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The housing requirements of different groups are taken into account through the Partial Review of the Local Plan, including through policies LP31 Specialist Housing for Vulnerable People and Older People which covers sheltered housing, residential care homes, nursing homes, dual-registered care homes, extra care homes, and requires that applicants for specialist and supported housing can robustly demonstrate that the accommodation meets an identified need, having regard to the evidence set out in the Council's most up-to-date Local Housing Needs				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<p>Assessment. LP28 Purpose Built Student Accommodation also sets out the framework for purpose-built student accommodation.</p> <p>The Equality Impact and Needs Assessment also assesses the proposals for amended policies against their impact on people with protected characteristics such as age, disability and religious belief.</p> <p>The full Local Plan, adopted in 2023, also takes into account the housing needs of different groups through Policy LP32 Traveller Accommodation.</p> <p>Implications of taking no further action: n/a</p> <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
30.	<p>Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified?</p> <p>Does the local plan policies update provide for the delivery of the full need for affordable housing? If not, can you explain and justify why?</p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p>Reason for score: Policy LP23 Affordable Housing seeks to maximise the delivery of affordable housing from new development across the borough to meet the identified need in the Council's Local Housing Need Assessment. There is a significant shortage of affordable housing, and an urgent need to boost supply to meet the need of a diverse population. This means a greater variety of affordable housing products and well-designed homes of the right size, tenure and a price that people can afford. The London Plan requires that affordable housing provision is focused on genuinely affordable tenures including low cost rented products and intermediate products. The Council's proposed policies seek to prioritise social rent as the tenure most needed in the Borough, with the balance of affordable housing being made up of intermediate tenures. The Council's affordable housing requirements have been subject to viability testing through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment which has demonstrated a majority of typologies can meet the proposed policy. Further analysis is set out in the Housing Background Paper including the strong correlation between more viable typologies and the types of sites expected to make up the Council's future housing trajectory.</p> <p>There are no geographical variations proposed within the policy.</p>				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
31.	Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence? Does the local plan policies update make adequate provision for the identified needs?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to demonstrate soundness of the strategy for accommodating housing needs for travellers and travelling showpeople which is covered by Policy LP32 in the adopted Local Plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
32.	Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to demonstrate soundness of the strategy for accommodating housing needs for travellers and travelling showpeople which is covered by Policy LP32 in the adopted Local Plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				

Wandsworth Local Plan Partial Review 2021/22		October 2021				
	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
H	List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery	The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies relating to the provision of Affordable Housing and other housing. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to demonstrate soundness of the strategy for accommodating housing needs for travellers and travelling showpeople which is covered by Policy LP32 in the adopted Local Plan.				
	Justified approaches to plan policy and content					
33.	Where thresholds are set in policies which trigger specific policy requirements, are these thresholds justified by evidence and is this clear in the supporting text? [You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Policy LP23 Affordable Housing includes a threshold which triggers certain policy requirements for the delivery of affordable housing on major sites. This is considered to be justified by proportionate evidence and is appropriately explained within the supporting text. The threshold approach set out in the proposed wording for policy LP23 provides a local threshold that differs slightly to those stated in the current London Plan, however this has been informed by a Whole Plan Viability Assessment which concludes that the threshold demonstrated in the policy is economically viable for a majority of developers and that residential development will still generate a return on investment for developers, and that the policy is therefore deliverable. Further analysis of the justification for the policy requirements is set out in the evidence base and summarised in the Housing Background Paper.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
34.	Does the local plan policies update avoid deferring details on strategic matters to other documents? If it does, is it clear <i>why</i> matters will be covered in other Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate?	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review does not defer details on strategic matters to other documents.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
35.	Where the local plan policies update defines a hierarchy do policies throughout the Plan consistently: (i) reflect this hierarchical approach; (ii) make clear the level of protection afforded to designations depending on their status within the hierarchy; and (iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy? [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: None of the six updated policies in the Local Plan Partial Review define a hierarchy in the way described here.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
36.	Where policies seek to limit certain uses, is this justified by evidence and is the rationale clear in the supporting text to the policy and in the evidence. [For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: None of the six policies in the Local Plan Partial Review seek to limit certain uses in the way described here. Draft policy LP28 (Purpose Built Student Accommodation) seeks to limit where such schemes will be considered appropriate, which is justified by the need to safeguard and prioritise the supply of conventional				

Wandsworth Local Plan Partial Review 2024/25

October 2021

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment				
		Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.				
		affordable housing. Further analysis of the justification for the policy requirements is set out in the evidence base and summarised in the Housing Background Paper.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
37.	Is it clear that any standards proposed for development are justified and deliverable, taking into account the scale of the development? Where relevant, are they consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Code and National Model Design Code? [For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: Where standards are proposed within the Local Plan, these are considered to be justified, based on the Council's evidence base, and deliverable. The Partial Review of the Local Plan does not introduce any new standards for development which deviate from existing standards for development set out in the adopted Local Plan. The adopted Local Plan as a whole promotes a design-led approach as informed by the borough's Urban Design Study (December 2021) .				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
Deliverability						
38.	Has the viability of the local plan policies update been suitably tested and does this testing cover all requirements including in respect of any required standards, affordable housing provision and transport and other infrastructure needs and if relevant the implications of CIL?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review has been informed by a Whole Plan Viability Assessment which found that the updated policies are realistic and deliverable. Specifically, the appraisals indicate that "the change to tenure mix will have limited impacts on the viability percentage of affordable housing in most development scenarios. In				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<p>situations where there is an impact, this is likely to be modest, with the viable level of affordable housing falling by up to 5%...appraisals indicate that a majority of typologies tested, particularly those brought forward on sites in secondary retail use, secondary industrial use and backlands could viably provide 40% to 50% affordable housing in many cases". Further analysis and justification of the deliverability of local plan policies in the context of viability is included in the evidence base, including the Housing Background Paper.</p> <p>Implications of taking no further action: n/a</p> <p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
39.	<p>Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence?</p> <p>Is it clear the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan policies update?</p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p>Reason for score: The Publication (Regulation 19) version of the Local Plan Partial Review has been developed alongside and informed by the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and the updated policies reflect the conclusions and recommendations of this viability evidence. Further analysis and justification of the deliverability of local plan policies in the context of viability is included in the evidence base, including the Housing Background Paper.</p>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
40.	<p>Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored, and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured?</p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p>Reason for score: This is set out in the adopted Monitoring Framework (2023). The data required is considered to be reasonably available.</p>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				

Wandsworth Local Plan Partial Review 2021/22		October 2021				
	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
41.	Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for <u>plan review</u> ? Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The mechanisms for review are set out in LP61 Monitoring the Local Plan. This policy sets out The Council’s commitment to undertake a complete review of the Local Plan at least every 5 years. This Partial Review does not propose any changes to policy LP61, and so this remains in place, as does the rest of the adopted Local Plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
	Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity)					
42.	Does the local plan policies update clearly set out the timeframe that it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will the strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years <u>from adoption</u> ? Does the evidence relied on to support those policies correspond/cover this whole period? Where larger scale developments are proposed as part of the strategy, does the vision look further ahead (at least 30 years)?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The adopted Local Plan clearly sets out that it covers the time period from 2022/23 to 2037/38, providing for a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption (2023). The strategic policies for the Local Plan are set out in paragraph 1.11, in which LP23 Affordable Housing is included. The Local Plan does not consider the timeframe beyond the 15-year post-adoption period.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
43.	Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which <u>adopted</u> Development Plan policies it supersedes?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review proposes to amend only six policies from the adopted Local Plan. These policies are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP23 Affordable Housing • LP24 Housing Mix • LP28 Purpose Built Student Accommodation • LP29 Housing with Shared Facilities • LP30 Build to Rent • LP31 Specialist Housing for Vulnerable People and Older People All other parts of the adopted Local Plan remain in place.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				
44.	Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The objectives of the Local Plan are set out in Chapter 2 of the Adopted Local Plan. The Local Plan Partial Review does not propose any amendments to the overarching objectives of local plan policies.				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
45.	<p>For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; <u>and</u> (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?</p> <p>Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan policies update are these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?</p>	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan Partial Review seeks to update only six policies in the Local Plan. These policy proposals have no impact on the designations and site allocations featured in the Local Plan Policies Map and so it is not considered necessary to update the Policies Map, which was examined and found to be sound prior to its adoption in 2023.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a Reviewer Comments:				
46.	Does each local plan policies update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording?	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The six policies that have been subject to review under the Local Plan Partial Review have been carefully evaluated to ensure it is clear what type of development they will promote. The six amended policies have been specifically reviewed to promote the use of positive wording, and the policies are generally phrased to stipulate the types of development that will be supported.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: The LPA is happy to modify language, as informed by the Planning Inspector, where opportunities exist for policies to be more positively expressed.				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
47.	<p>Do policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on (i) scale; (ii) use; or (iii) location of development proposed.</p> <p>[Note: If you have said ‘all development’ this implies equal application irrespective of the development scale/use/location and this may not be either justified or deliverable]</p>	<p>Reason for score: Policies have been drafted to clearly stipulate the types of uses, and (where appropriate) the scale and location of these uses. This aspect of the plan has been examined and found sound by inspectors prior to the adoption of the current Local Plan in 2023. Where applicable, the reviewed policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on scale, use or location. This includes thresholds above or below which different requirements apply. For example, proposed wording for policy LP29 sets out that large-scale purpose-built shared living accommodation will be permitted where it is proposed on a site which is unsuitable for conventional housing and where it would not lead to an overconcentration of single-person accommodation at the neighbourhood level.</p>				
		<p>Implications of taking no further action: n/a</p>				
		<p>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: The LPA is happy to modify language, as informed by the Planning Inspector, to clarify the application of policies where this is differentiated based on scale, use, or location where this is not considered clear.</p>				
		Reviewer Comments:				
I	<p>State how many policies are in your local plan update?</p> <p>Can you list any policies within the local plan update that: (i) repeat parts of other policies within the plan; (ii) replicate or repeat</p>	<p>There are six policies subject to review in the Local Plan Partial Review. These policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LP23 Affordable Housing LP24 Housing Mix LP28 Purpose Built Student Accommodation LP29 Housing with Shared Facilities 				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	<i>paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LP30 Build to Rent LP31 Specialist Housing for Vulnerable People and Older People <p>(i) The following policies reference parts of other policies in the Local Plan: LP23, LP28, LP29, LP30 and LP31.</p> <p>(ii) The following policies reference paragraphs in the NPPF: None.</p> <p>(iii) The following policies reference London Plan policies: LP23, LP28, LP29 and LP30.</p>				
48.	Based on the above, have you tried to avoid unnecessary repetition (of the NPPF or other policies within the local plan policies update) and cross referencing in policies? If you find duplication or repetition you may want to take minute to consider whether this is appropriate.	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: There is unavoidable cross-reference in the reviewed policies to other policies within the Local Plan as well as policies within the London Plan. Generally, these do not repeat wording or criteria and are considered either necessary to clarify the application of the policy or helpful for signposting.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: The LPA is happy to remove any cross-referencing that is considered to be unnecessary or repetitious.				
49.	Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: The policies reviewed under the Partial Review do not contain any text or clauses which is considered to duplicate other regulatory requirements.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: n/a				
		Reviewer Comments:				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
50.	Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker? [For instance, policies should avoid using overly subjective terms such as “to the Council’s satisfaction”, “considered necessary by the Council” or “appropriate” without associated clarification.]	Reason for score: In the proposed policy wording, there are occurrences where the phrase “to the Council’s satisfaction” is used. It is considered that either sufficient clarification is provided within the wording of the policies or the activation of the requirement will only apply to a limited number of circumstances, and it is therefore unlikely for this phrase to cause significant issues for the decision-maker.				
		Implications of taking no further action: n/a				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: The LPA is happy to remove any references to ambiguous wording from the Local Plan, if considered appropriate by the Planning Inspector.				
		Reviewer Comments:				

Date of assessment:	15 th April 2025
Assessed by:	Amy Ingle (Senior Planning Policy Officer)
Checked by	Daniel Goodman (Principal Planning Policy Officer)
Overall Score:	88
Comments:	n/a