

# IIA examination addendum – Main Modifications

June 2022

# Contents

- 1. Introduction .....3
- 2. Non-technical summary .....4
- 3. Screening of modifications ..... 14
- 4. Updated policy assessments – Strategic and Development Management Policies modifications .....98
- 5. Updated policy assessments – Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan modifications ..... 145
- 6. Updated policy assessments – Site Allocations ..... 161
- 7. IIA: Mitigation .....222
- Appendix 1: HRA screening update.....226
- Appendix 2: Flood Risk update.....227
- Appendix 3: EqIA Local Plan Modifications .....233

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Plan was published for consultation in September 2019. The interim Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) formed part of the Regulation 19 consultation (examination ref: PD4), and was subsequently submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2020. Following submission the Inspectors raised concerns about the IIA and the document was updated to present new information to respond to these concerns. This was set out in the 'IIA examination addendum' (examination library document reference: PD4a) and was published as part of a pre-hearing modifications consultation in March 2021.
- 1.2 This is a further addendum to the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). This document will be known as the 'IIA examination addendum May 2022'. The document is available for comment alongside the Local Plan modifications as part of the consultation on them. The consultation runs from [insert date] until [insert date]. Following the consultation the representations to the modifications and representations on this examination IIA will be sent to the Inspectors appointed by the Government as part of the examination process.
- 1.3 The aim of this report is to present an appraisal of the changes to the plan that are subject to modification following the Local Plan Examination Hearings which took place between September and October 2021. The report includes an update to Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Equalities Impact Assessment.
- 1.4 All the main modifications made to the draft Local Plan have been screened to consider which changes need to be assessed and where alternatives need to be considered. The assessments commentary focus on the effects of the modifications only. The tables present both the results of the submission assessment and the effects of the modifications combined with the submission assessment. The submission assessment – the original assessment score – is provided for context to enable identification of changes in effects of the modifications.
- 1.5 Further considerations has been given in respect to the implications of the changes in relation to the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Flood Risk and the Equalities Impact Assessment, this is set out in appendices 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

## 2. Non-technical summary

This is the Non-Technical Summary of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) examination addendum of Islington's Local Plan.

- o The London Borough of Islington (LBI) is preparing a new Local Plan for the borough to cover the period 2020 to 2036. The Islington Local Plan is part of the Development Plan alongside the London Plan and is made up of four documents:
  - o Local Plan: Strategic and Development Management policies – the principal document in the Local Plan, which sets out strategic policies to identify where and how change will happen in Islington; and detailed policies to manage development.
  - o Site Allocations – this document sets out site specific policy for a number of sites across the borough which will contribute to meeting development needs.
  - o Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan (AAP) – a plan for the south of the borough where significant change is expected to occur. The plan sets out spatial policies covering different parts of the area with further policies to manage development.
  - o North London Waste Plan (NLWP) - a joint waste plan together with six other boroughs within the North London Waste Authority area (Camden, Haringey, Hackney, Barnet, Enfield and Waltham Forest). The Waste Plan will identify a range of suitable sites for the management of all North London's waste up to 2035 and will include policies and guidelines for determining planning applications for waste developments. The North London Waste Plan is being produced separately to the other Local Plan documents.
- o The IIA brings together into a single document a number of assessments which are required to assess the social, environmental and economic impact of the planning policies contained in the three Development Plan documents (The NLWP is not part of this assessment). The following statutory requirements are addressed and presented together in one document:
  - o Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA)
  - o Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)
  - o Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)
- o The methodology used for the IIA process for the Islington Local Plan review is based on the Sustainability Appraisal process set out in Government guidance.

- o The Sustainability Appraisal process is a five stage process and this document follows on from the third stage in the process, which saw the preparation of the interim Sustainability Appraisal report, the first substantial reporting stage at Regulation 19 consultation in September 2019.
- o The Islington Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 12 February 2020 along with the interim Sustainability Appraisal Report – known in this document as the ‘submission IIA’. The Secretary of State appointed two Inspectors to undertake an independent examination of the Local Plan; this is the last stage in the Plan making process. Through their initial questions the Inspectors identified concerns with housing supply and the Sustainability Appraisal assessment. To address the Inspectors concerns additional consultation and an update to the IIA were undertaken. The update to the IIA – the ‘IIA examination addendum’ (examination library reference PD4a) was published in March 2021.
- o The aim of the IIA from March 2021 was:
  - o to present new information to respond to the concerns raised by the Inspectors (Part 1).
  - o to present an appraisal of the changes to the plan that are subject to pre-hearings modifications consultation (Part 2).
- o The Local Plan Examination Hearings took place between September and October 2021. Following the discussion at the hearings changes to the Plan policies were proposed. These changes, known as modifications, are subject to assessment and this report presents the assessment of the main changes proposed to the plan.
- o This Non-Technical Summary updates the version set out in the IIA examination addendum March 2021 to consider the modifications .
- o The IIA examination addendum May 2022 presents an assessment of the main modifications the Inspectors have deemed necessary to make the Plan sound and that are subject to consultation.
- o Some of the changes to the plan that were previously published as part of a pre-hearing modifications consultation in March 2021 have now been superseded, some remain the same whilst others have been amended. This consolidated set of changes is now being consulted on.
- o The Sustainability Appraisal process is iterative and on-going process, which has been in train from the start of the Local Plan review.

### **Other assessments**

- o Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a systematic approach which ensures decision making at all levels considers the potential impacts of decisions on health and health inequalities. Camden and Islington Public Health have undertaken a HIA of the Local Plan. The HIA has eleven topics which were adapted by Camden and Islington Public Health for their consideration of the Local Plan. Where an impact was identified an action to mitigate that effect was considered or enhance a positive effect.

- o An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a way of measuring the potential impacts (both positive and negative) that a policy may have on groups with key protected characteristics covered by the Equality Duty and on Human Rights. The examination IIA has considered the modifications for potential impacts.
- o The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) purpose is to assess the impacts of a land-use plan against the conservation objectives of a European Site and determine whether it would adversely affect the integrity of that site. The closest European site to Islington is Epping Forest. European sites are designated to provide legal protection of habitats and species that are of European significance. The examination IIA has screened the modifications.

### Summary of cumulative effects of the modifications

This section considers the overall cumulative effects of the modifications to the plan when considered against the sustainability framework objectives. This has been presented below in table form. A similar table was provided in the March 2021 IIA presenting the cumulative effects of the whole plan. It is noted that no further synergistic effects - the effects of other strategies, plans or programmes acting in combination with the draft Local Plan – are considered to exist in relation to the modifications. The table below seeks to bring together the overall cumulative effects of the modifications to the plan against the sustainability framework objectives, drawing out positive effects between policy areas but also potential tensions in a concise way to highlight the important issues identified in the addendum assessments.

**Table 1.1 IIA Examination Modifications Summary**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment</b>
<b>Objective 1 - Promote a high quality, inclusive, safe and sustainable built environment</b>	There is some uncertainty of the effects from the policy changes to submission policies in response to introduction of Class E, particularly in relation to retail, however the modifications across various policy areas are considered to maintain positive effects and continue to focus development in the right areas that enhances local character.
<b>Objective 2 - Ensure efficient use of land, buildings and infrastructure</b>	The effect of Class E in particular in town centres but also in the LSIS is recognised as a risk in terms of the efficient use of land. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
	<p>service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. The risk is the potential for cumulative impacts and dilution of retail development in the most appropriate locations in town centres. Similarly light industrial floorspace in LSIS could change to other E Class Uses. However, through the use of conditions the modifications go some way to mitigating this change in national policy. It is also noted that there is some uncertainty in relation to the take up of Class E.</p> <p>There is policy relaxation in respect of residential uses in town centres, changes in requirements to protect against loss of business floorspace and also changes to marketing requirements. Whilst these changes have the potential to lead to an overall reduction in commercial floorspace the assessment recognises that there could be positive effects by encouraging landowners to optimise the use of buildings for alternate uses and intensify their land through the planning process. Also, the assessment recognises that in some cases the development of underutilised upper floors for residential development could aid in the efficient use of buildings and meet different development needs including those for housing. Whilst overall the modifications to retail and business policy may have cumulative effects which combine to reduce opportunities for commercial, social and cultural floorspace it is considered that the policies in the plan will ensure that retail and business needs can be met.</p>
<b>Objective 3 - Conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, and the wider historic and cultural environment</b>	None of the modifications have significantly changed the assessments outcomes against this objective.
<b>Objective 4 - Promote liveable neighbourhoods which support</b>	The submission policy with modifications is more permissive of residential uses in town centres, which could increase local accessibility to services for the new residents living within town centres which is positive. Conversely this could reduce access to

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
<p><b>good quality accessible services and sustainable lifestyles</b></p>	<p>services cumulatively by reducing the amount of commercial floorspace available in town centres albeit the policy enables residents and business needs to still be met.. The assessment considered the wider impact on town centre vibrancy from the potential for Class E uses which do not form active frontages (such as offices at ground floor), which could cumulatively and in specific locations individually, have a negative impact on the diversity, vibrancy and economic prosperity of town centres and LSAs. Overall these changes are beyond the scope of Local Plan policy and the overall effects remain positive.</p> <p>The additional site allocations specifically to address housing supply will deliver wider improvements beyond housing quality and supply that will help create a safer and more inclusive environment and promote more liveable neighbourhoods through landscaping, safety measures, improved play spaces and community facilities.</p>
<p><b>Objective 5 - Ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing</b></p>	<p>The policy change which sets out a more flexible and permissive approach to residential use in town centres alongside the additional policy clauses for relevant spatial policies could cumulatively help to increase land available for housing and therefore affordable housing, contributing to meeting housing need which combined with the additional site allocations specifically to address housing supply will make a significant contribution to affordable housing which will help to meet need in the borough as well as contribute to wider improvements on housing estates. The identification of sites to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs and increased clarity for meeting boat dwellers needs significantly increases cumulative positive effects in relation to meeting these specific housing needs.</p>
<p><b>Objective 6 - Promote social inclusion, equality, diversity and community cohesion</b></p>	<p>There is a reduction in percentage requirement for both wheelchair accessible Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedspaces in Policy H6 and Large-Scale HMOs in Policy H10 from 10% to 5% of the total bedspaces and a further change to make requirements adaptable on completion rather than accessible on completion. Overall these changes are still considered to have positive effects However, the modification to remove the requirement for bursary contributions towards students</p>

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
	<p>leaving council care and students facing hardship does not help in reducing inequality and therefore the overall effect of the policy changes are considered to be neutral. Policy H4 which applies to conventional housing and various Wheelchair Accessible Unit requirements has also been subject to modifications, although for these changes the screening notes that there is considerable uncertainty identified in part because the effect would depend on the demand for these units.</p>
<p><b>Objective 7 - Improve the health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities</b></p>	<p>The modifications to the retail policies which clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E will provide a framework which goes some way to supporting the facilities which can meet the needs and wellbeing of communities. Whilst the protection afforded by individual policy is not considered to be significantly reduced there may be effects at a borough level due in terms of cumulative total floorspace which meets community needs, although as the assessment makes clear these effects are considered uncertain at this stage.</p>
<p><b>Objective 8: Foster sustainable economic growth and increase employment opportunities</b></p>	<p>As noted above under objective 2 the changes to retail and business policy may have cumulative effects which combine to reduce opportunities for commercial, social and cultural floorspace albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met. There is policy relaxation in respect of residential uses in town centres, changes in requirements to protect against loss of business floorspace and also changes to marketing requirements. In addition policy supporting office co-location in Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs) is introduced. These changes when combined with the flexibility provided by UCO changes creates a potential cumulative effect on providing sufficient space in the right locations for different types of businesses to develop, grow and thrive. There are positive aspects to some of the changes to protecting existing business floorspace (for example retaining the 24 month marketing period but instead requiring vacancy to be demonstrated at the time of application rather than 24 months of vacancy) which reduces the negative impact of short term vacancy. This change may also encourage landowners to seek alternative</p>

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
	<p>uses through the planning system in the medium and long term rather than consider changing use within Class E. Using Class E could result in not intensifying an existing office use of a building but simply changing existing floorspace to another Class E use.</p> <p>The wider positives of Class E are noted in particular the creation of a wider range of employment opportunities which could potentially help remove some barriers to employment across the borough with the increased flexibility around where uses can locate. The assessments recognise the uncertainty in the longer term effect on the existing economic function of parts of the borough if a significant quantum of floorspace changes via Class E to flexible uses over time. Where new development is concerned this effect is mitigated against through use of conditions. There could also be a detrimental effect on LSISs, in particular Vale Royal, Islington's most significant LSIS where light industrial floorspace is potentially at risk of being lost to other non-industrial class E use that attract higher values. This effect is considered uncertain and the update to the policy will help to ensure that potential impacts can be mitigated through the planning system as far as possible. Protecting the industrial function of LSIS has wider benefits serving other economic functions in both the local and wider London economy, so there could be a detrimental effect in neighbouring boroughs depending on their dependency on the activities usually found in LSIS which support businesses in other boroughs. Overall the protection given by demonstrating the continued industrial function mitigates the risk of displacement of this important and unique cluster of industrial businesses. In addition the use of conditions for new light industrial floorspace also helps to mitigate the potential loss of light industrial class E uses.</p>
<p><b>Objective 9: Minimise the need to travel and create accessible, safe and sustainable connections and</b></p>	<p>The uncertainty over where uses will be located from Class E in particular could have a minor negative impact on road networks and sustainable transport modes when there is an accumulation of uses that have loading and parking requirements. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend</p>

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
<b>networks by road, public transport, cycling and walking</b>	and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. Where new development is concerned this effect is mitigated against as far as possible through the use of conditions.
<b>Objective 10: Protect and enhance open spaces that are high quality, networked, accessible and multi-functional</b>	The changes to Policy G2, SP2 and BC4 provide clarification on how proposals for moorings and facilities to support moorings should be approached in the context of the canal as public open space. No effects were identified as the policy states that development can only take place where there is no detrimental impact on nature conservation and biodiversity value, and the character and amenity of the waterway corridor including its function as public open space. The modifications clarify the approach in terms of future operation of the canal for different uses and the development of a Waterspace Strategy for Islington's canal network which will help balance the competing demands on use of the canal and its role as open space.
<b>Objective 11: Create, protect and enhance suitable wildlife habitats wherever possible and protect species and diversity</b>	The submission Policy G4 with modifications is revised in respect to SINC's being protected commensurate with their classification. The assessment considers that the mitigation measures alongside other measures in the policy mean that overall there is no change in the effects identified in respect to this modification with a strong emphasis on maintaining biodiversity and there is no cumulative effect.
<b>Objective 12: Reduce contribution to climate change and enhance community resilience to climate change impacts</b>	The policy changes add to the submission policies Sustainable Design policies by responding to technological evolution and will help to minimise carbon emissions from heating systems and promote sustainable energy infrastructure, which will contribute towards a more sustainable built environment improving air quality through reduced NOx and a reduction in carbon emissions.

Objectives	Updated consideration of cumulative effects following modifications assessment
<p><b>Objective 13: Promote resource efficiency by decoupling waste generation from economic growth and enabling a circular economy that optimises resource use and minimises waste</b></p>	<p>None of the modifications have significantly changed the assessments outcomes against this objective.</p>
<p><b>Objective 14: Maximise protection and enhancement of natural resources including water, land and air</b></p>	<p>There is a potential negative impact on efficient, sustainable travel from class E through impacting on the retail hierarchy. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. High trip generating Class E uses located outside of town centres could see these uses not located in the most well served locations for public transport infrastructure specifically bus, tube and rail connections. The take up of Class E is uncertain although it is recognised as working against some of the policies which sought to balance the tensions between land uses in a fine grain way. The modifications go some way to mitigating this by encouraging retail uses to locate according to the retail hierarchy e.g. at ground floor in the core of town centres, application of the sequential test and impact assessments but ultimately there is considerable uncertainty over the effectiveness of this given Class E changes do not require planning permission.</p>

- **Monitoring** - The regulations set out that local planning authorities should monitor the significant environmental effects of implementing the Local Plan and a series of indicators have been identified in the IIA Examination addendum March 2021. No additional changes to the monitoring indicators are proposed.



# 3. Screening of modifications

The IIA examination addendum May 2022 considers and assesses, where necessary, changes made to the plan, known as main modifications which are considered necessary for soundness. The main modifications replace all of, and in some instances supersede, the earlier pre-hearing modifications that were consulted on previously during the examination process in March 2021. The main modifications are those that are considered to be necessary to make the Plan sound.

The modifications relate to the three Development Plan documents – Strategic and Development Management Policies, the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan and Site Allocations.

All the main modifications made to the draft Local Plan have been screened to consider which changes need to be assessed in the tables below. Minor modifications are automatically screened out because by their nature they cannot make a material change to the plan’s policies and therefore would not change any effects identified in the assessment.

**Table 1.2: Strategic and Development Management Policies screening**

Reference	Section	Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
SD-MM-01	Introduction	Paragraph 1.2	The plan period is to be extended to complete in 2036/37 to allow a full 15 years of plan period. This is necessary as the plan is unlikely to be adopted before April 2022.	The amendment will change the end of the plan period and this has been reflected in relevant parts of the plan which will be screened separately however this modification is not considered to have an effect and no further assessment is needed.
SD-MM-02	Introduction	Table 1.1	To be positively prepared and justified and clarify the strategic policies and non-strategic policies.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-03	Introduction	Paragraph 1.38	Modification made removing requirement for student bursaries for soundness.	Assessment of the removal of the requirement for student bursaries is set out under Policy H6.
SD-MM-04	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.1: Key Diagram	Boundary to LSIS updated for effectiveness taking into account residential sites as set out in Examination Library document reference LBI18.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed. The effects of this are also considered under Policy SP3.
SD-MM-05	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP1: Bunhill and Clerkenwell	Main modification to cross reference expected number of dwellings and office jobs from site allocations.	The factual cross reference is not considered to have an effect.
SD-MM-06	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP2: King's Cross and Pentonville	Main modifications include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing reference to the knowledge quarter from the policy and supporting text (clause B).</li> </ul>	Screened in. Assessment required.

		Road and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications to part H with regard to criteria for residential moorings and boater facilities.</li> <li>• An additional clause Part I on how the council will work to meet boat dwellers needs.</li> <li>• New Part L which clarifies where housing development will come forward in the spatial area.</li> <li>• A factual cross reference in new Part M on the expected capacity as set out in the site allocations.</li> </ul> <p>Amended supporting text in paragraph 2.13, deletion of paragraph 2.15 and addition of paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24.</p>	
SD-MM-07	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.3: King's Cross and Pentonville Road Spatial Strategy diagram	Update to map to reflect changes to site allocations.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.
SD-MM-08	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP3: Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site, parts A, B, C,	Modifications to Part A to be positively prepared and justified and to cross-reference to other relevant policies. Changes also clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E.	Screened in. Assessment necessary.

		D, E, F, G and H, and supporting text paragraphs 2.31, 2.32, 2.35 and 2.36	<p>Update to part C to add reference to research and development uses in the same context as office uses to ensure consistency with other modifications.</p> <p>Updated parts A to D to reflect the modifications regarding office co-location (examination library reference INS15).</p> <p>Deletion of former parts E, F and G (examination library reference INS15).</p> <p>Addition of new Part H which adds the office delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.</p> <p>Updates to paragraph 2.31 and 2.32 and new paragraph in relation to UCO changes and to provide relevant context to the function of the LSIS in light of changes to Parts A and C.</p> <p>Deletion of paragraph 2.36 for consistency with other policy changes (examination library reference INS15).</p>	
SD-MM-09	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.4: Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site Spatial	Boundary to LSIS updated for effectiveness taking into account residential sites as set out in note LBI18.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.

		Strategy diagram		
SD-MM-10	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP4: Angel and Upper Street, part E and I and new parts Q and R and supporting text paragraph 2.52	<p>Amendments to policy in relation to housing in the town centre. Amendment to Part E to ensure clarity regarding the approach to residential in Specialist Shopping Areas (SSAs) and related changes to Part Q to be positively prepared and justified by providing additional text on role of residential in the spatial area.</p> <p>Clarification to part I in relation to changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Addition of Part R which adds the office and housing delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.</p> <p>Update to paragraph 2.52 to provide updated text in relation to Crossrail 2.</p>	Screened in. Assessment necessary.
SD-MM-11	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.5: Angel and Upper Street Spatial Strategy diagram	<p>To reflect the inclusion of new site allocations, KC8, OIS28, OIS30 and the amended boundary for site allocation OIS24.</p> <p>Please see Site Allocation modifications for further details.</p>	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.
SD-MM-12	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP5: Nag's Head and Holloway, part E, part K and new Part	<p>Amendment to Part E to provide clarification for consistency with modification to Site Allocation NH1.</p> <p>Amendment made to Part I for clarity.</p>	Policy modifications to Part E to reflect the change in emphasis for residential development on site allocation NH1 from retail-led mixed use to mixed-use development with a greater proportion of

		<p>O and supporting text at paragraph 2.58.</p>	<p>Addition to Part K in response to Matter 2 to be positively prepared and justified by providing text which ensures impacts on existing businesses and residents are considered.</p> <p>Addition of Part N to be positively prepared and justified by providing additional text on role of residential in the spatial area, in response to Matter 2.</p> <p>Addition of Part O which adds the office and housing delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.</p> <p>Change to paragraph 2.58 related to amendment to Part E to provide clarification for consistency with modification to Site Allocation NH1.</p>	<p>housing. The amendments are assessed under Site Allocation NH1 - see screening in table 1.4 below. No further assessment on this needed.</p> <p>Changes to Part I to cross reference policy elsewhere in the plan and no assessment required.</p> <p>Change to Part K includes modification to consider effects on neighbours and businesses is not considered likely to affect the minor positive effects already identified in relation to objective 4.</p> <p>Change to Part N is not considered that adding reference to utilising upper floors for housing and windfall sites will change the minor positive effects already identified in relation to objective 5.</p> <p>The factual cross reference in part O to delivery figures does not have an effect.</p>
SD-MM-13	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.6: Nag's Head and Holloway Spatial Strategy diagram	Updated map for effectiveness to reflect changes to site allocations.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.

SD-MM-14	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP6: Finsbury Park and supporting text at paragraph 2.70.	<p>Addition to Part C to ensure clarity regarding the approach to residential in Specialist Shopping Areas.</p> <p>Reference to 'CAZ satellite' removed from part D to ensure policy is justified. Update to Part D to reflect changes to Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Amendment to part E to be positively prepared and justified in relation to residential use in the spatial area.</p> <p>Amendment made to Part M to ensure the policy is effective in protecting heritage assets in neighbouring boroughs.</p> <p>Addition of Part P which adds the office and housing delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text to ensure consistency with changes to FP6 and reflect changes to Use Classes Order.</p>	<p>Change to Part C in relation to SSA will have no effect on assessment</p> <p>Update to Part D which removes the reference to Finsbury Park as a CAZ 'satellite' is considered to have no effect on the assessment, as reference to the town centre as a potential business location remains. The updates to references following changes to the Use Classes Order do not change the policy approach, no further assessment is necessary.</p> <p>The change to Part E is not considered to change the minor positive effect already identified in relation to objective 5.</p> <p>The screening has identified the addition to criteria M of the policy does not need assessment as it is not considered to change the assessment and minor positive effects identified in relation to objective 3.</p> <p>The factual cross reference in Part P to delivery figures does not have an effect.</p> <p>No additional effects identified from supporting text changes.</p>
SD-MM-15	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.7: Finsbury Park Spatial	Updated for effectiveness to reflect changes to site allocation.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements

		Strategy diagram		for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.
SD-MM-16	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP7: Archway and supporting text at paragraph 2.83 and 2.84	<p>Modification to Part B to delete references within Policy SP7 to Archway cultural quarter.</p> <p>Update to Part F to reflect changes to Use Class Order.</p> <p>Additional Part N added to be positively prepared and justified by providing additional text on role of residential in the spatial area.</p> <p>Addition of Part O which adds the office and housing delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.</p> <p>Changes made to supporting text for consistency with changes to policy and following changes to Use Classes Order.</p>	<p>The removal of the reference to the cultural quarter is not considered to change the effects identified in the assessment overall with other aspects of Policy SP7 contributing positive effects. The town centre will remain the focus of development for commercial and cultural uses despite removal of the cultural quarter designation. The change and other changes relating to cultural policy are considered under the assessment of policy R10.</p> <p>The change to part F is a factual change to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and does not have an effect.</p> <p>Change to Part N adding reference to windfall sites is not considered to change the minor positive effects already identified in relation to objective 5.</p> <p>The factual cross reference in Part O to delivery figures does not have an effect.</p> <p>No additional effects identified from supporting text changes.</p>

SD-MM-17	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.8: Archway Spatial Strategy diagram	Map updated for effectiveness to reflect changes to site allocations.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.
SD-MM-18	Area Spatial Strategies	Policy SP8: Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	Additional Part H added to be positively prepared and justified by providing additional text on role of residential in the spatial area.  Addition of Part I which adds the office and housing delivery figures for the spatial policy area from the Site Allocations document for effectiveness.	Screened in. Assessment required.
SD-MM-19	Area Spatial Strategies	Figure 2.9: Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway Spatial Strategy diagram	Updated map for effectiveness to reflect amendments to site allocations.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation screening for further details.
SD-MM-20	Thriving communities	Policy H1: Thriving Communities	Updates and cross references added for effectiveness.  Modifications to Part M to ensure consistency with changes to Policy H6 and delete requirement for student bursaries.  Modifications to parts N and Q to ensure policy is positively prepared.	Further assessment is not considered necessary for the factual changes and changes to provide cross references. Changes to policies in H1 as the strategic housing policy, reflect changes to other detailed housing policies.  The removal of policy for student bursaries and approach to purpose built student are

			Change to part R reflects changes to policy H12.	considered under Policy H6 so no further assessment required.
SD-MM-21	Thriving communities	Policy H2: New and existing conventional housing, Parts A, C, F, G and H and supporting text paragraphs 3.29, 3.34 and 3.35	<p>Modification made to Part A to be positively prepared and set out the overall housing requirement for the Plan period.</p> <p>Modification made to Part C to include supporting text from paragraph 3.29 for soundness and consistency with the London Plan. Policy restructured for clarity. Supporting text restructured for clarity. Modification made to part (i) make policy positive worded.</p> <p>Modification made to part F make policy positively prepared.</p> <p>Amendments to part G necessary for effectiveness.</p> <p>Modification for soundness to delete entire Part H (examination library ref: INS14).</p> <p>Modification to make supporting text positively worded in line with modification to part F.</p> <p>Modification for soundness to delete entire paragraph 3.35 in relation to removal of Part H.</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.
SD-MM-22	Thriving communities	Policy H3: Genuinely affordable housing	Modifications to Part B, C, D, E, F, G, J and new part I and supporting text to ensure the plan is justified and for effectiveness.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the modifications to the policy would not change the significant positive effects previously identified. The changes add a degree of flexibility, but are not

		And supporting text at paragraphs 3.44, 3.45, 3.46, 3.47, 3.48, 3.49, 3.51, 3.60, 3.61, 3.62 and 3.63.	This includes modifications to make clear the level of affordable housing requirements required for private and public sector ownership sites, setting out the exceptional circumstances when viability evidence maybe accepted, additions to clarify the portfolio approach and off site contributions and revisions to the policy for the application of vacant building credit.	considered to change the effects already identified in the assessment.
SD-MM-23	Thriving communities	Policy H4: Delivering high quality housing and supporting text at paragraphs 3.71, 3.73-3.76 and 3.89	<p>Modification made to Part A for soundness as not all parts of Policy H4 are relevant to Policy H6 and H10.</p> <p>Modification to Part B to reflect London Plan. Also modification required to move paragraph 3.74 into policy.</p> <p>Modification made to part J to make policy positively prepared.</p> <p>Modification of paragraph 3.71 for effectiveness to differentiate Approved Document M Category M4(3)(2)(a) and M4(3)(2)(b)</p>	<p>The changes to Part B regarding tenure have removed the ability to clearly apply the requirement for 10% Wheelchair Accessible Units (WAU) to be made accessible (M4(3)(2)(b) for all tenures from the outset.</p> <p>Whilst there is potential for short term effects, as some homes would be adaptable on completion rather than accessible, should the need arise Part B maintains the ability to deliver the same overall percentage of units. Therefore long term effects and overall effects remain the same..</p>

			<p>Modification for soundness to delete paragraphs 3.73- 3.76.</p> <p>Modifications to paragraph 3.89 made for soundness and to justify policy approach with the additional supporting text added which provides an example of where dual aspect may be considered impossible.</p>	Regarding paragraph 3.89 further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-24	Thriving communities	Policy H6: Purpose-built student accommodation and supporting text paragraphs 3.99, 3.100 and 3.101, 3.105, 3.106 and 3.107	<p>Amendment proposed to Part A to clarify approach to student accommodation provision on university campus' as part of master planned approach.</p> <p>Three modifications made for soundness to Part B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first, to reduce the amount of bedspaces to be made accessible for wheelchairs from 10% to 5% and to change the requirement to easily adaptable for occupation from accessible from the outset.</li> <li>• The second change to Part B to completely remove the policy requirement for financial contributions for bursaries to be made for students.</li> <li>• The third to bring the temporary use of student accommodation for ancillary uses in line with London Plan policy.</li> </ul>	Screened in. Assessment required.
SD-MM-25	Thriving communities	Policy H7: Meeting the needs of	Amendments to Part A and Part C made to be positively prepared and justified and consistent with	The amendments add reference to a strategic element of need (the London Plan benchmark) to be considered which could

		vulnerable older people, Parts A, C and F  Supporting text, paragraphs 3.108 to 3.109	the London Plan, providing reference to relevant benchmark figure for Islington.  Amendments made to supporting text to be positively prepared, justified and consistent with the London Plan.	lead to more older peoples housing proposals coming forward. The policy emphasis on meeting local needs for affordable older persons accommodation remains. There is no change in positive effects considered to occur for the changes made to policy and no further assessment is necessary.
SD-MM-26	Thriving communities	Policy H10: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), Parts A and C  Supporting text paragraphs 3.129 and 3.130	Amendments made to Part A to be consistent with other policies in the Plan.  Amendments made to Part C which ensure it is positively prepared, justified and consistent with the London Plan in respect to application of the affordable housing policy.  Amendments made to supporting text to be positively prepared, justified and consistent with the London Plan.	No further assessment necessary. The changes made to policy are not considered to change the effects identified previously.
SD-MM-27	Thriving communities	Policy H11: Purpose Built Private Rented Sector development, Part A  Supporting text, paragraphs	Various amendments to be positively prepared and justified and consistent with the London Plan including reduction in covenant period from 50 years to 15 years, reference to partnership management arrangements, amendment of tenancy notice period and more positive policy approach.	The effects of the additional flexibility added through amendments are uncertain and are not considered to change the effects already identified. No further assessment necessary.

		3.139, 3.141-3.142		
SD-MM-28	Thriving communities	<p>Policy H12: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation, part A</p> <p>Supporting text, paragraphs 3.146-3.150</p>	<p>Amendment made to Part A to revise the identified need figure down from 10 pitches to 6 gypsy and traveller pitches to reflect London Plan paragraph 3.148 and the need figure which reflects Government's Planning Policy for Travellers definition. Amendment also made to remove references to exploring sites through use of own land/sub-regional working and replaced with reference to allocation of suitable sites as set out in Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Amendment made to Part B for effectiveness and consistency.</p> <p>Clarifications and updates to the supporting text.</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.
SD-MM-29	Thriving communities	<p>Policy SC1: Social and Community Infrastructure, Part A, new Criterion C</p> <p>Supporting text, paragraphs 3.154 and 3.165</p>	<p>Amendment made to Part A to clarify the Council will support proposals for new or extended community infrastructure subject to an assessment of need.</p> <p>Addition of Criterion C and supporting text to clarify the Council's approach following amendments to the Use Classes Order and introduction of Class E</p> <p>Amendment made to Criterion I (formerly E) and update to supporting text to reflect updated</p>	<p>No further assessment necessary. The amendment to part A is not considered to change the effects identified in the original assessment.</p> <p>The addition of Criterion C and amendment to Criterion E are not considered to change the positive effects already identified through the protection of social and community infrastructure.</p> <p>No further assessment necessary regarding</p>

			Approved Document M requirements for provision of Changing Places toilets.	the amendment to Part I, this change is not considered to change the previous assessment of effects overall.
SD-MM-30	Thriving communities	Policy SC2: Play space, part A, part C	<p>Modification made to Part A for effectiveness to reflect requirements for maintenance set out within paragraph 3.169 in the policy.</p> <p>Modification made to Part C for effectiveness, to explain how unrestricted access to replacement play space under part A is to be secured.</p>	The screening has identified that further assessment of modifications to Parts A and C are not considered necessary as the amendments to policy would not change the effects previously identified.
SD-MM-31	Thriving communities	<p>Policy SC3: Health Impact Assessment, part B and part D</p> <p>Supporting text, paragraphs 3.178</p>	<p>For effectiveness, modification made to require Health Impact Assessments to be submitted at the planning stage.</p> <p>For effectiveness addition of Part D made adding a clause to secure any measures identified within the HIA.</p> <p>Clarification made to reference to guidance in supporting text.</p>	The screening has identified that further assessment of modifications to Parts B and D are not considered necessary as the amendments to policy would not change the effects previously identified.
SD-MM-32	Thriving communities	Policy SC4 Promoting Social Value as well as deleting paragraphs 3.179-3.184 inclusive	Policy removed, not justified.	Further assessment of removal of Policy SC4 is not considered necessary as the removal of the policy would not change the effects previously identified. Policy SC4 has no effect against delivery of any of the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. While the policy does encourage all development to maximise social value and, for certain development, set out exactly what social value is added by the development, there

				are no explicit requirements attached to the policy.
SD-MM-33	Inclusive economy	<p>Policy B1 (modifications added to Parts B, C, D and E)</p> <p>Supporting text paragraphs 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 and 4.14</p>	<p>Updated business floorspace need referenced and addition of appropriate references to relevant policies.</p> <p>Change to Part B and reference to efficient use of land introduced replacing reference to maximisation made for effectiveness/clarity.</p> <p>Update to Part E to clarify the Council's approach following amendments to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text for effectiveness and to clarify approach following changes to Use Classes Order.</p>	<p>The updated business floorspace need figure has been added to part C for clarity and to provide context to the policy. No assessment necessary.</p> <p>The amendments to Parts B provide updated wording in relation to making an efficient use of land. This is not considered to change the effects of assessment already undertaken.</p> <p>The amendment to Part E introduces cross references to the relevant policy approaches to new industrial uses. These changes are considered in further assessments for policies B2, B3 and SP3.</p> <p>Updates to support not considered to change effects previously identified.</p>
SD-MM-34	Inclusive economy	<p>Policy B2 part A, C, D, E, F and G and supporting text new paragraphs and amendments to paragraphs 4.23, 4.24, 4.31</p>	<p>Modifications to Part A in relation to Use Classes Order changes. Other changes to Part A to be positively prepared and to cross-refer to other relevant policies related to business floorspace provision and the relevant spatial areas.</p> <p>Modifications to Part C updated to be positively prepared and justified, to cross-reference to other relevant policies as well as allow for co-location of offices and research and development uses.</p> <p>Reference added to research and development uses</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.

			<p>in the same context as office uses to ensure consistency with other modifications.</p> <p>New clause Part D provides a cross reference to other relevant policies to clarify approach to proposals for industrial uses with significant vehicle movements and air quality in LSIS. Additional paragraph added to supporting text.</p> <p>Updates to part E to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and provide cross references to other relevant policies.</p> <p>New paragraphs after paragraph 4.17 and after paragraph 4.23 and amendments to supporting text to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and use of conditions to secure new light industrial floorspace.</p> <p>To clarify the policy approach to business floorspace design with the addition of words 'wherever possible' in paragraph 4.31 in relation to the list of design features.</p>	
SD-MM-35	Inclusive economy	Figure 4.1: Local Plan Business Designations	Update to reflect amended LSIS boundary	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-36	Inclusive economy	Policy B3 Part B, C and D	Update to part B (i) to add clarification on vacancy requirements. Addition of new criteria B (iii) to	Screened in. Assessment required.

		Supporting text, paragraphs 4.33 and 4.36	<p>provide an alternate route to redeveloping land to non-business floorspace.</p> <p>New Part C for effectiveness and for clarification.</p> <p>Amendment to Part D which splits the clause into two parts in relation to marketing for industrial uses inside and outside of LSISs. Modifications also made as a result of UCO changes.</p> <p>Updated office need figure added to paragraph 4.33 in line with modification to Policy B1, part C and updates to reflect changes in policy in paragraph 4.33 and 4.40.</p> <p>Change to paragraph 4.36 to reflect updates to Policy E4 in line with the London Plan.</p>	
SD-MM-37	Inclusive economy	Policy B4 Parts A, B, C, G and H Supporting text, paragraphs 4.44 - 4.51	Further modifications made to Policy B4 for effectiveness and to be justified to introduce higher policy thresholds for the affordable workspace requirements to be triggered in town centres outside Angel, LSIS and PELS in response to updated viability evidence. The thresholds and requirements remain the same for proposals within the CAZ, Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP area, CAZ fringe Spatial Strategy areas (Angel and Upper Street; and Kings Cross and Pentonville Road). Clarity introduced for proposals over 10,000sqm where space will be sought in perpetuity.	Whilst some of the thresholds have been amended which could affect the number of circumstances in which affordable workspace is secured, it is not considered to change the effects already identified and further assessment is not considered necessary. It is noted that the threshold has not changed in the CAZ which is where significant levels of new office floorspace are expected to be delivered.

			<p>Further modification made to Policy B4 Part A changing the application of the policy from gross uplift in floorspace to net uplift in floorspace in response to refurbishment. Reference to 'at least 20 years' also removed.</p> <p>New part G added in relation to provide clarification in relation to viability assessments.</p> <p>New Part H added to clarify approach to financial contributions.</p> <p>Addition of new Part I which moves supporting text paragraph 4.48 into policy for effectiveness.</p> <p>Update in relation to UCO changes in Part A.</p> <p>Various amendments to the supporting to reflect the policy changes and changes to the use classes order as well as other clarifications.</p>	<p>The addition of Part I from the supporting text para 4.48 does not change the effects already identified and does not require an assessment.</p> <p>The addition of Part G and Part H do not change the effects already identified.</p>
SD-MM-38-39	Inclusive economy	Footnotes 25-26	Footnotes updates a clarification and to reflect changes to use classes order.	No further assessment required – modifications are not considered to change effects previously identified in relation to policy B4.
SD-MM-40	Inclusive economy	Affordable workspace contributions formula	Updates to reflect changes to Use Classes Order.	Factual update. No change in effects and no further assessment required.
SD-MM-41	Inclusive economy	Policy B5 Part A, B and C.	Modification made to Part A of policy to change threshold from 500sqm to 1,000sqm for non-residential uses only. Other uses threshold remain	The changes to are not considered to change the effects previously identified. No further assessment necessary.

			<p>same. Policy Parts A and B combined to avoid repetition.</p> <p>Update to Part B to be justified and effective, and consistency with Planning Obligations SPD. Clarification that Part B applies to all major developments.</p>	
SD-MM-42	Inclusive economy	Policy R1: Retail, leisure and services, culture and visitor accommodation and supporting text	<p>Changes made to Parts C, E and G clarifies the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Modification to Part G for effectiveness and consistency with changes to other retail policies. Part G now includes reference to 'commercial units' as well as shops.</p> <p>Amendment made to Policy R1 part F for soundness which reflects a more positive approach to residential uses in town centres in respect to NPPF para 86. Wording has been changed to not discourage residential uses on upper floors in town centres and that this applies to the whole of town centres including the Primary Shopping Area.</p> <p>Update to Part H for effectiveness and consistency with policy R7 which clarifies the SSAs and adds reference to protecting retail use on upper floors in SSAs.</p>	<p>No further assessment necessary for Part C or E.</p> <p>No further IIA assessment is necessary for Policy R1 Part F. This policy change is considered in full against policy R3.</p> <p>No further assessment necessary for the modification to part G which does not change the approach and adds reference to 'commercial units' as well as 'retail units' in order to ensure small commercial units are promoted in light of the ability for retail units to change to other E uses. Related changes to supporting text are same. Part G's removal of reference to ancillary space is considered below against the same change made in Policy R3 and Policy R4.</p> <p>No further assessment necessary for Part H. The modification does not change the approach to protecting retail across all floors in the SSAs.</p>

			<p>Updates to part N for effectiveness to refer to policies map and for consistency to delete references to Archway as cultural quarter.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text for effectiveness, for consistency with other policy changes and to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order</p>	<p>No further assessment necessary for change to Part N because the amendment makes reference to the Policies Map for the boundaries of the Cultural Quarters but does not alter the approach.</p> <p>Further assessment for the removal of Archway cultural quarter is considered as part of assessment set out against Policy R10.</p> <p>No further assessment necessary for amendment to paragraph 4.64 which adds factual reference to figures for retail need figure and does not change the policy approach.</p> <p>Other changes to supporting text respond to the amendments to the Use Classes Order and updating referencing.</p>
SD-MM-43	Inclusive economy	Policy R2: Primary Shopping Areas and supporting text, paragraphs 4.86 – 4.91	<p>Modifications to clarify the Council’s approach following the amendments to the Use Classes Order and for effectiveness.</p> <p>Clarification at Part B of approach to new retail development in the PSA and how this will be secured.</p> <p>Modifications to parts D and E for soundness to clarify approach to for applications for change of use from conditioned E uses to other E uses and from E</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.

			<p>uses to other main town centre uses at ground floor in PSAs.</p> <p>Update to part F clarifies approach to change of use to residential.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text to clarify approach following changes to the Use Classes Order, for effectiveness and consistency with other policy changes.</p>	
SD-MM-44	Inclusive economy	Policy R3: Islington's Town Centres and supporting text	<p>Policy title updated for effectiveness. Related retail hierarchy headings also added through policy.</p> <p>Other updates to respond to changes to the Use Classes Order, for effectiveness, to be justified and positively prepared.</p> <p>Modification to Part B adds reference to Part F which focuses on edge of centre/out of centre locations for clarity and effectiveness so that Part B refers to the whole retail hierarchy in different parts of Policy R3.</p> <p>Modification removes reference to 'Class E uses' in Part C (ii). Part C criteria updated, in particular part i, vi and use of ancillary floorspace for effectiveness.</p> <p>Part D has been updated for effectiveness to make clear the priority development type in the CAZ and to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.

			<p>Modifications to Part F to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and remove the word 'detailed' in for consistency.</p> <p>Update to part G to be positively prepared and effective in relation to residential development in town centres including criteria in relation to ancillary use and removal of vacancy criteria.</p> <p>Modification to Part H to more positively address housing not involving change of use of main town centre uses.</p> <p>Updates to paragraphs 4.92-4.96 and 4.100 to reflect changes to the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order</p> <p>New text at paragraph 4.97 in relation to impact assessments added for clarity and effectiveness.</p> <p>Updates to paragraphs 4.98 and 4.99 to be effective and positively prepared.</p>	
SD-MM-45	Inclusive economy	Policy R4: Local Shopping Areas and supporting text	<p>Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Modification to add reference to policies map in Part A for clarity and effectiveness.</p> <p>Modification to add reference to Appendix 1 in Part B for clarity and effectiveness.</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.

			<p>Modification to Part C to reference relevant part of Policy R3 for clarity and brevity. Modification clarifies the approach in respect to use of impact assessments.</p> <p>Modification to Part D to be positively prepared in relation to residential uses. This includes removal of text relating to 'ancillary space' Part E(v).</p> <p>Update to part E to reflect changes to Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text for effectiveness and to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.</p>	
SD-MM-46	Inclusive economy	Policy R5: Dispersed retail and leisure uses and supporting text	<p>Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order</p> <p>Modifications amend reference to 'operational and ancillary space' and revises marketing criteria (Part A and B) for effectiveness. New part B added to clarify approach to conditioning new retail development to provide essential daily goods following changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Modification to part C revised to reflect a more positive approach to residential in dispersed locations in respect to NPPF paragraph 86.</p>	No further assessment necessary. The changes clarify the Council's approach following amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E but are not considered to change the effects previously assessed.

			Updates to supporting text to reflect changes to Use Classes Order.	
SD-MM-47	Inclusive economy	Policy R6 and supporting text	Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order	No further assessment necessary. The changes clarify the Council's approach following amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E but are not considered to change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-48	Inclusive economy	Policy R7 and supporting text	<p>Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order</p> <p>Modification adding a cross reference to marketing requirements set out in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Modification inserts new Part D to clarify approach to residential in each SSA.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text in response to changes to the Use Classes Order and to define the Specialist Shopping Areas for clarity and effectiveness.</p> <p>Modification to supporting text at paragraph 4.125 to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order include Camden Walk and Charlton Place into the Camden Passage SSA for clarity.</p> <p>Modification to supporting text which adds paragraph 4.126 to specifically define the extent of the SSAs for clarity and effectiveness.</p>	<p>No further assessment necessary in respect to amendments as a result of changes to the Use Classes Order and cross references.</p> <p>For Policy R7 the modification at Part D differs from the approach to residential use in the rest of the town centre because the requirements in SSAs also relate to all floors and ancillary space so the approach has not changed in SSAs therefore no further assessment is necessary.</p> <p>No further assessment needed in relation to the supporting text changes as the modification just corrects the names of the streets included in the SSAs. No further assessment needed as modification clarifies extent of the SSAs through addresses but does not change the approach.</p>

SD-MM-49	Inclusive economy	Policy R8	<p>Modification to remove reference to estate agents in Part A and reworded to make the policy positively prepared.</p> <p>Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order</p>	<p>No assessment necessary as the removal of reference to estate agents does not have an effect.</p> <p>The proposed change that introduces reference to overconcentration of Class E uses is not considered to have sufficient effects to require an assessment</p>
SD-MM-50	Inclusive economy	Policy R9 and supporting text	<p>Modifications to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and to cross reference relevant glossary definition.</p>	<p>No assessment necessary. The modifications provide updates as a result of the Use Classes Order 2020 amendments and cross references to relevant definitions in the glossary – they are not considered to change the previous assessment.</p>
SD-MM-51	Inclusive economy	Policy R10 and supporting text	<p>Modifications to part A and B for effectiveness in relation to new cultural uses and for proposals outside of the CAZ and Town Centres.</p> <p>Update to part C to clarify expectations for marketing of cultural uses.</p> <p>Update to part D to reflect that fact that other policies consider amenity impacts.</p> <p>Modifications made to supporting text to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, for effectiveness and consistency with other modifications. This includes a modification to delete reference in paragraph 4.144 to cultural quarter designation of Archway.</p>	<p>Screened in. Assessment required.</p>

SD-MM-52	Inclusive economy	Policy R11	<p>Modification to Part A for effectiveness.</p> <p>Modification clarifies marketing requirements for effectiveness.</p>	No further assessment necessary as the modifications clarify approach for effectiveness and are not considered to change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-53	Green infrastructure	Policy G1 and supporting text	Modification for effectiveness and consistency with the London Plan to exclude B2 general industry and B8 storage and distribution uses from the urban greening factor assessment requirement.	Overall the modification is not considered to affect the significant positive effect previously identified. No further assessment necessary.
SD-MM-54	Green infrastructure	Policy G2: Protecting Open Space and supporting text	<p>Modifications to Part A, first sentence, and Part D: to be positively prepared.</p> <p>The modification to Part A spans three policies in the Local Plan (SP2, BC4 and G2) and provides clarification on how proposals for moorings and facilities to support moorings should be approached.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text for consistency and effectiveness with changes to the policy.</p>	<p>The rephrasing to make positively prepared these are not considered to change the effects previously assessed.</p> <p>For the modifications in relation to moorings and associated facilities the effects of this have been assessed in related policies SP2 and BC4.</p> <p>The modification stating open space is both investigated and secured this is not considered to change the effects identified in the previous assessment of the policy.</p> <p>The modification ensures the supporting text reflects the Policy and ensures internal consistency – this does not affect the results of the previous assessment of the policy. ..</p>
SD-MM-55	Green infrastructure	Policy G4, parts B and H	Modification for effectiveness and to reflect London Plan and SINC hierarchy setting out the level of	Screened in. Assessment required

		and supporting text	<p>protection commensurate to the different SINC values and mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>Update to part H For effectiveness to clarify when a financial contribution is required.</p> <p>Update to supporting text for effectiveness to provide clarity when a landscape design strategy will be required.</p> <p>Modification to remove the reference in paragraph 5.34 that larger extensions may be defined as less than 100sqm in relation to landscape design strategies.</p>	
SD-MM-56	Green infrastructure	Figure 5.2: Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) designation	<p>Revision to correct an error and to improve accuracy of mapping. See Policies Map Changes for full explanation.</p> <p>To correct an inaccuracy and show Skinner Street Open Space as a Site In Nature Conservation (SINC) for effectiveness.</p>	The site boundary has been amended to reflect improved mapping that has been made available following completion of the development. This is a factual update and is does not require an assessment.
SD-MM-57	Green infrastructure	Policy G5: Green Infrastructure, supporting text, paragraphs 5.51 and 5.52	Modifications to clarify that intensive and semi-intensive green roofs are not always accessible as amenity space, and may be acceptable if they prioritise biodiversity.	No further assessment necessary, the screening does not consider the modification will change the effects to require an assessment, the policy and supporting text continue to prioritise biodiversity-based extensive green roofs.
SD-MM-58	Sustainable design	Policy S1: Delivering Sustainable	Modifications for effectiveness to clarify that gas CHP is no longer considered to be 'low carbon' and that the use of low-emission CHP systems will only	Screened in. Further assessment required.

		Design, supporting text, Paragraphs 6.9, 6.10, 6.11	be acceptable in exceptional circumstances to support the expansion of area-wide heat networks.	
SD-MM-59	Sustainable design	S2 Part D (iii) and insert supporting text after paragraph 6.19	<p>Amendment to add reference to legal agreement in line with policy S4 part G to clarify how the fee will be collected and ensure effectiveness.</p> <p>Numbering of bullet points also amended to correct error.</p> <p>Modification to add additional text to explain the application of the monitoring fee to ensure the policy is justified and effective.</p>	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-60	Sustainable design	Policy S5: Energy Infrastructure, part A, C and D and supporting text	<p>Modification for effectiveness to Part A and reference to the BEIS dataset instead of DUKES to ensure a development's future carbon emissions are captured.</p> <p>Modification for effectiveness to clarify the policy approach to larger minor new-build developments following amendments to Part D (formally Part C).</p> <p>Amendment to Part D for effectiveness to clarify that low carbon heating systems, including ASHPs, are prioritised over gas boilers for minor new-build developments with an individual heating system.</p> <p>Modifications to paragraphs 6.60 to 6.67 for effectiveness</p>	Screened in. Assessment required.

			<p>New paragraph 6.69 to clarify the requirements for minor new-build developments with an individual heating system following the amendments to Part D (formerly part C).</p> <p>New paragraph 6.70 to clarify when direct electric heating and ultra-low NOx gas boilers may be considered for individual heating systems.</p> <p>Amended wording to paragraph 6.73 (formerly 6.71) in line with change to S5 Part A which replaced reference to DUKES with BEIS energy projections for effectiveness.</p> <p>Update to paragraphs 6.77 and 6.78 (formerly 6.75) to ensure effectiveness in terms of whole life-cycle assessment to allow this to be effective prior to further guidance being published.</p> <p>Amended wording to paragraph 6.79 (formerly 6.76) to clarify that the 'cut-off point' referred to in this paragraph is in line with S5, Part G to ensure the policy is effective. This paragraph also amended to take account of lettering change due to addition of new Part C.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.80 (formerly 6.77) and the references to CIL updated to ensure effectiveness and to clarify the distinction between costs of connecting to a heat network and costs of heat network development.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

SD-MM-61	Sustainable design	S7 Part D and F and supporting text paragraphs 6.92 and 6.101	<p>Size thresholds for Air Quality Positive applications amended for consistency with London Plan.</p> <p>Modification adds reference to Part F regarding financial contributions to ensure the effectiveness of the policy. Further detail provided on financial contributions in paragraph 6.92 to ensure the effectiveness of the policy.</p> <p>Modification adds a cross reference in new paragraph 6.101 to Policy PLAN1 and the impacts of overshadowing of solar panels, particularly in terms of canal boats etc. to ensure the effectiveness of the policy.</p>	The modifications do not change the results of the original assessment and no further assessment is necessary.
SD-MM-62	Sustainable design	S8 Part D and paragraph 6.118	Modification to add reference to the Exception Test in Policy S8 Part D to ensure effectiveness and consistency with national policy.	This modification is a clarification and will not change the effects already identified. No further assessment necessary.
SD-MM-63	Sustainable design	S8 (including footnote 39) and supporting text paragraph 6.116	<p>Modification to update Table 6.4 Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification to ensure consistency with national policy following updates to the NPPF. Table 6.4 has been amended to reflect Annex 3 of the updated NPPF, pages 74-75.</p> <p>References in supporting text paragraph 6.116 updated to reflect updates to NPPF paragraphs 161 and 162 to take account of 'all sources of flood risk'.</p>	Modifications to policy and supporting text are clarification, do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.

SD-MM-64	Sustainable design	Policy S9, Parts, C, G, O and supporting text paragraph 6.147	<p>Update to part C to clarify that direct and cumulative risk should be considered.</p> <p>Clarification to Part G for effectiveness to ensure major developments utilise opportunities to reduce run-off rates.</p> <p>Update to part O for effectiveness. Update to paragraph 6.147</p>	<p>Modifications to policy and supporting text are clarification, do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.</p>
SD-MM-65	Public realm and transport	Policy T1, Parts B and D and supporting text	<p>To ensure policy is effective amendment of Criterion B requires design of development to include accessible parking provision, stating that private vehicle use relating to Blue Badge Holders will not be restricted.</p> <p>Reference to taxis removed from description of private motor vehicles to help the policy to be justified.</p> <p>Addition of paragraph to supporting text which provides details of the Islington Transport Strategy, including Low Traffic Neighbourhoods</p>	<p>The amendments to criterion do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.</p> <p>The update to the supporting text in relation to the Islington Transport Strategy is factual and does not require an assessment.</p>
SD-MM-66	Public realm and transport	Policy T2, part A and supporting text former 7.11 (now 7.12),7.15 (now 7.16) and 7.17 (now 7.18)	<p>Amendment made to Part A amended for effectiveness, to include future planned sustainable transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Modifications to policy and supporting text do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.</p> <p>(Note: the modification to Policy B2 Part D in relation to air quality and industrial uses provides a cross reference to this policy and is assessed against Policy B2).</p>

SD-MM-67	Public realm and transport	Policy T3, Parts B, C, F and G and supporting text at paragraph 7.27 (now 7.28)	<p>Amendment to part B to be positively prepared and effective, ensuring essential drop-off and accessible parking is provided for new homes.</p> <p>Amendment to Part C wording to be positively prepared, to describe when parking will be allowed for non-residential development.</p> <p>Amendment to Part F to be positively prepared and effective.</p> <p>Amendment to Part G to clarify the use of financial contributions in accessible or sustainable transport initiatives where accessible parking spaces cannot be provided (formerly in supporting text). Clarifications made to paragraph 7.28.</p>	No further assessment necessary. The overall policy approach remains unchanged from and would not change the effects previously assessed
SD-MM-68	Public realm and transport	Policy T5, part A	Clarification made for soundness and consistency with the London Plan to require delivery and servicing plans to specify how safe, clean and efficient deliveries and servicing have been facilitated.	<p>Modifications are clarification, do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.</p> <p>(Note: the modification to Policy B2 Part D in relation to air quality and industrial uses provides a cross reference to this policy and is assessed against Policy B2.)</p>
SD-MM-69	Design and heritage	Policy DH1, part C and removal of paragraph 8.5	<p>Change to Part C to clarify that protection or enhancement of a view will meet the policy objective.</p> <p>Separating clause C into two parts so that new Part D refers to protection of or enhancement of the settings of Local Landmarks.</p>	<p>The change resulting from the modification to Part C is not considered to be significant to change the overall effects in the assessment. No further assessment necessary.</p> <p>The separation of Part C into two parts reflects a change in approach to local</p>

			<p>Removal of supporting text for effectiveness as this content is covered by PLAN1</p>	<p>landmarks to reflect the fact they are not defined in the same way as protected views. The change resulting from the modification is not considered to be significant to change the overall effects in the assessment. This is related to the new Part K in Policy DH2 below.</p> <p>The removal of the supporting text at paragraph 8.5 will not change the policy requirements as the content is covered under PLAN1 therefore further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the effects previously assessed.</p>
SD-MM-70	Design and heritage	Policy DH2 Heritage Assets Conservation Areas, Parts B and J and supporting text	<p>Changes for effectiveness to Part B ensure Policy DH2 is consistent with the duty in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>Part J updated for effectiveness as views to Local Landmarks are not formally defined.</p> <p>New part K added for effectiveness, to clarify that development in proximity to Local Landmarks should protect or enhance their settings.</p> <p>Update to paragraph 8.34 for effectiveness as St John's Gate has been de-scheduled (as a historic monument). It remains a grade I listed building.</p> <p>Update to paragraph 8.35 for effectiveness.</p>	<p>The changes in relation to parts B and J are not considered to be significant to change the overall effects in the assessment. No further assessment necessary. For the policy change in relation to Local Landmarks, the modification is not considered to be significant to change the overall effects previously identified in the assessment. No further assessment necessary.</p> <p>The changes to paragraphs 8.34 and 8.35 are factual and do not require an assessment.</p>

SD-MM-71	Design and heritage	Policy DH3, Building Heights	<p>Changes to multiple parts of the policy for effectiveness and consistency with the London Plan which updates definition of tall buildings and changes related policy for buildings under 30m.</p> <p>Update to criteria to reflect that views to Local Landmarks have different level of protection to protected views.</p> <p>Updates to Part E for effectiveness with regard to protecting heritage in neighbouring boroughs and to reflect changes to policy in relation to protected views and local landmarks.</p> <p>Updates to supporting text for effectiveness.</p>	The most significant modification to DH3 is excluding buildings which are considered prominent in their context from application of the tall buildings criteria set out in part E however this is not considered to change the overall principle of a plan led approach to tall building locations and the modifications are not considered to change the overall effects in the assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SD-MM-72	Design and heritage	Policy DH5, Part D	Modifications to make the policy positively worded.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments do not change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.
SD-MM-73	Strategic infrastructure	Paragraph 9.6	Two changes made in paragraph 9.6 for effectiveness. Amendment to remove reference to CIL 123 list to be effective and reference to infrastructure costs for school places to be sought through CIL added.	<p>The first modification is a factual update and does not require assessment.</p> <p>The second modification does not require an assessment as it will not change the effects already identified.</p>

SD-MM-74	Strategic infrastructure	Paragraph 9.11	A clarification for effectiveness in relation to identifying the safeguarded Hornsey Street Re-use and recycling centre on the Policies Map.	The clarification will not change the effects already identified so no further assessment is necessary.
SD-MM-75	Strategic infrastructure	Policy ST3: Telecommunications, communications and utilities equipment, Part C and supporting text	Updates for effectiveness.	The screening has identified that the modifications do not require an assessment and will not change the effects already identified.
SD-MM-76	Monitoring	Monitoring	Amendments which provides further clarification to monitoring and updates some of the monitoring indicators.	The screening has identified that the changes are clarification and do not change the effects already identified and does not require an assessment.
SD-MM-77	Monitoring	Monitoring	Amendment to provide further clarification about how the plan will be monitored.	The screening has identified that the changes are clarification and do not change the effects already identified and does not require an assessment.
SD-MM-78	Appendices	Appendix 1	For effectiveness a table summarising the marketing and vacancy requirements for the Local plan policies is introduced.  Amendments are to add further clarity on when the marketing without vacancy is applied within Class E in the retail hierarchy.	No further assessment required for the table as it repeats the requirements set out in policy. Where necessary these have been assessed (Policies B2, B3, R2, R3 and R4).
SD-MM-79	Appendices	Appendix 2: Noise and vibration	Appendix 2 sets out how noise impacts should be considered has been updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order. A clarification has been	The screening has identified that this clarification does not change the effects

			added in relation to the examples where assessments of internal sound transfer should be considered (for example gyms and nurseries where there is residential above. There is also a clarification about how impact generating uses are considered where there are likely to be noise issues which could impact upon residential properties (below or above). This helps to provide further clarification in relation to policy DH5.	already identified and does not require an assessment.
SD-MM-80		Appendix 3 – Table A3.1	Updated in response to changes to the Use Class Order	No further assessment required. The modification is not considered to change the positive effects previously identified.
SD-MM-81-83	Appendices	Appendix 3 Appendix 4 Table A4.1	<p>New supporting paragraph to clarify the requirement for transport assessment in premises larger than 750 sqm where Class E Use is unspecified.</p> <p>New supporting paragraphs to clarify application of minimum cycle parking standards to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Proposed changes to standards to clarify the application of cycle parking responding to Use Classes Order changes, with the introduction of a standard for general Class E</p>	No further assessment required. The modification is not considered to change the positive effects previously identified
SD-MM-84	Appendices	Appendix 5: Social Value self-assessment	Appendix 5 deleted for consistency with removal Policy SC4.	No further assessment necessary as set out under the related modification for policy SC4.
SD-MM-85	Appendices	Appendix 7 Location of public open	Updated Figure A7.1: Location of public open spaces; SINCs, historic green spaces and adventure playgrounds with high resolution map which includes	The site boundary has been amended to reflect improved mapping that has been made available following completion of the

		spaces; SINC, historic green spaces and adventure playgrounds	the amendment to the SINC for 351 Caledonian Road and showing Skinner Street Open Space as SINC. To ensure consistency with Policies Map changes and for legibility. Update to correct an inaccuracy and show Skinner Street Open Space as a Site In Nature Conservation (SINC) for effectiveness.	development. This is a factual update and is does not require an assessment.
SD-MM-86 - 98	Appendices	Appendix 9: Glossary and abbreviations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated definition of business space</li> <li>• Updated definition of hybrid space</li> <li>• Updated definition of industrial floorspace</li> <li>• Updated definition of LSIS</li> <li>• Updated definition of office led development</li> <li>• Additional definition of peppercorn rent added for effectiveness and clarity.</li> <li>• Updated definition Primary Shopping Area</li> <li>• Definition of Private Open Space added effectiveness, consistent with modifications to G2.</li> <li>• Updated definition of retail uses</li> <li>• Updated definition of leisure uses</li> <li>• Definition of low traffic neighbourhoods added.</li> <li>• The Glossary includes a new definition for a shop for effectiveness, and clarifies the definition in relation to retail.</li> <li>• The Glossary includes a new definition for non-motorised transport modes</li> </ul>	The screening has identified that the changes are clarification. The modifications to the glossary will assist with the implementation of policy that has been assessed for its effects and do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.

SD-MM-99	Appendices	Add new appendix 10	New appendix which presents the housing trajectory	No assessment required as factual updates, updates to plan period taken into account in relevant modifications.
----------	------------	---------------------	--	---

**Table 1.3: Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan Modifications screening**

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
BC-MM-01	Paragraph 1.7	Change of the plan period from 2020/21-2035/36 to 2020/21-2036/37	The amendment will change the end of the plan period and this has been reflected in relevant parts of the plan which will be screened separately however this modification is not considered to have an effect and no further assessment is needed.
BC-MM-02	Figure 1.4 Open Space Map	To fix an inaccuracy and show Skinner Street Open Space as Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) for effectiveness.	No effects identified. Skinner Street SINC was never de-designated and this change corrects an inaccuracy in the map.
BC-MM-03	Policy BC1: Prioritising Office Use (including supporting text)	<p>Modifications to policy and supporting text following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E.</p> <p>Modification to add ‘non-residential institutions’ to the examples of uses which could be publicly funded uses in B1 Part D (iii).</p> <p>The modification changes one of the exceptions to Policy BC1 from applying to ‘wholly’ residential areas, to ‘predominantly’ residential areas in BC1 Part D (iv).</p> <p>New paragraph at 2.13 added clarifying the meaning of majority to mean more than 50%.</p>	No further assessment required. The modification is not considered to change the effects previously identified. The changes to Part D offer a degree of flexibility but this is not considered sufficient to affect the amount of either commercial floorspace that could be delivered or provide additional housing to change the effects previously identified.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
BC-MM-04	Footnote 10:	Provides a definition of retail and leisure uses, so users will not have to refer to the Strategic and Development Management Policies document.	This is a clarification to include an existing definition from elsewhere in the Local Plan for ease of reference. It is not considered to effect the previous assessment of the policy.
BC-MM-05	BC2 Culture, retail and leisure uses and supporting text paragraphs 2.13, 2.18-2.19.	<p>Modifications to policy and supporting text following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E.</p> <p>Modification to clarify that cultural, retail, and leisure uses are appropriate in Local Shopping Areas.</p> <p>There are changes made in Part B which clarify the application of the approach to location of cultural uses and removes the sequential test for cultural uses so as not to unnecessarily constrain development of cultural uses in the CAZ.</p> <p>Modifications to improve clarity and readability.</p>	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
BC-MM-06	Policy BC3, part G and supporting text paragraphs 3.11 and 3.17-3.18 and 3.19.	<p>Rewording of Part G to make it positively prepared.</p> <p>Update to paragraph 3.11 to clarify the Council's approach following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and the introduction of Class E.</p>	<p>The modification to Part G is not considered to require a further assessment as the modification is not considered to change the effects previously identified.</p> <p>Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments to para 3.11 and 3.17 do not</p>

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		<p>Modification to paragraph 3.17 to cross reference to the tall buildings study and to link to Policy DH3 in the Strategic and Development Management Policies.</p> <p>Modification to 3.19 which changes 'conserve and enhance' to 'conserve or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets.</p>	<p>change the policy requirements and would not change the effects previously assessed.</p> <p>The modification to paragraph 3.19 is not considered to result in a change to effects previously identified and no further assessment necessary.</p>
BC-MM-07	Figure 3.2 City Fringe Opportunity Area Spatial Strategy diagram	Replacement map to reflect the new boundary to BC10.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements for the site allocations. See Site Allocation assessment for further details.
BC-MM-08	Policy BC4 and supporting text	<p>Modifications provide clarity on approach to boater facilities and moorings and the development of a water space strategy to provide a framework for different uses on the canal.</p> <p>A change to allow that development may have some impact on leisure provision, provided the impacts can be mitigated.</p>	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
BC-MM-09	Policy BC5: Farrington and supporting text	<p>Modifications to recognise the cultural quarter in the spatial strategy areas.</p> <p>Addition of missing text to aid readability of the policy.</p>	The various modifications will not change the effects previously identified and no further assessment required.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		<p>Change of policy references is to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations.</p> <p>A modification to reflect that heritage value of the railway cuttings has not been established.</p> <p>The modification to paragraph 3.39 changes 'conserve and enhance' to 'conserve or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets, and to make consistent with policy DH2.</p>	
BC-MM-10	Figure 3.4: Farringdon Spatial Strategy diagram	Correction to include spatial strategy boundary and also to include the Clerkenwell / Farringdon Cultural Quarter on the map necessary for effectiveness.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements.
BC-MM-11	Policy BC6 part B, D and G and supporting text para 3.43	<p>Modifications at part B and paragraph 3.43 removes element of policy duplicated in policy R3 and R4.</p> <p>Modifications at part D: changes 'conserve and enhance' to 'conserve or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets, and to make consistent with policy DH2.</p> <p>Modifications at part G recognises the cultural quarter in the spatial strategy area, for</p>	<p>For part B no effects are created as the removed text is addressed by policy R3 and R4.</p> <p>Change to part D is not considered to result in a change to the effects previously identified.</p> <p>For part G the identification of the cultural quarter does not alter the policy approach.</p> <p>No further assessment necessary.</p>

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		consistency with other references within the Plan.	
BC-MM-12	Figure 3.5: Mount Pleasant and Exmouth Market Spatial Strategy diagram	To add the boundary of the cultural quarter to the spatial strategy area map. To correct an inaccuracy and show Skinner Street Open Space as a Site In Nature Conservation (SINC) for effectiveness.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements.
BC-MM-13	Policy BC7 Central Finsbury and supporting text	<p>Amended policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations.</p> <p>Changes necessary for clarity and effectiveness in Part F to state that the sports and leisure function at the Finsbury Leisure Centre will be re-provided in accordance with Strategic and Development Management Policy SC1.</p> <p>Part of the modification states that part of the Farringdon / Smithfield Cultural Quarter is within this spatial strategy area and that the Cultural Quarter is the focus for cultural uses in the AAP area.</p> <p>Modifications to move policy from supporting text into the policy box for Parts J, K and L and design criteria.</p>	<p>Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements.</p> <p>No effects for new policy references.</p> <p>Screening of the link to policy SC1 and Finsbury Leisure Centre sports and leisure function is addressed in the site allocation screening table.</p> <p>For Part G the identification of the cultural quarter aids usability but does not alter the policy approach.</p> <p>The supporting text moved into the policy box relates to design, scale, definition of space, public realm, and pedestrian and cycle connections. Moving this into policy clarifies its status in the document. This policy also works alongside other policies within the plan, including in PLAN1 in the Strategic and Development Management Policies. It is not considered the modifications</p>

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
			change the effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-15	Figure 3.6: Central Finsbury Spatial Strategy diagram	Central Finsbury Spatial Strategy diagram To add the boundary of the Cultural Quarter to the spatial strategy area map. Skinner Street SINC is also reinstated where previously omitted in error.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the amendments are factual and do not change the policy requirements.
BC-MM-15	Policy BC8 Historic Clerkenwell including supporting text	<p>Changes to A, B, F, G, and H of policy text: necessary for consistency with legislation, to provide greater clarity to the policy.</p> <p>Modification to Part A removes the reference to 'limited' commercial development and moves supporting text to the policy in part B with associated deletion at paragraph 3.68.</p> <p>The modification to Part F and paragraph 3.71 changes 'conserve and enhance' to 'conserve or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets and Policy DH2.</p> <p>Addition of Part G which encourages conversion of carriageway and parking to pedestrian space.</p> <p>Addition of part H which states that the spatial strategy area includes part of the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter and</p>	<p>The modification to part B clarifies the approach to commercial development and removes the requirement for it to be limited in scale. This is not considered to change the effects previously identified.</p> <p>The modification to Parts A and F brings the policy in line with the Statutory Duty and is not considered to result in a change to the effects previously identified for the conservation of heritage assets. No further assessment necessary.</p> <p>The modification to Part G will not change the effects already identified.</p> <p>With regard to Part H, the identification of the cultural quarter does not alter the policy approach.</p> <p>For paragraph 3.66 no effects are identified as these are factual changes related to scheduled monuments.</p>

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		<p>that this is the focus for cultural uses in the AAP area.</p> <p>Supporting text changes: 3.66: factual update (removal of reference to a scheduled monument which has been de-designated).</p>	
BC-MM-16	Figure 3.7 Historic Clerkenwell Spatial Strategy Diagram	Addition of the Clerkenwell / Farringdon Cultural Quarter.	The location of the Cultural Quarter is shown on Figure 2.2 of the Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP. Addition of the Cultural Quarter boundary on the Farringdon Spatial Strategy diagram does not change the policy designation and has no effects .
BC-MM-17	Policy AAP1: Delivering development priorities and supporting text	<p>Modifications to clarify that AAP Plan 1 applies to site allocations within the Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP area.</p> <p>Modifications to set out that when allocated uses which fall within a broader use class (i.e. office or retail uses which sit within use class E), they will be secured for the specific allocated use at planning stage.</p>	This clarification is in response to changes to the Use Classes Order. There are related policies where the impacts of class E and the need to secure specific use through condition to meet identified development needs have been assessed. No further assessment is considered necessary.
BC-MM-18	Figure 4.1 Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP site allocations (with Spatial Strategy areas identified for reference)	Replacement map to include modified BC10 boundary.	The update to the map is not considered to have any effects. The modification to Site Allocation BC10 has been assessed separately.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
BC-MM-19	Table 4.2 Site Capacity Assumptions	The table of site capacity assumptions for the Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP area has been updated to include up to date figures following changes to the plan.	No effects are identified. The amount of floorspace provided is comparable at a strategic level.
BC-MM-20	Site Allocation BC3 Islington Boat Club	Changes to the development considerations stating that the community and sporting uses should be re-provided consistent with Strategic and Development Management Policy SC1, and residential uses may be developed where they do not harm the Islington Boat Club in accordance with the agent of change principal in Policy DH5 in the Strategic and Development Management Policies.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-21	Site Allocation BC4 Finsbury Leisure Centre	Changes to the development considerations stating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development must be high quality contextual design in accordance with PLAN1 and protect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, particularly those on Norman Street and at Burnhill House, Norman Street.</li> <li>• Development should ensure re-provision the sports pitches and facilities in accordance with Policy SC1 part D in the Strategic and Development Management Policies.</li> </ul>	The cross references to other policies do not have additional effects and do alter the previous assessment of the policy. No further assessment necessary.
BC-MM-22	Site Allocation BC5: London College of	The modification states that an additional set back storey on the roof of the retained building may be appropriate.	The modifications would not change the previous effects identified and the assessment remains

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
	Fashion, Golden Lane		appropriate for this allocation. No further assessment necessary.
BC-MM-23	Site Allocation BC6: Redbrick Estate	The allocation and justification has been expanded to reflect the planning permission on the site, which is currently under construction.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-24	Site Allocation BC7: 198-208 Old Street (petrol station)	A modification to clarify that the current use may continue.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-25	Site Allocation BC8: Old Street roundabout area	Modifications which set out how TfL is redeveloping Old Street with a public realm scheme and that proposals should improve conditions and safety for cycling.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-26	Site Allocation BC10: 254-262 Old Street (east of roundabout)	Removal of a pub/bar from the site allocation.	Updated assessment required.
BC-MM-27	Site Allocation BC11: Longbow House, 14-20 Chiswell Street	<p>A modification to confirm that the existing building is over 30m.</p> <p>The modification changes 'preserve and enhance' to 'preserve or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets.</p> <p>The estimated timescale has been moved later in the plan period.</p>	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-28	Site Allocation BC12 Cass Business School, 106 Bunhill Row	A modification states that only a modest upwards extension is likely to be acceptable due to site and surrounding townscape constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
BC-MM-29	Site Allocation BC13: Car park at 11 Shire House, Whitbread Centre, Lamb's Passage	A modification to state that residential use and hotel uses are acceptable. Additional information stating the details of the extant permission.	Updated assessment required
BC-MM-30	Site Allocation BC15: Richard Cloudesley School, 99 Golden Lane	Update to planning history.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-31	Site Allocation BC16 36-43 Great Sutton Street (Berry Street)	Identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-32	Site Allocation BC17 Caxton House, 2 Farringdon Road	New planning history information setting out that construction has started on site and that the building is above 30m in height. Updates to list the view corridors which affect this site.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-33	Site Allocation BC18 Cardinal Tower, 2A, 4-12 Farringdon Road and 48-50 Cowcross Street	New planning history information setting out that construction has started on site and that the building is above 30m in height. Updates to list the view corridors which affect this site.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-34	Site Allocation BC19 Farringdon Place, 20 Farringdon Road	Modifications to change descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order and identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-35	Site Allocation BC20 Lincoln Place, 50 Farringdon Road	Modification to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order	Factual update. No effects identified.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		and identification of protected views in site constraints.	
BC-MM-36	Site Allocation BC21: 2, 4-10 Clerkenwell Road, 29-39 Goswell Road, & 1-4 Great Sutton Street	Modification to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order  The allocation has been amended to reflect the permission which is currently under construction. Details of the permission have been added.	Screened in. Refer to updated assessment.
BC-MM-37	Site Allocation BC22 Vine Street Bridge	Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations and identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-38	Site Allocation BC24 Clerkenwell Fire Station, 42-44 Rosebery Avenue	The allocation has been amended to from requiring some social and infrastructure use to encouraging active frontages at the ground floor for commercial, social infrastructure, or community use.  Development considerations amended from reference to 'conserve and enhance' heritage assets to 'conserve or enhance' heritage assets to make consistent with legislation.	Screened in. Refer to updated assessment.
BC-MM-39	Site Allocation BC25 Mount Pleasant Post Office, 45 Rosebery Avenue	Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations and identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-40	Site Allocation BC26 68-86 Farringdon Road (NCP carpark)	Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		allocations and identification of protected views in site constraints.	
BC-MM-41	Site Allocation BC27: Finsbury Health Centre and the Michael Palin Centre for Stammering	Modification to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.  Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations.  Identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-42	Site Allocation BC28: Angel Gate, Goswell Road	Modification to ensure that a listed building on site must be retained.	Screened in. Refer to the updated assessment.
BC-MM-43	Site Allocation BC29: Taylor House, 88 Rosebery Avenue	Modification to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.  Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations.  Identification of protected views in site constraints.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-44	Site Allocation BC32: Monmouth House, 58-64 City Road	New planning history information setting out that construction has started on site and that the building is above 30m in height.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-45	Site Allocation BC33: Oliver House, 51-53 City Road	A modification that states commercial uses are allowed on the ground floor to provide greater clarity.	The effects of this modification are limited in the amount of floorspace affected and are not of a

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
			scale to change the positive effects previously identified. No further assessment needed.
BC-MM-46	Site Allocation BC34: 20 Ropemaker Street, 101-117 Finsbury Pavement, 10-12 Finsbury Street	Modifications to update planning history information setting out that site has permission for a building is above 30m in height.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-47	Site Allocation BC35: Finsbury Tower, 103-105 Bunhill Row	A modification to state that the site has permission for a 28 storey tower to reflect that the permission being implemented on site is for a tall building.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-48	Site Allocation BC36: London Metropolitan Archives and Finsbury Business Centre	A modification to clarify there are two sites and the relevant uses for each site: Office uses on the Finsbury Design Centre, Cultural use/visitor attraction on the Metropolitan Archive.	The clarification setting out where the office and cultural visitor attractor uses should be located does not change the assessment. No further assessment needed.
BC-MM-49	Site Allocation BC37: Triangle Estate, Goswell Road/Compton Street/Cyrus Street	New development considerations setting out that development must not lead to unacceptable impacts on residents, and should improve the security, function, accessibility, and appearance of public realm and open space on the estate.	Screened in. Refer to updated assessment.
BC-MM-50	Site Allocation BC38: Moorfields Eye Hospital	Removal of the reference to “legacy” eye clinic facility and change to clarify that social infrastructure is to be small scale.	The modifications do not change the positive effects previously identified. The change in relation to social infrastructure is not considered

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
		Removal of the requirement that the open space must be located on Cayton Street.	to change the positive effects previously identified. No further assessment needed.
BC-MM-51	Site Allocations BC40: The Pentagon, 48 Chiswell Street	The development considerations notes that the existing building is above 30m in height.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-52	Site Allocation BC41: Central Foundation School, 15 Cowper Street, 63-67 Tabernacle Street and 19 & 21-23 Leonard Street	Changes to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.  Amendment to the allocation to reflect quantum of floorspace agreed in permission P2017/1046/FUL.	Change in relation to Use Classes Order is a factual update, no further assessment.  The modification related to the quantum of floorspace has not been identified as changing the effects. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-53	Site Allocation BC43: easyHotel, 80-86 Old Street	Amendment of estimated delivery period.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-54	Site Allocation BC44: Crown House, 108 Aldersgate Street	Changing superseded use classes to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-55	Site Allocation BC45: 27 Goswell Road	The development considerations notes that the existing building is above 30m in height.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary.
BC-MM-56	Site Allocation BC46: City, University of London, 10	A modification that identifies that permission has been granted for an extension above 30m in height.	No effects identified. Further assessment is not considered necessary. The change in relation to existing teaching facilities is not identified as having any change in

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
	Northampton Square	A modification that removes the statement that additional teaching facilities may be provided where in accordance with other planning polices as it is a redundant policy statement.	effects as this can be dealt with through other policies in the plan.
BC-MM-57	Site Allocation BC47: Braithwaite House and Quaker Court	The modification identifies a particular podium space on the estate as contributing to open space and that development which affects this space must be considered against Policy G2.	BC47 was assessed to have no effects against the protection and provision of open space objective. It is considered that the cross reference to policy G2 does not change this, providing clarification about the application of strategic policy rather than a significant change in the overall policy approach.
BC-MM-58	Site Allocation BC49 Building adjacent to railway lines and opposite	<p>Changes to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order. Updates to policy references to avoid confusion between BCAAP policies and site allocations and identification of protected views in site constraints.</p> <p>An update to current use.</p> <p>An update to development considerations to state that redevelopment will be contingent on the electrical substation being integrated or relocated if still required.</p>	Screened in. Refer to updated assessment.
BC-MM-59	Site Allocation BC50: Queen Mary University,	Changes to descriptions of use following the 2020 amendments to the Use Classes Order.	No effects identified for UCO change. Further assessment is not considered necessary.

Reference	Section/Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
	Charterhouse Square Campus	<p>Modifications to clarify that student accommodation is acceptable on university campus sites.</p> <p>The development considerations have been amended with regard to the pedestrian connection through the site.</p>	<p>The modification in relation to student housing makes a cross reference to policy H6 which is being assessed separately. No further assessment required.</p> <p>The allocation continues to encourage provision of the pedestrian link and there is no change in effects.</p>
BC-MM-60	Site Allocation BC51: Italia Conti School, 23 Goswell Road	Deletion of the requirement to justify loss of D1 use as this has been established through the planning permission for the site.	Screened in. Refer to updated assessment.
BC-MM-61	Site Allocation Monitoring	Inclusion of monitoring indicators.	The inclusion of the monitoring indicators within the plan will improve the ability of policies within the plan to be effectively implemented however it is not considered to change the effects identified in relation to different policies.
BC-MM-62	Appendix 1, Scheduled Monuments	Removal of St John's gate as a scheduled monument to reflect current status.	No effects identified. The modification does not change the designation.
BC-MM-63	Appendix 1 Heritage Assets in Historic Clerkenwell, first paragraph.	The modification changes 'protect and enhance' to 'protect or enhance' to bring it in line with the statutory duty for protecting heritage assets.	This reflects a policy change in AAP8 which brings the policy in line with the Statutory Duty and is not considered to result in a change to the effects previously identified for the conservation of heritage assets. No further assessment necessary.
BC-MM-64 to	Glossary and Abbreviations	Updated definitions of these uses in the glossary to remove reference to superseded	The screening has identified that the changes are clarification. The modifications to the glossary will

Reference	Section/Paragraph/ Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
BC-MM-69	Business, Entertainment, Industrial, Retail, Social and Community Infrastructure.	use classes and to define which uses are included.	assist with the implementation of policy that has been assessed for its effects and do not change the effects already identified and do not require an assessment.

**Table 1.4: Site Allocations Modifications Screening**

Reference	Section	Paragraph/Policy	Description	Screening Assessment
SA-MM-01	Introduction	Paragraph 1.2	Amendment to plan period reflected in text.	This clarification is not considered to require further assessment.
SA-MM-02	Introduction	Figure 1.2: Islington Spatial Strategy areas and site allocations	Update to figure to reflect changes in site allocations and the boundary of the LSIS.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations and designations which have been separately screened for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-03 and SA-MM-04	Introduction	Section 1, Policy SA1  New paragraph 1.17.  Paragraph 1.18 (formerly 1.17).	This modification updates policy SA1 and the supporting text in light of changes to the Use Classes Order to clarify the approach to allocations.	This clarification is in response to changes to the Use Classes Order. There are related policies where the impacts of Class E and the need to secure specific uses through condition to meet identified development needs have been assessed. No further assessment is considered necessary.
SA-MM-05	Introduction	Section 1, Table 1.1: List of strategic and non-strategic policies and allocations	List of strategic and non-strategic sites updated to reflect changes to site allocations and include the Barnsbury Estate as a strategic allocation due to the significant amount of housing growth it will provide. Gypsy and Traveller sites also added as the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Pitches is considered to be a strategic issue.	No further assessment considered necessary. The impacts of relevant site allocations, and strategic policies in relation to housing growth and meeting identified housing needs have been considered separately. The change in the categorisation of the allocations in Table 1.1 is in itself not considered to lead to any changes in effects.

SA-MM-06	Introduction	Section 1, Table 1.2: Site capacity assumptions	Table 1.2 amended to reflect changes made to capacity assumptions following the grant of planning permission for certain sites, as well as the addition of new site allocations and amendments to existing site allocations outlined in this schedule of modifications.	The assessment of effects of all site allocations is considered as part of the cumulative effects section. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-07	Introduction	Paragraph 1.32 (formerly paragraph 1.30)	Paragraph updated to reflect amended plan period, the housing requirement associated with that and the number of homes that need to be identified on sites of one hectare or less.	No further assessment is considered necessary to reflect clarification/factual update.
SA-MM-08	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	Table 2.1	Table 2.1 allocations in the King's Cross and Pentonville Road Spatial Strategy Area updated to include KC8: Bemerton Estate South	No further assessment necessary. This is a factual update to reflect a new site allocation the effects of which have been assessed separately.
SA-MM-09	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	Figure 2.1	Figure 2.1 showing Location of King's Cross and Pentonville Road Spatial Strategy area site allocations updated to reflect changes to site allocations.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations which have been separately screened for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-10	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	Site KC1: King's Cross Triangle Site	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, specific protected view identified and reference to concrete batching plant added for effectiveness.	The modifications are not considered to affect the overall scoring of the original assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-11	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	KC2: 176-178 York Way & 57-65 Randell's Road	Update to reflect planning permission, reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and add reference to concrete batching plant.	The modifications are not considered to change the existing assessment. No further assessment necessary.

SA-MM-12	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	KC3: Regents Wharf, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 All Saints Street	Updates to ownership details, to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and planning permission, to identify specific neighbouring residential properties and remove reference to 'limited' in relation to intensification of business use.	The modification are not considered to change the existing assessment. The removal of the word 'limited' is not considered to change the overall effects identified. The previous wording already recognised that development should respect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.
SA-MM-13	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	KC6: 8 All Saints Street	Allocation updated to identify the specific viewing corridor the site sits partially within.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment. Further assessment is unnecessary.
SA-MM-14	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	KC7: All Saints Triangle	Modification to add reference to development considerations to respect amenity of neighbouring residents.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the addition to the development considerations, would not change the effects previously assessed.
SA-MM-15	King's Cross and Pentonville Road	KC8, Bemerton Estate South, Section 2	Allocation for infill residential development, including re-provision of community space and provision of new retail/commercial spaces along Caledonian Road. An updated reference to the sites location within a Source Protection Zone has been added.	New site allocation. Further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-16	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	Table 3.1	List of Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site Spatial Strategy area site allocations updated to reflect changes to site allocations.	No further assessment necessary. This is a factual update to reflect changes to site allocations which have been screened separately.
SA-MM-17	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	Figure 3.1	Location of Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site Spatial Strategy area site allocations updated to take into account changes to sites and the boundary of the LSIS.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations and designations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.

SA-MM-18	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR1: Fayers Site, 202-228 York Way, Former Venus Printers, 22-23 Tileyard Road, adjacent 196-200 York Way	<p>Site Allocation updated to separate the site into two separate sites, with the allocation updated to reflect planning permissions on respective parts of the site.</p> <p>VR1 is now Fayers Site, 202-228 York Way, Former Venus Printers, 196-200 York Way N7 9AX, allocated for Intensification for a significant amount of B8 use alongside a small proportion of flexible office space, reflecting the extant permission.</p>	For completeness it is considered that updated assessments are required for both of the new allocations
SA-MM-19	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR2: 230-238 York Way, Allocation and justification	Allocation updated to provide for co-location of office and/or research and development use where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site and it can be demonstrated that its industrial function would remain. Cross references to other relevant policies added, as well as reference to the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits partially within. The development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height has been removed. The uses have been updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-20	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	Section 3, VR3: Tileyard Studios, Tileyard Road, N7 9AH	Allocation updated to provide for intensification of studios and offices on the site to support the music industry and related supporting sectors where it is demonstrated the flexibility of the existing spaces for studio and hybrid uses would remain, with the full functionality of the studios and any workshops/light industrial units secured and continued provision of a range of unit sites, including those for SMEs. Reference to the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits partially within added. The development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height has been removed.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-21	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR4: 20 Tileyard Road,	Allocation updated to provide for co-location of office and/or research and development use where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site and it can be demonstrated that its industrial function would remain. Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies, identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-22	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR5: 4 Brandon Road	New allocation for 22-23 Tileyard Road and part of 226-228 York Way to reflect amendment to VR1. This recognises the existing permission on the site and that should the site be subject to further amendments the co-location of office and/or research and development use should provide an intensification of industrial use on the site and it should be demonstrated that the continued industrial function of the LSIS would remain.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-23	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR6: The Fitzpatrick Building, 188 York Way, Allocation and justification	The Fitzpatrick Building, 188 York Way proposed to be deleted.	Allocation of Fitzpatrick building proposed to be deleted because the site has been subject to a development that has now been completed. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-24	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR6: 4 Brandon Road (formerly site reference VR5)	Allocation updated to provide for co-location of office and/or research and development use where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site and it can be demonstrated that its industrial function would remain. Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-25	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR7: 43-53 Brewery Road	Allocation updated to reflect planning history, changes to the Use Classes Order, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies, identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits partially within and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-26	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR8: 55-61 Brewery Road	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the use classes order, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies, identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-27	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR9: Rebond House, 98-124 Brewery Road	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-28	Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site	VR10: 34 Brandon Road	Allocation updated to provide for co-location of office and/or research and development use where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site and it can be demonstrated that its industrial function would remain. Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and to be specific to light industrial uses, provide a cross reference to other relevant policies, identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within and remove reference to the development consideration specifying a maximum 5 storey building height.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-29	Angel and Upper Street	Figure 4.1: Location of Angel and Upper Street Spatial Strategy area site allocations	Updated map of spatial strategy areas to take into account updates to site allocations.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations and designations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-30	Angel and Upper Street	AUS1 Royal Bank of Scotland	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the use classes order and identify the specific viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modifications are not considered to change the existing assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-31	Angel and Upper Street	AUS2: Pride Court, 80-82 White Lion Street	Allocation amended to reflect changes to the use classes order. The planning history and allocation and justification have also been updated following a grant of planning permission.	The modifications are not considered to change the existing assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-32	Angel and Upper Street	AUS5: 94 White Lion Street (BSG House)	Factual update to take into account changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modifications are not considered to change the existing assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-33	Angel and Upper Street	AUS6: Sainsbury's, 31-41 Liverpool Road,	Allocation updated to identify the specific viewing corridor the site sits partially within.	The modifications are not considered to change the existing assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-34	Angel and Upper Street	AUS7: 1-7 Torrens Street	Addition to the development considerations to recognise that future development should respect the amenity of adjacent residential properties, and an update to the site constraints to identify the specific viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment considered necessary.

SA-MM-35	Angel and Upper Street	AUS8: 161-169 Essex Road	<p>Update to take into account changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Changes to the allocation to recognise the opportunity for an element of residential to the rear of the site as well as a change to the allocation to recognise the use as a place of worship, whilst retaining the primary use of building for culture or assembly and leisure uses. Clarification added to development considerations in relation to marketing/vacancy evidence required.</p>	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-36	Angel and Upper Street	AUS9: 10-14 White Lion Street	<p>Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Update to planning history.</p>	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-37	Angel and Upper Street	AUS10: 1-9 White Lion Street	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-38	Angel and Upper Street	AUS12: Public Carriage Office, 15 Penton Street	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-39	Angel and Upper Street	AUS13: N1 Centre, Parkfield Street	Allocation amended to identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.

SA-MM-40	Angel and Upper Street	AUS14: 46-52 Pentonville Road	Updated to current/previous use to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-41	Angel and Upper Street	AUS16: Angel Square	Allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site sits within.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-42	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	Figure 5.1: Location of Nag's Head and Holloway Spatial Strategy area site allocations	Update to spatial strategy areas map to take into account changes to site allocations.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations and designations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-43	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH1: Morrison's supermarket and adjacent car park, 10 Hertslet Road, and 8-32 Seven Sisters Road, Allocation and justification	Modifications to increase proportion of residential on the site and clarify the use of active frontages for the site, to ensure a social and community use is protected and to ensure residential amenity is addressed. Timescales also updated.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-44	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH2: 368-376 Holloway Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.

SA-MM-45	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH3: 443-453 Holloway Road	Updates to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.  Update to planning history and estimated timescales.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-46	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH4: Territorial Army Centre, 65-69 Parkhurst Road	Update to planning history	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-47	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH6: 11-13 Benwell Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-48	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH7: Holloway Prison, Parkhurst Road	Allocation amended to updated planning history details and identify the specific protected viewing corridors the western portion of the site falls within.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-49	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH8: 457-463 Holloway Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-50	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH9: Islington Arts Factory, 2 and 2a Parkhurst Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-51	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH10: 45 Hornsey Road and 252 Holloway Road	Allocation amended to identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site partially falls within.	The modification is not considered to change the original assessment of the site. No further assessment required.

SA-MM-52	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH11: Mamma Roma, 377 Holloway Road	<p>Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>Clarification in relation to the site's location in the Primary Shopping Area added.</p> <p>Update to recognise opportunity for site assembly with neighbouring site.</p>	The modifications are not considered to change the original assessment of the site. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-53	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH12: 379-391 Camden Road and 341-345 Holloway Road	Update to ensure residential amenity is addressed.	The modification is not considered to change the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-54	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH13: 166-220 Holloway Road, Current/previous use	Allocation amended to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and proposed modifications to policy H6 on student accommodation, clarify the approach to active frontages and tall buildings, and identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site falls within.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-55	Nag's Head and Holloway Road	NH14 236-250 Holloway Road and 29 Hornsey Road, Allocation and justification	Allocation amended to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and the proposed modifications to policy H6 on student accommodation. In addition the specific protected viewing corridor the site falls partially within is identified and clarification added in relation to active frontages.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-56	Finsbury Park	Figure 6.1: Location of Finsbury Park Spatial Strategy area site allocations	Update to spatial strategy map to reflect changes to site allocations.	This is factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-57	Finsbury Park	FP1: City North Islington Trading Estate, Fonthill Road and 8-10 Goodwin Street	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-58	Finsbury Park	FP2: Morris Place/Wells Terrace (including Clifton House)	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-59	Finsbury Park	FP3: Finsbury Park Station and Island, Seven Sisters Road,	Correction to error in site size and update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-60	Finsbury Park	FP4: 129-131 & 133 Fonthill Road & 13 Goodwin Street	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and update to planning history.  Allocation modified to recognise the potential for an element of residential use.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-61	Finsbury Park	FP5: 1 Prah Road	Update to allocation to reflect residential use rather than business use, alongside removal of reference to public realm improvements.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.

SA-MM-62	Finsbury Park	FP7: Holloway Police Station, 284 Hornsey Road	Updated to identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site falls within. Reference to justifying the loss of social infrastructure removed from allocation.	The modification in relation to the loss of social infrastructure is not considered to affect the original assessment of the allocation which was based on a residential-led mixed use development. The updated reference to a specific viewing corridor is not considered to change the original assessment. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-63	Finsbury Park	FP8: 113-119 Fonthill Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-64	Finsbury Park	FP9: 221-233 Seven Sisters Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order. Clarification in relation to how the comprehensive development of the site should be approached.	The modification to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. The flexibility in relation to comprehensive development of the site is not considered to alter the original assessment of the allocation in relation to the objectives addressed and the effects identified. No further assessment is considered necessary.
SA-MM-65	Finsbury Park	FP10: Former George Robey Public House, 240 Seven Sisters Road	Allocation proposed to be deleted.	Allocation proposed to be deleted because the site has been subject to a development that has now been completed. No further assessment required.

SA-MM-66	Finsbury Park	FP10: 139-149 Fonthill Road  (formerly referenced FP11)	Planning history updated.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-67	Finsbury Park	FP11: 179-199 Hornsey Road, N7 9RA  (formerly referenced FP12)	Allocation amended to reflect the site's planning permission and changes to the Use Classes Order, identify the specific protected view the site falls within.	The original assessment assessed the site for mixed use development including residential use alongside provision of some community use, this reflects the planning permission. No further assessment is considered necessary.
SA-MM-68	Finsbury Park	FP12: Tesco, 103-115 Stroud Green Road, N4 3PX  (formerly referenced FP13)	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-69	Finsbury Park	FP13: Andover Estate bounded by Durham Road, Moray Road, Andover Road, Hornsey Road, Newington Barrow Way and Seven Sisters Road, London N7  (formerly referenced FP14)	Allocation amended to identify the specific protected view the site falls within.	The modification to the viewing corridor is not considered to affect the original assessment. No further assessment is necessary.

SA-MM-70	Finsbury Park	FP14: 216-220 Seven Sisters Road  (formerly referenced FP15)	Update to phasing of the site.	The change to phasing is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-71	Archway	Figure 7.1: Location of Archway Spatial Strategy area site allocations	Update to spatial strategy area map to reflect changes to site allocations.	This is a factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-72	Archway	ARCH1: Vorley Road/Archway Bus Station	Update to allocation to include social infrastructure uses. Reference to cultural quarter removed.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-73	Archway	ARCH2: 4-10 Junction Road	Update to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order. Reference to cultural quarter removed.	The change to the current/previous use to reflect the changes to the Use Classes Order is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. The removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site – the impacts of the removal of that designation have been considered in relation to other policies. No further assessment required.

SA-MM-74	Archway	ARCH3: Archway Central Methodist Hall	Allocation amended to be for offices and retail and remove reference to the creation of a cultural hub. In addition updated site address, current/previous use updated, planning history details are provided and the specific viewing corridor the site falls within is identified. Reference to cultural quarter removed.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-75	Archway	ARCH4: Whittington Hospital Ancillary Buildings	Update to correct error in phasing.	This is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-76	Archway	ARCH5: Archway Campus, Highgate Hill	Allocation updated to include increased flexibility and potential for an element of student accommodation alongside an additional clarification about the approach to active frontages. An update to the current/previous use is provided and the specific viewing corridor the site falls within is identified. Reference to policy SC1 removed. Reference to respecting amenity of neighbouring residential properties added.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-77	Archway	ARCH6: Job Centre, 1 Elthorne Road	Updates to ownership and use. Phasing updated to reflect information from the landowner. Amendment to allocation changes the uses specified from business led to mixed use. Reference to cultural quarter removed.	Screened in. Updated assessment required.
SA-MM-78	Archway	ARCH7: 207A Junction Road	Allocation amended and identified as Site GT1.	An updated assessment of the amended site allocation GT1 has been carried out.

SA-MM-79	Archway	ARCH7: Brookstone House, 4-6 Elthorne Road  (formerly ARCH8)	Updated address. Updated use to reflect Use Classes Order. Reference to Cultural Quarter removed. Site reference updated.	The updates are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. The removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site – the impacts of the removal of that designation have been considered in relation to other policies. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-80	Archway	ARCH8: 724 Holloway Road  (formerly ARCH9)	Update to reflect Use Classes Order. Planning history updated. Reference to cultural quarter removed. Site reference updated.	The updates are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment required. The removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site – the impacts of the removal of that designation have been considered in relation to other policies. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-81	Archway	ARCH9: Elthorne Estate  (formerly ARCH10)	Minor updates to reflect changes to Use Classes Order and planning history alongside updates to allocation and development considerations in relation to social infrastructure provision to reflect the extant permission on the site. Site reference updated.	The updates to the allocation reflect the social infrastructure provision associated with the extant permission on the site. Further assessment is not considered necessary as this addition would not change the effects previously identified. No further assessment considered necessary.

SA-MM-82	Archway	ARCH10: Dwell House, 619-639 Holloway Road  (formerly ARCH11)	Clarification that the site is partly within the town centre and that development should respect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. Reference to cultural quarter removed. Site reference updated.	Further assessment is not considered necessary as the addition to the development considerations would not change the effects previously identified. The removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site – the impacts of the removal of that designation have been considered in relation to other policies.
SA-MM-83	Archway	ARCH11: 798-804 Holloway Road  (formerly ARCH12)	Update to reflect Use Classes Order and planning history. Reference to cultural quarter removed. Site reference updated.	The updates are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment required. The removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site – the impacts of the removal of that designation have been considered in relation to other policies. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-84	Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	HC1: 10, 12, 16-18, 20-22 and 24 Highbury Corner	Update to reflect Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-85	Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	HC2: Spring House, 6-38 Holloway Road	Update to reflect Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.

SA-MM-86	Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	HC3: Highbury and Islington Station, Holloway Road	Update to reflect Use Classes Order. Update to clarify that a future decking scheme should be sensitively designed in relation to amenity impacts on residents.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-87	Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	HC4: Dixon Clark Court	Update to planning history.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-88	Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway	HC5: 2 Holloway Road and 4 Highbury Crescent	Update to reflect Use Classes Order.	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-89	Other important sites	Figure 9.1: Location of site allocations outside Spatial Strategy areas	Update to spatial strategy map to reflect changes to site allocations.	This is a factual update of the map to reflect changes to site allocations which have been separately assessed for their impacts where relevant. No further assessment considered necessary.
SA-MM-90	Other important sites	OIS1: Leroy House, 436 Essex Road	Updates to planning history and to reflect Use Classes Order.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-91	Other important sites	OIS2: The Ivories, 6-8 Northampton Street	Update to reflect Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-92	Other important sites	OIS4: 1 Kingsland Passage and the BT Telephone Exchange, Kingsland Green	Updates to the allocation to reflect the planning history to take into account that part of the site has planning permission and that the whole site is unlikely to come forward for comprehensive redevelopment. Site boundary, allocation text and development considerations amended to reflect this. Timescales updated.	No further assessment necessary. The modification does not impact on the uses proposed and is not considered to contribute to a change in the effects previously identified in the assessment.

SA-MM-93	Other important sites	OIS5: Bush Industrial Estate, Station Road	Updates to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, updates to the site designation and constraints for accuracy as well as updates to the development considerations in relation to nearby uses and mitigation of potential impacts. Allocation updated to provide for co-location of office and/or research and development use where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site and it can be demonstrated that its industrial function would remain.	Updated assessment required. Screened in.
SA-MM-94	Other important sites	OIS6: Site of Harvist Under Fives, 100 Hornsey Road	Updates to allocation to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order alongside planning history. Allocation updated to remove the provision of a nursery.	The modification reflects the planning permission and reflects advice from the council's Early Years Service. The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the allocation. No further assessment is considered necessary.
SA-MM-95	Other important sites	OIS7: Highbury Delivery Office, 2 Hamilton Lane	Update to use to reflect the fact the site is now vacant.	No further assessment necessary. This is not considered to affect the original assessment of the allocation as the uses and considerations remain the same.
SA-MM-96	Other important sites	OIS8: Legard Works, 17a Legard Road	Update to reflect Use Classes Order	The modification is not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-97	Other important sites	OIS9: Ladbroke House, 62-66 Highbury Grove	Site to be deleted.	Allocation proposed to be deleted because the site has been subject to a development that has now been completed. No further assessment required.

SA-MM-98	Other important sites	OIS9: Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church (formerly OIS 29).	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-99	Other important sites	OIS10: 500-502 Hornsey Road and Grenville Works, 2A Grenville Road,	Site allocation updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, with planning history and allocation updated to reflect permission	Screened in. Further assessment required.
SA-MM-100	Other important sites	OIS12: 202-210 Fairbridge Road	Site allocation proposed to be deleted	Allocation proposed to be deleted because the site has been subject to a development that has now been completed. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-101	Other important sites	OIS12: New Orleans Estate (formerly reference OIS32)	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-102	Other important sites	OIS13: Highbury Roundhouse Community Centre, 71 Ronald's Road	Community centre to the rear of the site has been delivered and can be removed from the allocation. Part of the site has been included in site allocation GT3.	Site allocation GT3 has been assessed separately.

SA-MM-103	Other important sites	OIS14: Athenaeum Court, 94 Highbury New Park, N5 2DN  (formerly referenced OIS15)	Update to development considerations to reference the need to respect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and how trees should be considered as part of landscaping plan. Update to site reference.	The reference to protecting amenity, is not considered to affect the original assessment. The reference to trees being carefully considered as part of a landscape plan is not considered to change the assessment as the effects of this are uncertain depending on what is proposed and this would be something that would be expected consistent with other Local Plan policies. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-104	Other important sites	OIS15: Harvist Estate Car Park  (formerly referenced OIS16)	Update to reflect planning permission. Update to site reference.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-105	Other important sites	OIS16: Hathersage and Besant Courts, Newington Green  (formerly referenced OIS17)	Update to reflect planning history and update to site reference.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.
SA-MM-106	Other important sites	OIS18: 25-27 Horsell Road  (formerly referenced OIS19)	Update to reflect planning history. Update to site reference.	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment of the site allocation. No further assessment necessary.

SA-MM-107	Other important sites	OIS19: Vernon Square, Penton Rise  (formerly referenced OIS20)	Current use updated, viewing corridor specified and allocation updated to clarify that the loss of social infrastructure is subject to policy SC1. Updated site reference.	The previous assessment of the site assessed its potential for business-led development. The clarification in relation to the loss of social infrastructure use is not considered to affect the previous assessment. No further assessment required.
SA-MM-108	Other important sites	OIS20: Former Railway Sidings Adjacent to Caledonian Road Station  (formerly referenced OIS21)	Modifications to development considerations in relation to the heritage asset on the site. Updated site reference.	Updated assessment required. Screened in.
SA-MM-109	Other important sites	OIS22 1 Lowther Road, N7 8US  (formerly referenced OIS23)	Updated to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order, identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site falls within and amend the site reference (now OIS22).	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment. No further assessment is necessary.
SA-MM-110	Other important sites	OIS23: Pentonville Prison, Caledonian Road  (formerly referenced OIS24)	Site boundary and site size amended, viewing corridor specified and site reference updated (now OIS23).	The amendments to the site boundary are not considered to impact on the uses proposed or contribute to a change in the original assessment. No further assessment is required.

SA-MM-111	Other important sites	OIS24: Charles Simmons House  (formerly referenced OIS25)	Updated to identify the specific protected viewing corridor the site falls within and amend the site reference (now OIS24).	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment. No further assessment is necessary.
SA-MM-112	Other important sites	OIS25: Amwell Street Pumping Station  (formerly referenced OIS26)	Updated to identify the specific protected viewing corridors the site falls within and amend the site reference (now OIS25).	The modifications are not considered to affect the original assessment. No further assessment is necessary.
SA-MM-113	Other important sites	OIS26: York Way Estate  (formerly referenced OIS27)	New site allocation proposed to be included, site allocation updated to reflect planning permission.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-114	Other important sites	OIS27: Barnsbury Estate  (formerly referenced OIS28)	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-115	Other important sites	OIS28: Cluse Court (previously OIS30)	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-116	Other important sites	OIS29: Hillside Estate (formerly OIS31).	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.

SA-MM-117	Other important sites	OIS30: Kerridge Court (formerly referenced OIS34)	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-118	Other important sites	OIS31: Drakeley Court and Aubert Court (formerly reference OIS33)	New site allocation proposed to be included.	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-119	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	New paragraphs 11.1-11.3	New text added in relation to identified of sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.	No further assessment necessary. This text provides background in relation to other policies which have been assessed for their effects.
SA-MM-120	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	Figure 11.1: Location of Gypsy and Traveller site allocations	Map showing location of sites.	No further assessment necessary. This text provides background in relation to other policies which have been assessed for their effects.
SA-MM-121	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	GT1: 207A Junction Road	Allocation proposed to meet the need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Change in allocation, further assessment required.
SA-MM-122	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	GT2: 154 Junction Road	Allocation proposed to meet the need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-123	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	GT3: 71 Ronalds Road	Allocation proposed to meet the need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches	New site allocation. Assessment required.
SA-MM-124	Monitoring	Paragraph 10.4	Update to provide additional information on how the delivery of allocated sites will be monitored	The clarification of the approach to monitoring is not considered to require a further assessment.

SA-MM-125 - 132	Appendices	Appendix 2: Glossary and Abbreviations	<p>Updated definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business floorspace/buildings/development/uses</li> <li>• Hybrid space</li> <li>• Industrial floorspace/buildings/development/uses/land</li> <li>• Locally Significant Industrial Sites</li> <li>• Office-led development</li> <li>• Retail floorspace/buildings/development/uses</li> <li>• Social and community infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>New definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leisure uses</li> </ul>	<p>The modifications will assist with the implementation of policy that has been assessed for its effects. The changes are clarification and do not change the effects already identified. No further assessment required.</p>
-----------------	------------	--	---	--

# 4. Updated policy assessments – Strategic and Development Management Policies modifications

## Policy SP2: King’s Cross and Pentonville Road

Table 1.5 Assessment of modifications to Policy SP2: King’s Cross and Pentonville Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	++	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modification to remove the knowledge quarter in Part B reduces the additional emphasis this placed on this aspect of employment development in this area reducing the promotion of the Knowledge Quarter. However, the policy itself alongside policy B2 and identified Priority Employment Location designations enables opportunities for development relevant to the knowledge quarter to come forward therefore development continues to be focused in the most appropriate areas so no effects are considered to occur as a result of this modification in relation to <b>objective 2</b>. For the same reason no effects are considered to occur against <b>objective 8</b> economic growth. Overall effects remain positive against both objectives.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	++	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
	<p>The modifications will, subject to mitigation, allow improved boater facilities and infrastructure to be built along the canal corridor, improving the function and amenity of those living on and using the canal and could therefore contribute towards the efficient use of space. The modifications clarify the approach in terms of future operation of the canal for different uses through the development of a Waterspace Strategy for Islington’s canal network which will help balance the competing demands on use of the canal. In particular the policy identifies how and where the identified need for boat dwellers will be met. Whilst it is considered there is some uncertainty around implementation of improved boater facilities the modifications are considered to have a minor positive effect against this objective because of the Waterspace Strategy but this is not considered to change the minor positive effect already identified overall for <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to minor positive effects on <b>objective 4</b> promoting liveable neighbourhoods as boater facilities could include waste and recycling infrastructure which would improve amenity, and electricity infrastructure that will reduce reliance on diesel generators and improve air quality. On balance the policy does not require improvements therefore the effect would depend on implementation and is considered neutral. Overall the policy with modifications will continue to have minor positive effects.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to have a minor positive effect against <b>objective 5</b> by improving the standard of accommodation for boaters. In particular the policy identifies how and where the identified need for boat dwellers will be met with the potential conversion of leisure moorings. The approach to the provision of residential moorings has been clarified with a wider Waterspace Strategy and clear focus on this spatial area. Therefore given the clear requirements on how housing needs will be met the effect is considered to be significant positive. In addition a clause is proposed as part of the modifications to clarify the role of residential development in the spatial strategy area and that this will come forward not only through sites</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	++	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
	<p>allocated for housing, but also through smaller windfall developments. This could also contribute towards the supply of housing and affordable housing which will help to meet housing needs.</p> <p>The modifications provide clarification in relation to the consideration of moorings and boater facilities on the canal where parts of the towpath are designated as open space. The submission policy with modifications provides further clarity and states that development of boater facilities can only take place where there is no detrimental impact on nature conservation and biodiversity value, and the character and amenity of the waterway corridor and its function as public open space. Whilst this could have minor positive effects, this is not considered to change the minor positive effects already identified in relation to <b>objective 10</b>.</p> <p>The modifications provide clarification in relation to the consideration of moorings and boater facilities on the canal which is a Site of Importance for Nature conservation. No additional effects on <b>objective 11</b> and biodiversity have been identified as the policy states that development can only take place where there is no detrimental impact on nature conservation and biodiversity value, and the character and amenity of the waterway corridor and its function as public open space.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 12</b> reducing climate change by potentially introducing more electricity supply points shifting energy use of boats away from fossil fuels (diesel generators) on <b>objective 13</b> reducing waste by providing reuse and recycling facilities for boaters which will increase the proportion of household waste that is recycled and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and on both <b>objective 7</b> and <b>objective 14</b> by improving air quality through supply of</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	++	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
	<p>electricity to boats and shifting away from diesel generator use, and also on water by providing water and sewerage infrastructure is available to service boats. On balance the policy does not require improvements therefore the effect would depend on implementation and overall the effect is considered neutral.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<p>The modifications to the approach to the provision of residential moorings clarify how housing needs will be met which is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to objective 5; the additional clause which clarifies the role of residential development in the spatial strategy area will also have positive effects through supporting additional housing resulting in an increase to significant positive effects for housing quality. No change in the assessment of effects is considered to occur with the removal of reference to the Knowledge Quarter given the other business related policies in the plan.</p>													

### Policy SP3: Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS)

Table 1.6: Assessment of Modifications to Policy SP3: Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS)

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modifications could introduce more flexibility for buildings to be adaptable for evolving economic needs. However, this approach can have minor negative effects on the preservation of the industrial character of the LSIS through the introduction of building design features that could limit future industrial operations. Development including co-location of office with industrial could introduce positive design features such as improvements in the connectivity between buildings and public realm contributing to safer spaces. The LSIS has a distinctive industrial character. Significant intensification of non-industrial uses such as office could place further limitations on the capacity of industrial space in the area and affect the overall character of the area however the modifications are clear about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and to demonstrate the continued industrial function of the LSIS will remain which will help to mitigate the potential impacts that intensification of offices could have on character. Overall there remains a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 1</b>.</p> <p>As a higher density employment use, offices could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and intensification of industrial floorspace. However, there is already a significant proportion of office buildings integrated within parts of the LSIS and if new development is likely to introduce a significant quantum of office, there is potential for the land use balance to shift to offices which could start to exclude industrial use. The modifications are clear though about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and to demonstrate that the continued industrial function of the LSIS will remain which will help to mitigate the potential impacts that intensification of offices could have. It is noted that there are other more appropriate locations promoted for office use across the borough but providing offices in the LSIS will also contribute to meeting the need at borough level for office floorspace. There are land use benefits from the co-location of offices with industrial, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, which on balance is</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>considered to have minor positive effects for the objective. The policy with modifications also removes the restriction on building heights which increases the contribution of the policy to optimising the use of land. There is some uncertainty over the introduction of the new class E which means that over 10,000sqm of light industrial floorspace in the LSIS is potentially at risk of being lost to other non-industrial use classes that attract higher values. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. The modifications are not able to address this uncertainty. However the policy ensures that future light industrial Class E space is restricted to that use therefore creates a positive effect on focusing development in the right locations. Overall for the submission policy with modifications, whilst there are potential impacts in terms of opportunity for industrial intensification there are also positive effects and overall minor positive effects are considered on <b>objective 2</b> and the optimisation of land use and balancing the economic needs of the area.</p> <p>The effects of the modification and removal of restriction of the building heights may have potential effects against <b>objective 3</b> for the conservation of heritage assets and potentially on <b>objective 1</b> in terms of character. However, these effects are not considered to be significant to change the overall effects identified in the assessment. The potential effects are counterbalanced by policies PLAN1 and DH1, DH2 and DH3 so overall effects are considered to remain as neutral.</p> <p>The modifications to SP3 introduce an office co-location approach. As a higher density employment use, offices/research and development use could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of industrial floorspace albeit there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. Opportunities within sectors which locate in the LSIS may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>access work, this means that an increase in offices uses may not have the same level of positive benefits as office space and associated jobs can demand a higher level of skills which potentially increase barriers to employment. However, the proposed approach to co-location under the modifications could bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could counteract this depending on the extent to which the intensification and availability of premises for industrial uses could be accommodated in the longer term. Overall it is considered that there will still be investment in industrial floorspace from modified SP3 which is considered to still have significant positive effects overall on <b>objective 6</b>.</p> <p>For the modifications the principle remains that the primary economic function of the area will be protected however the modified policy could reduce the scope for intensification of industrial operations in the LSIS. It is also noted that there is no evidence to suggest that industrial uses have any more long term impacts on air quality compared to office uses or vice versa. Therefore allowing more office uses instead of industrial uses, would have no pronounced effect on health and wellbeing in the short and medium term however over time there is uncertainty that the evolving economic industrial needs of the area would be affected by office co-location and the extent to which this could limit the availability of premises suitable for industrial land uses. However there are positive effects from providing a range of employment spaces that are high quality and will support diverse jobs in different sectors, including SMEs, training opportunities and affordable workspace for local people can help provide for local job opportunities and can contribute to healthy, independent lifestyles which can improve health. Overall it is considered minor positive for the health effects on residents against <b>objective 7</b>.</p> <p>Similarly there are minor positive effects for <b>objectives 9, 12 and 14</b>. Co-location could potentially affect longer term scope for intensification of industrial operations in the LSIS. This could potentially increase vehicle mileage through Islington if industrial uses expand in Outer London, which risks increased congestion and emissions. Overall the protection given by demonstrating the continued industrial function mitigates the risk of displacement from office co-</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>location on the Vale Royal Brewery Road LSIS cluster of industrial businesses. The modifications also require intensification of industrial uses and co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could also counteract this longer term effect. Introducing office uses are likely to create more journeys to work than many industrial uses, and for this reason are usually supported in locations which are more accessible than the LSIS (which has low PTAL ratings along the western edge along York Way), such as town centres and CAZ where transport infrastructure better supports the intensity of journeys created. However accessibility is still reasonable in the LSIS. Overall there are land use benefits from the co-location of offices with industrial so depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, the approach on balance is considered to have minor positive effects for these three objectives.</p> <p>The modifications are considered a minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> economic growth. The intensification of new business floorspace as office space co-located with industrial will strengthen the local economy and provide a higher density of jobs by encouraging development of employment floorspace. Whilst there are other locations for housing and offices to be promoted in the borough, industrial uses are only sought in LSISs and therefore the scope for intensification of industrial uses is particularly important in this context. There is the potential for office uses to compete with industrial floorspace which could affect the extent to which industrial floorspace can be intensified. The scale of this effect would be dependent on the degree of the impact on the industrial function of the area caused by office development over time, and the scale of industrial activities lost, displaced and /or prevented from expansion in this location. The modifications are clear though about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could counteract this. The protection given by demonstrating the continued industrial function of the LSIS will also help to mitigate potential impacts that intensification of offices could have. It is noted that there are other more appropriate locations promoted for office use across the borough but providing offices in the LSIS will also contribute to meeting the need at borough level for office</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>floorspace. There are land use benefits from the co-location of offices with industrial, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, which on balance is considered to have minor positive effects for the objective. There is some uncertainty over the introduction of the new class E which means that over 10,000sqm of light industrial floorspace in the LSIS is potentially at risk of being lost to other non-industrial use classes that attract higher values. The modifications are not able to address this uncertainty although the policy modification that ensures future light industrial Class E space is restricted to that use creates a positive effect on focusing development in the right locations. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The modification that introduces office co-location on the one hand would bring additional jobs and opportunities for economic growth but on the other hand, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, could reduce the capacity for industrial growth. The modifications are clear about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise. On balance this modification is considered positive given the policy requirements to intensify industrial use and demonstrate the continued industrial function of the LSIS. The modification to secure new light industrial floorspace for that particular use through condition will also have positive effects in relation to the economic function of the area. The modification to remove the policy clause that specified maximum building heights is not considered to be significant to change the overall effects identified in the assessment. There are no changes to the overall assessment of effects identified as a result of the modifications.</p>													

## Policy SP4 Angel and Upper Street Spatial Strategy Area

Table 1.7 Assessment of Policy SP4 Angel and Upper Street Spatial Strategy Area

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The assessment for <b>objective 4</b> is a minor positive for the modifications. The implementation of housing in the spatial strategy area could have benefits in improving connections between neighbourhoods within the spatial strategy area and facilities/amenities. For residential uses in the town centre there would be an increase in accessibility to services for some residents living within the town centre but this could limit the already constrained land supply to provide commercial, cultural and civic activity for all Islington residents. Overall this positive effect does not change the minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> already identified.</p> <p>The assessment for <b>objective 5</b> has been changed to a minor positive. The modifications to policy for housing in parts of the spatial strategy area will contribute towards the supply of housing and affordable housing which will help to meet housing needs. The development of housing in the strategy area will provide housing options for people wanting to locate in or near Islington's main town centre where benefits will be linked to access to high PTAL multi-modal transport networks.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications add an additional clause which clarifies the role of residential development in the spatial strategy area which will have positive effects through supporting additional housing which will contribute towards the supply of housing and affordable housing which will help to meet housing needs.</li> <li>Objective 5 (housing quality) is now identified as a minor positive effect rather than a neutral because of the above change in respect to policy for housing and the spatial strategy area.</li> </ul>													

## Policy SP8 Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway

Table 1.8: Assessment of Policy SP8 Highbury Corner and Lower Holloway

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	++	+	+	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	+	+	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>For the modified policy the acknowledgement that housing will be appropriate on allocated sites and windfall sites will provide additional housing whilst carefully balancing the ability of the LSAs to provide a retail and service function through other parts of the policy. The approach will ensure access to services, facilities and amenities for residents and workers within the vicinity is maintained and allows for the expansion of such amenities to not be jeopardised to meet changing economic and social needs. Housing development will also contribute to the vibrancy of the area and enhance the commercial corridor between Angel Town Centre and Nag's Head Town Centre, improving connections, ensuring attractiveness for visitors and residents and enhancing an inviting public realm. Overall this positive effect does not change the minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> already identified</p> <p>The assessment for the submission policy with modifications has been changed to a minor positive for <b>objective 5</b>. The policy acknowledgement of residential uses on sites in the spatial strategy area will contribute to the supply of housing and affordable housing which will help to meet housing needs.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
<b>Submission policy</b>	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	++	+	+	0	0	0
<b>Submission policy with modifications</b>	++	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	+	+	0	0	0
<b>Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The modifications add an additional clause which clarifies the role of residential development in the spatial strategy area will have positive effects through supporting additional housing which will contribute towards the supply of housing and affordable housing and help to meet housing needs.</li> <li>• Objective 5 for housing quality is now identified as a minor positive effect rather than a neutral because of the above change in respect to policy for housing and the spatial strategy area.</li> </ul>													

## Policy H2: New and existing conventional housing

Table 1.9: Assessment of Modifications to Policy H2: New and existing conventional housing

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	++	0	+	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	++	0	+	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modification removes the aspect of policy H2 which prevents housing supply being wasted by ensuring new homes will be occupied. There is potential for a negative effect, as it would mean there is less certainty that units will be occupied and meet the boroughs housing need. Whilst this reduces the positive effect it is not considered to be sufficient to reduce the overall significant positive effects that policy has in terms of optimising the use of buildings/land and overall the policy with modifications will continue to have significant positive effect in respect of <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modification removes the guarantees on occupancy, so units could remain vacant which does not promote social cohesion. This modification is considered to have a minor negative effect but overall is not considered to change the effects on <b>objective 6</b> of the policy.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification removes the clause which prevents housing supply being wasted by ensuring new homes will be occupied. This creates negative effects against the efficient use of land and social inclusion. When considered against the positive effects of the submission policy this is not considered to be sufficient to reduce the overall significant positive effects of the policy.</li> </ul>													

## Policy H6: Purpose Built Student Accommodation

Table 1.10: Assessment of Policy H6: Purpose Built Student Accommodation

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	-	0	+	-	+	-	+	0	0	0	0	-	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The policy as modified contains provisions to manage amenity impacts, but removing the restriction on change of use on a temporary basis to visitor accommodation and allowing the temporary use of existing student accommodation is likely to lead to increased noise impacts from the more frequent trips generated by a hotel use which may not always be possible to mitigate through a management plan. The effect of the modification is to change the assessment from minor positive to neutral for <b>objective 4</b>.</p> <p>The potential provision of Purpose Built Student Accommodation will contribute to housing supply which will have a positive effect on improving the diversity of housing in the borough. However additional student accommodation will not help to meet an identified need for affordable housing in the borough. In addition it is unclear whether affordable student accommodation would meet accommodation needs of Islington students and therefore a neutral effect has been identified overall for <b>objective 5</b>.</p> <p>The modification to remove the requirement for bursary contributions towards students leaving council care and students facing hardship does not help in reducing inequality. This will have a negative effect on <b>objective 6</b>. In addition a similar negative effect is identified against <b>objective 8</b> as the removal of the bursary reduces some of the support for local people to increase their employment opportunities through education. Overall this changes the effects from positive to neutral for <b>objectives 6 and 8</b>.</p>													

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	-	0	+	-	+	-	+	0	0	0	0	-	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	<p>The percentage of bedspaces to be adaptable has reduced from 10% to 5% of bedspaces. Whilst there is potential for short term effects from the modification as some bedspaces would be adaptable on completion rather than accessible, should the need arise the option to convert remains if a student were to seek accessible accommodation. Whilst this still has a positive effect, when taking into account the removal of bursaries overall the effect for objective 6 is considered to be neutral.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications make a number of changes to policy which creates negative effects. The removal of the requirement for bursary contributions creates negative effects in relation to social inclusion and economic development by reducing some of the support for local people to increase their employment opportunities through education. There is no mitigation for this effect as the policy proposal did not meet the relevant CIL tests for planning obligations. The additional flexibility to allow the temporary use of existing student accommodation as visitor accommodation is likely to lead to increased noise impacts from the more frequent trips generated by a hotel use which may not always be possible to mitigate through a management plan so the effect on objective 4 liveable neighbourhoods is negative.</li> <li>The modification which reduces the percentage for accessible accommodation from 10% to 5% and the change to adaptable on completion rather than accessible on completion reduces the positive effects but is still considered positive. Overall the effect for objective 6 is considered neutral because of the removal of the requirement for bursary contributions. There is a positive effect on objective 5 and housing supply however there are other uncertain effects which results in a change to neutral overall.</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	-	0	+	-	+	-	+	0	0	0	0	-	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of the policy overall results in four changes in assessment effects resulting from the modifications to objective 4 for liveable neighbourhoods, objective 5 for housing quality, objective 6 for social inclusion and objective 8 for economic growth. Objectives 4, 6 and 8 change from minor positive to neutral. Objective 5 changes from negative to neutral.</li> </ul>													

## Policy H12: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Table 1.11: Assessment of Policy H12: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modifications to Policy H12 are considered to have a positive effect on housing quality (<b>objective 5</b>) and meeting housing needs. The modification to change Part A which replaces exploring sites with the allocation of sites has amended the mechanism to achieve meeting need which provides more certainty about how need will be met and this is considered to increase the effects to significant positive. There are three site allocations (GT1, GT2 and GT3) identified in modifications and these have been assessed separately. The modification to reflect the London Plan approach for defining gypsy and traveller need reduces the potential provision overall but it is still considered positive as it seeks to meet needs for gypsy and travellers which will help to meet the diverse and changing needs of Islington. Overall the effect for the policy with modifications is considered significant positive for <b>objective 5</b>.</p> <p>Likewise a change in effects is considered to occur for <b>objective 6</b> to significant positive overall with the increase in certainty around how gypsy and traveller needs will be met through the identification of sites helping to promote social inclusion and improve opportunities for gypsies and travellers to have their accommodation needs met in Islington.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications make a number of changes to policy which creates positive effects in terms of how the defined needs of gypsies and travellers as set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment will be met through the provision of sites.</li> </ul>													

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of the policy overall results in two changes in assessment effects resulting from the modifications: objective 5 for housing quality and objective 6 for social inclusion changing from minor positive to significant positive.</li> </ul>													

## Policy B2: New business floorspace

Table 1.12: Assessment of Policy B2: New business floorspace

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modifications introduce office co-location with industrial uses in Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs) in Part C which could introduce positive design features such as improvements in the connectivity between buildings and public realm contributing to safer spaces. However the modifications are clear about need for industrial uses to be intensified and the continued industrial function of the area, therefore on balance the effects for <b>objective 1</b> are still considered to continue to be minor positive.</p> <p>The modifications introduce a change which seeks new Class E development to be conditioned for office, research and development, or light industrial use for the various locations identified in the policy. This will have a positive effect by encouraging development which primarily supports the existing economic function of an area which will reinforce the economic sustainability of an area. The conditioning of specific business uses will assist in making the most efficient use of land by encouraging maximisation of business floorspace in locations which already have well-established employment hubs and suitable business clusters. The submission policy with modifications introduces office co-location with industrial in LSISs in Part C which, as a higher density employment use, could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of industrial floorspace. However, new development is likely to introduce a significant quantum of office, which has the potential for the land use balance to shift to offices which could start to exclude industrial use. But co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could counteract this to some extent. The modifications are clear though about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and to demonstrate the continued industrial function of LSISs will remain which will help to mitigate some of the potential impacts that intensification of offices could have. It is noted that there are other</p>													

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>more appropriate locations promoted for office use across the borough but providing office in the LSIS will also contribute to meeting the need at borough level for office floorspace. There are land use benefits from the co-location of offices with industrial, whilst it will depend on the extent to which offices are intensified and there are some uncertainties over this, on balance is considered to remain overall significant positive for <b>objective 2</b> given the other positive aspects of the policy.</p> <p>The modifications will secure new employment floorspace in the CAZ and town centres and PELs with use of conditions which will help support diversity in town centres and should benefit existing services in these locations. This will continue to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b>.</p> <p>The modifications that introduce co-location of offices with industrial space in part C could have effects on <b>objective 8</b>. Whilst the policy protects the industrial function of LSISs and seeks to intensify industrial uses, there are other locations in the borough where offices are sought and industrial uses are only sought in LSISs and therefore the scope for intensification of industrial uses is particularly important in this context. The scale of this effect would be dependent on the degree of the impact on the industrial function of the area over time with the potential for office uses to compete with industrial floorspace affecting the extent to which industrial floorspace can be intensified. Also there is some uncertainty over the introduction of the new class E which means that light industrial floorspace in LSISs is potentially at risk of being lost to other non-industrial use classes that attract higher values. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. The submission policy is not able to address this uncertainty. The policy restriction that ensures future light industrial Class E space is restricted to that use therefore creates a positive effect on focusing development in the right locations. Overall the modifications are clear about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and to demonstrate the continued industrial function of LSISs will remain which will help to mitigate some of the potential impacts that</p>													

I/A Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>intensification of offices could have. It is noted that there are other more appropriate locations promoted for office use across the borough but providing office in the LSIS will also contribute to meeting the need at borough level for office floorspace. Co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could counteract this to some extent. On balance with the other positive aspects of the policy it is considered to have significant positive effects overall for the objective.</p> <p>The modifications have introduced a new clause D which cross references to other policies where development proposed in LSIS would have a significant increase in vehicle movements and makes clear mitigation should be provided. This will also encourage sustainable transport choices. Co-location could affect the longer term sustainability of the LSIS as functional industrial areas because the capacity to which industrial floorspace can be intensified could be reduced. This could potentially increase vehicle mileage through Islington if existing industrial uses expand in Outer London, which risks increased congestion and emissions. Overall the protection given by demonstrating the continued industrial function mitigates the risk of displacement from office co-location on the Vale Royal Brewery Road LSIS cluster of industrial businesses. The modifications also require intensification of industrial uses and co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could counteract this. Overall the policy as modified is still considered to have a sufficient positive effect to not change overall effects in relation to reducing harmful emissions for <b>objective 9</b> and climate change, <b>objective 12</b> and air quality, <b>objective 14</b> and natural resources through the positive effect of new clause dealing with industrial uses that create significant increases in vehicle movements.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change which introduces office co-location is considered on balance to be positive because the modifications are clear about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and demonstrate that the continued</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>industrial function of the LSIS will remain. Also the approach could bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise. This will help to mitigate some of the potential impacts that intensification of offices could have in the LSIS. The second change relates to air quality which introduces policy to provide mitigation against development proposed in LSIS which would have significant increase in vehicle movements, these are also considered to have minor positive effects.</p>													

## Policy B3: Existing Business Floorspace

Table 1.13: Assessment of Policy B3: Existing business floorspace

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modifications have positive effects with a new clause which deals with existing buildings that are no longer suitable for their existing business use and cannot reasonably be redeveloped for continued business use. This provides an alternate route to redeveloping land compared to the marketing route which requires 24 months marketing. It is uncertain how often the approach will be applied by landowners but it potentially supports an expedient alternative to 24 months marketing and therefore a positive effect on the objective of optimising the use of previously developed land. Also the submission policy with modifications has removed the vacancy requirement for the 24 month marketing period which is considered positive and will lead to optimising the use of buildings for alternate uses and intensifying their use. Overall the effects do not change the minor positive effects on <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications will have a positive effect on <b>objective 8</b>. The modifications have removed the 24 month vacancy test (retaining the 24 month marketing period but instead require vacancy to be demonstrated at the time of application) which reduces the potential short term negative impact the vacancy period could have on reduced footfall and impacts on neighbouring businesses and therefore potentially increases the short term positive effects in relation to objective 8. Removing the 24 month vacancy period may also encourage landowners to seek alternative uses through the planning system in the medium and long term rather than consider changing use within Class E. Using Class E could result in not intensifying an existing office use with floorspace to another Class E use.. Maintaining the marketing test limits the negative effects of loss of business floorspace. The modifications introduces a new clause which deals with existing buildings that are no longer suitable for their existing business use and cannot reasonably be redeveloped for continued business use. This provides a new and alternate route to redeveloping land compared to the marketing route which requires 24 months marketing. It is uncertain how often the approach will be applied by landowners but potentially</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
	<p>supports an expedient alternative to 24 months marketing. Overall however this does not detract significantly from the positive effects of the submission policy with modifications, which is considered to have similar minor positive effects on <b>objective 8</b> as the submission policy and will foster sustainable economic growth and increase employment opportunities.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a number of modifications to this policy. The main effects are felt by the changes which deal with the policy approaches to managing the release of business floorspace to alternative uses. In particular the marketing of business floorspace and the removal of vacancy test. The assessment considers the pros and cons of each but ultimately considers it to maintain the positive effects of the submission policy approach. The assessment also considers the further change which provides a new and alternate route to redeveloping land compared to the marketing route and considers the effects more uncertain.</li> </ul>													

## R2: Primary Shopping Areas

Table 1.14: Assessment of Policy R2: Primary Shopping Areas

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>With respect to <b>objective 2</b> the modifications continue to focus and encourage retail development in the most appropriate Primary Shopping Areas (PSAs) locations. The inflexibility and related potential vacancy of a two - year vacancy and marketing period for change of use away from A1 (E(a)) in the PSA had potential to limit a range of main town centre uses therefore the modifications reducing this period is positive. The approach for Policy R2 is considered to have a positive effect in terms of directing appropriate new build Class E retail use and other Sui Generis and F.2 main town centre uses to the core of the town centres - the PSA. However the scope of uses available through Class E weakens the strength of the PSA and will result in uses establishing in the retail core that do not necessarily need the high PTAL location and would therefore not focus development in the most appropriate locations. This results in a minor positive effect for <b>objective 2</b>. It is noted that this is finely balanced and the take up Class E flexibility is uncertain and the approach for R2 will go some way to encouraging development to focus in the most appropriate locations in town centres and their primary shopping areas, overall the assessment for the modifications to <b>objective 2</b> is considered a significant positive effect</p> <p>It is noted that modifications in other policies accept residential uses on upper floors in the PSA which has the potential to reduce the floorspace in the commercial core of town centres for commercial uses where agglomeration benefits can be realised. The effects of this are considered in more detail in the assessment of Policy R3.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>The modifications will have positive effects on enabling town centres PSAs to continue to serve the needs and wellbeing of the local residents across different retail catchment areas by seeking to maintain a balance of retail, leisure and business uses. The approach is diminished by the introduction of Class E which creates uncertain impacts with the potential for E uses to not form active frontages, such as offices at ground floor in the retail core. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. The scope of uses available through Class E weakens the strength of the PSA and will potentially result in non-retail Class E uses establishing in the retail core which would cumulatively and in specific locations individually, have a negative impact on the diversity and vibrancy and economic prosperity of town centres and the PSAs as retail centres reducing their ability to meet retail needs of residents. The ability to use conditions for new E class uses would mitigate this to some extent however the overall effect to <b>objective 4</b> is considered to be minor positive.</p> <p>The assessment of the submission policy with modifications for <b>objective 8</b> is considered a significant positive. Retaining the protection for retail on ground floors will continue to have a positive effect and enable space in the right locations for different types of businesses, maintaining support for local businesses and employment in retail. The scope of uses available through Class E weakens the strength of the PSA and will result in uses establishing in the retail core that do not necessarily need the high PTAL location and would therefore not focus development in the most appropriate locations. Whilst some Class E uses are potentially detrimental to the retail core the Class E uses that are not retail would still be likely to be commercial in focus and result in positive economic effects. It is noted that there is removal of the protection for upper floors which has the</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>potential to limit the range of unit sizes and configurations to meet a variety of business's needs. The effects of this are considered in more detail in the assessment of Policy R3. Overall the changes in policy are considered to maintain a significant positive for economic growth.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a number of modifications to the policy approach which has evolved in response to the flexibility introduced by Class E and which creates uncertain impacts however the policy principle remains that new development should contribute to the retail function of the PSA at ground floor level. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. Despite the positive effects of the modifications the impact of Class E flexibility is considered to reduce the positive effects in relation to objective 4 and serving the needs and wellbeing of residents; however given the range of Class E commercial uses that can take advantage of locating in the retail core the significant positive effects on economic growth and efficient use of land are maintained. Overall the modifications are considered positive.</li> </ul>													

## Policy R3: Islington’s retail hierarchy

Table 1.15: Assessment of Modifications to Policy R3: Islington’s retail hierarchy

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>Although Islington’s Town Centres are not devoid of any residential uses they are fundamentally commercial in character, particularly the Primary Shopping Areas. The more permissive approach to residential uses could erode the commercial character in the long term and limit the ability for the built environment to adapt to evolving commercial needs in the future. Policy R2 seeks to mitigate to some extent the development of ground floor in the PSA to maintain the retail function in the PSA. More residential use in Town Centres in particular in the PSA would also introduce potential for greater concerns for amenity considerations, which could further diminish the commercial function. Allowing increased residential on upper floors and more generally in town centres can create amenity impacts which will need to be mitigated and in the long term reduce the ability of cultural and leisure uses to operate effectively and expand. The agent of change principle will go some way in mitigating this negative impact however. The local character of town centres outside the PSA may also be eroded to some degree, however Policy R3 Part C considers impact on character whilst accepting mitigation of adverse impacts. Modifications to Part C therefore limits but does not avoid completely changes to the commercial character of Town Centres if residential uses start to cumulatively occupy sites that would be preferable to keep in commercial use. There may be a minor positive effect in certain circumstances in reducing crime or fear of crime through an increase in natural surveillance from residential uses. This may contribute to an increase in safety, especially in relation to the night time economy. Overall the changes are considered minor positive for <b>objective 1</b>.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>The assessment for <b>objective 2</b> has been changed to a minor positive for the submission policy with modifications. The modifications relaxes the approach to permit residential uses more widely across town centres and in the PSA, which could reduce opportunities to meet commercial, cultural and civic activity needs and associated agglomeration benefits which may not balance competing land uses optimally. Too much housing in town centres could detract from the ability of other land uses to take advantage of the commercial location. The impacts on the efficient use of land outside the PSA may be more profound given the specific protection for ground retail use within PSAs. Balancing the competing demand of land uses will be more challenging with a more permissive approach to residential uses on upper floors in the PSA. This is mitigated in part by R3 Part C and G which ensures that residential development would not cause adverse impacts on viability, vibrancy, vitality, character, and amenity. However, there may be specific opportunities for residential development on upper floors which are not attractive opportunities for commercial development, providing an opportunity for a greater mix of uses and efficient use of land. For example it is recognised that in some cases such as in Nag's Head the development of underutilised upper floors for residential development could aid in the efficient use of buildings. The assessment considers a minor positive effect overall recognising there is a fine balance to be had between competing demands for land.</p> <p>The assessment of the modifications for <b>objective 4</b> overall is considered a minor positive effect. For residential uses in the town centre there would be an increase in accessibility to services for some residents living within the town centre which is positive but this could limit the already constrained land supply to provide commercial, cultural and civic activity for all Islington residents albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met. Part C seeks to ensure adverse impacts on vibrancy, vitality, viability and character are fully mitigated as well as requiring engaging frontages and a good level of amenity for</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>residents and businesses. This will go some way to ensuring a vibrant environment is achieved that supports sufficient access to a range of uses whilst respecting the needs and amenity of residential uses within town centre. The relaxation of policy restricting residential uses could reduce the ability of town Centre’s to continue to serve the needs and wellbeing of the local residents across different retail catchment areas potentially reducing the optimum mix of main town centre uses albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met. This effect would be felt more in the PSA with the removal of upper floor floorspace from the commercial market reducing the spaces for access to multi floor retail, upper floor offices for employment and the unfettered expansion of cultural and NTE uses. Overall there is considered to be a minor positive effect for <b>objective 4</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of the submission policy with modifications for <b>objective 5</b> is a minor positive effect because allowing residential uses across all of the town centre would increase land available for housing and therefore affordable housing, contributing to meeting housing need. Town centres are highly accessible locations with a wide range of services available for residents.</p> <p>The assessment for <b>objective 7</b> is a minor positive. The submission policy with modifications would go some way to maintaining retail in the face of changes to the Use Class Order; access to shops in particular is vital for health and wellbeing. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. Overall whilst there could potentially be negative effects due to the loss of retail to other class E uses, it is not clear that this</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>would bear out as an effect. Access to health and other services may increase for town centre residents however, the land available for health and wellbeing services that can often occupy upper floor town centre locations could be decreased. Health facilities do however benefit from Class E flexibility, allowing a wider range of ground floor and upper floor sites to support health facilities across the town centre as a whole. The cumulative introduction of residential uses in town centres may limit the range of unit sizes for health however, the magnitude of this effect is unknown. A minor positive effect overall for the submission policy with modifications is therefore still considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The assessment for <b>objective 8</b> against the submission policy with modifications is considered a minor positive effect overall on the ability for town centres to foster sustainable economic growth and increase employment opportunities across a range of sectors and business sizes. The submission policy with modifications is more permissive to residential. Although residential uses can support the economic growth of town centres by creating a localised customer base, increasing footfall and contributing to the vibrancy of a place, this is far more profound in smaller towns and rural areas that have fewer external factors in the viability of their shopping cores. Islington has four town centres in good health, supported by a population of 236,000 residents and significant flows of workers and tourists travelling into Islington. The vitality of town centres in Islington is more reliant on commercial growth to take place than the need to entice people to the town centres. Class E also increases the commercial opportunities on all floors especially in the PSA but also across the wider town centre; residential use could inhibit this growth in the long term. The removal of specific consideration to the loss of ancillary space could have a negative effect of releasing parts of buildings that allow viable operation by a wide range of town centre uses, whether this be for store room functions, back office use or other ancillary needs. The removal of the two year marketing requirement may cause a negative impact because testing the</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>viability of a main town centre use is one of the most effective indicators as to whether the market has demand for such a unit in a specific location. The removal of this requirement will likely result in the loss of commercially viable town centre units, where cumulatively this could have negative effects on the viability, vibrancy and vitality of the town centre as a whole. On the other hand the removal of the marketing requirement can be considered positive as it will lead to optimising the use of buildings for alternate uses and intensifying their use. Whilst the inclusion of additional housing across town centre sites could be considered to have a positive effect, in the context of Islington this aspect of the modified policy is considered to have a minor negative effect because it could stifle commercial growth opportunities and results in an overall minor positive effect for the policy with modifications.</p> <p>The assessment for <b>objective 9</b> has remained a minor positive. Increased support of residential uses across town centres would have a positive effect on minimising the need to travel to town centres for the people living there, but cumulatively and in the long term this approach could see an increase in the need for travel by limiting the ability for commercial growth in town centres, pushing this growth into areas with less sustainable connections. However, the effects that would materialise in relation to residential uses impacting on the retail hierarchy is uncertain. The impact of Class E could see impacts on efficient, sustainable travel with potential distortion of the retail hierarchy across all policies which could increase the need to travel. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. High trip generating E uses located outside of town centres could see these uses not located in the most well served locations for public transport infrastructure specifically bus, tube and rail connections. The scale of this impact may be mitigated in part by application of</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	++	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>the sequential test and impact assessments and ultimately there is considerable uncertainty over this possible effect. The assessment has therefore remained as a minor positive overall.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of modifications to the policy approach which has evolved in response to the flexibility introduced by Class E. The other main change of the modifications is a more permissive approach to residential removing marketing, protection at ground floor and ancillary space which does have effects notwithstanding that policy expects adverse impacts on vibrancy, vitality, viability and character of the centre are fully mitigated. On the one hand this has the potential to reduce the floorspace for commercial uses in town centres and reduces the ability of the town centres to meet resident's needs albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met, but on the other hand the approach provides additional land for housing to meet housing needs.</li> <li>• There are a number of changes in assessment of effects of the overall policy. There is a reduction in positive effects for objective 2 and efficient use of land, objective 4 and liveable neighbourhoods and objective 8 and economic growth, which all reduce from significant positive to minor positive because of the approach to residential in the town centre. Conversely there will be an increase in positive effects for objective 5 and housing quality which change from neutral to minor positive because of the approach to residential.</li> </ul>													

## R4: Local Shopping Areas

Table 1.16: Assessment of Modifications to Policy R4: Local Shopping Areas

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The modifications cross references to a requirement for impact assessments as referenced in Policy R3 Part E for development over 200sqm, which will be positive for promoting a sustainable built environment through assessing impacts on character and function. This also helps focus appropriately scaled development in line with the retail hierarchy. The modifications removes specific protection for ancillary space which may have minor negative effects, especially related to the conversion of commercial ancillary space to residential use because this limits the adaptability of buildings to meet future needs of main town centre uses in LSAs however overall this is not considered significant enough to change the overall assessment of minor positive for <b>objective 1</b>.</p> <p>The modifications have seen the removal of specific protection for ancillary space which may have minor negative effects in terms of balancing competing demands between land uses and providing the full range of development needs of the area, because this could limit buildings ability to meet future needs of commercial uses in LSAs. On the other hand it is recognised that there may be circumstances where the re-use of ancillary</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
<p>space that is no longer required could have positive effects in relation to the efficient use of land. Overall this is not considered significant and the overall assessment is considered minor positive for <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications through removing the reference that residential use would be strongly resisted at ground floor and protecting ancillary floorspace may increase the ability for residential uses to establish at the rear of LSA units and add to housing supply and affordable housing contributions, albeit to a minimal degree and the effect is not considered certain enough to change the overall neutral effect on <b>objective 5</b>.</p> <p>The submission policy with modifications has been amended to reflect Class E and although the policy seeks to enable LSAs to continue to support a range of local businesses of different types and sizes, the advent of Class E may have potential negative effects on access to the right spaces in the right locations. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. The requirement for impact assessments as referenced in Policy R3 Part E will help to focus appropriately scaled development in line with the retail hierarchy with Policy R4 having a threshold of 200sqm which will help to guide development to the most appropriate locations.</p>														

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>The modifications which remove specific protection for ancillary space may have minor negative effects in terms of balancing competing demands between land uses and providing the full range of development needs of the area, especially where related to the conversion of commercial ancillary space to residential use because this could limit the ability of buildings to meet future needs of commercial uses in LSAs albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met; however, this negative effect would not be significant enough to change the submission policy assessment. Also there may be different localised effects depending on the LSA, its size, location and function with some LSAs more susceptible to erosion of commercial space than others however this is hard to determine with certainty and whilst at a borough level there could be a cumulative effect on commercial ancillary space within LSA this is not considered certain enough to merit a significant enough effect to change the overall minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b>.</p> <p>The submission policy with modifications requirement for impact assessments as cross referenced to in Policy R3 Part E will help to focus appropriately scaled development in line with the retail hierarchy so that developments of a significant scale are not putting unnecessary pressure on transport systems. The introduction of Class E may create the potential for an uncontrolled decrease in retail units to provide essential daily goods, and this could increase the need for people to travel further for these goods. However, with a</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	comprehensive spread of LSAs and Town Centres in the borough this impact is both uncertain and unlikely to be significant and will not affect the positive effect. Overall the effects for the submission policy with modifications are minor positive against <b>objective 9</b> .													
	No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications which address the Use Classes Order (UCO) changes have not changed the fundamental policy approach for LSAs. The UCO changes refer to Class E which was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models.</li> <li>• Many of the UCO changes are beyond the scope of Local Plan policy and the overall effects remain positive. The other significant modification is the removal of specific protection for ancillary space and reference to ground floor residential. This may have minor negative effects in terms of balancing competing demands between land uses and providing the full range of development needs of the area, albeit the policy is considered to still enable residents and business needs to be met. There is the potential for cumulative affects at a borough level although these are not considered significant enough</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
	to change the scoring. It may also have positive effects by adding housing supply and affordable housing contributions, albeit this is less certain. Overall the effects for LSAs have not changed compared to other retail policies however the commentary demonstrates the consideration of effects for the modifications sufficient to warrant completing the assessment.													

## Policy R10: Culture and the Night Time Economy

Table 1.17: Assessment of modifications to Policy R10: Culture and the Night Time Economy

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The modifications have a positive effect on <b>objective 2</b>. To some extent compared to the submission policy the modifications have relaxed the locational aspect and there is more opportunity that cultural uses could potentially develop outside the town centres which may have benefits in making use of existing buildings/sites in other parts of the borough for communities and helps to ensure development is flexible and adaptable to changing economic and social needs. However Policy R10 still encourages cultural development to take place primarily in Town Centres and the CAZ so remains a positive effect for this reason. Overall the effect of policy is considered significant positive on <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications will have a positive effect in relation to <b>objective 4</b>, due to cultural uses being promoted specifically in town centre and CAZ locations although enhancing the cultural offer outside of town centres and the CAZ, has benefits for the neighbourhoods those uses are located in. Noise impacts especially, are likely to</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>be greater where residential character is more prominent and where background noise levels are generally lower than in town centres or the CAZ where introducing a cultural venue could have a greater effect on amenity. However, this does depend on the nature of the cultural use and Part B requires the mitigation of adverse impacts such as noise. The omission of the cultural quarter in Archway is not considered significant enough to affect the assessment, there will be reduced policy support for cultural provision in Archway although cultural uses will still be supported in Archway. Overall the effect of policy is considered significant positive on objective 4</p> <p>The modifications provide some additional flexibility for cultural development outside of the CAZ and town centres which could reduce the supporting effect on the function and viability of CAZ and town centres although the policy still strongly directs development to these locations and could also support localised economies elsewhere. The omission of the Archway Cultural Quarter has removed specific policy support for a cultural quarter in this location although the policy approach still supports cultural uses locating in town centres. The policy with modifications overall is considered to have significant positive effects for <b>objective 8</b>.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
	No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
<b>Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifications have relaxed to some extent the locational requirement for cultural uses which on the one hand could provide for more cultural uses outside of town centres and cultural quarters but on the other hand may lead to more amenity impacts where cultural uses locate in areas where residential character is more prominent and where background noise levels are generally lower than in town centres or the CAZ. This is in part mitigated by Part B of the policy though. The modification could also reduce the support cultural uses have on the economy in town centres or the CAZ although they could also support local economies elsewhere. The omission of the Archway Cultural Quarter has removed policy support for this specific location although the policy approach still supports cultural uses locating in town centres. Overall the effects for Policy R10 have not changed compared to other retail policies however the commentary demonstrates the consideration of the effects for the modifications is sufficient to warrant completing the assessment.</li> </ul>													

## Policy G4: Biodiversity, landscape design and trees

Table 1.18: Assessment of G4: Biodiversity, landscape design and trees

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The submission policy with modifications is assessed positively against the biodiversity objective. A key aim of the policy is to minimise impacts and damage to existing trees, hedges, shrubs and other significant vegetation, so the modifications which clarify the approach to trees will help achieve this objective. The modifications also clarifies the level of protection is commensurate with the status of a SINC which could be considered to reduce the protection most for lower category SINC's i.e. local SINC's. However, it is considered that the mitigation measures set out in the modification alongside these other measures in the policy mean that overall there continues to be a significant positive effect on <b>objective 11</b> with a strong emphasis on maintaining biodiversity. There is more potential however for a reduction in biodiversity to occur with the introduction of planning benefits included in the modifications. There are compensation criteria in the policy which are applied where harm is unavoidable. These seek to avoid impacts to the most significant ecological features, then minimise overall spatial impacts or make improvements to management of a SINC and deliver off-site compensation. Whilst all the criteria may reduce biodiversity overall the last criteria could reduce the positive effects of the policy by reducing access to nature if that compensation were not delivered proximate to the affected SINC. Overall though the aim is to minimise development impacts and a strong emphasis remains on maintaining biodiversity and the potential reduction in positive effects are not considered to change the overall score and the effect of the policy with modifications is considered to be significant positive.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications have revised the policy in respect to SINCs being protected commensurate with their classification. The assessment considers that although the modifications have the potential to reduce the positive affects the mitigation measures set out in the policy modification alongside other measures in the policy mean that overall there is no change in effects with a strong emphasis on maintaining biodiversity.</li> </ul>													

## Policy S1: Delivering Sustainable Design and Policy S5: Energy Infrastructure

Table 1.19: Assessment of modifications to Policy S1: Delivering Sustainable Design and Policy S5: Energy Infrastructure

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy S1/S5	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
Submission policy S1/S5 with modifications	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modifications will have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 1</b> because they set out requirements for minimising greenhouse gas emissions and prioritising low and zero carbon heat sources for all development. This will contribute towards a more sustainable built environment and help to create buildings that are adaptable and can respond to change over their life. There is no change in effects to the overall assessment of the policy.</p> <p>The changes introduced through modifications to both S1 and S5 take a step further towards eliminating air pollution from heat and energy sources. The changes to Policy S1 will ensure that gas CHP will only be allowed in exceptional cases where CHP is essential for the creation of a strategic heat network. As a result, the modifications will have a minor positive effect on objective 4. The proposed change to Policy S5 will limit the use of gas boilers in minor developments resulting in fewer instances where gas boilers will be acceptable. The proposed change to Paragraph 6.67 of S5 will also prevent the use of ultra-low NOx gas boilers as the sole heat source for the communal heating system of major and larger minor developments. There will, however, continue to be a limited number of situations where gas powered CHP and ultra-low NOx gas boilers may be acceptable and the changes to policy S5 are more positive and will have an overall neutral effect on the promotion of liveable neighbourhoods – <b>objective 4</b>.</p> <p>The proposed changes to Policy S1 and S5 will limit the use of gas powered heating systems. The policy changes to both S1 and S5 take a step further towards eliminating air pollution from heat and energy sources. There will, however, continue to be a limited number of situations where gas powered CHP and ultra-low NOx gas boilers may be acceptable</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy S1/S5	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
Submission policy S1/S5 with modifications	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
	<p>and therefore will still contribute to existing poor air quality. As a result, these policy changes will have a positive effect on improving health and wellbeing and <b>objective 7</b>. Likewise the same positive effect against <b>objective 14</b> is identified for the same reasons in respect to reducing air pollution. Overall there will be no change in effects to the assessment of the policy for these objectives.</p> <p>The modifications to both policies S1 and S5 will have a significant positive effect on <b>objective 12</b> and reducing the borough's contribution to climate change because it will reduce carbon emissions by ensuring that gas CHP will only be allowed in exceptional cases where CHP is essential for the creation of a strategic heat network as part of the transition to the use of secondary sources to power heat networks. The proposed change to policy S5 will have a significant positive effect on reducing the borough's contribution to climate change because it will reduce carbon emissions by prioritising low carbon heating systems, in particular ASHPs, over gas boilers as the power source for minor developments with an individual heating system. The policy change to require a high standard of fabric energy efficiency for such developments will also contribute to reducing carbon emissions by reducing energy demand. The proposed change to Paragraph 6.67 of S5 will prevent the use of ultra-low NOx gas boilers as the sole heat source for the communal heating system of major and larger minor developments, which will have a positive effect on reducing carbon emissions. The modifications to paragraphs 6.79 and 6.80 provides clarification and does not change the policy requirement in terms of the cut-off point in relation to connection to a heat network. Overall the effect of the policy with modifications is considered to be significant positive on <b>objective 12</b>.</p> <p>The modifications to policies S1 and S5 will help to minimise the use of non-renewable energy sources by limiting the use of gas CHP and gas boilers. The change to policy S5 will also promote the use of ASHPs which are a renewable sustainable energy source. The modification to paragraph 6.75 does not change the requirement for the feasibility</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy S1/S5	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
Submission policy S1/S5 with modifications	++/+	+	0	+/0	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	++	++/+	+/0
	<p>assessment to use a whole life-cycle assessment methodology, the modification provides additional detail on this requirement so does not change the affects. The modifications will have minor positive effects on <b>objective 13</b> and overall the effects of the assessment will not change for the policy.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications to policy respond to technological evolution and will help to minimise carbon emissions from heating systems and promote sustainable energy infrastructure. The main positive effect of the modifications is their contribution to the decarbonisation of heat and the reduction of carbon emissions and helping reduce air pollution. There are no change in effects to the overall assessment of the policy.</li> </ul>													

# 5. Updated policy assessments – Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan modifications

## Policy BC2: Culture, retail and leisure uses

Table 1.20: Assessment of modifications to Policy BC2: Culture, retail and leisure uses

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The modification in relation to the locations for cultural uses and removal of sequential test may mean that there will be more cultural uses across the AAP area, however the policy still seeks to focus such uses within the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter, with retail and leisure uses encouraged within Local Shopping Areas. Such uses will still have to meet policies, including in part D, which will help avoid harmful impacts on amenity. The modifications are therefore considered to have a positive effect on <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications through the removal of the sequential test may mean that there will be more cultural uses across the AAP area which could have a positive impact on economic growth. The policy now encourages retail and leisure uses within the four Local Shopping Areas in the AAP area but they can be provided elsewhere too in line with other policies. Whilst the modifications could result in a slightly more positive framework for retail,</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELL BEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>cultural and leisure uses which can help support economic growth and a significant positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> overall the effect of the policy with modifications is considered to be significant positive.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification in relation to the locations for cultural uses and removal of sequential test may mean that there will be more cultural uses across the AAP area, however the policy still seeks to focus such uses within the Clerkenwell/Farringdon Cultural Quarter, with retail and leisure uses encouraged within Local Shopping Areas. Cultural uses will still have to meet policies to protect amenity, including in part D of BC2. The removal of the sequential approach could help support economic growth across the AAP area more and result in a slightly more positive effects although significant positive effects are already identified.</li> </ul>													

## Policy BC4: City Road

Table 1.21: Assessment of Policy BC4: City Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The modifications clarify the approach in terms of future operation of the canal for different uses through the development of a Waterspace Strategy for Islington’s canal network which will help balance the competing demands on use of the canal. Whilst it is considered there is some uncertainty around implementation of improved boater facilities the modifications are considered to have a minor positive effect against this objective because of the Waterspace Strategy but this is not considered to change the minor positive effect already identified overall for <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to have a minor positive effect against <b>objective 5</b> by improving the standard of accommodation for boaters. The modifications clarify the role of policies in relation to the open space policy but are not considered to have any additional effects in relation to the provision of moorings. Spatial Policy SP2 also provides further detail on this. On balance the overall effect is considered to remain as minor positive.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to have positive effects on <b>objective 7</b> health and wellbeing by improving the air quality. This could be achieved by installation of power supply to more moorings reducing reliance on diesel generators. On balance the policy does not require improvements therefore the effect would depend on implementation and is considered neutral. Overall the effect on <b>objective 7</b> therefore continues to be minor positive.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
	<p>The modifications make reference to educational and training uses as well as other uses that are appropriate to the function of the open space at City Road Basin in relation to the Waterspace Strategy, which may provide benefits to residents and are considered minor positive effect for <b>objective 8</b> and overall the effect of the policy with modifications is considered to be minor positive.</p> <p>The modifications provide clarification in relation to the consideration of moorings and boater facilities on the canal, where parts of the tow path are designated as open space. The criteria ensure that moorings do not harm the open space and have a minor positive effect. No additional effects on <b>objective 10</b> for open space have been identified as a result of the modifications.</p> <p>The modifications provide clarification in relation to the consideration of moorings and boater facilities on the canal, which is an SINC. No additional effects on <b>objective 11</b> and biodiversity have been identified as the policy states that development can only take place where it there is no detrimental impact on nature conservation and biodiversity value, and the character and amenity of the waterway corridor and its function as public open space therefore it is considered neutral. Overall a minor positive effect continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>The modifications, through clarifying the approach to the provision of boater facilities on the canal, have the potential to have minor positive effects on <b>objective 4</b> promoting liveable neighbourhoods as boater facilities could include waste and recycling infrastructure which would improve amenity, and electricity infrastructure that will reduce reliance on diesel generators and improve air quality; on <b>objective 12</b> reducing climate change by potentially introducing more electricity supply points shifting energy use of boats away from fossil fuels (diesel generators) on <b>objective 13</b> reducing waste by providing reuse and recycling facilities for boaters which will increase the proportion of household waste that is recycled and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and on <b>objective 14</b> and protecting natural resources by improving air</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
<b>Submission policy</b>	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
<b>Submission policy with modifications</b>	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0
	<p>quality through supply of electricity to boats and shifting away from diesel generator use, and also on water by providing water and sewerage infrastructure is available to service boats. On balance the policy does not require improvements therefore the effect would depend on implementation and is considered neutral. Overall a minor positive effect continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications will have mainly neutral effects for providing a framework for improved boater facilities and infrastructure along the canal corridor because of uncertainty around implementation, with positive effects dependant on implementation which could improve the function and amenity of those living on and using the canal. The modifications also clarify the approach in terms of future operation of the canal for different uses to develop a Waterspace Strategy for Islington’s canal network which will help balance the competing demands on use of the canal. However overall the positive effects for Policy BC4 have not changed and whilst the positive effects have not changed the results of the assessment the commentary demonstrates the consideration of the effects for the modifications sufficient to warrant completing the assessment.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC10: 254-262 Old Street (east of roundabout)

An assessment for BC10 was omitted from the IIA Examination Addendum, the assessment below is provided to correct this.

Table 1.22: Assessment of Site Allocation BC10: 254-262 Old Street (east of roundabout)

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Effect of site allocation	+	++	0	+	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>This allocation will have significant positive effects on <b>objective 8</b> and economic growth by providing employment (office) floorspace. Lack of office floorspace is a barrier to economic growth in the area. The Local Plan strategy is that new business floorspace will be focused in the CAZ, Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP area, the CAZ Fringe Spatial Strategy Areas and the Locally Strategic Industrial Sites. Given land constraints demand will not be met without prioritising business space in these areas, including the BCAAP area.</p> <p>The location of Bunhill and Clerkenwell is particularly suited to development of employment uses, with easy access to the major centres of employment and business of the London's West End, the City of London, Canary Wharf, as well as the emerging clusters of the City Fringe, Tech City, King's Cross and the Knowledge Quarter. The additional office floorspace in this central London location will support the economy and a range of employment types and opportunities in the borough that will reduce barriers to employment and have a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. The designation of this site as potentially suitable for tall buildings will assist in achieving the significant positive effects by provision of a substantial quantum of floorspace, and will lead to significant positive effects against <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land.</p> <p>Minor positive effects are identified against the <b>objectives 1 and 4</b> for a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods as refurbishment or redevelopment presents an opportunity to substantially improve the quality of the local environment and may provide local services or facilities at ground floor. The building at present does not offer a quality and attractive active frontage at street level, part of which is used for car parking.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Reasonable alternative: mixed use	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>This alternative is where this site allocation would be amended to allow more housing to be developed, allowing up to 50% of the uplift to be provided as housing with the other 50% office use, in addition to retail and leisure use on the ground floor.</p> <p>The alternative would have significant negative effects on economic growth. The additional housing would displace office floorspace, which is needed to meet demand from businesses, grow the economy, and provide employment and training opportunities. This site is particularly suitable for office development as it is located within the City Fringe Opportunity Area, very close to the Old Street roundabout and Old Street Station. This highly prominent location is valuable for an office use. The additional office floorspace would have positive effects on <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion through provision of a range of job opportunities, but less than an all office scheme.</p> <p>The alternative would have minor negative impacts on <b>objective 9</b> and reducing the need to travel by locating residential in the CAZ, rather than high trip generating office uses which can take advantage of the high accessibility by public transport and active travel, reducing trips by car. It has been assessed as minor positive against <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land as development would still lead to more intensive use of the land but is a less optimum use than an all office scheme.</p> <p>While there are residential uses fronting Old Street, the area suffers from high levels of noise and pollution which make providing an adequate level of amenity problematic, although these issues will decrease following public realm improvements in this area. There is some uncertainty about the likelihood of these impacts as good design may be able to overcome the limitations of the site for residential development which is why the assessment has minor positive effects against <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality, nevertheless this is a constrained location for residential development.</p> <p>As with the preferred approach minor positive effects are identified against <b>objective 1</b> for a high quality environment and minor positive effects are identified against <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods as refurbishment or</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	<p>redevelopment presents an opportunity to substantially improve the quality of the local environment. The building at present does not offer a quality and attractive active frontage at street level, part of which is used for car parking.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission policy will support economic development by locating offices in the optimum location. The alternative allows more housing in this location in place of offices which will have negative effects on economic growth, the efficient use of land, and transport. While this additional housing has positive effects it is considered on balance the site is considered more appropriate for offices with active uses at the ground floor given its current use, its location within the City Fringe Opportunity Area, it's location on Old Street, proximity to Tech City and access to the Old Street Station.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC13: Car park at 11 Shire House, Whitbread Centre, Lamb's Passage

Table 1.23: Site Assessment BC13: Car park at 11 Shire House, Whitbread Centre, Lamb's Passage

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The provision of significant office space, would have a positive effect in relation to economic growth and <b>objective 8</b> and on social inclusion <b>objective 6</b> through provision of a range of job opportunities. However it is considered that the modifications will reduce the effect for objective 8, given the potential for residential floorspace to reduce the overall amount of employment floorspace delivered. The assessment for economic growth has therefore been changed from a significant positive to a minor positive. The addition of housing will have a positive effect in relation to <b>objective 5</b>, and could also have positive effects on social inclusion. The introduction of hotel use in the submission allocation with modifications could reduce the availability of land to meet other development needs, in this case either housing or employment floorspace and it could potentially not as effectively balance competing demands on land but overall this affect is considered uncertain and overall this would not change the minor positives for objectives 5 and 8.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modifications are considered to have a positive effect in relation to housing delivery but may reduce the amount of employment floorspace delivered.</li> <li>Objective 5 and housing quality is now identified as a minor positive effect, as the delivery of additional housing will contribute towards Islington's significant housing need, and provide much needed affordable housing. Objective 8 and economic growth has been changed from a significant positive to a minor positive as the introduction of housing to the site may reduce the overall delivery of employment floorspace.</li> </ul>													



**Site Allocation BC21: 2, 4-10 Clerkenwell Road, 29-39 Goswell Road & 1-4 Great Sutton Street**

Table 1.24: Assessment of Site Allocation BC21: 2, 4-10 Clerkenwell Road, 29-39 Goswell Road & 1-4 Great Sutton Street

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	The policy with modifications is now allocated for hotel led mixed use development with retail and leisure uses. The modification to the allocation will reduce to minor positive effects for <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth by providing hotel use, retail and leisure floorspace, as there is a reduction in business floorspace from the submission allocation for an office development. With the office use no longer included there are no longer positive effects recorded against <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion as the proposed hotel use is not considered to support the same range and types of employment opportunities that can reduce barriers to employment. No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modified allocation is for hotel use which will support economic growth and employment, however the previous allocation for office development would have greater benefits for economic growth supporting the central activities zone office function and greater employment densities. Offices also provide a greater range of employment opportunities with positive effects with social inclusion when compared to hotels.</li> <li>The assessment against objective 8 for economic development has therefore been amended from significant positive effects down to minor positive effects. Effects on objective 6 for social inclusion has been moved from minor positive to neutral effects.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC24 Clerkenwell Fire Station, 42-44 Rosebery Avenue

Table 1.25: Assessment of Site Allocation BC24 Clerkenwell Fire Station, 42-44 Rosebery Avenue

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	++	+	++	+	0	+/0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modified site allocation seeks to clarify and expand other uses on the ground floor, to include commercial or community uses. As commercial uses have the potential to be located at ground floor a minor positive/neutral effects have been identified for <b>objective 8</b> to reflect the potential economic benefits of this whilst also recognising the uncertainty about which uses could be provided given the overall flexibility. In relation to liveable neighbourhoods, whilst the modified wording provides additional flexibility and may not result in the provision of social infrastructure use on the site, the other uses identified could also still contribute positively to the provision of liveable neighbourhoods and therefore no change in effect has been identified. No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification allows commercial uses on the ground floor which could have benefits for economic development.</li> <li>The assessment has been amended against objective 8 for economic growth from neutral for the submission policy compared to neutral/minor positive for the modifications.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC28: Angel Gate, Goswell Road

Table 1.26: Assessment of Site Allocation BC28: Angel Gate, Goswell Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	For the allocation with modifications whilst protection for the listed buildings on the site exists under Strategic and Development Management Policy DH2 which states that loss of a listed building will be strongly resisted, the clarification that these particular buildings should be retained strengthens this policy and results in minor positive effects against the heritage objective. No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification states that a listed building on the site should be retained which will protect the historic environment.</li> <li>A minor positive effect has been recorded against objective 3 for heritage.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC37: Triangle Estate, Goswell Road/Compton Street/Cyrus Street

Table 1.26: Assessment of Site Allocation BC37: Triangle Estate, Goswell Road/Compton Street/Cyrus Street

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	0	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	++	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	The site allocation with modifications will have positive effects on residential amenity and open space. New minor positive effects have been identified against the <b>objectives 7 and 10</b> for health and wellbeing and open space, resulting from the modifications due to the improvements on open space and public realm on the estate and the positive amenity and open space benefits for those living on the estate. No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification will benefit residents by ensuring that impacts on them are minimised and that development improves the security, function, accessibility, and appearance of public realm and open space on the estate.</li> <li>The assessment has been assessed to result in additional minor positive effects in relation to objectives 7 for health and well-being and objective 10 for open space.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC49: Building adjacent to railway lines and opposite

Table 1.27: Assessment of Site Allocation BC49: Building adjacent to railway lines and opposite 18-20 Farringdon Lane

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	For the allocation with modifications, the additional development consideration related to the electrical substation could potentially reduce the overall quantum of floorspace provided if the substation is re-provided on site. The potential re-provision of the substation could result in a lower quantum of development for office uses resulting in a minor positive effect for <b>objective 8</b> and economic development. The other effects identified previously remain unchanged. No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification states that the development should integrate or relocate the electricity substation on the site if this is still required, which may reduce the development capacity of the site.</li> <li>As a result of the modifications the effect for objective 8 for economic growth has been reduced from a significant positive and a minor positive.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation BC51: Italia Conti School, 23 Goswell Road

Table 1.29: Assessment of Site Allocation BC51: Italia Conti School, 23 Goswell Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCES	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	0	0	0/+	0	0/+	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The modified allocation is for office development which shows minor positive effects against <b>objective 8</b> and <b>objective 6</b> as the additional office floorspace in this central London location will support the economy and a range of employment types and opportunities in the borough that will reduce barriers to employment.</p> <p>The site is no longer allocated for social infrastructure, the assessment has been amended for neutral effects against the liveable neighbourhoods <b>objective 4</b>.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification changes the allocation to office development which will support the economy and a range of employment types and opportunities in the borough and reduce barriers to employment leading to positive effects for <b>objective 8</b> for economic development and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion through providing job opportunities. The requirement for retention of D1 has been removed and so no positive effects are assessed for <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods through provision of education use.</li> <li>The site allocation as amended would result in minor positive effects in relation to <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion, while a neutral effect has now been identified in relation to liveable neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>													

## 6. Updated policy assessments – Site Allocations

Table 1.30: Site Assessment KC8: Bemerton Estate

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location, positive for <b>objective 2</b> . Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need, positive for <b>objective 5</b> as well as addressing objectives relating to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. The allocation requires public realm improvements which will benefit the quality of the built environment, creating a safer and more inclusive environment, positive for <b>objective 1</b> as well as the re-provision of community and commercial space that will promote more liveable neighbourhoods, positive for <b>objective 4</b> .													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for infill residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing. The allocation should also deliver public realm improvements and re-provide commercial and community space, providing benefits in terms of a high quality environment, liveable neighbourhoods and social inclusion.</li> <li>Objective 5 for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for objective 1 for high quality environment, objective 2 for efficient use of land, objective 4 for liveable neighbourhoods and objective 6 for social inclusion.</li> </ul>													

Site Allocation VR1: Fayers Site, 202-228 York Way, Former Venus Printers, 196-200 York Way

Table 1.31: Site Assessment VR1: Fayers Site, 202-228 York Way, Former Venus Printers, 196-200 York Way

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>Following the decision to separate the submission VR1 site allocation into two allocations, the submission allocation with modifications VR1 allocation is for 'intensification for a significant amount of B8 use alongside a small proportion of flexible office space' reflecting the extant planning permission for the site. The 5-storey limit on building heights previously included in the allocation has been removed. The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on the local view as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2) therefore the effect on <b>objective 3</b> is changed to neutral.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The removal of the 5-storey height limit from the allocation has been identified as changing the effect on objective 3 (heritage) to neutral. The impact on the local view will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2).</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR2: 230-238 York Way

Table 1.32: Site Assessment VR2: 230-238 York Way

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>As a higher density employment use, offices/research and development use could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of industrial floorspace at the site, albeit there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that the amended allocation is not likely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS (an appropriate location for such development) and may bring a different balance to competing demands between land uses. Whilst there are land use benefits from the co-location of offices/research and development with industrial, depending on the extent they are intensified, there are also potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses, given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land from a significant positive, to a minor positive.</p> <p>The amended allocation is considered to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> economic growth. Office development would bring higher-density employment to the site and co-locating office/research and development space with intensification of industrial could strengthen the local economy through the intensification of employment floorspace. The additional text added in terms of the industrial function of the LSIS remaining will help to address some of the potential longer term and cumulative effects relating to the impacts of offices on the wider industrial function of the LSIS. However, given the difference in values between office and industrial uses, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification for industrial uses overall. The LSIS has a strategic position in relation to the CAZ. It is one of the last remaining industrial clusters within close proximity to the CAZ and supports Central London's economy through</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>the provision of 'last mile' distribution/logistics and 'just in time' servicing. Given offices/research and development uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS and this is the key location for their intensification a reduction in the positive effect for <b>objective 8</b> has been identified, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced. The modified allocation would continue to have a positive effect on social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for industrial intensification alongside office uses, a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 6</b> and social inclusion is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>The site is partially within a protected viewing corridor. The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on the local view as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2) therefore the effect on <b>objective 3</b> is changed to neutral.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objectives 2</b> the efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positives rather than significant positives, recognising that whilst co-location can have some positive effects in relation to the overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses in a priority industrial location, although it is accepted that judgements on both are finely balanced. The removal of the 5-storey height limit from the allocation has been identified as changing the effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage to</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	neutral. The impact on the local view will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2).													

## Site Allocation VR3: Tileyard Studios, Tileyard Road, N7 9AH

Table 1.33: Site Assessment VR3: Tileyard Studios, Tileyard Road, N7 9AH

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>Under the modified wording of the allocation, there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that it is not likely to have the same extent of benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS (an appropriate location for such development), although it is recognised that the allocation seeks to retain the functionality of workshops and light industrial units. Whilst there are land use benefits from the intensification of studios and offices on the site, there are potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses and given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> the efficient use of land from a significant positive, to a minor positive.</p> <p>Despite the change in focus from industrial intensification to the co-location of office and industrial uses, the amended allocation is considered to retain potential to have a significant positive effect in relation to economic growth. The ability to secure a range of unit sizes through condition should support the creation of small and micro businesses of the kind already accommodated within the site, and facilitate their growth. In addition, the allocation seeks to retain the flexibility of existing spaces for studio/hybrid uses.</p> <p>To reflect the removal of the height limit from the development considerations the assessment for <b>objective 3</b> for heritage and <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment have been changed to neutral. Any impacts on heritage and the built</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
	environment will be determined by the design of any proposed development and assessed through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2).													
	No other effects have been identified for the modifications.													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the submission allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land is now identified as a minor positive rather than a significant positive, as whilst there may be benefits arising from the intensification of studios and offices on the site, there may also be impacts due to there being less intensification for industrial uses, although it is accepted this is a finely balanced judgement. <b>Objectives 1</b> for high-quality environment and <b>objective 3</b> for heritage have been changed from a minor positive to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR4: 20 Tileyard Road

Table 1.34: Site Assessment VR4: 20 Tileyard Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>As a higher density employment use, office/research and development uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of industrial floorspace, albeit there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that the amended allocation is not likely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS (an appropriate location for such development), bringing a different balance to the competing demands between land uses. Whilst there are land use benefits from the co-location of offices/research and development with industrial, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, there are potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses and given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land from a significant positive, to a minor positive.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a minor positive effect on economic growth and social inclusion. Office/research and development uses would bring higher-density employment to the site and co-locating office/research and development space with intensification of industrial could strengthen the local economy through the intensification of employment floorspace. The additional text added in terms of the industrial function of the LSIS remaining will help to address some of the potential longer term and cumulative effects relating to the impacts of offices on the wider industrial function of the LSIS. However, given the difference in values between office and industrial uses, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification for industrial uses overall. The LSIS has a strategic</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>position in relation to the CAZ. It is one of the last remaining industrial clusters within close proximity to the CAZ and supports Central London's economy through the provision of 'last mile' distribution/logistics and 'just in time' servicing. Given office uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS and this is the key location for their intensification a reduction in the positive effect has been identified, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced. The modified allocation would continue to have a positive effect on social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for industrial intensification, alongside offices, a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 6</b> is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>The site is within a protected viewing corridor. The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on the local view as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2) therefore the effect on <b>objective 3</b> is changed to neutral.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positives rather than significant positives, recognising that whilst co-location can have some positive effects in relation to the</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses in a priority industrial location, although it is accepted that judgements on both are finely balanced. <b>Objective 1</b> for high-quality environment and <b>objective 3</b> for heritage have been changed from a minor positive to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage.</p>													

## Site Allocation VR5: 22-23 Tileyard Road and part of 226-228 York Way

Table 1.35: Site Assessment VR5: 22-23 Tileyard Road and part of 226-228 York Way

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The site is partially within a protected viewing corridor The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on the local view as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2) therefore the effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage is changed to neutral.</p> <p>Although not subject to a modification the minor positive in relation to high quality design in <b>objective 1</b> remains given the retention of a specific criterion within the development considerations regarding the prominent corner location of the site warranting a high-quality, well-designed building.</p> <p>Flexible business uses could include office use which is a higher density employment use and could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace, alongside the provision of light industrial use. The allocation also now recognises that other future proposals on the site would be required to provide for co-location. Within this amended policy context there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that the allocation is not likely to have the same extent of benefits previously identified, bringing a different balance to competing demands between land uses. Whilst there are benefits from the provision of flexible business floorspace alongside light industrial use (as well as co-location), depending on the extent to which higher density employment uses are intensified, there are potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses, given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land from a significant positive to a minor positive.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a minor positive effect on economic growth and social inclusion as it has the potential to bring higher-density employment to the site, which could strengthen the local economy through the intensification of employment floorspace. However, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification for industrial uses overall. The LSIS has a strategic position in relation to the CAZ. It is one of the last remaining industrial clusters within close proximity to the CAZ and supports Central London’s economy through the provision of 'last mile' distribution/logistics and ‘just in time’ servicing. Given flexible business uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS and this is the key location for their intensification a reduction in the positive effect has been identified, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced. The revised allocation would continue to have a positive effect on social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for light industrial uses, alongside flexible business space (and potentially co-location) a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 6</b> is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positives rather than significant positives, recognising that whilst the allocation may have some positive effects in relation to the overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses, although it is accepted that judgements on both are finely balanced. The removal of the 5-storey height limit from the allocation has been identified as changing the effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage to neutral. The impact on the local view will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2).</li> </ul>													

## Site Assessment VR6: 4 Brandon Road (formerly site reference VR5)

Table 1.36: Site Assessment VR6: 4 Brandon Road (formerly site reference VR5)

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>As a higher density employment use, offices/research and development uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of industrial floorspace, albeit there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that it is not likely to have the same extent of benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS (an appropriate location for such development), bringing a different balance to the competing demands between land uses. Whilst there are land use benefits from the co-location of offices/research and development with industrial, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, there are potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses, given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land from a significant positive, to a minor positive.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth. Office/research and development uses would bring higher-density employment to the site and co-locating office/research and development space with intensification of industrial could strengthen the local economy through the intensification of employment floorspace. The additional text added in terms of the industrial function of the LSIS remaining will help to address some of the potential longer term and cumulative effects relating to the impacts of offices on the wider industrial function of the LSIS. However, given the difference in values between office and industrial uses, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification for industrial uses overall. The LSIS has a strategic position in relation to the CAZ. It is one of the last remaining industrial clusters within close proximity of the CAZ and</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>supports Central London's economy through the provision of 'last mile' distribution/logistics and 'just in time' servicing. Given office uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS and this is the key location for their intensification a reduction in the positive effect has been identified for <b>objective 8</b>, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced. The revised allocation would continue to have a positive effect on social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for industrial intensification, alongside offices, a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 6</b> is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on the local view as that impact will be determined by the design of a proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2) therefore the effect on <b>objective 3</b> is changed to neutral. The minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> has been amended to neutral, as whilst there is no site-specific criteria guiding location sensitive design, this will be considered through the application of other plan policies. Removing the height restriction may result in a marginally higher building coming forward, although that is uncertain as it will be determined by the design of any proposed development.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positives rather than significant positives, recognising that whilst co-location can have some positive effects in relation to the overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses in a priority industrial location, although it is accepted that judgements on both are finely balanced. <b>Objective 1</b> for high-quality environment and <b>objective 3</b> for heritage have been changed from a minor positive to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR7: 43-53 Brewery Road

Table 1.37: Site Assessment VR7: 43-53 Brewery Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications to remove the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on local views as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed building, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2). The effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage has therefore been changed to neutral. The minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment has been amended to neutral, as whilst there is not site-specific criteria guiding location sensitive design, this will be considered through the application of other plan policies.</p> <p>Removing the height restriction may result in a marginally higher building coming forward, although that is uncertain as it will be determined by the design of any proposed development, therefore there is no change to the assessment of <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed modification to remove the limit on building heights will not necessarily result in a negative impact on heritage assets but could be considered to offer less protection than the originally allocation.</li> <li>Objective 1 for high-quality environment and objective 3 heritage have been changed from minor positives to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage. The rest of the assessment remains unchanged.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR8: 55-61 Brewery Road

Table 1.38: Site Assessment VR8: 55-61 Brewery Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The site sits within a protected viewing corridor. The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on local views as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed development, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2). The effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage has therefore been changed to neutral. The minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment has been amended to neutral, as although there is not site-specific criteria guiding location sensitive design, this will be considered through the application of other plan policies.</p> <p>Removing the height restriction may result in a marginally higher building coming forward, although that is uncertain as it will be determined by the design of any proposed building, therefore there is no change to the assessment of <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed modification to remove the limit on building heights will not necessarily result in a negative impact on heritage assets but could be considered to provide less protection than the original allocation.</li> <li><b>Objective 1</b> for high-quality environment and <b>objective 3</b> heritage have been changed from minor positives to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage. The rest of the assessment remains unchanged.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR9: Rebond House, 98-124 Brewery Road

Table 1.39: Site Assessment VR9: Rebond House, 98-124 Brewery Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on local views as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed development, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2). The effect on <b>objective 3</b> for heritage has therefore been changed to neutral. The minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment has been amended to neutral, as although there is not site-specific criteria guiding location sensitive design, this will be considered through the application of other plan policies.</p> <p>Removing the height restriction may result in a marginally higher building coming forward, although that is uncertain as it will be determined by the design of any proposed building, therefore there is no change to the assessment of <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed modification to remove the limit on building heights will not necessarily result in a negative impact on heritage assets but does offer less protection than originally envisioned in the allocation.</li> <li><b>Objective 1</b> for high-quality environment and <b>objective 3</b> for heritage have been changed from minor positives to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design and heritage. The rest of the assessment remains unchanged.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation VR10: 34 Brandon Road

Table 1.40: Site Assessment VR10: 34 Brandon Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The site sits within a protected viewing corridor. The removal of the height limit will not necessarily result in a negative impact on local views as that impact will be determined by the design of any proposed development, and will also be considered through other relevant policies (e.g. DH2). The minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment has been amended to neutral, as although there is no longer site-specific criteria guiding location sensitive design, this will be considered through the application of other plan policies.</p> <p>As a higher density employment use, co-location of offices/research and development uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace and some intensification of light industrial floorspace, albeit there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the same extent. As a result it is considered that it is not likely to have the same extent of benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS (an appropriate location for such development), bringing a different balance to the competing demands between land uses. Whilst there are land use benefits from the co-location of offices with light industrial, depending on the extent to which offices are intensified, there are potential impacts that could arise from less intensification for industrial uses, given that office needs are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough. Whilst it is finely balanced it is considered that overall there is likely to be a change in effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land from a significant positive to a minor positive.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth. Office/research and development uses would bring higher-density employment to the site and co-locating office space/research and development with the intensification of industrial uses could strengthen the local economy through the</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>intensification of employment floorspace. The additional text added in terms of the industrial function of the LSIS remaining will help to address some of the potential longer term and cumulative effects relating to the impacts of offices on the wider industrial function of the LSIS. However, given the difference in values between office and industrial uses, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification for industrial uses overall. The LSIS has a strategic position in relation to the CAZ. It is one of the last remaining industrial clusters within close proximity of the CAZ and supports Central London's economy through the provision of 'last mile' distribution/logistics and 'just in time' servicing. Given offices uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS and this is the key location for their intensification a reduction in the positive effect has been identified, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced. The revised allocation would continue to have a positive effect on <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for industrial intensification, alongside offices, a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 6</b> is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment considers there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation and as a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positives rather than significant positives, recognising that whilst co-location can have some positive effects in relation to the overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses in a priority</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	industrial location, although it is accepted that judgements on both are finely balanced. <b>Objective 1</b> for high-quality environment has been changed from minor positive to neutral, as there is no longer specific text in relation to building heights. However no negative effects have been identified and other relevant policies will be applied in relation to design. The rest of the assessment remains unchanged													

## Site Allocation AUS8: 161-169 Essex Road

Table 1.41 Site Assessment AUS8: 161-169 Essex Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	++	++	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	++	++	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>For the allocation with modifications, the development of the car park for residential use would help to meet the need for additional housing in the area including affordable housing, leading to a minor positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Whilst the change from business use to residential could have an effect in relation to economic growth, the site would still provide relevant town centre uses which would continue to provide for positive economic growth effects albeit less positive. However, overall minor positive in relation to <b>objective 8</b> continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modification changes the focus of uses on the car park to the rear of the site, from business uses being prioritised to recognising residential use could be appropriate, this will be positive effects in terms of meeting housing needs. Whilst the change away from business use could have an effect in relation to economic growth, the site allocation with modifications still provides for town centre uses which would continue to provide for positive economic growth effects.</li> <li>The submission allocation with modifications would lead to an additional minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality. No other changes in effects have been identified.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation NH1: Morrison’s supermarket and adjacent car park, 10 Hertslet Road, and 8-32 Seven Sisters Road

Table 1.42: Site Assessment NH1: Morrison’s supermarket and adjacent car park, 10 Hertslet Road, and 8-32 Seven Sisters Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	++	0	++	+	+	+	++	0	+	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	++	0	++	++	+	+	++	0	+	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications no longer seeks to increase in retail floorspace and seeks retention and improvements to existing floorspace. Whilst slightly less positive this will still help meet resident’s needs, maintain access to town centre uses and foster economic growth and is not considered to change the positive assessments overall for objectives <b>4, and 8</b>.</p> <p>The modification which changes the emphasis and seeks a large quantum of residential will have positive effects in relation to <b>objective 5</b>, which will change the effects to significant positive effects overall. It is considered the additional modifications in relation to active frontages, social inclusion and residential amenity, whilst positive, do not affect the overall assessment</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The only change in effects has been identified for the submission policy as modified from the change in emphasis on land uses the site is for a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs. The allocation will still contribute towards the delivery of economic growth.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation NH13: 166-220 Holloway Road

Table 1.43: Site Assessment NH13: 166-220 Holloway Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications allows for an element of student accommodation in accordance with the modification to SDMP Policy H6 part A(iii). The amendment permits the provision of purpose-built student accommodation on university campuses as part of a master-planned reconfiguration of educational floorspace where it would result in the consolidation of social infrastructure in compliance with Policy SC1 part D(iii). Whilst student accommodation is not considered to deliver flexible and adaptable buildings to meet evolving social and economic needs compared to other types of development, overall this does not outweigh the positive effect that has already been identified as the consolidation of existing uses alongside some student accommodation is an efficient use of land. A significant positive effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land therefore continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications could be argued to have positive effects in relation to <b>objective 5</b> as it will contribute towards housing supply, however the provision and quantum of such accommodation is uncertain and it is unclear whether affordable student accommodation would meet the accommodation needs of Islington students, therefore a neutral effect has continued to be identified.</p> <p>The references to active frontages are not considered to change the effects of the original assessment which already identifies a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment and a significant</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>positive for <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods. The additional reference to tall buildings is not considered to alter the original assessment, which accounted for this.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst student accommodation is not considered to deliver flexible and adaptable buildings to meet evolving social and economic needs compared to other types of development and the contribution it might make towards housing supply is uncertain overall the modifications do not change the outcome of the assessment for efficient use of land and housing quality.</li> <li>Whilst the modifications impact on the commentary about some of the effects, no change in effects has been identified.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation NH14: 236-250 Holloway Road and 29 Hornsey Road

Table 1.44: Site Assessment NH14: 236-250 Holloway Road and 29 Hornsey Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications will allow for an element of student accommodation in accordance with the modification to SDMP Policy H6 part A(iii). The amendment permits the provision of purpose-built student accommodation on university campuses as part of a master-planned reconfiguration of educational floorspace where it would result in the consolidation of social infrastructure in compliance with Policy SC1 part D(iii). The allocation will continue to have a minor positive effect in optimising the use of previously developed land and buildings. Whilst student accommodation is not considered to deliver flexible and adaptable buildings to meet evolving social and economic needs compared to other types of development, overall this does not outweigh the minor positive that has already been identified as the consolidation of existing uses alongside some student accommodation is an efficient use of land. A minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land therefore continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst the submission allocation with modifications could be argued to have positive effects in relation to <b>objective 5</b> as it will contribute towards housing supply, the provision and quantum of such accommodation is uncertain and it is unclear whether affordable student accommodation would meet the accommodation needs of Islington students, therefore a neutral effect has continued to be identified.</p> <p>The references to active frontages are not considered to affect the original assessment which already identifies a minor positive in relation to <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment and a significant positive for <b>objective 4</b></p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	<p>for liveable neighbourhoods. The updates to the Use Classes Order and viewing corridor are not considered to affect the original assessment.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst student accommodation is not considered to deliver flexible and adaptable buildings to meet evolving social and economic needs compared to other types of development and the contribution it might make towards housing supply is uncertain overall the modifications do not change the outcome of the assessment for efficient use of land and housing quality. It is recognised however that the allocation requires consolidation and improvement of the existing education use which will have benefits in terms of liveable neighbourhoods, economic growth and social inclusion.</li> <li>• Whilst the modifications impact on the discussion about some of the effects, no change in effects has been identified.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation FP4: 129-131 & 133 Fonthill Road & 13 Goodwin Street

Table 1.45: Site Assessment FP4: 129-131 & 133 Fonthill Road & 13 Goodwin Street

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications to allow for an element of residential use at the site would have a positive effect in terms of housing quality and <b>objective 5</b>. Good quality housing, including the provision of affordable housing to meet identified need, would be required in line with other Plan policies.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications would still help to foster economic growth but perhaps not to same extent given the provision of an element of residential use. In recognition of this the significant positive effect has been reduced to a minor positive effect <b>for objective 8</b>.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission allocation with modifications allows for an element of residential use at the site, whilst continuing to promote a retail-led mixed use development. The submission allocation with modifications will still foster economic growth, but perhaps not to the same extent. The delivery of housing would however contribute towards the borough's significant housing need and provide much needed affordable housing.</li> <li>The introduction of an element of residential use results in an additional minor positive in relation to affordable housing <b>objective 5</b>. However, a minor positive rather than a significant positive effect has been identified in relation to <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth as the overall delivery of retail and business floorspace in an appropriate location may be reduced due to the inclusion of residential use.</li> </ul>													



## Site Allocation FP5: 1 Prah Road

Table 1.46: Site Assessment FP5: 1 Prah Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a significant positive effect with regards to <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality as affordable housing would be required as part of any residential development to contribute towards the borough's evidenced housing need. However the removal of business floorspace from the allocation, including SME workspace would result in in a change in effect for <b>objective 8</b> for economic development from significant positive to neutral.</p> <p>For the submission allocation with modifications, as the site is within the town centre, it would provide future residents with good access to facilities and amenities in accordance with <b>objective 4</b> and liveable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>For the submission allocation with modifications, the removal of the reference to public realm improvements from the allocation is not considered to have altered the initial assessment for a residential development in this location. Although the allocation no longer makes explicit reference to public realm improvements, the need for new development to make improvements to the public realm will be dealt with through other Plan policies where appropriate.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For submission allocation with modifications, the change in the land use would provide benefits in relation to meeting housing needs and would also contribute toward liveable neighbourhoods, however the change from business use would reduce the positive effects previously identified in relation to economic growth.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is now identified as a significant positive as the submission allocation with modification would contribute towards meeting housing need. The provision of housing on the side would also lead to a minor positive effect in relation to liveable neighbourhoods. However the change from business use results in the significant positive for <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth is reduced to a neutral effect.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation ARCH1: Vorley Road/Archway Bus Station, N19

Table 1.47: Site Assessment ARCH1: Vorley Road/Archway Bus Station, N19

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	++	++	0	+	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	++	++	0	+	++	+	+	+/0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The provision of social and community infrastructure is likely to have a positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods, <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion and <b>objective 7</b> for health and wellbeing but does not change the minor positive effects already identified for these objectives.</p> <p>The modification requires the site to accommodate social and community infrastructure. As a result the assessment of the effect on economic growth has changed slightly from a minor positive to a neutral/minor positive for <b>objective 8</b>. This means the previous requirement for an element of business floorspace including affordable workspace and space suitable for SMEs has been slightly downgraded, although the potential for such provision is still acknowledged.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission allocation with modifications promotes residential development with an additional requirement for social and community infrastructure and suggests there may be potential for an element of business floorspace. The introduction of social and community uses will have positive effects in relation to liveable neighbourhoods and social inclusion. The effect of the change in emphasis regarding business floorspace is less certain, and has been reflected in the assessment.</li> <li><b>Objective 8</b> for economic growth is now identified as a neutral/minor positive rather than a minor positive, as the requirement for the site to provide social and community infrastructure may affect the delivery of business floorspace. The assessment remains unchanged in other respects.</li> </ul>													



## Site Allocation ARCH3: Archway Central Methodist Hall

Table 1.48: Site Assessment ARCH3: Archway Central Methodist Hall

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>Although support for cultural provision has been removed from the submission allocation with modifications it is considered that a mixed-use development including retail could also improve access to essential services and promote an economically thriving town centre and therefore the minor positive effect for <b>objective 4</b> and liveable neighbourhoods remains appropriate.</p> <p>The new emphasis in the allocation on mixed-use development including offices and retail will also provide employment opportunities and provide space in an accessible location for business use and therefore a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 8</b> remains appropriate.</p> <p>The modifications in relation to the site address, current and/or previous use, planning history and viewing corridor are not considered to affect the original assessment.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the modified allocation has a more commercial focus, it is considered that on balance this will also boost the local economy, improve the vitality of the town centre and deliver essential services that support liveable neighbourhoods with positive effects identified in relation to <b>objectives 4 and 8</b>, however overall no change in effects has been identified as a result of the modifications to the allocation.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation ARCH5: Archway Campus, Highgate Hill, N19

Table 1.49: Site Assessment ARCH5: Archway Campus, Highgate Hill, N19

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBO	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSIO N	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEIN	8. ECONOMIC	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE	14. NATURAL RESOURC
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	+	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The introduction of some commercial use to the submission allocation with modifications may have a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 8</b> economic growth, with both commercial use and community and social infrastructure use also contributing to the liveable neighbourhoods objective by providing accessible services.</p> <p>The introduction of an element of student housing has the potential to make less efficient use of the land against <b>objective 1</b> and for priority land uses, however the allocation text is clear that student accommodation may be provided where it is not considered to impact negatively on the provision of priority conventional housing on-site.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strong positive benefits identified in the original assessment in relation to housing and the efficient use of land are unchanged, as although student accommodation is not considered to be the most efficient use of land, the allocation text is clear that it should not be delivered at the expense of conventional residential use. The most significant change to the assessment relates to the introduction of an element of commercial use, which is considered likely to have a minor positive effect on economic growth.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation ARCH6: Job Centre, 1 Elthorne Road

Table 1.50: Site Assessment ARCH6: Job Centre, 1 Elthorne Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The modification changes the allocation from being business-led to mixed use development. The change in the potential balance of uses on the site could lead to a more significant positive effect with regards to housing quality if more housing, and specifically more affordable housing, is delivered on the site. A significant positive effect has therefore been identified as a result of the modification in relation to <b>objective 5</b>. For the residential use there would be an increase in accessibility to services in Archway for the residents on the site although it is not considered that this is significant enough to change in overall minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> liveable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Conversely, the submission allocation with modifications may have a more limited positive effect with regards to <b>objective 2 and</b> the efficient use of land and economic growth for <b>objective 8</b> than the original business-led allocation if less business floorspace, including SME space, is delivered. The site is located in Archway Town Centre where competing demands for land have to be carefully balanced, and non-residential uses are likely to be necessary to meet the needs of residents for services and facilities and promote diverse, vibrant and economically thriving town centres. Whilst residential development could bring more residents into the town centre, potentially improving footfall for local businesses, the site itself would not make as significant a contribution towards the borough's economy. Therefore whilst the mix of uses within the allocation is appropriate, the mixed use allocation does not prioritise either an employment or retail led use of land which given the town centre location is not the most efficient use of the land possible and results in an overall minor positive effect.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	0	+	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<p>The factual update to the ownership and use of the building and update to phasing do not affect the original assessment and the removal of reference to the Archway Cultural Quarter from the development considerations is also not considered to affect the previous assessment of the site.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered the more flexible approach to residential use will have a significant positive effect on housing delivery and the provision of much needed affordable housing. However, there could also be a reduction in the amount of business floorspace secured in what is an appropriate town centre location due to the change in the approach to housing.</li> <li><b>Objectives 2</b> for efficient use of land and <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth are now identified as minor positive instead of significant positive effects, as although the uses identified in the allocation are appropriate they are not considered to optimise the use of the land to the same extent or provide as much opportunity for economic growth and employment generation. <b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is now identified as a significant positive effect instead of a minor positive due to the stronger support for residential use in the allocation.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS5: Bush Industrial Estate, Station Road

Table 1.51: Site Assessment OIS5: Bush Industrial Estate, Station Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>As a higher density employment use, co-locating office/research and development uses with industrial uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace, although there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation. As a result it is considered that the submission allocation with modifications is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS, an appropriate location for such development, but there are likely to be benefits in terms of intensifying overall employment floorspace. Whilst it is a finely balanced judgement, particularly given that the need for office floorspace are prioritised for delivery elsewhere in the borough, it is considered that overall the amended allocation continues to make an efficient use of previously developed land and buildings and there will continue to be a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 2</b> and the efficient use of land.</p> <p>The modifications add development considerations to ensure potential impact on the school and residential uses amenity are considered and are mitigated for which has a minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods by reducing impacts of noise, vibration or pollution.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to have a minor positive effect on <b>objective 8</b> for economic growth. Office/research and development uses would bring higher-density employment to the site and co-locating office/research and development space with intensification of industrial could strengthen the local economy through the intensification of employment floorspace. The additional text added in terms of</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	<p>retaining the industrial function of the LSIS will help to address some of the potential longer term and cumulative effects relating to the impacts of offices on the wider industrial function of the LSIS. However, given the difference in values between office and industrial uses, it is recognised that the revised policy could result in less intensification of industrial uses overall. As office uses are sought elsewhere in the borough and industrial uses are specifically sought within the LSIS, which is a key location for their intensification, a reduction in the positive effect in economic growth (objective 8) has been identified, although it is recognised that this judgement is finely balanced.</p> <p>The submission allocation with modifications would continue to have a positive effect on <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion by providing opportunities for residents to access employment in the borough in line with the social inclusion objective. Industrial sectors provide job opportunities for the resident population. Opportunities within these sectors may offer more diverse ways of accessing employment through learning skills on the job for those who have low qualification levels or no qualifications, who often face more barriers to access work. If these sectors are lost in the local area, residents dependent on these jobs may be at risk of unemployment. Through providing for industrial intensification, alongside offices, a minor positive in relation to is considered to still be justified.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a higher density employment use, co-locating office/research and development uses with industrial uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace, although there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation. As a result it is considered that the amended allocation is unlikely to have the same benefits previously identified in terms of increasing industrial provision within the LSIS.</li> <li><b>Objectives 8</b> for economic growth is now identified as a minor positive effect rather than a significant positive, recognising that whilst co-location may have some positive effects in relation to the overall intensification of employment uses, there could also be less intensification of industrial uses in a priority industrial location, although it is accepted that the judgement is finely balanced. <b>Objective 4</b> is also</li> </ul>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	identified as a minor positive through addressing the need to consider amenity impacts for neighbouring sensitive uses.													

**Site Allocation OIS9 (formerly site reference OIS29): Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church**

Table 1.52: Site Assessment OIS9: Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE	14. NATURAL RESOURCE
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The co-location of social and community infrastructure uses with housing at the site is considered to be an efficient use of the site which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>. The existing buildings on site are currently in a state of disrepair and development should have a positive effect on the built environment for <b>objective 1</b>. This would support the delivery of much needed affordable housing on the site and is positive for <b>objective 5</b>, bring back underused social and community infrastructure into more productive use which is positive for <b>objectives 6 and 7</b>. This would have significant positive effects for local residents by encouraging social interaction and providing community and faith facilities, alongside the benefits brought by new good quality housing. This supports the liveable neighbourhoods, social inclusion and health objectives.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation allows for re-provision of the Church and community space alongside residential development. This will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, as well as helping to address social inclusion, liveable neighbourhoods and health and wellbeing objectives.</li> <li><b>Objective 2</b> for efficient use of land and <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods are identified as significant positive effects, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment, <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality, <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion and <b>objective 7</b> for health and wellbeing.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS10: Hornsey Road and Grenville Works, 2A Grenville Road

Table 1.53: Site Assessment OIS10: Hornsey Road and Grenville Works, 2A Grenville Road

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCES	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	-/0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications is considered to make an efficient use of land as it will provide office floorspace in a Priority Employment Location (PEL), albeit given the need to balance land uses this is less positive than the submission allocation because the residential floorspace is not focusing appropriate development in the right location - a priority employment location. However, on balance the modifications are still considered minor positive in relation to <b>objective 2</b>.</p> <p>For the submission allocation with modifications, given the employment use of the site and its location within the Hornsey Road/Marlborough Road Priority Employment Location (PEL), a mixed use development could lead to the loss of existing business floorspace resulting in negative impacts on economic growth. However the provision of some office development would contribute towards employment objectives and help to mitigate the impacts of this to some extent, meaning that a neutral/minor negative effect in relation to economic growth has been identified for <b>objective 8</b>.</p> <p>For the submission allocation with modifications, the site would provide affordable housing as part of any residential element, contributing towards meeting Islington's housing need and which is positive for <b>objective 5</b> as well as addressing objectives relating to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. There is some potential for conflict between residents and existing commercial occupiers in the PEL, resulting from noise from vehicle movements associated with business operating hours and delivery and servicing requirements. The development considerations recognise this potential impact and expect no harm to neighbouring amenity from service and delivery arrangements therefore no changes to the effects on <b>objective 4</b> are identified and they remain neutral.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE	14. NATURAL RESOURCE
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission allocation with modifications for mixed-use office and residential development reflects the extant planning permission for the site. Whilst this could have a minor negative effect on economic growth given the previous employment use of the site and its location within a PEL, the provision of some office development would contribute towards employment objectives and help to mitigate the impacts of this to some extent. The modified allocation would have positive effects on housing delivery and the provision of much needed affordable housing.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is now identified as a minor positive effect, following the amendment to the allocation to include residential use. <b>Objective 8</b> for economic growth is now identified as a neutral/minor negative rather than a minor positive, as the change in emphasis away from business-led redevelopment may have negative impacts on the local economy, although it is recognised this may be mitigated, at least partially, by some office use of the site.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS12 (formerly site reference OIS32): New Orleans Estate

Table 1.54: Site Assessment OIS12: New Orleans Estate

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area which is positive for <b>objective 2</b> , offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location which is positive for <b>objective 5</b> . Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion which is positive for <b>objective 6</b> . The allocation requires public realm improvements that will benefit the quality of the built environment which is positive for <b>objective 1</b> , creating a safer and more inclusive environment that will promote more liveable neighbourhoods which is positive for <b>objective 4</b> .													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Improvements to play space, amenity space and landscaping are also required, providing benefits in terms of a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS20: Former Railway Sidings Adjacent to Caledonian Road Station

Table 1.55: Site Assessment OIS20: Former Railway Sidings Adjacent to Caledonian Road Station

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	+	++	-	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	-/0	0	0	0
Submission policy with modifications	+	++	-/0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	-/0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The submission allocation with modifications have added additional criteria to the development considerations aimed at mitigating the impacts of future development on the heritage of the site. Applicants will be required to prepare a heritage statement responding to the potential impacts of development on the site's heritage, and considering opportunities for improvement. Whilst the additional development considerations are necessary to emphasise the importance of a careful and sensitive approach to the site's heritage, and appropriate mitigation could be achieved, the potential for development to have a negative impact on heritage and biodiversity remains. The assessment in relation to <b>objective 3</b> for heritage has been amended slightly with this in mind, to a minor negative/neutral. The submission allocation with modifications are not considered to affect the assessment of the allocation in relation to the other objectives.</p> <p>No other effects have been identified for the modifications.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission allocation with modifications adds additional criteria to the development considerations with the intention of mitigating the impacts of future development on the site's heritage. It is considered that mitigation could be achieved but there also remains potential for development to harm the site's heritage if it is not designed carefully and sympathetically.</li> <li><b>Objective 3</b> for heritage is now identified as a neutral/minor negative effect following the inclusion of development considerations aimed at mitigating potential impacts of development on heritage. The rest of the assessment remains unchanged following the modification.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS26: York Way Estate

Table 1.56: Site Assessment OIS26: York Way Estate

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area, which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location which is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion, which is positive for <b>objective 6</b>. The allocation requires improvements to play space and communal facilities which will benefit the quality of the built environment, creating a safer and more inclusive environment and is positive for <b>objective 1</b> and promoting a more liveable neighbourhood, which is positive for <b>objective 4</b>.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for infill residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Improvements to play space, communal facilities and landscaping are also required, providing benefits in terms of a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS27: Barnsbury Estate

Table 1.57: Site Assessment OIS27: Barnsbury Estate

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area, which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location and is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion which is positive for <b>objective 6</b>. The allocation requires extensive improvements to communal facilities, including play spaces, a new community centre and improved routes through the estate, which will benefit the quality of the built environment, create a safer and more inclusive environment and promote a more liveable neighbourhood addressing <b>objectives 1 and 4</b>. New publicly accessible open spaces should be provided, contributing towards the increasing need for open space in the borough and is positive for <b>objective 10</b>.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Improvements to open spaces, social and community infrastructure, security measures and landscaping are also required, providing benefits in terms of a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS28: Cluse Court

Table 1.58: Site Assessment OIS28: Cluse Court

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE	14. NATURAL RESOURCE
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area and is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location which is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion and is positive for <b>objective 6</b>. The allocation requires public realm improvements that will benefit the quality of the built environment which is positive for <b>objective 1</b>, creating a safer and more inclusive environment that will promote more liveable neighbourhoods and is positive for <b>objective 4</b>.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Improvements to play space, amenity space and landscaping are also required, providing benefits in terms of a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS29: Hillside Estate

Table 1.59: Site Assessment OIS29: Hillside Estate

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	-/0	++	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location, which is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion and <b>objective 6</b>. The allocation requires public realm improvements which will benefit the quality of the built environment, creating a safer and more inclusive environment which is positive for <b>objective 1</b>. There is the potential for existing community facilities to be lost as a result of development of this site. Unless this can be robustly justified in accordance with policy SC1, it could have a negative effect on liveable neighbourhoods for <b>objective 4</b> and social inclusion by reducing residents’ access to essential services and opportunities for people to connect with their community.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing. There is existing social and community infrastructure on the site, any loss of which would need to be robustly justified against the requirements of policy SC1.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> for high quality environment and <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land. Due to the potential for community facilities to be lost, neutral/minor negative effects have been identified in relation to <b>objectives 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and for <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. The application of policy SC1 should mitigate the risk of valued facilities being lost to the community.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS30: Kerridge Court

Table 1.60: Site Assessment OIS30: Kerridge Court

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location and is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to social inclusion which is positive for <b>objective 6</b>. The allocation requires public realm improvements that will benefit the quality of the built environment, which is positive for <b>objective 1</b>, creating a safer and more inclusive environment and promoting more liveable neighbourhoods, which is positive for <b>objective 4</b>. The new public space will contribute towards the increasing need for open space in the borough which is positive for <b>objective 10</b>.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Re-provision of the multi-use games area alongside improvements to play and amenity space, and the creation of a new public square will provide benefits in terms of the high quality environment, liveable neighbourhoods and open space objectives.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion and <b>objective 10</b> for open space.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation OIS31: Drakeley Court and Aubert Court

Table 1.61: Site Assessment OIS31: Drakeley Court and Aubert Court

IIA Objective	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Submission policy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Submission policy with modifications	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation aims to optimise the use of land in a residential area which is positive for <b>objective 2</b>, offering the opportunity to deliver quality housing in an appropriate location which is positive for <b>objective 5</b>. Affordable housing would be provided as part of the development of the site, contributing towards meeting Islington’s housing need as well as addressing objectives relating to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. The allocation requires public realm improvements that will benefit the quality of the built environment for <b>objective 1</b>, creating a safer and more inclusive environment and promoting more liveable neighbourhoods which is positive for <b>objective 4</b>. The new green square will contribute towards the increasing need for open space in the borough, positive for <b>objective 10</b>.</p>													
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is for residential development, which will contribute towards Islington’s housing delivery and provide much needed affordable housing, helping to address social inclusion objectives. Relocation of the community centre alongside improvements to play space, security measures and the creation of a new green square will provide benefits in terms of a high quality environment and liveable neighbourhoods.</li> <li><b>Objective 5</b> for housing quality is identified as a significant positive effect, with minor positive effects identified for <b>objective 1</b> high quality environment, <b>objective 2</b> for efficient use of land, <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods and <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion and <b>objective 10</b> for open space.</li> </ul>													

## Site Allocation GT1: 207A Junction Road

Table 1.62: Site Assessment GT1: 207A Junction Road

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRON	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Gypsy and Traveller site	+	+	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The allocation is for a 'Gypsy and Traveller site for provision of up to 3 permanent pitches to meet identified Gypsy and Traveller need'.</p> <p>In terms of promoting a high-quality environment for <b>objective 1</b> the development considerations are assessed to have a minor positive effect as they are location sensitive with reference to the adjacent railway. They consider the potential impacts of noise and vibration from the railway on residents of the site and require mitigation of such impacts. In addition mitigation of the site through screening and/or landscaping to secure a good level of residential amenity for neighbours is required, contributing towards a high-quality environment.</p> <p>Allocating the site for Gypsy and Traveller use seeks to balance competing demands between land uses to provide for the borough's full range of development needs. The allocation makes efficient use of previously developed land and buildings and contributes towards the provision of housing to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the borough, in line with <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality. However, it is considered that the allocation is likely to provide a lower amount of housing than if the site was developed for conventional housing, resulting in a minor positive effect in relation to the efficient use of land. The allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect however in relation to housing quality, helping to improve the diversity of housing types and providing for housing that meets the diverse needs of Islington's communities.</p> <p>The allocation seeks to re-locate the existing community use on the site and re-provide this in the local area, which is considered to have a neutral effect with regards to the liveable neighbourhoods for <b>objective 4</b>. By providing accommodation for people who may possess a protected characteristic the allocation is considered to</p>													

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	have a significant positive effect in relation to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion. The draft allocation requires the provision of infrastructure to support development which will have a minor positive effect against the natural resources for <b>objective 14</b> , ensuring the necessary water and sewerage infrastructure is available.													
IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Alternative 1: Residential development	+	++	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects of Alternative 1	<p>Allocating the site for residential development optimises the use of previously developed land and contributes to the provision of housing in the borough. The site would provide affordable housing as part of any residential element, but careful consideration must be given to the close proximity of railway infrastructure and the need to mitigate any noise and vibration from the railway to ensure future residential amenity is not negatively affected. The submission allocation for this site (referenced ARCH7) also suggested the existing D2 use of the site may be re-provided, which could positively contribute to the vitality of the area and increase cultural provision, with a minor positive effect on <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The assessment of the submission allocation identified that development of the site could help to enhance local character and contribute to <b>objective 1</b> and a high-quality environment, although this has been revised as the backland location of the site means any development would not be clearly visible from Junction Road. Nevertheless, there is still considered to be a minor positive effect in relation to <b>objective 1</b> as the development considerations are location sensitive with reference to the requirement to mitigate noise and vibration associated with the adjacent railway.</p>													
IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES

Alternative 2: Mixed-use development	+	+	0	-	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects of Alternative 2	<p>This alternative is where the site allocation would be amended to be for mixed-use development (including residential and commercial uses). Development of the site can help to enhance the local character of the area and promote a high-quality built environment that helps make efficient use of the site. Mixed-use development would have a positive effect in terms of the efficient use of land and buildings. It is however noted that there is potential with mixed-use allocations for higher-value residential uses to be chosen at the expense of delivering the employment floorspace needed to support Islington’s projected economic growth.</p> <p>Some housing would be delivered as part of mixed-use development, leading to a minor positive effect with regards to <b>objective 5</b> and housing quality. Affordable housing will be required as part of residential-led development, which is likely to have positive effects on social inclusion for <b>objective 6</b>.</p> <p>Some commercial uses on the site are likely to have a minor positive effect in relation to economic growth and <b>objective 8</b>. This would help to create employment opportunities that would also support social inclusion objectives.</p> <p>Mixed-use development could lead to the loss of the existing D2 use, however any loss would have to be justified in accordance with SDMP Policy SC1 and therefore this is considered to have a neutral effect in relation to <b>objective 4</b> for liveable neighbourhoods. In addition the other reasonable alternatives assumed the social infrastructure use would be relocated to a suitable site within the local area which could also be achieved under this scenario.</p>													
Alternative 3: Business- led development	+	+	0	-	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects of Alternative 3	<p>This alternative is for business-led development. The intensification of the site would help to optimise use of the site for employment use, giving a minor positive effect in terms of the efficient use of land for <b>objective 2</b>. Development of the site can help to enhance the local character of the area and promote a high-quality built environment for <b>objective 1</b>. Business-led development would have a positive effect on economic growth <b>objective 8</b>. This would help create employment opportunities that could support social inclusion objectives <b>objective 6</b>. Any loss of the existing D2 use would have to be assessed against SDMP policy SC1, and is considered to have a neutral effect in relation to liveable neighbourhoods <b>objective 4</b>.</p>													

## Conclusions

Three reasonable alternatives to the Gypsy and Traveller sites allocation for GT1 were identified: residential-led development, mixed-use development and business-led development. Whilst it was felt that mixed-use development could have positive effects by supporting a range of the borough's identified development needs, and business-led development could have positive effects in terms of supporting economic growth (objective 8), the site is considered to provide an opportunity to deliver a Gypsy and Traveller site which would contribute towards meeting Islington's identified need in an appropriate location. In relation to the provision of residential development on the site, the proposed use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches would arguably provide a less efficient use of land **objective 2**, in terms of the number of dwellings that can be provided, than conventional residential use. The re-provision of the existing community use in a suitable location off-site but within the local area is considered to have a neutral effect in relation to **objective 4** for liveable neighbourhoods. The modification is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to **objective 5** housing in terms of meeting diverse needs as well as a positive effect in relation to social inclusion. It is recognised that the effects are finely balanced between a residential allocation and an allocation for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches.

## Site Allocation GT2: 154 Junction Road

Table 1.63 Site Assessment GT2: 154 Junction Road

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Gypsy and Traveller site	+	+	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely effects	<p>The site is allocated as a 'Gypsy and Traveller site for the provision of 1 permanent pitch to meet identified Gypsy and Traveller need'.</p> <p>In terms of promoting a high-quality environment for <b>objective 1</b> the development considerations are assessed to have a minor positive effect as they are location sensitive with reference to the adjacent railway. They consider the potential impacts of noise and vibration from the railway on residents of the site and require mitigation of such impacts. In addition mitigation of the site through screening and/or landscaping to secure a good level of residential amenity for nearby residential properties helps contribute towards a high-quality environment.</p> <p>Allocating the site for Gypsy and Traveller use seeks to balance competing demands between land uses to provide for the borough's full range of development needs. The allocation makes efficient use of previously developed land and buildings and contributes towards the provision of housing to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the borough, in line with <b>objectives 2</b> for efficient use of land and <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality. However, it is considered that the allocation is likely to provide a lower amount of housing than if the site was developed for conventional housing, resulting in a minor positive effect in relation to the efficient use of land. The allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to housing quality, helping to improve the diversity of housing types and providing for housing that meets the diverse needs of Islington's communities.</p> <p>By providing accommodation for people who may possess a protected characteristic the allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to <b>objective 6</b> the social inclusion objective.</p> <p>There are existing trees on the site which will need to be taken into careful consideration. The allocation highlights that development should minimise impacts on trees and protect those trees with Tree Preservation Orders, however the impacts are uncertain and therefore there is a neutral assessment in relation to biodiversity overall.</p>													

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	The draft allocation requires the provision of infrastructure to support development which will have a minor positive effect against natural resources <b>objective 14</b> by ensuring necessary water and sewerage infrastructure is available.													
Alternative 1: residential development	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects of Alternative 1	Allocating the site for residential development optimises the use of previously developed land for <b>objective 1</b> , and contributes to the provision of housing in the borough for <b>objective 5</b> . The site would provide affordable housing as part of any residential element, and the development considerations would require careful consideration to be given to the close proximity of railway infrastructure and the need to mitigate any noise and vibration from the railway to ensure future residential amenity is not negatively affected, resulting in a minor positive effect against the built environment <b>objective 1</b> . There would be a positive effect from any residential development at the site which would provide affordable housing and contribute towards meeting Islington's housing need. The allocation would also make more efficient use of the site. There are existing trees on the site which would need to be taken into careful consideration. Development should minimise impacts on trees and protect the trees with Tree Preservation Orders, however the impacts of development are uncertain and therefore there is a neutral effect in relation to <b>objective 11</b> for biodiversity overall.													
Conclusion	One reasonable alternative to the Gypsy and Traveller site allocation at 154 Junction Road was identified: residential-led development. The site is considered to provide an opportunity to deliver a Gypsy and Traveller site which would contribute towards meeting Islington's identified need in an appropriate location. In relation to the provision of residential development on the site, the proposed use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches would arguably provide a less efficient use of land in terms of the number of dwellings provided than conventional residential use. The allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to housing in terms of meeting diverse needs as well a positive effect in relation to social inclusion. It is recognised that the effects are finely balanced between a residential allocation and an allocation for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches.													

## Site Allocation GT3: Ronald's Road

Table 1.64 Site Assessment GT3: Ronald's Road

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
Gypsy and Traveller site	+	+	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects	<p>The allocation is for a 'Gypsy and Traveller site for provision of up to 3 permanent pitches to meet identified Gypsy and Traveller need'.</p> <p>In terms of promoting a high-quality environment for <b>objective 1</b> the development considerations are assessed to have a minor positive effect as they are location sensitive with reference to the railway tunnel beneath the site. They consider the potential impacts of noise and vibration from the railway on residents of the site and require mitigation of such impacts. In addition mitigation of the site through screening and/or landscaping to secure a good level of residential amenity for surrounding residential properties is required and contributes towards a high-quality environment.</p> <p>Allocating the site for Gypsy and Traveller use seeks to balance competing demands between land uses to provide for the borough's full range of development needs. The allocation makes efficient use of previously developed land and buildings and contributes towards the provision of housing to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the borough, in line with <b>objective 2</b> for the efficient use of land and <b>objective 5</b> for housing quality. However, it is considered that the allocation is likely to provide a lower amount of housing than if the site was developed for conventional housing, resulting in a minor positive effect in relation to the efficient use of land. The allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to housing quality, helping to improve the diversity of housing types and providing for housing that meets the diverse needs of Islington's communities.</p> <p>By providing accommodation for people who may possess a protected characteristic the allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to <b>objective 6</b> for social inclusion objective.</p>													

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	<p>There are existing trees on the site which will need to be taken into careful consideration, the allocation highlights that development should minimise impacts on trees, however the impacts are uncertain and therefore there is a neutral effect in relation to biodiversity and <b>objective 11</b> overall.</p> <p>The draft allocation requires the provision of infrastructure to support development which will have a minor positive effect against <b>objective 14</b> for natural resources, ensuring that the necessary water and sewerage infrastructure is available.</p>													
Alternative 1: residential development	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Commentary on assessment of likely significant effects Alternative 1</b>	<p>Allocating the site for residential development optimises the use of previously developed land for <b>objective 1</b>, and contributes to the provision of housing in the borough for <b>objective 5</b>. The site would provide affordable housing as part of any residential element, and the development considerations would require careful consideration to be given to the close proximity of railway infrastructure and the need to mitigate any noise and vibration from the railway to ensure future residential amenity is not negatively affected, resulting in a minor positive effect against <b>objective 1</b> the built environment objective.</p> <p>There would be a positive effect from any residential development at the site which would provide affordable housing and contribute towards meeting Islington's housing need. The allocation will also make more efficient use of the site.</p> <p>There are existing trees on the site which would need to be taken into careful consideration. Development should minimise impacts on trees, however the impacts of development are uncertain and therefore there is a neutral effect in relation to <b>objective 11</b> and biodiversity overall.</p>													
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>One reasonable alternative to the Gypsy and Traveller site allocation at Ronalds Road was identified: residential-led development. The site is considered to provide an opportunity to deliver a Gypsy and Traveller site which would contribute towards meeting Islington's identified need in an appropriate location. In relation to the provision of residential development on the site, the proposed use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches would arguably provide a less efficient use of land in terms of the number of dwellings that can be provided than</p>													

IIA Objective / Site	1. HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT	2. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	3. HERITAGE	4. LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS	5. HOUSING QUALITY	6. SOCIAL INCLUSION	7. HEALTH AND WELLBEING	8. ECONOMIC GROWTH	9. NEED TO TRAVEL	10. OPEN SPACE	11. BIODIVERSITY	12. CLIMATE CHANGE	13. RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	14. NATURAL RESOURCES
	conventional residential use. The allocation is considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to housing in terms of meeting diverse needs as well a positive effect in relation to social inclusion. It is recognised that the effects are finely balanced between a residential allocation and an allocation for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches.													

## 7. IIA: Mitigation

In line with guidance potential mitigation measures should be considered where the assessments identify negative effects in order to reduce the negative effects. The assessment should also consider ways that policies can be improved. This section considers mitigation for the effects identified from the modifications. There are no significant negative effects from the modifications which require mitigation. However minor negative effects from the modifications have been identified. These are considered below.

The appraisal for Policy H7: Meeting the Needs of Vulnerable Older People identifies the same negative effects as for other housing policies i.e. that older persons accommodation cannot provide the same level of flexibility and adaptability as conventional housing in meeting housing need over the short, medium and long term. The modifications to the submission policy have amended the policy to take into account the London Plan benchmark which was previously considered as part of a more permissive policy alternative. The assessment of the alternative notes that a more permissive alternative approach would contribute to meeting wider London needs in addition to local older people's specialist housing needs, which would be a positive effect with 60 units a year sought in Islington by the London Plan benchmark. This may lead to more proposals for specialist housing coming forward in the borough and provide more choice including for market specialist housing. The policy provides a clear steer on the need for affordable specialist accommodation as opposed to market accommodation which provides some mitigation given the local evidence on need.

The industrial area of Vale Royal presents an opportunity in respect of Class E where commercial uses such as offices or town centre uses maybe introduced into the industrial area of Vale Royal via use of Class E. Where it is development it would require some form of mitigation to enable the continued operation of existing industrial users. The policy also seeks to mitigation this through the use of conditions.

The co-location of industrial use with offices would bring additional jobs and opportunities for economic growth but depending on the extent to which offices are intensified it could reduce the capacity for industrial growth and restrict expansion of existing industrial operations in Inner London locations, effecting supply chains for central London and leading to impacts on air quality and climate change. But the modifications are clear about the need to intensify industrial uses as part of co-location and to demonstrate the continued industrial function of the LSIS will remain which will help to mitigate the effects intensification of offices could have. Co-location could also bring forward more intensification of industrial uses than would have happened otherwise which could further

counteract this effect. The modified policy SP3 will therefore still lead to the intensification of industrial uses. The modifications are clear about the need to demonstrate the continued industrial function of the LSIS which will help to mitigate some of the potential impacts that intensification of offices could have. Also the submission policy with modifications has introduced a new clause D in policy B2 which cross references to other policies where development proposed in LSIS would have significant increase in vehicle movements and makes clear mitigation should be provided. This will also encourage sustainable transport choices.

For policy R1 the submission assessment identified a potential for a minor negative effect as the policies affected the supply of housing in the primary shopping areas across the borough. Whilst the assessment considered this to have no effect overall as other policy ensured housing is delivered outside the locations identified which will ensure housing targets are met. The modifications introduce a more flexible approach to housing in the PSA and wider town centre, which mitigates this effect on housing supply. The changes to retail and business policy may have cumulative effects which combine to reduce opportunities to meet commercial, social and cultural needs and reduce the balance between competing land uses. This policy relaxation in respect of residential uses in town centres, the changes in requirements to protect against loss of business floorspace and also changes to marketing requirements may result in reduced floorspace for commercial purposes. Meeting housing needs and affordable housing needs is one of the priorities of the plan alongside meeting the need for business floorspace and it is noted that overall the modifications to retail policies still maintain a positive effect in relation to economic development whilst employment policies clearly identify the priority locations for new business floorspace.

### **Site Allocations**

The development of site allocation OIS20: Former railway sidings adjacent to Caledonian Road Station was identified in the submission IIA that it may have a negative impact on the Caledonian Road Station which is a grade II listed building. Modifications have been made to the development considerations in the site allocation in terms of heritage impacts. Additional criteria have been added aimed at mitigating the impacts of future development on the heritage of the site. Applicants will be required to prepare a heritage statement responding to the potential impacts of development on the site's heritage, and considering opportunities for improvement. The criteria were informed by additional work in the form of a heritage assessment (examination document reference: SD75), completed during the examination process.

OIS29: Hillside Estate is a new site allocated to meet housing need and the proposal consists of residential development where there is the potential for existing community facilities to be lost as a result of development of this site. Unless this can be robustly justified in accordance with policy SC1, it could have a negative effect on liveable neighbourhoods and social inclusion by reducing residents' access to essential services and opportunities for people to connect with their community. The mitigation would be

provided by application of policy SC1 which would require development to consider local social infrastructure needs through a Community Needs Assessment. Other examples of modifications where social and community infrastructure is expected to be re-provided in line with policy SC1 are OIS27: Barnsbury Estate and BC4: Finsbury Leisure Centre.

The site GT1: 207a Junction Road which is allocated for a Gypsy and Traveller site in the modifications is currently used as a martial arts centre. The loss of the current use could have negative impacts on communities who use it. The site allocation highlights that the council will work with the current occupiers of the site to identify a suitable site for its relocation within the local area and that this should be of equivalent quality, quantity and accessibility. This will help to mitigate potential negative impacts.

OIS10: Hornsey Road and Grenville Works, 2A Grenville Road, this modification introduces residential development into the allocation. Given the site is within the Hornsey Road/Marlborough Road Priority Employment Location and the current employment use of the site, a mixed use development could lead to the loss of existing business floorpace which could have a negative impact on economic growth, however the provision of some office development would still contribute towards employment objectives helping to mitigate the impacts of this to some extent leading to a neutral/minor negative effect in relation to economic development overall.

The modifications include several new site allocations for residential use identified on existing housing estates:

- KC8: Bemerton Estate South (modification reference SA-MM-15)
- OIS9: Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church (modification reference SA-MM-98)
- OIS12: New Orleans Estate, N19 (modification reference SA-MM-101)
- OIS26: York Way Estate (modification reference SA-MM-113)
- OIS27: Barnsbury Estate (modification reference SA-MM-114)
- OIS28: Cluse Court Estate (modification reference SA-MM-115)
- OIS29: Hillside Estate (modification reference SA-MM-116)
- OIS30: Kerridge Court (modification reference SA-MM-117)
- OIS31: Drakeley Court Estate and Aubert Court Estate (modification reference SA-MM-118)

Increasing housing on a site might lead to a loss of amenity space for residents. This risk could affect all residents benefitting from existing play space, outdoor or community space. This risk is partly mitigated by the fact that the details of each proposal will be set out at planning stage, with site specific issues and local amenity need identified and addressed in line with other relevant policies,

for example Policy G2 C. Allocations do not specify exactly where different uses need to be on site, and the Council would expect a design-led approach to respond to different strategic needs

# Appendix 1: HRA screening update

The effects of Islington's Local Plan policies and allocations on the identified European sites were assessed through a Screening Assessment, as part of the regulation 19 IIA and were not considered to be significant. The effect 'in combination' with other plans when combined with the Local Plan was also not considered to be significant. Therefore, it is concluded it was not necessary to carry out a full appropriate assessment (Stage 2 of the HRA process) as the Local Plan policies and allocations have been 'screened out'. The modifications to the Local Plan are not considered to effect the conclusions of the original screening.

An update to the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out for the proposed modifications. As part of this, possible negative environmental impacts of the Local Plan have been assessed. In order to effectively manage any less than significant impacts attributed to the Local Plan policies and allocations, the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan will continue to evaluate the impacts of any further changes to the document.

# Appendix 2: Flood Risk update

This provides an updated flood risk sequential test for new sites proposed to be allocated to the Local Plan. This is an update to the flood risk analysis in appendix 3 of the regulation 19 IIA.

A sequential test has been applied, using the outputs of Islington’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), to each of the sites allocated as part of the Islington’s Local Plan Site Allocations. While Islington is located in Flood Risk Zone 1, which means there is low risk of fluvial flooding, the SFRA demonstrates that there are areas of surface water flood risk across the borough and these must be taken into account when deciding on the appropriateness of a site location.

The matrix below displays the surface water flood risk for each of Islington’s site allocations and indicates whether the level of risk is deemed to be acceptable. The level of surface water flood risk has been assessed using the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Dataset, which provides an indication of the broad areas likely to be at risk of surface water flooding, and data from Islington’s Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).

**Table 1: Updated flood risk sequential test for new sites proposed to be allocated**

Site name/address	Reference number	Site located in a SWMP Critical Drainage Area (CDA)	Site located in a SWMP Local Flood Risk Zone (LFRZ)	Site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area - 1 in 30 year (3.3% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area- 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Low Risk Area- 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual probability)	Additional Notes	Opportunities for flood risk management/mitigation where site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Areas	Is the level of flood risk acceptable?
Bemerton Estate South	KC8						Small area of the site includes EA RoFSW	N/A	Yes

Site name/address	Reference number	Site located in a SWMP Critical Drainage Area (CDA)	Site located in a SWMP Local Flood Risk Zone (LFRZ)	Site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area - 1 in 30 year (3.3% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area- 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Low Risk Area- 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual probability)	Additional Notes	Opportunities for flood risk management/mitigation where site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Areas	Is the level of flood risk acceptable?
							Medium Risk Area, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk. Eastern boundary adjacent to RoFSW High Risk Area and LFRZ.		
York Way Estate	OIS27							N/A	Yes
Barnsbury Estate	OIS28						Some EA RoFSW High and Medium Risk Areas concentrated in western quarter of site. Majority of site has no EA RoFSW flood risk. Western part of site is	Development to include open space and landscape improvements, and to maximise urban greening.	Yes

Site name/address	Reference number	Site located in a SWMP Critical Drainage Area (CDA)	Site located in a SWMP Local Flood Risk Zone (LFRZ)	Site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area - 1 in 30 year (3.3% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area- 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Low Risk Area- 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual probability)	Additional Notes	Opportunities for flood risk management/mitigation where site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Areas	Is the level of flood risk acceptable?
							located in a LFRZ.		
Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church	OIS29							N/A	Yes
Cluse Court	OIS30						Small area in the eastern part of the site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.	Development to include landscape improvements and maximise urban greening.	Yes
Hillside Estate	OIS31						Small areas of the site include EA RoFSW High Risk Areas, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.	Development to include landscape improvements and maximise urban greening.	Yes

Site name/address	Reference number	Site located in a SWMP Critical Drainage Area (CDA)	Site located in a SWMP Local Flood Risk Zone (LFRZ)	Site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area - 1 in 30 year (3.3% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area- 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Low Risk Area- 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual probability)	Additional Notes	Opportunities for flood risk management/mitigation where site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Areas	Is the level of flood risk acceptable?
New Orleans Estate	OIS32						Small areas of the site include EA RoFSW High Risk Areas, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.	Development to include landscape improvements and maximise urban greening.	Yes
Drakeley Court and Aubert Court	OIS33						Small area of the site include EA RoFSW High Risk Areas, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.	Development to include landscape improvements and maximise urban greening, including creation of a new green square.	Yes
Kerridge Court	OIS34						Very small EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area on south eastern boundary of	N/A	Yes

Site name/address	Reference number	Site located in a SWMP Critical Drainage Area (CDA)	Site located in a SWMP Local Flood Risk Zone (LFRZ)	Site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Area - 1 in 30 year (3.3% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Medium Risk Area- 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability)	Site includes EA RoFSW Low Risk Area- 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual probability)	Additional Notes	Opportunities for flood risk management/mitigation where site includes EA RoFSW High Risk Areas	Is the level of flood risk acceptable?
							site, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.		
Junction Road	GT2						The site does not include any areas of EA RoFSW flood risk. Northern boundary adjacent to RoFSW Medium Risk Area along railway line.	N/A	Yes

The above matrix demonstrates that the level of flood risk for each of the 10 new allocated sites is deemed to be acceptable following the application of the sequential test. 7 of the allocated sites are located within a CDA, but only 1 is located in a LFRZ. The location of a development within a CDA does not necessarily mean it is at higher risk from surface water flooding, but that it is within a catchment area which contributes to a flooding in a LFRZ. The assessment demonstrates that the majority of the 10 new sites include an EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) Low Risk Area, with 1 site including Low Risk Areas only (no Medium or High Risk Areas) and 2 sites including no EA RoFSW identified risk of surface water flooding at all. 2 sites include a Medium Risk Area with no High Risk Areas and 5 sites include a High Risk Area. Where the new sites include areas of EA RoFSW, there are only some areas of flood risk within the site, with the majority of each of these sites including no EA RoFSW flood risk at

all. For 4 of the 5 sites that include EA RoFSW High Risk Areas, the high risk area only covers a small area of the site. Barnsbury Estate is the only new site that includes a larger EA RoFSW High Risk Area when compared to the other sites and is also located in a LFRZ. The high risk area is, however, concentrated in one part of the site, with the majority of the site having no EA RoFSW flood risk.

It is concluded that following the application of the sequential test to Islington's new site allocations, the council is satisfied that there are no alternative locations where the allocated sites can be located due to wider sustainable development objectives and constraints on development in the borough. The above matrix demonstrates that for all of the 10 new sites the flood risk to the majority of each site is low, and that where sites that do coincide with higher surface water flood risk, this risk only covers a small area and can be successfully managed using appropriate flood risk management and mitigation measures in accordance with the requirements set out in Appendix 8 of the Draft Regulation 19 IIA Interim Report, alongside the sequential approach to site layout. Further details explaining how the sequential test has been applied, and the use of appropriate flood risk management and mitigation measures, are set out in Appendix 8 of the Draft Regulation 19 IIA Interim Report.

# Appendix 3: EqIA Local Plan Modifications

## Islington Local Plan modifications – Equalities Impact Assessment update

A full equalities impact assessment was undertaken as part of the Regulation 19 IIA. The following provides an update to this specifically looking at the equalities implications of proposed modifications to the plan.

**Table 1: Area Spatial Strategies, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies SP1 to SP8; and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan policies BC3 to BC8**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
Modifications are likely to positively impact on groups with protected characteristics.	<p><b>Policies SP2 and BC4</b></p> <p>Modifications to SP2 (reference SD-MM-065) and BC4 (reference BC-MM-08) provide clarification on how proposals for moorings and facilities to support moorings should be approached in the context of identified needs and the canal as an open space. The modifications have the potential to improve boat dwellers’ safety, convenience and quality of life by improving their access to water, electricity and waste collection facilities and by improving air by reducing reliance on combustion heating. Modifications to SP2 seek to identify opportunities to meet the need of 7 permanent boat dwellers’ moorings by 2025. This change will benefit boat dwellers who may possess one or more protected characteristics; a 2016 survey of London boat dwellers conducted by the Canal and River Trust found 10% of respondents reported a disability and 11% were from non-white backgrounds.<sup>1</sup> Better boater facilities also contribute to creating a cleaner and better-quality environment for pedestrians and cyclists, therefore benefitting many protected groups who walk, cycle or spend time</p>

<sup>1</sup> <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/media/original/30901-whos-on-londons-boats-survey-summary-report.pdf>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>beside the canal. The development of a waterspace strategy will help to provide a framework for different uses on the canal including leisure, recreational, education and training uses which could have wider benefits for local communities, including those with protected characteristics. The development of a strategy may help to identify where improvements to facilities - water, electricity and waste collection – can be made. However, the policy does not require improvements are made and so the extent of positive impacts will depend on implementation. This modification is cross-referenced by a modification in G2. The impacts of modifications of G2 for protected groups are considered in that section below.</p> <p><b>Policy SP3</b></p> <p>In the modification to SP3 Part A (reference SD-MM-08), the approach to securing new light industrial floorspace through planning conditions, responding to the introduction of Class E, will help to retain a range of employment opportunities which can help to benefit local people who may possess one or more protected characteristics. Islington’s 2016 Employment Study<sup>2</sup> highlights that land prices in the LSIS are much more affordable than in other parts of the borough, which provides a lower price threshold for enterprise space needed for new and emerging businesses. This can favour small to medium size businesses. The location of the LSIS in Inner London makes it an accessible employment area for local people, who can also access it by public transport. This is likely to have a positive impact on people who possess one or more protected characteristics, who may be on lower incomes; Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities, disabled people and pregnant women in</p>

<sup>2</sup> Islington 2016 Employment Study <https://www.islington.gov.uk/-/media/sharepoint-lists/public-records/planningandbuildingcontrol/publicity/publicconsultation/20192020/20190904/bislingtonelsreportmay2016.pdf?la=en&hash=C3305DAEED480FD4B392393D31A69DDEFC1E0A51>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>particular are less likely to have access to private motorised transport.<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting that car ownership increases with household income, types of household and homes. People on lower incomes, lone parents and people who rent their properties are less likely to own a car.<sup>4</sup> In spite of these identified positive impacts, existing light industrial floorspace can be converted into other uses within Class E, which could lead to a reduction in the range of employment opportunities. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad 'Commercial, business and service' use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. This could have negative impacts for local people, including those with protected characteristics as identified above, albeit this is uncertain and beyond the scope of the policy. The additional wording for SP3 Part C relating to co-location seeks to protect and intensify industrial functions. This promotes intensification for other types of jobs such as office jobs, providing employment options which could benefit low income or unemployed workers with or without additional protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>Policy SP5</b></p> <p>The proposed changes to SP5 (reference SD-MM-12) and Site Allocation NH1 (reference SA-MM-43) seek to balance the retention and enhancement of retail and employment floorspace and to emphasise the need to provide a significant amount of residential space on upper floors. This will help to provide additional housing including affordable housing to support meeting identified housing needs. Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities (with the exception of India/Pakistani and White Other households) as well as young and older people and those with disabilities are more likely to be on lower incomes</p>

<sup>3</sup>Future of Transport -Equalities and access to opportunity. Department of Transport, 2020

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/937223/F13-Future-of-Transport-Equalities-access-to-opportunity-rapid-evidence-review-accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/937223/F13-Future-of-Transport-Equalities-access-to-opportunity-rapid-evidence-review-accessible.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.centreforlondon.org/reader/parking-kerbside-mangement/chapter-1/#car-ownership-in-london-has-changed-little-over-time>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>and to be housed in social rented housing.<sup>5</sup> Providing increased and improved housing opportunities for those on low incomes is likely to have a positive effect on these protected groups. The provision of accessible accommodation will also have a positive effect on disabled people and people with mobility needs. Modifications to Part K seek to mitigate any adverse impacts on residents or businesses resulting from removal of the Seven Sisters Road, Isledon Road/Tollington Road gyratory system. Benefits of this could be felt by residents with protected characteristics and by local SME business owners. However, the specific impacts and mitigation measures are unclear at this stage and the extent of positive impacts will depend upon implementation.</p> <p><b>Policies SP2, SP4 and SP8</b>  Several of the spatial policy areas including SP2, SP4 and SP8 have had additional policy clauses added which address the future provision of residential uses in these areas. These additions provide a more positive policy framework for the provision of housing which, alongside other policies, can help to provide additional affordable housing. As identified in the Regulation 19 EqIA, this can have a number of positive effects for groups who possess one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>Policy SP7</b>  Modification reference SD-MM-16 removes reference to Archway’s designation as a cultural quarter following Inspectors letter INS14. Cultural venues are important for all groups including groups with protected characteristics such as those with gender reassignment characteristic, or religious or Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities</p>

<sup>5</sup> Islington State of Equalities Report, 2019 <https://www.islington.gov.uk/~media/sharepoint-lists/public-records/communications/information/adviceandinformation/20182019/20190131stateofequalitiesreport2019.pdf> , New Social Housing Lettings, UK Gov, 2018, <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/housing/social-housing/new-social-housing-lettings/latest#by-ethnicity-and-local-authority> , as identified in the original Regulation 19 EqIA

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>because they provide meeting venues/ night time venues for everybody. There will be reduced policy support for cultural provision in Archway. However, that is not to say cultural uses will not be supported in Archway. R10 still provides a framework for such development, promoting such uses within town centres which are accessible and SC1 still seeks to protect existing cultural uses. Therefore, the effect of this modification is uncertain.</p> <p><b>Policy BC7</b> The modifications to BC7 (reference BC-MM-13) policy moved from supporting text into the policy box relates to design, scale, definition of space, public realm, and pedestrian and cycle connections and so is not considered to have additional impacts. The clarification in relation to Finsbury Leisure Centre and social infrastructure is not considered to effect the positive impacts previously identified in relation to improved sporting and social facilities supporting physical and mental health and wellbeing and helping to encourage community cohesion for all groups.<sup>6</sup></p> <p><b>Policy BC8</b> The modification to BC8 (BC-MM-15) clarifies the approach to commercial development and removes the requirement for it to be limited in scale and provides clarity about the protection of existing employment uses. This provides a clearer and more positive framework for employment uses in the spatial strategy area alongside other policies which could have positive effects in relation to employment opportunities including for those with protected characteristics. The new text in relation to the provision of additional public space, public realm and street improvements, through providing a clearer more positive policy framework also has the potential to have positive impacts depending on implementation. As identified in the Regulation 19 EqIA, the increased access to open space can benefit all local residents including groups with protected characteristics; particularly disabled groups and young</p>

<sup>6</sup> Regulation 19 EqIA 4.67

<p><b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b></p>	<p><b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b></p>
	<p>people, helping to increase opportunities to access health and wellbeing benefits. Improved conditions for walking and cycling can also have physical and mental health benefits which can have positive impacts for people with protected characteristics. Other modifications were identified to have no specific impacts.</p> <p>Overall the spatial policies of the local plan are still considered to have positive effects as identified in the Regulation 19 EQIA.</p>

**Table 2: Thriving Communities, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies H1 to H12 and SC1 to SC4**

<p><b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b></p>	<p><b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b></p>
<p>Modifications likely to positively impact on groups with protected characteristics.</p>	<p><b>Policy H4</b> The Regulation 19 EqIA considered that achieving the required 10% wheelchair user standard will lead to a positive effect for people who are disabled. However, this positive impact could be slightly reduced as a result of the changes made to H4 B following Inspector’s letter INS14. Modifications (reference SD-MM-23) to this policy could result in fewer market homes being ready for immediate occupancy by wheelchair users’, potentially affecting disabled people in urgent need of market wheelchair accessible units. This will not affect low-income wheelchair users with a need for social rented wheelchair accessible housing, who will still be provided with M4(3)(2)(b) units. The effects of this change is however considered to be uncertain as identified in the IIA screening. Further requirements for wheelchair user dwellings have been removed following receipt of INS14; wheelchair user dwellings are no longer required to be located on the ground floor, or where they are provided above or below entrance level, to be served by two lifts at a convenient distance from front doors. This change could negatively impact wheelchair users if the sole lift they rely on is found to be out of service, resulting in them being unable to</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>leave or enter their dwelling until repairs are made. However, the policy will still lead to the development of wheelchair accessible dwellings which will have a positive effect on people who are disabled.</p> <p><b>Policy H6</b></p> <p>H6 was found, in the round, to have a positive effect on people with protected characteristics in the IIA, requiring a proportion of student bedspaces to be adaptable for wheelchair users. The modification to H6- part B (ii) (reference SD-MM-24) following Inspector’s letter INS14 reduces the percentage of bedspaces required for purpose-built student accommodation from 10% to 5% and removes the requirement for the bedspaces to be accessible from the outset. If disabled students require accommodation, they may experience delays before they can move in, especially if rooms need extensive adaptation. Whilst this could cause a minor short term negative effect, it is not considered to change the policy’s overall positive impact.</p> <p>The requirement for accessible bedspaces to adhere to best practice guidance, and to be served by two lifts if located above the ground floor has also been removed. This means that regular space standards will be applied, and design details that would make the accommodation easier to live in for disabled people will not be specifically supported by policy. This could mean that if a lift malfunctions, a disabled student may find themselves trapped either inside or outside of their room, or not able to enter their accommodation with ease and dignity. These changes may have a negative impact on disabled students, resulting in less choice of wheelchair accessible accommodation, ready from the outset, and available close to their university which could serve as an additional barrier to higher education for disabled students who already experience significant barriers to education due to greater living costs.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>The modification to H6 Part B (iii) removes the provision of student bursaries (requested in Inspectors letter LBI INS14) which would have provided financial support to Islington care-leavers and Islington students facing hardship to attend further or higher education. This policy</p>

<sup>7</sup> SD26 Specialist Housing Topic Paper 4.56

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>provision could equally impact people with protected characteristics or not. The policy was previously identified as having a positive impact on young people and low income households in particular. The removal of this policy clause will therefore have a negative effect for those who might have otherwise have benefited from the provision of bursaries.</p> <p>Despite the effects of the modifications considered above the policy is still considered to have overall positive impacts on students who possess one or more protected characteristics, including young people and disabled students.</p> <p><b>Policy H7- Meeting the needs of vulnerable older people</b>  The amendments (reference SD-MM-25) reflect a more permissive approach allowing a strategic element of need (the London Plan benchmark) to be considered which could lead to more older people’s housing proposals coming forward. This would have benefits for some older people, including those who can self-fund their care needs in the borough as well as older people outside of the borough, in providing more specialist accommodation. However, there is also a recognition that specialist accommodation can also be less flexible/adaptable.</p> <p><b>Policy H10</b>  Modifications to H10 (reference SD-MM-26) have reduced the proportion of wheelchair accessible HMO bedspaces from 10% to 5%. Similar to the changes to H6 B (ii), the modification removes requirements for these bedspaces to be delivered according to best practice guidance, to be accessible from the outset, and for rooms above ground level to be served by two lifts. These features will serve to make this type of accommodation less accessible to disabled people. However, overall the policy will still have a positive effect on disabled people who require HMO accommodation.</p> <p><b>Policy H12</b>  As identified in the Regulation 19 EqIA, Gypsy and Travellers are a protected ethnicity and H12: Gypsies and Travellers aims to provide accommodation to meet identified need for this group.</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>Evidence has identified a need and the Council will seek to identify site(s) to meet that defined need. The policy context recognises that the shortage of vacant sites, very high land values and the pressure to meet significant need for conventional housing and business floorspace (amongst other uses) - mean there will be significant challenges to meeting the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</p> <p>The modifications to H12 (reference SD-MM-28) and the supporting text respond to the deletion of the London Plan definition of Gypsies and Travellers and reflect the Government's definition. Islington has given consideration to how differing definitions of this protected ethnic group influence the identified accommodation need (Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2019)). The proposed modifications retain the commitment to meeting identified need. However, the change to the level of need now reflects the amended London Plan definition.</p> <p>The planning and delivery of new pitches may result in a reduction in social exclusion, and promote equality, fairness and respect for some Gypsies and Travellers. Providing for pitches based on the government's definition is now proposed. This will lead to the delivery of a lower number of pitches (6 rather than 10). The provision of pitches in line with the government's definition has the potential to reduce the overall positive impact, but is still considered to have a positive effect overall. The Local Plan, whilst recognising the challenges in meeting identified need due to the circumstances of the borough, has identified three sites in the Local Plan. This will be the first time that pitches have been identified and planned for in the borough. The change to Part A and the replacement of wording from <i>exploring</i> to <i>allocation</i> of sites has amended the mechanism to achieve meeting need which provides more certainty about how need will be met.</p> <p>The modification relating to windfall sites that come forward during the plan period, adds additional clarification that proposed sites must provide a high quality of housing consistent with</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>relevant aspects of policy H4, reiterating the important requirement of high-quality housing for the Gypsy and Traveller community. Additions to paragraph 3.150 emphasise that amenity blocks must meet accessibility standards and a good level of privacy is to be maintained. This detail will promote high accessibility standards for members of the Gypsy and Traveller community, especially for those who possess a disability.</p> <p><b>Policy SC1</b>  SC1 new criterion C (reference SD-MM-29) proposes to secure necessary social and community infrastructure at planning stage. Securing social and community infrastructure services and facilities is generally considered to have a positive impact on all groups in terms of supporting physical and mental health and wellbeing and helping to encourage community cohesion. As stated in the Regulation 19 Equality Impact Assessment for SC1, this infrastructure is likely to have a positive impact on disabled people and older people, particularly older women, who live longer but spend more years living with a disability, as these groups rely more on health services. Positive impacts are also especially likely to be felt by some specific Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities who are more likely to experience poor health.<sup>8</sup> Community infrastructure also supports children, older people, and families and can also offer support to people who possess one or more protected characteristics relating to religion, race, gender reassignment, sex and sexual orientation. In spite of this positive impact, it is worth noting that the introduction of Class E has potential impacts in terms of loss of certain social infrastructure which the policy can no longer affect. The introduction of Class E has curtailed the ability of the policy to safeguard existing social and community infrastructure facilities that fall within Class E, such as nurseries, day centres, medical and health services and indoor sports facilities. This could both help to increase access to facilities by increasing opportunities for healthcare facilities, as well as leisure and indoor recreation uses such as</p>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities/health>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>gyms but could also decrease access to facilities by not protecting these facilities against change of use to higher value uses. Whilst these wider impacts are considered uncertain, the update to the policy will help to ensure that potential impacts can be mitigated through the planning system as far as possible.</p> <p><b>Policy SC2</b> Updated text to policy SC2 (reference SD-MM-30) clarifies that replacement play space should be secured and where on-site play is provided, details of management and maintenance will be secured by condition. Whilst these modifications will assist with the implementation of the policy and the benefits this can provide, they are not considered to change the positive impacts already identified for children and young people.</p> <p><b>Policy SC3</b> The updated text to policy SC3 (reference SD-MM-31) clarifies that HIAs, where required, should be secured by condition at planning stage and that where specific measures are required to mitigate a health impact or enhance health benefits these will be secured through a legal agreement/condition. Whilst these changes will help with the implementation of the policy, no specific equalities impacts have been identified.</p> <p><b>Policy SC4</b> The deletion of Policy SC4 (Social Value) is considered to have no specific impacts. While the policy does encourage all development to maximise social value and, for certain development, set out exactly what social value is added by the development, there are no explicit requirements attached to the policy. Other modifications were identified as have no specific impacts. The Regulation 19 EqlA concluded that the Local Plan Thriving Communities policies are likely to have an overall positive impact for groups with protected characteristics with particular</p>

<p><b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b></p>	<p><b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b></p>
	<p>positive benefits for those protected groups who may be on low incomes. This continues to be the case.</p>

**Table 3: Inclusive Economy, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies B1 to B5 and R1 to R12; and Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan policies BC1 and BC2**

<p><b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b></p>	<p><b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b></p>
<p>There are likely to be various positive impacts on groups with protected characteristics.</p>	<p><b>Policy B1</b>  The amendment to B1, part E (reference SD-MM-33) clarifies the approach to Locally Significant Industrial Sites within the context of the changes to the use class order, their continued protection and encouragement for their renewal, modernisation and intensification. However, the changes are clarifications and updates will not change the overall positive benefits previously identified in the EqIA.</p> <p><b>Policy B2</b>  B2 Part A and supporting text modifications relating to the use of planning conditions to secure employment activities in the right locations could have a positive impact on lower income communities who might suffer from unemployment or job insecurity. The change to part C (SD-MM-34) and additional wording relating to co-location seeks to protect and intensify industrial functions whilst also providing intensification for other types of jobs such as office jobs. Provision of a diversity of job opportunities can help to secure a range of employment provision</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>for employed and unemployed Islington residents, including people with protected characteristics. This could especially benefit Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities for example, as a greater proportion of people from these backgrounds have no qualifications and face barriers to employment when compared to people from white British backgrounds<sup>9</sup>. This policy could also benefit children living in poverty as child poverty is also closely linked to unemployment.</p> <p>It should however be recognised that beyond the new policies, Class E, whilst providing flexibility, also limits the Council’s ability to protect employment space in the right locations. Existing business floorspace can be converted into other uses within Class E, which could lead to a reduction of business floorspace in the borough’s employment locations potentially reducing employment opportunities for protected groups. Class E was introduced by the Government through legislation in September 2020 to amend and simplify the system of use classes in England and create one new broad ‘Commercial, business and service’ use class to allow for a mix of uses to reflect changing retail and business models. Whilst these wider impacts are considered uncertain, the update to the policy will help to ensure that potential impacts can be mitigated through the planning system as far as possible.</p> <p>The modification to policy B2, part D and associated supporting text require developments to mitigate air quality impacts in Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs). As stated in the Islington Air Quality Strategy (2019)<sup>5</sup> disabled people, children, older people and those on lower incomes are more likely to suffer from the negative impacts of air pollution. The policy, alongside other policies in the plan which address air quality can therefore help to have a positive effect on people who possess one or more of these protected characteristics.</p>

<sup>9</sup> <https://data.london.gov.uk/economic-fairness/> Data available in the ‘labour market’ and ‘equal opportunities’ sections.

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p><b>Policy B3</b> Changes to B3 (reference SD-MM-36) and the various amendments to Parts B and D are not considered to significantly change the policy requirements which seek to protect business uses. As set out in the Regulation 19 EqIA, the policies seek to protect a range of different businesses on sites across the borough including industrial. All of this will help to ensure a range of employment provision for Islington residents, including lower skilled residents.</p> <p><b>Policy B4</b> There have been a number of changes to the affordable workspace policy, B4 (reference SD-MM-37). Whilst some of the thresholds which trigger the policy have been amended which could affect the number of circumstances in which affordable workspace is secured, it is not considered to result in an overall significant change in the likely positive effects for the policy. It is noted that the threshold has not changed in the CAZ which is where significant levels of new office floorspace are expected to be delivered. Overall the policy is still considered to have positive impacts in helping to deliver a range of employment space in the borough which will help to provide a range of employment opportunities, including for lower skilled residents. A new policy clause clarifies that on mixed use proposals, where there are exceptional circumstances where provision of affordable workspace will undermine the ability to secure affordable housing, affordable housing would take precedence. This both has the potential to have negative and positive impacts where the situations arise, as affordable workspace provides opportunities for people in lower income groups whilst at the same time, the acute need for affordable housing is evidenced. The paragraph ensures that in limited cases affordable workspace would not prevent schemes that deliver policy compliant affordable housing from coming forward.</p> <p><b>Policy B5</b> Modifications have been made to B5 (SD-MM-41). The threshold in Part A has been amended which could affect the number of circumstances in which the policy for on-site training is applied. However, this has only changed for non-residential schemes and whilst this could lead</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>to a reduction in the overall number of employment and training opportunities secured, it is not considered a significant change and brings the threshold to be consistent with the current Planning Obligations SPD. The policy will continue to have positive impacts in the provision of training opportunities which will also benefit people with protected characteristics. Similarly, the modification in the policy Part B to apply to major development and refer to guidance is also not considered to significantly change the positive impacts in relation to the provision of financial contributions to help tackle worklessness in the borough.</p> <p><b>Policy R1</b> The modifications to R1 (SD-MM-72) are made to reflect changes to the Use Class Order and to reflect policy changes to other more detailed policies which have been assessed, where relevant, below.</p> <p><b>Policy R2</b> The changes to policy R2 (SD-MM-76) aim to maintain a retail core in Town Centres, in particular maintaining a ground floor retail frontage, ensuring shops and services are accessible and managing the impacts of uses. This has beneficial impacts on protected groups as having accessible shops helps to cater for the needs of older people, children and young people, disabled residents, pregnant women and parents with young children. Town Centres are a focal point for socialising and support social interaction, they also support employment and training by offering flexible entry level jobs for young and older people. Older people will benefit from retail which is conveniently located as they will be able to make fewer journeys. The proximity and accessibility to Town Centre also incentivises walking trip generation, increasing the amount of physical exercise people take with its accompanying health and social benefits which could be felt by all groups of residents.</p> <p>It should however be recognised that beyond the new policies, Class E, whilst providing flexibility, also limits the Council's ability to protect retail spaces in the right locations. Existing</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>retail floorspace can be converted into other uses within Class E, which can lead to a reduction of retail floorspace in the borough’s shopping areas. Whilst these wider impacts are considered uncertain, the update to the policy will help to ensure that potential impacts can be mitigated through the planning system as far as possible.</p> <p><b>Policy R3</b>  There are various amendments to R3 (modification reference SD-MM-44). These include modifications to part G which are more supportive of residential uses within town centres, which could provide benefits in relation to additional housing supply and affordable housing to meet identified needs and to increase accessibility to services for some residents living within the town centre. However, this could potentially lead to the loss of some retail and service premises in accessible locations such as the borough’s town centres. It could also limit the already constrained land supply to provide commercial, cultural and civic activity for all Islington residents. The relaxation of policy restricting residential uses could reduce the ability of town centres to continue to serve the needs and wellbeing of local residents across different retail catchment areas. This potential reduction of the optimum mix of main town centre uses could particularly impact people who possess one or more protected characteristics who make use of town centre services. However, Part C seeks to ensure adverse impacts on vibrancy, vitality, viability and character are fully mitigated as well as requiring engaging frontages and a good level of amenity for residents and businesses. This will go some way to ensuring a vibrant environment is achieved that supports sufficient access to a range of uses whilst respecting the needs and amenity of residential uses within town centres. The policy overall still seeks to protect and enhance retail and service functions in accessible locations. It is recognised that there is additional uncertainty introduced as a result of the introduction of class E in terms of access to specific shops and services. However, this is beyond the scope of the policy and other policies seek to secure specific retail uses, for example in Primary Shopping Areas in R2 which will help to ensure development of shops and services in accessible locations.</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>Additional supporting text has been added in relation to impact assessments outside of town centres which could help to identify impacts of proposals for specific town centre uses on different retail centres which will help to ensure that the vitality of different retail/service locations is considered. This can help to limit impacts on retail and services and help to provide accessible services to residents, including those with protected characteristics. The cross reference to the requirement for impact assessments for developments over 200sqm of main town centre uses will result in the identification of potential individual and cumulative impacts of uses, including amenity impacts</p> <p>R3 Footnote 30 states that some Class E uses like clinics and nurseries will not be required to adhere to the Sequential Test in certain circumstances but may be conditioned to operate in that use. The clarification of not requiring the sequential test for planning application purposes is unlikely to have an impact on the provision of social infrastructure alone.</p> <p><b>Policy R4</b> R4 supporting paragraph 4.106 ensures that suitable Class E premises are vacant and marketed for 6 months prior to a non – E main town centre change of use which has scope to ensure that demand for Class E uses is fully explored before such a change of use. This is likely to benefit families, children, older people and people with physical, sensory and cognitive disabilities and related limited mobility to retain access to suitable retail, services and leisure uses.</p> <p><b>Policy R5</b> Modifications to part B enable the council to secure a retail unit outside of a designated Town Centre for the provision of essential daily goods where a need is identified. As with R4 (D) - this policy will benefit those older people and disabled people who may have limited mobility. It will also improve convenience shopping for the wider population. However, it is recognised that there will be impacts associated with the introduction of class E which could result in the loss of</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>existing retail which provide essential daily goods to users of other class E uses such as offices, albeit this is not something that policy can affect.</p> <p><b>Policy R10</b> Modifications to R10 have been considered and where changes increase the flexibility for cultural facilities to be located outside of the CAZ or Town Centres, this could lead to improved access of cultural uses closer to homes. As identified in the regulation 19 EqIA, supporting cultural uses will have positive effects, for example, by promoting various cultural spaces such as pubs, theatres, nightclubs and galleries which are important for a number of groups.</p> <p><b>Policy BC1</b> Modifications to BC1 and supporting text (reference BC-MM-03) clarify the policy in the context of use class order changes. This includes clarifying the use of conditions for new developments in Bunhill and Clerkenwell consistent with the modifications for policies B1 and B2. Ensuring that new development can provide for business space can help to secure positive benefits for people receiving lower incomes, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities<sup>10</sup> and disabled people<sup>11</sup> who face employment barriers. This in part mitigates against the other impacts of Class E which remove the Council's ability to prevent existing office stock from changing to other Class E uses. Other modifications provide further clarity in relation to the circumstances which set out exceptions and clauses which require proposals to be 80% or 90% of office floorspace or office-led. Whilst this provides a greater degree of flexibility in certain circumstances, it is not considered to change the positive overall effects of the policy for residents in the borough in relation to creation of jobs. Although it is recognised that there is still a more restrictive approach to residential uses in this location, this is balanced with other policies in the plan which seek to meet housing needs.</p>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities/employment-fairness-at-work-and-enterprise>

<sup>11</sup> [https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5802/cmselect/cmworpen/189/18903.htm#\\_idTextAnchor000](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5802/cmselect/cmworpen/189/18903.htm#_idTextAnchor000)

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p><b>Policy BC2</b>  Modifications to BC2 (reference BC-MM-05) clarify the locations where retail, leisure and cultural uses might be appropriate. This will help to ensure that these uses do not harm the amenity of the area, which can have a positive impact on the wellbeing and safety of residents, including people who possess one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>The removal of the sequential test for cultural uses outside the cultural quarter could result in more cultural uses across the AAP. Cultural uses may not locate within cultural quarters and the wider agglomeration benefits of this may not be felt by people with protected characteristics such as LGBTQI+, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds / communities and children and young people who might have benefited from this. However, this change is not considered significant as the wider Local Plan policy framework still seeks to focus cultural uses within cultural quarters. This change could also result in positive effects by allowing more cultural uses across the CAZ. As identified in the regulation 19 EqIA supporting cultural uses will have positive effects, for example, by protecting and promoting various cultural spaces such as pubs which are important for a number of groups of people with protected characteristics, their location in the CAZ will be important particularly given the high level of accessibility via sustainable modes of transport in this location. Bunhill and Clerkenwell AAP policy BC2 Cultural policy is therefore still likely to be positive for people who possess one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified to have no specific impacts.</p> <p>Overall, the Inclusive Economy policies of the local plan are still considered to have positive effects on people who possess one or more protected characteristics as identified in the Regulation 19 EQIA.</p>

**Table 4: Green Infrastructure, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies G1 to G5**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
<p>This modification is likely to see mainly positive impacts on groups with protected characteristics. Some minor negative impacts may also be felt by people with protected characteristics- mitigation of this is suggested.</p>	<p>The modifications to G2, part A (SD-MM-MOD10954), alongside amendments to SP2 and BC4 provide clarification on how proposals for moorings should be approached in relation to the canal as an open space. As with SP2, this policy has potential to positively impact boat dwellers’ access to amenities and quality of life plus also improve the environment for pedestrian and cyclist users of the canals. There is potential for a minor negative impact on the amenity of open space enjoyed by pedestrians and cyclists with protected characteristics who use the canal depending on implementation. To mitigate this, any boater facilities must be designed to have no detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the waterway and its function as an open space.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified to have no specific impacts.</p> <p>As concluded in the Regulation 19 EqlA the green infrastructure policies in the plan are likely to have a positive impact for all groups with protected characteristics in particular disabled groups, older people and the young and children.</p>

**Table 5: Sustainable Design, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies S1 to S10**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
<p>No major additional impacts on protected groups have been identified as a result of the modifications</p>	<p>The modifications for policy S5 (SD-MM-60) and supporting text aim to reduce carbon consumption through low / zero carbon heating sources which will help to make homes more energy efficient. These energy efficiencies can lead to cheaper energy bills, which can reduce fuel poverty and improve long-term energy security, supporting lower income households as</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>well as groups more likely to live in poor housing accommodation including children<sup>12</sup> and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds residents<sup>13</sup>. The modifications to policy S5 and supporting text also include requirements for minor developments with an individual heating system using air source heat pumps and direct electric heating to achieve a high specification of fabric energy efficiency. This will ensure that developments using these heating systems achieve minimal heat demands, and as a result, do not lead to increased energy bills.</p> <p>Low and zero carbon heating sources, including low-carbon heat networks and secondary heat sources will have a positive impact on air quality. The modifications to policy S5 and supporting text seek to ensure that minor new-build developments with an individual heating system prioritise low carbon heating systems, such as air source heat pumps. The modifications also ensure that the use of ultra-low NOx gas boilers in both individual and communal heating systems will only be acceptable in exceptional circumstances where other heating options are not feasible. Gas will only be considered as the heat source for communally heated developments as part of a hybrid system involving heat pumps. These modifications will ensure that the impact on air quality of heating systems used by minor and major developments is minimised and has benefits for all groups, and in particular for children, older and disabled people, as identified in the Islington 2020 Zero Carbon Strategy.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified as having no specific impacts.</p> <p>Overall, consistent with the conclusions in the Regulation 19 EqIA the sustainable design policies are still likely to have a positive impact for all groups with protected characteristics in particular the very young and old who are most at risk of the impacts of climate change.</p>

<sup>12</sup> [https://www.housing.org.uk/globalassets/files/people-in-housing-need/people-in-housing-need-2021\\_summary.pdf](https://www.housing.org.uk/globalassets/files/people-in-housing-need/people-in-housing-need-2021_summary.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/housing/housing-conditions/non-decent-homes/latest>

**Table 6: Public Realm and Transport, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies T1 to T5**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
<p>Positive impacts have been identified for people with protected characteristics.</p>	<p><b>Policy T1</b></p> <p>The modification to Policy T1 Part B (reference SD-MM-65) will have a slight positive effect on disabled people who require a car for their mobility; it ensures that developments must include accessible parking provision alongside the prioritisation of sustainable transport modes. It also explicitly excludes Blue Badge Holders’ vehicles from being included in the description of private vehicle use.</p> <p>Policy T1 supporting text - modification referencing Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, Vision Zero and People Friendly Streets relate to the Islington 2020 Transport Strategy – and they aim at improving the environment for walking and cycling through minimising through traffic and reducing speeds, therefore reducing road danger and air pollution. These benefits will be particularly felt by children and older adults who are disproportionately likely to be involved in collisions, killed or seriously injured by motor vehicles. Reducing through traffic also improves air quality which will especially benefit people with disabilities relating to respiratory health. Whilst the policies referred to above are not directly linked to the Local Plan, policy T1-T5 are complementary of its objectives and will help deliver the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Appendix 3 and 4 modifications translate the former use class order into the new use class order, and create a general Class E requirement which aims at mitigating transport impacts via Transport assessments or provide appropriate cycle parking for Class E. The mitigation of transport impacts via Transport Assessments will have positive impacts on people on low incomes, disabled people, children and older people who all suffer disproportionately from traffic externalities<sup>14</sup>. The provision of general needs and accessible cycle parking at an</p>

<sup>14</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/784685/future\\_of\\_mobility\\_access.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/784685/future_of_mobility_access.pdf)

<b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b>	<b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b>
	<p>appropriate level for general Class E will also support those who do not have access to a private car in providing a more sustainable transport choice.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified to have no specific impacts.</p> <p>Overall, consistent with the conclusions in the Regulation 19 EqIA, The Public Realm and Transport section is likely to have a broadly positive impact for all groups with protected characteristics with particular benefits for old and young people and disabled groups with regards to accessibility.</p>

**Table 7: Design and Heritage, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies DH1 to DH8**

<b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b>	<b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b>
No major additional impacts on protected groups have been identified as a result of the modifications	Modifications were identified as having no impacts.

**Table 8: Strategic infrastructure, set out in Strategic and Development Management Policies, policies ST1 to ST4**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
Modifications likely to have minor positive impacts on groups with protected characteristics.	<p>The supporting text for paragraph 9.4 sets out that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively to forward fund infrastructure projects, which can benefit all Islington residents and particularly those with protected characteristics who might benefit from a more inclusive and sustainable environment delivered through infrastructure.</p> <p>The supporting text for paragraph 9.6 establishes that the Council might secure infrastructure costs for additional education infrastructure via CIL. The supply of that infrastructure has benefits for children and parents and more generally for the wider community.</p> <p>Overall, the main conclusions of the Regulation 19 EqIA are still considered to be applicable, with the strategic infrastructure policies likely to have a positive impact for all protected characteristic groups as aims to provide the infrastructure necessary for growth</p>

**Table 9: Site Allocations, including sites within the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan**

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
Various positive impacts are identified.	<p><b>New Site Allocations for residential use</b></p> <p>The modifications include several new site allocations for residential use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KC8: Bemerton Estate South (modification reference SA-MM-15)</li> <li>• OIS9: Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church (modification reference SA-MM-98)</li> <li>• OIS12: New Orleans Estate, N19 (modification reference SA-MM-101)</li> <li>• OIS26: York Way Estate (modification reference SA-MM-113)</li> <li>• OIS27: Barnsbury Estate (modification reference SA-MM-114)</li> <li>• OIS28: Cluse Court Estate (modification reference SA-MM-115)</li> </ul>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OIS29: Hillside Estate (modification reference SA-MM-116)</li> <li>• OIS30: Kerridge Court (modification reference SA-MM-117)</li> <li>• OIS31: Drakeley Court Estate and Aubert Court Estate (modification reference SA-MM-118)</li> </ul> <p>The modifications include additional site allocations for residential development which will provide affordable housing. Low income groups are more likely to benefit from the provision of affordable housing and are likely to include groups with protected characteristics.<sup>15</sup> Provision of residential schemes providing more than 10 units will benefit disabled and older people, as suitable accessible housing will be required for these schemes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these positive impacts, it should be noted that increasing housing on a site might lead to a loss of amenity space for residents. This risk could impact all residents benefitting from existing playspace, outdoor or community space, which may be particularly felt by older residents, families and children. This risk is partly mitigated by the fact that the details of each proposal will be set out at planning stage, with site specific issues and local amenity need identified and addressed in line with other relevant policies, for example Policy G2 C. Allocations do not specify exactly where different uses need to be on site, and the Council would expect a design-led approach to respond to different strategic needs.</p> <p>The following allocations include reprovision, refurbishment and/or addition of community facilities which are considered to have a positive impact on people who possess one or more protected characteristics in terms of supporting physical and mental health and wellbeing and helping encourage community cohesion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KC8: Bemerton Estate South - includes the replacement of community space,</li> </ul>

<sup>15</sup> [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/homes\\_for\\_londoners\\_-\\_affordable\\_homes\\_programme\\_2021-2026\\_-\\_equality\\_impact\\_assessment.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/homes_for_londoners_-_affordable_homes_programme_2021-2026_-_equality_impact_assessment.pdf)

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OIS9: Highbury Quadrant Congregational Church - reprovision of church and community space.</li> <li>• OIS26: York Way Estate - enhancement of communal facilities, playspace and landscaping,</li> <li>• OIS27: Barnsbury Estate - provision of two new parks, a community centre, a play space and public realm improvements,</li> <li>• OIS29: Hillside Estate - is added but on condition that development does not result in a loss of social infrastructure which would disproportionately affect groups who possess one or more protected characteristics.</li> </ul> <p>These facilities are considered to have a positive impact on people who possess one or more protected characteristics in terms of wellbeing and helping to encourage community cohesion. They have the more specific potential to benefit older people and disabled people, as well as children and young people, through improved access to services.</p> <p>The following allocations will see improvements in landscaping, community amenity areas, play space or games areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OIS12: New Orleans Estate - play space, landscaping and reprovision of multi-use games area.</li> <li>• OIS28: Cluse Court - playspace, amenity space and landscaping.</li> <li>• OIS30: Kerridge Court- re-provision of the existing multi-use games area within a new, centrally located public space. Improvements to play space, amenity space and landscaping across the estate.</li> <li>• OIS31: Drakeley Court and Aubert Court - relocation of Aubert Court community centre to improve visibility and accessibility. Improved landscaping, including the creation of a new green square.</li> </ul> <p><b>Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site Allocations</b></p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>Modifications to several of the site allocations in the Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site (e.g. VR2, VR4, VR5, VR6 and VR10) recognise the potential for co-location of offices and industrial uses. Whilst this is a change from allocating the sites solely for industrial intensification, the modifications seek to protect and intensify industrial functions whilst also supporting intensification for other types of jobs such as office jobs. This could help to provide employment options which would benefit low income or unemployed workers including those with protected characteristics.</p> <p>The modification to site VR3 seeks to intensify offices and studios on site to support existing businesses in the music industry and related sectors. The allocation supports a range of unit sizes including those suitable for SMEs which, whilst no longer solely promoting intensification of industrial uses, could also help to provide a range of employment opportunities which could benefit low income or unemployed workers including those with protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>AUS8: 161-169 Essex Road</b> Through recognising the potential suitability of the site for use as a place of worship, alongside other uses, the modification to the site allocation (SA-MM-35) could have positive impacts for those with a religion/belief.</p> <p><b>NH1: Morrison’s supermarket and adjacent car park, 10 Hertslet Road, and 8-32 Seven Sisters Road</b> Modifications to this site allocation (SA-MM-43) recognise the scope for a large quantum of residential use, together with retention of and improvements to existing retail floorspace and new office space. The previous EQIA recognised the potential for the site to have a greater beneficial impact on those on low incomes who themselves are more likely to include groups with protected characteristics. This is because housing proposals must provide affordable housing which is of a high quality, as well as a proportion of accessible accommodation which will have a positive effect on disabled people and others with mobility needs. The increased recognition of the scope for housing on the site is not considered to change the earlier</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>assessment of positive impacts, although the provision of a greater amount of housing is likely to increase the extent of positive impacts overall.</p> <p><b>FP4: 129-131 &amp; 133 Fonthill Road &amp; 13 Goodwin Street</b>  The modification to the site allocation (SA-MM-60) recognises that an element of residential use may be acceptable as part of a retail-led mixed use development. This could have positive impacts if it contributes towards the provision of affordable and accessible housing as identified above.</p> <p><b>FP5: 1 Prah Road</b>  The modification for residential use (SA-MM-61) may have positive impacts in relation to people with protected characteristics through the provision of affordable and accessible housing. The removal of specific reference to public realm improvements at the site is not considered to change the earlier assessment of positive impacts. However, the removal of the requirement for business floorspace, particularly workspace suitable for SMEs, could reduce the range of job opportunities in the area. Such jobs may have benefitted low income or unemployed workers, including those with protected characteristics, although the impact is uncertain.</p> <p><b>ARCH1: Vorley Road/Archway Bus Station</b>  The modification to include social and community infrastructure (SA-MM-72) could have positive impacts on social inclusion and health and well-being, through the provision of new community facilities in the area. However, the specific benefits for protected characteristics will depend on the final use that comes forward as part of future development on the site/through the planning application process.</p> <p><b>ARCH3: Archway Central Methodist Hall</b>  Modification SA-MM-74 removes reference to the provision of a cultural hub and replaces the uses specified with mixed use development including offices and retail. The provision of retail and office use could have positive impacts through the provision of a range of employment</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>opportunities. However, the removal of the cultural hub for the site could serve to restrict space for increased cultural activities in Archway - the impacts of this on people with protected characteristics is however uncertain.</p> <p><b>Site Allocation ARCH6: Job Centre, 1 Elthorne Road</b>  The change in the allocation from business-led to mixed use development, could increase provision of residential on-site and reduce the amount of business floorspace delivered. However, a mixed use development could provide a range of employment opportunities alongside housing, including affordable and accessible housing, which both have benefits including for those with protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>Site Allocation OIS5: Bush Industrial Estate, Station Road</b>  The site allocation is subject to a modification that co-location of offices and/or research and development uses will be permitted where there is an intensification of industrial use on the site, where it can be demonstrated that the continued industrial function of the LSIS would remain. The retention and intensification of industrial use remains as an objective. As a higher density employment use, co-locating office/research and development uses with industrial uses could result in an optimisation of existing employment floorspace. Whilst this is a change from solely intensification for industrial uses, the modifications seek to protect and intensify industrial functions whilst also providing intensification for other types of jobs such as office jobs. This can help to provide employment options which could benefit low income or unemployed workers including those with protected characteristics. However, it is noted that there is likely to be less opportunity to intensify industrial uses to the extent envisaged in the original allocation.</p> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Sites</b>  Gypsy and Travellers are a protected ethnicity. Three sites have been identified to meet the evidenced need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the borough. This is considered to have a</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>positive effect in relation to the housing needs of future residents who share that protected characteristic.</p> <p>The site at 154 Junction Road is currently vacant. Its close proximity to the railway line will mean that impacts in relation to noise and vibration will need to be considered. The allocation recognises this and seeks to provide a good level of residential amenity for future occupiers. The site at 207a Junction Road is currently used as a martial arts centre. The loss of the current use could have negative impacts on communities who use it, including those with protected characteristics. The site allocation highlights that the council will work with the current occupiers of the site to identify a suitable site for its relocation within the local area and that this should be of equivalent quality, quantity and accessibility. This will help to mitigate potential negative impacts. The site is also in close proximity to the railway line and so consideration of noise and vibration impacts will be important to provide a good level of amenity as recognised by the allocation.</p> <p>The site at Ronald’s Road is a vacant site, part of which forms access to the Highbury Roundhouse Community Centre to the rear of the site. As part of site design it will be important that suitable access to the new community centre is provided – this is recognised in the allocation. The allocation also highlights the importance of screening to provide a good level of amenity in relation to the access road to the community centre as well as Ronald’s Road. Finally, as recognised in the allocation it will be important to mitigate vibrations from the railway tunnel that runs beneath the site.</p> <p>All three site allocations specify the need to provide essential infrastructure prior to occupation. Overall, given the site-specific issues identified it is considered that the allocations recognise these and provide a framework for suitable mitigation measures identified through the more detailed site design and planning application process.</p>

Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?	How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?
	<p>Each site allocation specifies the need to provide a good level of amenity, with the site design process carried out in consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community and local communities. This should help to identify and mitigate potential issues in relation to site design, which could also help to foster good relations between the communities.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified as having no specific impacts.</p> <p><b>Site Allocation BC13: Car park at 11 Shire House, Whitbread Centre, Lamb’s Passage</b>  The modifications to this allocation support the provision of a significant amount of office floorspace, as part of a mixed use development alongside residential use, whilst acknowledging that hotel use may be acceptable. It is considered this will have a positive effect in relation to housing delivery, including affordable and accessible housing, but may reduce the amount of employment floorspace delivered. However on balance both employment and housing use can have positive impacts for those with protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>Site Allocation BC24 Clerkenwell Fire Station, 42-44 Rosebery Avenue</b>  The modified site allocation seeks to clarify and expand other uses on the ground floor, to include commercial or community uses. This may not result in the provision of social infrastructure on the site and so may not have the same benefits in terms of the provision of community facilities, therefore the effects of this on groups with protected characteristics are uncertain.</p> <p><b>Site Allocation BC37: Triangle Estate, Goswell Road/Compton Street/Cyrus Street</b>  Modification to state that development should not lead to unacceptable impacts on existing residents, and should improve the security, function, accessibility, and appearance of public realm and open space on the estate.</p>

<p><b>Do the modifications have a positive or negative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</b></p>	<p><b>How will the modifications in this section impact and which groups with protected characteristics will it effect?</b></p>
	<p>The modification will benefit residents by ensuring that impacts on them are minimised and that development improves the security, function, accessibility, and appearance of public realm and open space on the estate. This is likely to help provide positive outcomes for disabled residents and others with mobility needs in particular.</p> <p>Other modifications were identified as having no specific impacts.</p>

## Conclusion

Overall the modifications made to policy at this stage are likely to have a positive effect or no additional effect on people who possess protected characteristics. Some of the modifications will have a potential positive effect, but at times this is uncertain and will depend on the implementation of policy. Notably, modifications relating to Gypsies and Travellers will improve the certainty that sites are delivered for this protected group. Social and Community and Retail and Employment policy modifications are affected by the wider effects of Class E. These effects are uncertain and beyond the scope of the policy. However they may affect people who possess protected characteristics.