

## The Onslow Neighbourhood Association

Answers to the Inspector's Questions relating to the Partial Review of RBKC core strategy  
on CONSERVATION and DESIGN

with reference to our response to the review of February 2014, dated 24 March 2014

## The Inspector's Questions:

1. Yes
2. No: The NPPF in its introduction at Paragraph 1 refers to a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. Yet despite consultation over a period of months, when in April 2014 the final draft was presented for final consultation, there were 172 detailed amendments submitted by 9 local Associations and 7 local Residents, but of these only 24 were accepted by RBKC. Thus the Partial Review from RBKC must be unsound in that it takes so little account of the appropriate level of detail submitted by local Associations and residents in an attempt to produce a distinctive local and neighbourhood plan reflecting the needs and priorities of the local community, as recommended by the NPPF. None of the amendments submitted were an attempt to stop sustainable development, but all were an attempt to get sustainable development adapted to the particular conditions of the locality.
3. Don't know
4. No: an example is in paragraphs 3.3.77 - 3.3.82 the justifications for policy CL9 are confused in their reasoning, because Conservatories as they say in 3.3.81 are a popular form of extension. But the policies in CL9 only make one reference to Conservatories, thus exempting them from the a-i clauses. Our amendment on our response in paragraph CL9 corrects this.
5. Yes: but they don't reflect the concerns of local residents, about certain issues.
6. Yes
7. No: see our amendments on our response in paragraph CL1 b,c and i.
8. No comment
9. No: it needs more precise explanation to prevent underground development of Mews houses.
10. No comment
11. No comment
12. No: see our amendments on our response in paragraphs CL8 and CL9
13. No comment
14. No: CL8 a in the review seems to give permission for Roof Alterations on the basis of "in filling" without regard of architectural merit for such an alteration on such a building.
15. It is not counter to the London Plan.
16. No comment
17. No comment
18. No: in our opinion the review should quote more from the NPPF.
19. Yes
20. No: it should copy the conditions listed in NPPF paragraphs 132 and 133. The NPPF states: 'Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where' (our underlining). See also our response paragraph CL4 to resist underground development on Heritage Assets.
21. No: these additional features should be added in.
22. No see our answer to your question 20.
23. No comment
24. No comment
25. See our response paragraph CL5 d.
26. No comment
27. Yes and see our response paragraph CR4.
28. No: see our response CR5 a and c.
29. No comment and no further comments on any more of the questions.