

R0237

| Chapter and policy number | Comment | Do you consider the Local Plan to be Legally Compliant? (yes/no) | Do you consider the Local Plan to be Sound? (yes/no) | Complies with Duty to Cooperate (yes/no) |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Chapter 14 The Temple, the Thames Policy Area & the Key Areas of Change, Policy S24 | <p>"Since it is expected that the meat market will move out of Smithfield during the Plan period, the Plan should set out much more specific requirements for the adaptive re-use of the Smithfield Market buildings. Currently, the plan only sets out high-level aspirations.</p> <p>Smithfield Market abuts the London Borough of Islington, however no mention has been made of cooperation, pedestrian links stop at the City boundary and no attempt has been made to link City policies to any Islington policies for the Farringdon area."</p> <p>Set out much more specific requirements for the adaptive re-use of the Smithfield Market buildings after the meat market relocation. Join up City policies and pedestrian links with their Islington counterparts.</p> | - | No | No |
| Chapter 14 The Temple, the Thames Policy Area & the Key Areas of Change, Figure 24 | <p>The Pool of London Spatial Priorities Map shows a Riverside Open Space in front of Customs House and Old Billingsgate. These spaces are currently in private use. It is not clear from the map and policies whether these areas should in future be publicly accessible. The term 'Riverside Open Space' has not been defined or linked to any policies.</p> <p>Provide a definition for 'Riverside Open Space' and link it to policies, including public access and greening.</p> | - | No | - |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|----|
| <p>Chapter 14 The Temple, the Thames Policy Area & the Key Areas of Change, Para. 14.2.3</p> | <p>Thames Estuary Partnership has a lead role in the Joint Thames Strategies refresh, but is missing from the list of collaborating organisations.</p> <p>Add Thames Estuary Partnership to the list of collaborating organisations.</p> | - | - | No |
| <p>Chapter 12 Open Spaces & Green Infrastructure, Para. 12.4.5</p> | <p>"The following sentence is unclear, and mentions a specific version of the Biodiversity Metric which will become out of date early in the Plan period:</p> <p>"Biodiverse features of value to wildlife that support the City of London's BAP, including target species and target habitats but are not included within the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Biodiversity Metric (DBM) 4.0."</p> <p>The sentence should be re-worded for clarity. References to a specific version of the Biodiversity Metric should be avoided.</p> | - | No | - |
| <p>Chapter 9 Design, Policy DE4</p> | <p>"Developers are already trying to use the provision of new elevated public spaces to offset negative impacts to existing public realm at street level.</p> <p>Provision and enhancement of public realm at street level should be prioritised over new elevated public spaces. New elevated public spaces should not be deemed to compensate for reduction in quality of existing public realm at street level.</p> <p>The provision of large elevated public spaces aimed at lunch time users requires separate entrances and a large number of lifts, which is wasteful of space and electricity.</p> <p>Therefore, the requirement for new elevated public spaces is unsound."</p> <p>Omit the requirement for tall buildings and major developments to include elevated public spaces.</p> | - | No | - |