

## **Matter 9 – Infrastructure**

### **Issue 4: Are the Plan's monitoring and review mechanisms effective and otherwise consistent with national policy?**

9.28 The plan on submission does not contain a monitoring framework for the Plan. How will the effectiveness and performance of the policies in the plan be measured? Should a monitoring framework (possibly based on the indicators in Appendix 9 of the IIA) form an appendix to the NSP as a main modification to guide future Annual Monitoring Report processes?

A monitoring framework for the plan is essential. The patchwork nature of the IIA and the baseline indicators (in terms of some of the categories, sources and their dates) show the plan has not been positively or legally prepared. If the baseline indicators in Appendix 9 are to be used as the starting point for a framework then indicators like Social Cohesion based on the Southwark Conversation should be replaced by a much more thorough and engaging process. Representations in SP2 have pointed to the need for a participative audit of social infrastructure to be undertaken for the borough taking account of inequalities and the value of local networks. SP2 in particular seems unjustified without a monitoring framework and the strategic policies should be considered together to inform the best strategy for allocating resources (and consultative energy in the context of the pandemic) to this exercise - rather than a simple update to the most out of date data. Climate change targets should be more ambitious in line with the council's climate emergency strategy and both soil and biodiversity should be measured in quantum and quality as well as the number of sites. Waste management should take account of building construction waste and circular economy principles. The historic environment should also be measured in more meaningful ways than the number of assets (in conversation with the development of the Local List).