

Planning and Development  
Town Hall  
Upper Street  
London N1 2UD

[www.islington.gov.uk](http://www.islington.gov.uk)

Planning Inspectors:  
Jonathan Manning and Christa Masters  
c/o Programme Officer, Ms Edwards

Your ref: INS08  
Our ref: LBI05

26 January 2021

Dear Inspectors,

**Re: LB Islington response to eighth letter (INS08) from Inspectors**

Thank you for your eighth letter (document reference INS08) where you asked the council if the recent updates in relation to the London Plan had any bearing on the soundness on the Draft Islington Local Plan. We have set out our thoughts on this below.

On 10 December the Secretary of State (SoS) wrote the Mayor of London setting out an update on the London Plan and highlighted where the Mayor's proposed wording in response to Directions had been accepted and where the SoS considered the original Directions should be kept. Following this – on 21 December – the Mayor wrote to the SoS with a 'Publication London Plan' setting out the text of the London Plan as the Mayor intends to publish it, with the Mayor considering this version to address all the matters set out by the SoS including the updated/new Directions. The SoS now has 6 weeks to consider the proposed changes.

As set out in the Soundness self-assessment (document reference SD32), the Draft Local Plan is in general conformity with the London Plan. The consultation statement (document reference PD7) demonstrates this conformity through the GLA responses to the Draft Local Plan. Having reviewed the modifications to the London Plan, this is still considered to be the case. Our thoughts on the main issues of relevance are set out below.

**Affordable Housing contributions on small sites**

Draft London Plan policy H2A contained a reference to boroughs having a tariff based approach to affordable housing requirements on small housing developments of nine homes or fewer. This clause was subsequently removed in response to the recommendations from the Inspector's that examined the plan.

In considering the small sites policy in the London Plan, the Panel's report recognised that it was a lack of evidence that small sites are a major source of housing supply in all boroughs

but that individual boroughs are not precluded from bringing forward their own policies where this is warranted:

“Part F of policy H2A refers to boroughs using a tariff approach to affordable housing requirements for schemes of nine homes or fewer. Whilst an approach that departs from the Written Ministerial Statement of 2014 and the PPG has been accepted in some boroughs there is no evidence that small sites are a major source of supply in all of them. It may well be that on-site provision in such circumstances is not feasible but there is no justification for imposing a policy provision to that end. As such, this is not justified. Although individual boroughs are not precluded from bringing forward their own policies in this respect if this is warranted and having regard to paragraph 63 of the 2019 NPPF”<sup>1</sup>.

Direction DR3 removes the remaining supporting text in paragraphs 4.2.12 and 4.2.13 which recognised that some boroughs have a significant source of housing supply arising from small sites and stated the Mayor’s support for securing cash in lieu contributions for affordable housing from such sites. The Mayor encouraged boroughs to require contributions where supported by local evidence.

This latest amendment is not considered to effect the Local Plan’s general conformity with the London Plan or the soundness of Islington’s affordable housing policy in relation to small sites. As set out in the Housing Topic Paper (SD19), Islington has a genuinely extreme set of circumstances with significant identified housing need coupled with capacity constraints meaning that identified affordable housing need cannot be met. Compounding this is a need for a significant amount of employment land. Within this context it is important to acknowledge the large proportion that small sites contribute towards Islington’s overall housing delivery. It is because of these unique circumstances as well as viability evidence that the borough has been able to successfully apply an affordable housing requirement for small sites contributions over the last 10 years which has made a significant contribution to the delivery of affordable housing. Islington’s approach has continued to be upheld at appeal following the publication of the revised NPPF. The evidence and justification for the approach to small sites affordable housing contributions is set out in detail in the Small Sites Viability Topic Paper (SD24).

## **Proposed modifications in relation to industrial land – policies E4 and E7**

### **Policy E4**

The SoS Direction and changes accepted by the Mayor in policy E4 removes an element of part C of the policy which specified that there should be no overall net loss of industrial land in London and referred to borough level categorisations for industrial land (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.1). Under these categorisations Islington is in the ‘retain’ capacity category – meaning that the borough should seek to intensify industrial floorspace capacity following the general principle of no net loss across designated SIL and LSIS. Islington’s Local Plan does not specifically refer the ‘retain’ category that was referred to in the London Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> [London Plan, Examination in Public: Panel Report, October 2018, page 41](#)

London Plan policy E4, part A, still requires there to be a sufficient supply of land and premises in different parts of London to meet current and future demands for industrial and related functions and that these should be provided and maintained taking into account strategic and local employment land reviews, industrial land audits and the potential for intensification, co-location and substitution. Whilst part B considers the retention, enhancement and provision of industrial capacity should be managed in relation to the three categories of industrial land/sites. Policy E4 part C continues to require boroughs to plan, monitor and manage the retention, enhancement and provision of industrial capacity is concerned. Part C also talks about the release of industrial land in order to manage issues of long-term vacancy and the delivery of strategic infrastructure – this is not considered to apply in Islington's case. The Draft Local Plan policies which protect existing industrial land are based on local evidence base which reinforces the need to safeguard the small amount industrial land that remains in the borough, most of which is concentrated within the Vale Royal and Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site. The Mayor's evidence supports this and suggests there is high demand and a lack of supply for such industrial space in Islington, and the need for strategic locations near the CAZ to support the service-based economy in Central London.

The SoS direction removes the approach to no net loss of floorspace capacity across London at a strategic level, which is different to a local approach which aims to protect industrial capacity based on evidence. The SoS Direction DR4 recognises the importance of the 'last mile' distribution 'just-in-time' essential servicing for the CAZ. The Vale Royal/Brewery Road LSIS has close proximity to the CAZ and has an important function in supporting essential services running in Central London and borough wide. Islington's Employment Land Study provides a detailed analysis of the type of industrial activities present in the LSIS that range from warehousing and distribution of supplies to creative production businesses. London Plan policy E4, part D highlights that the retention, enhancement and provision of industrial capacity should be prioritised in locations that are accessible to the strategic road network, provide services that support London's economy and population, they help to provide space for SMEs and support access to supply chains and local employment. Islington's remaining industrial sites are considered to meet these criteria.

The council is proposing a modification to paragraph 4.36 of Strategic and Development Management Policies to reflect the changes made to policy E4 in the Publication London Plan. This paragraph currently makes reference to the Mayor's approach for retaining and intensifying industrial land and the principle of no net loss.

### Policy E7

The proposed modification for policy E7 removes part of clause D which specified the need for industrial uses to be intensified or at least no net loss of industrial capacity:

- Where there are proposals to consolidate an identified SIL or LSIS to support delivery of residential or other uses, such as social infrastructure or to support town centre renewal (part B);

- In relation to where proposals for mixed use or residential proposals on non-designated industrial sites are supported (part C).

Clauses B and C of E7 do not apply in Islington's case. There are no proposals to consolidate an identified LSIS in the borough and no non-designated industrial sites have been identified for mixed use or residential development because of the need and demand for industrial premises in the borough. London Plan policy E7 still requires development plans to be proactive and encourage the intensification of industrial land.

Draft Local Plan policy B3(C) safeguard existing industrial land and floorspace, and policies B1(E) and B2(C) determine that Industrial Sites should be the focus for provision of new industrial uses, namely B1(c), B2 and B8 uses. Policies in the Draft Local Plan seek the intensification of industrial uses in LSIS designations to ensure that the economic function of these sites is not compromised in terms of their continued efficient function. Providing a local approach for intensification will continue to be in general conformity with the London Plan as the approach to intensification is retained in policy E7 part A.

In summary, given the strong evidence (both from the Mayor and Islington) which supports the need to retain and intensify industrial land provision in the borough, and overall aims of London Plan policies E4 and E7 in terms of retaining and intensifying industrial uses within this context, it is considered that there are no soundness implications. The Draft Islington Local Plan continues to be in general conformity with the London Plan on this issue.

### **The definition of Gypsies and Travellers**

Directions DR7 and DR8 remove the definition of Gypsies and Travellers from London Plan policy H14 and the supporting text.

Islington's Strategic and Development Management policy H12 sets out the approach to meeting identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The supporting text (paragraph 3.146) recognises the difference the application of the definition applied to Gypsies and Travellers makes in the assessment of accommodation needs and highlights that the effect of different definitions was considered as part of the council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Policy H12 reflects the identified need under the draft London Plan definition which is 10 pitches, recognising that this is higher than the more restrictive Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) definition.

The supporting text to London Plan policy H14 states that the Mayor will lead on a London-wide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessment and until the findings of the new assessment are available boroughs should continue to plan to meet the need for permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches in accordance with the requirements of Policy H14. Under London Plan Policy H14, part A, there is a requirement to plan to meet identified need for permanent pitch provision and the inclusion of targets within Development Plan Documents. The London Plan is now silent on the definition that should be used to identify need. The Islington Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (EB3) recommends use of the ethnic identity definition previously contained in the draft London Plan which identifies a need for 10 pitches. The more restrictive PPTS definition identifies a need for 6

pitches. The London Plan requirement is to have a 10 year pitch target. The removal of the definition from the draft London Plan has created uncertainty, particularly in advance of the London wide assessment by the Mayor taking place. It is also noted that the requirement in the London Plan is for a 10 year pitch target whilst the pitch provision specified in draft Local Plan policy H12 was up to 2036 and so beyond the 10 year requirement. The council are therefore proposing a modification to policy H12 which ensures that the policy can be effective in meeting need whilst accounting for the different definitions.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Gibb'.

Jonny Gibb  
Team Leader Planning Policy  
Islington Council