

Part 3

Issues and Options

Comments received and Council’s response:

**Part 3: Sections 8, 9 and 10. Town centres, Business and Social and Community Use.
November 2021**

Contents

Part 3	1
SECTION 8:	4
TOWN CENTRES	4
Issue 1: Covid-19 recovery and maintaining the vitality of our centres	4
Town centres first	4
Q.8.1. These options are not mutually exclusive. Do you support these options?	4
Q.8.2. Do you have any other options to suggest?	15
Q.8.3. Which of these options do you support?	20
Q.8.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?	33
Residential uses within our centres	36
Q.8.5. Do you support us making an Article 4 direction to ensure that planning permission will continue to be required for changes of use of commercial, business and service uses to residential? If so, should the direction cover all of our town centres?	36
Q.8.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?	43
Issue 2: The future nature of our town centres	44

Q.8.7. Do you support any of these suggested strategies for our town centres?	44
Q.8.8. Do you have any other options to suggest?	52
Q.8.9. Are any areas or parades which should be added to, or removed from an existing centre? Please be specific and explain why.	56
SECTION 9: BUSINESS AND CULTURE	60
Issue 1: The provision of offices	60
Q.9.1. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	60
Q.9.2. Do you have any other options to suggest?	78
Issue 2: Light industrial uses	80
Q.9.3. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	80
Q.9.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?	84
Issue 3: Affordable workspaces	86
Q.9.5. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	86
Q.9.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?	93
Issue 4: Hotels/visitor accommodation	95
Q.9.7. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	95
Q.9.8. Do you have any other options to suggest?	100
SECTION 10: SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY USE	103
Issue 1: Types of social and community uses	103
Q.10.1. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	103
Issue 2: The protection of social and community uses	113
Q.10.3. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.	113
Q.10.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?	119
Issue 3: The need for new social and community uses	123

Q.10.5. Do you support the option proposed?	123
Q.10.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?	131

SECTION 8: TOWN CENTRES

Issue 1: Covid-19 recovery and maintaining the vitality of our centres

Town centres first

Q.8.1. These options are not mutually exclusive. Do you support these options?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	SUPPORT BOTH OPTIONS	Noted.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Yes	Noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	<p>Finalised policies in a new Local Plan will need to take account of what have been major shifts in the world of work, the use of office premises, and e-retailing and delivery. It remains early days to establish how far all of these will return to the patterns that pre-dated the pandemic. Future reliance on former 'principles for centres that have served the Council well' seems premature. A new Local Plan will need to be creative in defining policies that prove flexible enough to deal with differing scenarios of city life.</p> <p>As per our earlier comments, the Borough's neighbourhoods – with residential streets surrounding a cluster of shops and other facilities within easy walking distance – have become more essential to the daily lives since the start of the pandemic. This is a strength that can be built on.</p> <p>Option 1: We support policies which will help to ensure the survival of smaller shops and other businesses in neighbourhood</p>	<p>Support for provision of smaller shops noted.</p> <p>Note view that offices do not make valuable contribution to Latimer Employment Zone.</p> <p>Note future uncertainty re need. ELPS (2021) confirms a continued, if reduced, need for additional office floorspace. We are required by NPPF to address this OAN. Whilst much may be located in town centres, Employment Zones, as existing concentrations, are also appropriate locations for additional provision.</p> <p>We recognise that the market may seek to provide additional offices in certain location, this may not include the northern part of the Latimer Road Employment Zone. However, the ELPS does note that this part of the borough is not inherently unsuitable for either the retention of, or provision of new, office floorspace.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>centres. The StQW Neighbourhood Plan introduced flexible policies on change of use between the former A, B, and D classes uses in our three neighbourhood centres. The new E class continues this flexibility. Vacancy levels in shop units, especially in North Pole Road, have reduced since five years ago despite the pandemic.</p> <p>Option 2: We see no evidence that the north-west corner of the Borough is in need of 'new office floorspace'. We have a longstanding problem of hard-to-let office floorspace in Latimer Road. Working from home was, for many professionals in this part of North Kensington, already a way of life long before lockdown. The RBKC evidence base on office floorspace, and concerns over loss offices, has never included data on working from home as this is hard to capture.</p> <p>We are not persuaded by the NLPR assertion that Offices make a particular contribution to our Employment Zones or to other areas outside of our town centres (see more below). This is a subject on which we think a new Local Plan needs a more fundamental rethink.</p>	
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	<p>Option 1: we agree that The Council should continue to support the provision of smaller shops, both in town centres and in mainly residential or office areas. With increased working from home (or working in small offices outside town centres), people need to have small local shopping areas close to where they live, so that they can pop out briefly to convenience stores, cafés etc</p> <p>Option 2: we agree that the Council should encourage the creation of new larger office floor space throughout the borough. While high streets will continue to be the main venue for offices, there are locations where it may makes sense for small new offices to be</p>	Support for both options noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	sited in residential areas, allowing small business people or professionals to have offices near their home.	
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	<p>Cadogan support Option 1. Cadogan do not support Option 2. Town centres are changing and there is a need to maintain a strong supply and range of uses to ensure they remain vibrant and vital. Offices are an important part of this make up. Diluting office demand across the Borough, rather than directing demand towards town centres and employment zones, could prejudice the key objective of town centre policies to maintain their vitality.</p>	<p>Support for new small shops noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises the contribution that offices will have in supporting the viability of town centres, and agrees with the consultee that town centres and Employment Zones will be the appropriate location for the majority of new offices. However, we do not wish to preclude the provision of new offices in other locations, given the role that out of centre (and Employment Zone) offices play to the local and the wider economy. We are unusual in enjoying such a scatter of offices, a scatter which serves as a wider cluster. In addition there is no evidence to suggest that the provision of the modest new offices outside town centres or Employment Zones has a detrimental impact upon our town centres.</p>
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We support Options 1 and 2 with regard to Town Centres.	Support for both options noted.
Greg Hammond	Broadly support both. We need sufficient flexibility to allow conversion of an oversupply of retail to offices, which would compensate for former dwellings being converted back from offices to homes (covered later in the consultation).	Support for both options noted. Note that planning permission is no longer required for the change of use of a shop to an office, be this within, our outside, a town centre.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Natural History Museum (Adam Donovan)	<p>The NHM acknowledges that town centres are under immense pressure as the market tries to adapt post Covid-19. This NHM supports the classification of South Kensington as a district town centre and is supportive of the 'town centre first' approach whereby commercial uses are directed towards existing centres. In terms of the options put forward by the Council, the NHM believes that the two options which are to support smaller shops in area of retail deficiency or support the creation of new office floorspace across the Borough are not mutually exclusive. The NHM suggests that a mixture of commercial uses in town centres should be supported and assessed on a case by case basis. This will ensure that the right uses are being brought forward.</p>	<p>The current and emerging policies support a diversity of uses within our town centres, and recognise the important contribution that the cultural institutions such as the NHM will have.</p> <p>We also recognise that the two options are not mutually exclusive, and note the NHM support for both offices and small shops within town centres.</p>
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Yes	Noted
Elizabeth Ashley	Option 1 - Community first, not offices	Noted. The two options are not mutually exclusive.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	<p>SUPPORT BOTH OPTIONS</p> <p>Option 1 The Council should continue to support the provision of smaller shops (less than 400 sq This helps create walkable neighbourhoods. Any applicant seeking such a use will not need to carry out a "retail impact assessment". This differs from the national indicative threshold for such an assessment of 2,500 sq m.37m) in areas of retail deficiency.</p> <p>Option 2 Support the creation of new office floorspace across the Borough.</p>	Support for both options noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Offices make a particular contribution to our Employment Zones or to other areas outside of our town centres.</p> <p>Normally proposals for new office floorspace must be assessed through the sequential test. They need to be within town centres, and only elsewhere when there is no room within a centre.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree 	Noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Option 1,2	Noted.
The Pembridge Association (Fiona Fleming-Brown)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBKC should create a stakeholders development group: Frogmore, retailers, residents' groups, independent landlords and the Borough to develop a new NHG retail plan • RBKC should prioritise retail interests over other commercial users 	<p>Desire for more stakeholder involvement noted. This is not something which can form a policy within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that both the retail and the non retail commercial sector has an important role to play in supporting the viability of our town centres. We also note that planning permission is no longer required for a Class E shop to be used for any other Class E use.</p>
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1: We support. Smaller retail uses should still be steered to local centres to strengthen these centres as the hub for local neighbourhoods</p> <p>Option 2: New office floorspace – as in the current Local Plan – should, in addition to being steered to town centres, and/or be in areas of high public transport accessibility levels (PTAL 4 or higher). This is in line with the NPPF (see glossary for edge-of-centre) and</p>	<p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises the value that offices play in supporting the viability of town centres. We also recognise that as a town centre uses they will be subject to the "town centre first" principal as set out in the NPPF. However, we do recognise the value that offices in</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>the London Plan. Offices should not be proposed in areas with low public transport accessibility.</p> <p>In addition, the Employment Zones will need to be maintained as a focus for local employment uses.</p> <p>Out-of-centre employment sites will need to be conditioned to preclude change of use to E Use Class uses which are subject to town centre first policy.</p>	<p>other locations can have in maintaining the character of the area as well as in supporting the local and wider economy.</p> <p>Employment Zones are important concentrations of offices and considered as appropriate locations for additional office floorspace.</p> <p>The Council recognises the value in making the use of planning conditions for new larger scale E class floorspace, outside of a town centre, to ensure that the viability of our town centres is maintained.</p>
GLA (Hassan Ahmed)	<p>Town Centres</p> <p>The Mayor welcomes RBKC's intention to promote and support a 'town centre first' approach for new retail floorspace which is consistent with the approach set out in Policies SD7 and T6.3 of the LP2021.</p> <p>The Local Plan should recognise that Table A1.1 of the LP2021 identifies Knightsbridge, Kings Road and Kensington High Street as having night-time economies of regional or sub-regional importance and that South Kensington, which lies within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), has a night time economy of international or national significance.</p> <p>As part of the borough lies within the CAZ, the guidance set out in Policy SD4 of the LP2021 applies and the Local Plan should reflect paragraph 2.4.11 which highlights the particular and special importance of the South Kensington museums complex with its unique and rich cultural activity.</p>	<p>Support for Town Centre first approach to new retail floor space noted.</p> <p>The role of the night-time economy in some of our larger town centres is noted and will be reflected in policy. This must recognise that the needs of both businesses and our residents must also be considered.</p> <p>The importance of the South Kensington museums complex is, and will continue to be recognised in the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>TfL CD supports Option 1 to support the provision of smaller shops in areas of retail deficiency. TfL owns and manages a large and varied commercial estate in the Borough and actively supports its smaller shops and tenants, around 90% of whom are SMEs.</p> <p>TfL CD also supports the creation of new office floorspace throughout the borough (Option 2). However, the ‘town centre first’ approach set out in the implications column should also take account of the suitability of Opportunity Areas (such as Earls Court) and other strategic sites for development of offices and other workspaces.</p> <p>Earls Court</p> <p>As part of the Earls Court / West Kensington Opportunity Area, the London Plan expects development to create at least 5,000 new jobs, with a proportion of this likely be delivered through new office floorspace and other types of workspace. This will create a new economic and employment centre; a workplace and destination which is likely to encompass both RBKC and LBHF.</p> <p>As explained elsewhere, to realise the full potential of the Earls Court masterplan framework, the proposals will need to optimise the development of the site to achieve all the desired outcomes for supporting housing delivery, providing new jobs and enhancing transport and social infrastructure. To help achieve this, future Local Plan policies should prioritise delivery in Opportunity Areas and other strategic sites and identify future economic and employment centres as appropriate locations for new workplace</p>	<p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes allocations for the borough’s Opportunity Areas. This will include a requirement for new office floorspace, of a scale as set out in the London Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	floorspace (including offices) in order to enable the development capacities sought by the London Plan.	
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q. 8.1 /8.2 Support Options 1 and 2	Noted.
David Campbell	I support option 1, but not option 2. The recent development of WFH and supporting technology allows many small businesses to be operated without needing a separate office. Only offices likely to disturb a residential area should be restricted to town centres.	Home working is a form of operation which does not normally require planning permission, with the home office being ancillary to the main residential use. The Council has long supported the provision of small offices across the borough as these help maintain the diversity of uses so valued by our residents. In addition we note that a small scale office should not conflict with nearby residential uses.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support Option 1, but am ambivalent about more offices in Town Centre unless they are designated Employment Zones. Do we not need more affordable housing in easy reach of town centres ?	<p>The ELPS has indicated that there is a need of 60,400 sq m of additional office floorspace over the lifetime of the plan. An office is a use that can contribute to the vitality of a town centre as attracts visitors and increases “spend” in the area It may also be a use which benefits from the high levels of public transport accessibility, a characteristic of a town centre location.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there is need for additional affordable housing across the borough, both within easy reach of a town centre and beyond.</p>
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 1&2	Noted.
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	Yes.	Noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Robert Dixon	Yes.	Noted.
NHS North West London CCG (Kate Brady)	<p>It is recognised that the NHS has a role in supporting the regeneration of town centres. The Health on the High Street report (NHS Confederation, December 2020) outlines the opportunities for the NHS to become directly involved in the high street policy agenda which could include running health services from vacant property, including vaccination programmes, broadening the range of services provided within communities and supporting and participating in the design of healthy communities and places.</p> <p>We suggest that the new local plan should seek to avoid an over concentration of uses which can have a determinantal impact on health and wellbeing such as hot food takeaways, betting shops, pawnbrokers, pay-day loan stores and amusement centres. In the case of hot food takeaways, the Council should consider restricting new takeaways within walking distance of schools in line with Policy E9 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>The borough is fortunate in not having a particular concentration of those uses which may have a “determinantal impact on health and wellbeing”. However, a policy restricting an over concentration of such uses is being taken forward in the Local Plan.</p> <p>By the same token, given the small size of the borough, nowhere will not be within walking distance of a school. As such, restricting takeaways within walking distance from a school would result in a de facto ban across the borough. This would not be appropriate.</p>
Alex Mackay	Agreed except that the need for further office space needs to be questioned.	The ELPS has indicated that there is a need of 60,400 sq m of additional office floorspace over the lifetime of the plan. This accounts for post pandemic work patterns. The Council does, however, recognise that this estimate is just that, an estimate, and we will review this need over time.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	<p>ECDC welcomes the support for the creation of new office floorspace proposed in Option 2. However, ECDC considers the town centre first approach explained in the implication’s column should also take account of the appropriateness of strategic sites for office and workspace development, such as Earls Court.</p> <p>As part of the Earls Court/West Kensington Opportunity Area, the</p>	<p>The Local Plan includes allocations for the borough’s Opportunity Areas. This will include a requirement for new office floorspace.</p> <p>Care must be taken to ensure that office development in such locations must not be of a scale that will harm the vitality of our town centres, particularly given the role that offices play in attracting visitors to centres and in generating spend.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>London Plan expects development to create at least 5,000 new jobs, with a proportion of the commercial floorspace likely be delivered through new office floorspace.</p> <p>As explained elsewhere, to realise the full potential of the Earls Court masterplan the proposals will need to optimise the development of the Site to achieve all the desired outcomes in supporting housing delivery, providing new jobs and enhancing transport and social infrastructure. To help achieve this, ECDC recommends that any future policy should also prioritise delivery of office floorspace on strategic sites and identify future centres (such as Earls Court) as appropriate locations for new employment (including office) floorspace to help achieve the development capacities sought by the London Plan.</p>	
DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)	Wellcome Trust supports policies to protect and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres, but also notes that policy should recognise that town centres will need to adapt to respond to market needs/demands and changing circumstances. Therefore, the policy should ensure flexibility for bringing forward development within town centres.	The Council recognises the need for flexibility within our town centres, if they are to remain vibrant and vital places. We also note the freedoms offered under Class E.
Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum (KNF) (Simon Birkett)	<p>Commercialisation of public spaces and Class E activities</p> <p>In relation to boundary roads, please consider Westminster City Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies 7: Managing development for Westminster’s people • Policy 16: Food drink and entertainment; and • Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan policies 14 and 15 (about mitigating and managing commercial activity) and policies 34 to 40 	<p>Noted. The area of the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum lies entirely outside the borough. As such it does not form part of the Development Plan for the Borough.</p> <p>However, we do recognise the importance of balancing the needs of businesses and local residents in all of our centres. We do also recognise that Knightsbridge has been designated as an</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>(healthy air, renewable energy, natural environment, trees, water, healthy people etc). https://www.knightsbridgeforum.org/media//documents/knp_made_version_december_2018_131218_website.pdf</p> <p>These policies are proving robust in the day-to-day balancing of the needs of businesses and local residents.</p>	<p>International Centre. As such is function and character will be very different from a smaller district or neighbourhood centre.</p>
<p>Turley (Laurence Brooker)</p>	<p>Our Client supports the approach, outlined by both Option 1 and Option 2, of continuing to support the provision of smaller shops and supporting the creation of new office floorspace across the Borough and not only in town centres.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Q.8.2. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Introduce EMPTY RETAIL PROPERTY ORDERS with powers to take over commercial property empty for one year or more for pop-up starter units for new young entrepreneurs on six-month Licences.	Noted. An Empty Retail Property Order does not fall within the remit of the planning system. However, the Council's town centre task force is exploring a number of ways to support our town centre. Many of these will go beyond pure "planning". This representation has been shared with that team.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Traffic congestion and the consequent air pollution in the King's Road is a disincentive to shoppers.	The Council recognises the impact that traffic will have upon the shopping environment of the King's Road. However, there is no opportunity to divert traffic from the area.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	Where there are clusters of food and drink establishments, e.g. as in Portobello Road (Acklam Road) and Exhibition Road, and where there is adequate space, we think it would be useful for the Council to promote the "food court" approach, whereby instead of each establishment having its own seating (or no seating in the case of food stalls), there would be a central seating area. This would make for greater flexibility and less clutter. We strongly support resisting the loss of existing office space to residential or other uses.	The Council recognises the value of the food court model, and notes that two units of this form have/ are opening on Kensington High Street. Whilst it is not in our power to require such uses we would support them as and when appropriate. Support for protection of offices noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I don't think you need too much control as it will take years before demand returns to pre-Covid levels. If you want to help offices and shops you should cut business rates.	The Council recognises that business rates are one of the key expenses or any commercial operator in this borough. However, cutting business rates is beyond the remit of the planning system.
Linda Wade	There must be an incentive that the outgoing business does not strip the units to avoid paying business rates so that young entrepreneurs can trial their products and help revivify the high streets. There should be an empty shop front policy so that the rest of the street remains animated.	The behaviour of outgoing businesses is beyond the remit of the planning system.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Work with owners to bring empty retail units into use as pop-up starter units for entrepreneurs on six-month licences.	Noted. The provision of “pop-ups” is not within the remit of the planning system. However, the Councils town centre task force is exploring a number of ways to support our town centre. Many of these will go beyond pure “planning”. This representation has been shared with that team.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	Support new offices as long as a portion of the sqm is affordable offices offered on a reduced rent but at the same standard	The Council is introducing a new affordable business policy. This will require the provision of office floorspace at a reduced rate to be let too provides who meet certain “social capital” criteria. However, this policy will only be introduced for larger proposals and where we are satisfied that the requirement will not jeopardise the viability of the proposal.
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	As above, in addition to a ‘town centre first’ approach, priority should also be given to office and other workplace / job-creating development in Opportunity Areas and other strategic sites. The Local Plan should identify future workplace centres, such as the Earls Court site, as appropriate locations for new employment (including office) floorspace in order to enable the development capacities sought by the London Plan.	The Local Plan includes allocations for the borough’s Opportunity Areas. This will include a requirement for new office floorspace, of a scale as set out in the London Plan.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	<p>Despite a lot of consultation, High Street Kensington seems to be problematic. Is it a major centre or a local centre or both? There seems to evidence of an over provision of retail already and this will only increase. However this may bring down rental prices. This may end up with loss of RBKC control of uses due to planning changes... or maybe the private sector will come up with innovative solutions such as the food market/small office rental concept at the Old Waterstones. Or smaller businesses can finally afford to rent vacant retail outlets.</p> <p>Town Centres do not need to be only about shopping, as</p>	<p>The Council recognises that Kensington High Street has a dual role, it is a major centre which attracts visitors from across the borough and beyond. However, it has an important role in serving the need of those who live and work in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Council will support applications (when planning permission is needed) which include innovative solutions to make better use of properties in the centre. However, this will only be the case when we are satisfied that these will support the vitality of the centre.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>mentioned they are also about meeting up, enjoying culture and entertainment. Scant attention is given to sport (to include dance) out of all proportion to the benefit it can provide to the community as a whole. Sport is an investment in future generations' health and well-being and needs to be designed for every site and in an attractive way that is accessible, affordable and enjoyable to visit (perhaps also as a spectator to one off events or demonstrations as well as to participate). Eg the swimming pool in Tesco Tower is wholly inadequate hidden away in the basement. The gym also looks very small. For a 24 storey development a much more positive and attractive facility should have been made available. For smaller spaces, ideas are to have gymnastic or ballet barres or a pommel horse by the Design Museum or a couple of them on the verges at the entrance to Holland Park.</p> <p>ESSA also supports the character of Kensington High Street having a strong cultural interest. Kensington Palace (and the Royal College of Art, just about) at one end of the High Street but still a continuum to the western end. Perhaps because ESSA is at the western end with the Odeon Cinema, Leighton House, the Design Museum and the legacy of the great 19th century studios on our doorstep, we would like the council to proactively encourage creative individuals and creative industries (fashion, fine art, product design, architecture) and dovetail these with measures to promote then protect open and inclusive individual retail spaces whilst protecting any studios or industrial spaces that may result from such measures or that still survive. Scarsdale Studios, Pembroke Studios are now private, mostly housing, but</p>	<p>The Council concurs with the view that the role of a town centre must be beyond shopping. We also recognise the value of sports facilities across our centre and elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>Support of cultural role of Kensington High Street noted.</p> <p>The Council will support the provision of new workspaces within our town centres.</p> <p>The Council does, and will continue to protect our remaining artists studios.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>nonetheless vestiges of this artistic heritage that ESSA would be happy to see nurtured going forward.</p> <p>More can be done to encourage cultural tourism through better signage, walking apps etc. It could be really invigorating with live updates of events or talks if done well. This can be expanded through the BID via a well-designed app that ties all amenities through the 5 different layers of food, art, shopping, royal heritage, parks and sport. It is important that such an app is joined up and dynamic.</p>	
<p>Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)</p>	<p>In a situation where we have moved from one economically damaging Covid-19 Lockdown and into a second last November, and possibly further in winter 2021/22, very few of the mentioned initiatives, as well-intentioned as they may be, will have more than a marginal effect on recovering the damage to business and jobs. Street markets have held their own during the pandemic and may continue to thrive; this may, or may not be a permanent shift in shopping habits.</p> <p>The Council needs to consult meaningfully with residents and their associations and compacts, business, commercial property owners, local ward Forums, Amenity Societies and others to re-imagine how we can re-energise our shopping streets and street markets. This may involve introducing uses we had never considered; we must be open to ideas. There have already been suggestions that high streets and shopping centres could host medical diagnostic centres, where people could access screening, have vaccinations, and general health advice. This could be a huge step forward in improving the health of those who are reticent to visit their GP in the first instance.</p>	<p>The Council recognise the importance of involving the community when looking at innovative solutions for our town centres. These may go beyond the narrow “planning” remit. In particular the Council has set up a town centre taskforce to explore these ideas in greater depth. This has included considerable consultation and conversations with those in the sector. This engagement will continue.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		Many of these comments go beyond the remit of the planning system. However, all have been passed to the Council's Town Centre Task force who are working on a number of projects to try to maintain the vitality of our centres in this time of great change. This will include "planning" as well as "non-planning initiatives.

Mix of uses in our centres

Q.8.3. Which of these options do you support?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
<p>The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)</p>	<p>SUPPORT ALL OPTIONS</p> <p>Option 1 Use planning conditions, when new floorspace is being proposed, to ensure that only those commercial uses which will support the vitality of a centre is allowed. For example, resist the creation of new offices in otherwise prime retail frontages. Ensures vibrancy in town centres by creating active frontages. Landowners / applicants will need planning permission to change the use in the future.</p> <p>Option 2 Develop a new policy setting out where pubs and takeaways are appropriate. As these are not included in the new Class E use class, planning permission is still required to create a new pub or takeaway. An over concentration of these uses could harm the retail function of part of a centre, and/or disturb those living nearby.</p> <p>Option 3 Embrace the Government's regulatory changes and let the centres evolve as the market sees fit. In-line with the Government's objectives to allow greater flexibility of uses within town centres. The Council's licencing, rather than planning regime, could protect the living conditions of those who live within, or close to, our centres. Class E uses included shops, estate agents, cafes and restaurants, offices, medical uses, gyms and nurseries.</p>	<p>Support for all options noted. Options 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive, although option 3 does support greater flexibility of uses within our town centres.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Options 1. We support Option 2 as far as pubs are concerned.	Support for options 1 and 2 noted. Option 2 does not seek to protect pubs or takeaways but to set out where they might be located.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	<p>We see Options 1 and 2 as reflecting what we see as a familiar desire of the planning profession to exert maximum control over building uses. Yet this is a moment when 18 months of fundamental change to city life suggests caution on overly detailed or prescriptive planning policies for town centres and offices. We therefore lean towards Option 3, at least for the next few years. The impact of allowing greater flexibility in uses and activities within neighbourhood centres and the smaller 'town centres' within the Borough (such as Notting Hill Gate) should at least be tested in the real world.</p> <p>In a part of the Borough now threatened with extreme housing densities and building heights, as a consequence of a lack of developable housing sites, we support the Government's moves to support mixed and flexible high streets through more limited restriction on change of use.</p> <p>We would want protections on social, community and cultural uses to be retained. But this seems a time in the history of global cities when classifications such as 'shop' or 'office' have a diminished meaning and relevance. Very different demands and uses may emerge, which make sense to the public, but which may clash with the orthodoxy of the planning profession.</p> <p>Hence we think that a new RBKC Local Plan needs to be alive to such possibilities and avoid assumptions by the Planning Department that what has 'worked well for the Council' in the past is what residents wish to see in the future.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that the new PDR does offer more flexibility, with the intention being to reduce regulation in order to allow town centres to evolve in seamless manner. We support this approach, and will not seek, in general to specify which "town centre use" might be appropriate and which one is not.</p> <p>However, the implications of one E class use, say retail, can be very different from another, say a destination restaurant. A condition could mitigate the impact of the "higher impact use". The use of conditions would only be possible when new floorspace is being permitted, and not when a change of use is occurring.</p> <p>Support for seeking to protect social and community uses noted. This will not be possible when an E class use and the loss will be to another E class use.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
<p>Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)</p>	<p>Option 1. We agree generally that the Council should use planning conditions, when new floorspace is being proposed, to ensure that only those commercial uses which will support the vitality of a centre is allowed. We note, however, that there can often be a case for offices and other commercial uses above retail outlets, and having employment in such establishments helps the town centre.</p> <p>Option 2. We would support the development of a new policy setting out where pubs and takeaways are appropriate. These are, however, two quite different categories, and need different treatment. New pubs are rare in our area, where our chief concern is to keep our old historic pubs. Takeaways can be a menace with congregations of delivery drivers, and thought needs to be given to how to deal with this. There is a particular problem with shops that are not hot takeaways and are therefore included in Class E, but cause a nuisance because they use delivery riders to deliver cold food and drink. This may be a case for a narrow Article 4 direction requiring planning permission so that the Council can impose conditions on the congregation of delivery riders outside these shops, especially in residential areas.</p> <p>Option 3: We would be concerned about letting centres evolve as the market sees fit. Particularly in areas like Portobello Road, there is a risk of the shops which attract the visitors being driven out and we have suggested the need for an Article 4 direction to remove Class E rights in the market area.</p>	<p>The Council concurs with the view that offices and other non-shop commercial uses can play an important contribution to the viability of a town centre.</p> <p>Policy CK2 of the existing Local Plan seeks to protect exiting pubs. Whilst this policy may be updated we do not seek to change our approach in this regard. Pubs are a use which our greatly valued and which help continue to a sense of place.</p> <p>The new Local Plan has a new draft policy concerning the evening economy. This is intended to ensure that town centre uses will be resisted (where pp ins required) where they have an unacceptable impact upon amenity.</p> <p>With the new E class PDR the Council must recognise that planning permission will not be required for the change of use of a shop to a restaurant. The only influence that we have will be through the licencing system.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	Cafés and restaurants can cause real nuisance. The licensing system is not necessarily the easiest way of dealing with this and is difficult for residents to engage with, especially because of a lack of transparency (which we hope can be looked at). We would favour a review of how it could be made more accessible and if possible strengthened.	
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	Option 1	Noted.
Greg Hammond	Option 3 seems the most pragmatic in uncertain times; the only certainty of central planning is that it will produce the wrong answers!	Noted. The Council does recognise that the planning system can struggle to keep up with a rapidly changing town centre environment. The Class E PDRs will help in this regard. However, there may be a role for the planning system to address the unintended consequences of the reforms.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	Support measures to promote walkable neighbourhoods and to provide new work spaces particularly if this creates opportunities for creative and cultural businesses.	Support for walkable neighbourhoods and new workspaces noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Option 3	Noted.
Elizabeth Ashley	I see problems with all three options. All established areas should be working to a individual, established town planning which provides the balance and diversity of that area and not replying on piecemeal one offs and licensing control.	Noted. The reforms to the PDR does mean that the planning permission is no longer required for the change of use of one E class use to another. We have to rely on the licencing stem to try to mitigate impacts of those uses which may cause nuisance.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	SUPPORT ALL OPTIONS Option 1 Use planning conditions, when new floorspace is being proposed, to ensure that only those commercial uses which will support the	Support for all three options is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>vitality of a centre is allowed. For example, resist the creation of new offices in otherwise prime retail frontages. Ensures vibrancy in town centres by creating active frontages. Landowners / applicants will need planning permission to change the use in the future.</p> <p>Option 2 Develop a new policy setting out where pubs and takeaways are appropriate. As these are not included in the new Class E use class, planning permission is still required to create a new pub or takeaway. An over concentration of these uses could harm the retail function of part of a centre, and/or disturb those living nearby.</p> <p>Option 3 Embrace the Government's regulatory changes and let the centres evolve as the market sees fit. In-line with the Government's objectives to allow greater flexibility of uses within town centres. The Council's licencing, rather than planning regime, could protect the living conditions of those who live within, or close to, our centres. Class E uses included shops, estate agents, cafes and restaurants, offices, medical uses, gyms and nurseries.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1 It is unclear as to whether this relates to new development within Conservation Areas, and the need to have planning permission to do so, when there has been a change of use from Class E and what protections can be secured.</p> <p>Option 2 There are areas where there is a saturation of takeaways and pubs, these are having an impact on the high street, as the former do not necessarily serve the local community and require bike deliveries.</p>	<p>Option 1 will only be possible when planning permission is required. Ordinarily this will only be when the proposal includes the creation of additional floorspace.</p> <p>Option 2: The new Local Plan has a new draft policy concerning the evening economy. This is intended to ensure that town centre uses will be resisted (where pp ins required) where they have an unacceptable impact upon amenity.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Option 3 Licensing is limited in what it can apply and as retail patterns are changing the legislation in Planning and Licensing does not appear to have kept up with companies such as Getir for example.</p>	<p>Option 3. The Council recognises that there are a number of new models in the retail sector. The existing planning and licencing regimes may have not been designed to address these new forms of use.</p>
<p>RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)</p>	<p>Option 2</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)</p>	<p>General comment: It is not clear which social and community uses in our town or local centre would cease to be protected – all of these uses listed in para 18.3.4 of the Local Plan are either not in the E Use Class or are protected, such as health facilities. In addition to the loss of retail uses, there will be increases in cafes and restaurants in the main shopping frontages, along with the loss of upper-floor office uses in the higher-order town centres</p> <p>Option 1. New commercial floorspace is likely to be quite rare in town centres and elsewhere, unless explicitly included as part of a mixed-use development. Planning conditions could be used to secure ground-floor E Use Class uses which generate footfall, to discourage uses which do not require constant customer access or do not generate vitality. Site allocations and, in particular, major developments in Growth Areas need to plan positively for commercial uses in mixed-use development.</p> <p>Option 2. Combining pubs and takeaways is unlikely to be successful. These</p>	<p>The Council would like to protect all social and community uses when possible. However we must recognise that this may not be possible when they are E class uses. This includes medical uses.</p> <p>Planning permission is no longer required for the change of use of a shop to a café or restaurant.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there will be relatively few proposals within our town centres which include the creation of new floorspace, rather than the change of use of existing. It may be appropriate to specify the types of E class uses which may be appropriate in different parts of the development. However, this should only be done when necessary as the Council must recognise the ambition of the government is to offer greater freedoms and not add additional restrictions.</p> <p>The site allocations included the creation of new floorspace. It is possible to specify the type of use that will be sought. Each allocation will specify this use. In some cases a generic E class use may be appropriate, in others it may not.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>are two very different sui generis uses and separate policies would be supported.</p> <p>We are opposed to hot food takeaways, particularly because of the impact of delivery riders. Despite “protection” of the Use Classes Order as ‘sui generis’ uses, securing premises could be difficult and, in the case of hot-food takeaways, concentrations could be problematic.</p> <p>Despite “protection” of the Use Classes Order as ‘sui generis’ uses, securing premises could be difficult and, in the case of hot-food takeaways, concentrations could be problematic.</p> <p>There is a particular problem with shops that are not hot takeaways and are therefore included in Class E. They often cause a nuisance because they use delivery riders to deliver cold food and drink.</p> <p>This may be a case for a narrow Article 4 direction requiring planning permission so that the Council can impose conditions on the congregation of delivery riders outside these shops, especially in residential areas.</p> <p>Option 3: We are opposed the Government’s regulatory changes. Greater creativity will be needed to retain competitiveness, but we are concerned that the licensing controls are not robust enough to control these uses and, if they are to be relied upon, must be strengthened.</p>	<p>The Council does recognise the problems that hot food takeaways can have in an area. The reforms to the GPDO have not removed the ability to control such uses. They are not a E class use and such planning permission is required for a change of use from a shop of café to a hot food takeaway. As such there is no reason why conditions limiting delivery drivers, or hours of operation cannot be used. The new Local Plan has a new draft policy concerning the evening economy. This is intended to ensure that town centre uses will be resisted (where pp ins required) where they have an unacceptable impact upon amenity.</p> <p>This is not the case for deliveries from shops. As noted these are E class and as such planning permission will not be required where a traditional shop has an increased delivery element. An Article 4 direction cannot be used as changes of use within the class is not development.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	TfL CD does not wish to comment at this stage, but will do so when the Council has a better idea of what direction it will take to encourage the vitality and viability of the borough’s town centres and future centres.	Noted.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 8.3 and 8.4 Support Options 1 and 2.	Noted

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Mozafar Amiri	I agree with option 1 and option 2.	Noted
David Campbell	I support Options 1 and 2 – especially to control take-aways and “dark kitchens”.	Noted. Hot-food takeaways are “sui generis” rather than a Class E use. Planning permission is required for such uses. The same is the case for “dark kitchens”. The new Local Plan has a new draft policy concerning the evening economy. This is intended to ensure that town centre uses will be resisted (where pp ins required) where they have an unacceptable impact upon amenity.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support Option 1.	Noted
David Lloyd-Davis	Options 1&2	Noted
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	All.	Noted
Robert Dixon	I am undecided as to the most appropriate regulation in this context.	Noted
Alex Mackay	Option 1 in some locations only and Option 3	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	The amendments to the Use Classes Order implemented the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 principally grouped compatible town centre uses into new Class E, such as office, shops, cafes any gyms. ECDC supports Option 3 and considers that the 2020 amendments to the	Noted. The Council recognises the freedoms offered under Class E. We also recognise that these freedoms will reduce “risk and delay” as removed the need for planning permission for certain changes of use. The Council is, however, concerned, that there may be circumstances where a particular use which lies within the E class

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Use Classes Order will help in reducing vacant units in town centres and reduce the risk and delay in applying for planning permission for appropriate changes of use.</p> <p>Furthermore, the amendments result in the need to apply for planning permission from Class E to Sui Generis for takeaways and drinking establishments, providing RBKC the ability to control their location. However, as proposed in Option 2, this could be supported by policy directing takeaways and drinking establishments to certain types of location.</p>	<p>may not be appropriate as may harm rather than support the vitality of a town centre. The Council would only have the ability to control such a use when new floorspace is being created.</p> <p>We also note that a takeaway and drinking establishment is not an E class use, and as such the Council can specify those areas where new uses might be concentrated.</p>
<p>Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum (KNF) (Simon Birkett)</p>	<p>Commercialisation of public spaces and Class E activities</p> <p>In relation to boundary roads, please consider Westminster City Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies 7: Managing development for Westminster’s people • Policy 16: Food drink and entertainment; and • Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan policies 14 and 15 (about mitigating and managing commercial activity) and policies 34 to 40 (healthy air, renewable energy, natural environment, trees, water, healthy people etc). <p>https://www.knightsbridgeforum.org/media//documents/knp_made_version_december_2018_131218_website.pdf</p> <p>These policies are proving robust in the day-to-day balancing of the needs of businesses and local residents.</p>	<p>Noted. The area of the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum lies entirely outside the borough. As such it does not form part of our development plan.</p> <p>However, we do recognise the importance of balancing the needs of businesses and local residents in all of our centres. We do also recognise that Knightsbridge has been designated as an International Centre. As such its function and character will be very different from a smaller district or neighbourhood centre.</p>
<p>Historic England (David English)</p>	<p>A diverse range of uses contributes to what is special about a number of the conservation areas in RBKC. This could potentially be affected negatively by option 3. Likewise, the best use for a listed building is usually that which it was originally designed for.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the implications that changes of use can have upon the character of a conservation area and of a listed building. These implications will be considered as long as planning permission is required. The Council’s A4D may help in this regard,</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Listed buildings whose significance is tied, even in part, to their use as a shop, pub or other commercial use will need to be considered carefully before being converted to residential which may cause unacceptable levels of harm.</p> <p>If there are clusters of such uses you may wish to consider if there is merit in developing a special policy area, of the type supported in the London Plan for the CAZ. These can help manage the cultural heritage significance of areas that are defined locally, particularly where development pressures and market conditions could lead to the loss of valued specialist clusters of uses or functions identified as having particular significance.</p>	<p>although we do note that the SoS may take a different view as to the extent of the A4D.</p> <p>There are clusters of commercial uses within our town centres. We recognise that cultural heritage may have a special role to play in supporting the ongoing vitality or these areas.</p>
Turley (Laurence Brooker)	<p>Option 1 to use planning conditions to restrict commercial uses is not considered to be in accordance with national legislation and policy direction. Use Class E was introduced specifically with the intention to provide greater flexibility to high streets and town centres, and therefore restricting this unduly is considered to constitute the introduction of restrictive mix policies by the backdoor. It is also noted that such an approach would unfairly target new planning permissions, whilst allowing other existing Class E premises to move between uses, which we do not consider to align with the principles behind the planning system.</p> <p>Our Client agrees with the statement at paragraph 8.7 of the Issues and Options document that “The core of these centres contain the critical mass of shops with the peripheral parts being home to more cafés, restaurants and other service uses. It is this mix, or range of uses, which make our centres the successful places that they are.” However, it is considered that the direction and changes in legislation from national government reflect this</p>	<p>The Council recognises the freedoms offered under Class E. We embrace the need for flexibility, as and when it helps support the viability of a town centre.</p> <p>However, there may be circumstances where the freedoms within class E could have unintended consequences. The use of conditions where new floorspace is permitted, could help prevent these consequences. This would comply with the Government’s overarching ambition to maintain the vitality and viability of town centres.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the freedoms offered under Class E does mean that the planning system may not be able to address amenity as it once did. Whilst planning permission may be required for associated paraphernalia, the principle of the change of use itself will have been set by the GPDO.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>and allow for such dynamic mixes that reflect need and how people interact and use spaces within the town centre and high streets.</p> <p>Option 3 sets out the option to embrace the Government’s regulatory changes and let the centres evolve as the market sees fit, and that this would allow for greater flexibility of uses within town centres. Although the Retail Needs Assessment within the evidence base is not yet published, it is noted in the Issues and Options consultation that early drafts have noted that there is likely to be an oversupply of retail in the Borough by 2043. It is therefore considered paramount to consider greater flexibility of town centre uses, in accordance with the policy direction from national government (use Class E). This would allow the flexible evolution of the town centre to better accord with needs.</p> <p>It is agreed that living conditions of residents could be protected through the licensing process. However, it is also considered disingenuous to suggest that planning no longer has control of protecting neighbouring amenity and living conditions of residents, as to successfully operate some premises in certain new uses, may require a number of adaptations resulting in the need for planning applications, such as application for extraction equipment or outdoor tables and chairs.</p> <p>In relation to this point, we would also like to note our Client’s support for the outdoor dining and ‘twilight’ economy that has grown further particularly during the pandemic. It is considered that such uses can help to revitalise town centres, providing activity, and reinvigorating local businesses and economies, whilst also being managed in a way that does not result in unacceptable</p>	<p>The Council recognise the role that outdoor dining and the “twilight economy” can have in supporting the vitality of our centres. Emerging policies will reflect this. However, we also recognise the need to balance this contribution with the impact that such uses can have upon the amenity of those living nearby.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>impacts on neighbouring amenity. We request the policies relating to the mix of uses in town centres, focus less on land use, and more on the contribution to activity that proposals make.</p>	
<p>Natural History Museum (Adam Donovan)</p>	<p>In terms of the mix of uses which are supported in Town Centres, the NHM is supportive of Option 3 whereby the Government’s regulatory changes which let centres evolve as the market sees fit is embraced. This option will ensure that the most appropriate uses come forward. For example, the potential additional space freed up at the NHM as a result of the Harwell Project provides the opportunity to consider complementary or alternative uses. The uses selected will likely be dependant on what is feasible for the NHM. If there is restrictive policy in place it may stop development coming forward.</p> <p>For the future nature of Towns, the NHM is supportive of the possible strategy for South Kensington which is to build on its strength as a world class cultural destination and a place to eat out and meet friends. The NHM requests that more clarity is provided on how the area can ‘build on its strength’. This will help to clarify how development can support growth in the borough.</p>	<p>Support for flexibility noted. The Council recognises that class E does allow considerable flexibility. The use of conditions would only be used when necessary to ensure that amenity is maintained rather than to curtail the successful operation of an institution such as the NHM. We explicitly recognise the value of our large institutions and intend to be explicit in this regard in emerging policy.</p>
<p>DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)</p>	<p>Mix of uses As above, Option 1 should reflect the changing market needs for the town centre, with restricting uses via planning conditions going against the spirit and intention of the government’s new Use Class E. Therefore, Wellcome Trust would support Option 3 with the Council’s licensing team protecting local amenity, rather than restricting flexibility through planning conditions.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the freedoms offered under Class E. We embrace the need for flexibility, as and when it helps support the viability of a town centre.</p> <p>However, there may be circumstances where the freedoms within class E could have unintended consequences. The use of conditions where new floorspace is permitted, could help prevent these consequences. This would comply with the Government’s over-</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		<p>arching ambition to maintain the vitality and viability of town centres.</p>
<p>Savills on behalf of COMMERCIAL ESTATES GROUP (Kirsty Turner)</p>	<p>Town Centres MOVE Town Centres are discussed in Section 8 of the NLPR. As an asset owner, investor, and office operator in RBKC, CEG are supportive of the creation of new office floorspace across the borough, recognising they make a significant contribution to the borough's economic success.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the freedoms offered under Class E. We embrace the need for flexibility, as and when it helps support the viability of a town centre.</p> <p>However, there may be circumstances where the freedoms within class E could have unintended consequences. The use of conditions where new floorspace is permitted, could help prevent these consequences. This would comply with the Government's overarching ambition to maintain the vitality and viability of town centres</p>

Q.8.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	The Shop Fronts Guide SPD to include not just architectural guidance, but also advice on planning uses, licensing requirements, T&Cs and objects on pavements, EH nuisances, air con and ventilation plant, street cleaning and sweeping down, BIDs etc.	The Council recognises that a wider approach needs to be taken to support our town centres. We have set up a taskforce to explore these ideas. Many of these issues do not fall within the remit of the planning system, and as such cannot form part of an SPD.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Preventing the further loss of pubs should be a priority for the Council. The Council should lobby for changes to the planning rules which would make it more difficult to change use from pub to retail.	Planning permission is required for the change of use of a public house to a shop. We intend to continue to protect pubs through our Local Plan.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	<p>Option 2</p> <p>Cadogan is keen to see a framework which supports a flexible approach to town centre uses. The Estate would not support measures seeking to limit pubs which are part of the make up of town centres, create vibrancy and increase dwell time. Measures to require the change of use of town centre units to a pub would slow down dynamic movement of town centres which has been important over the last 12 months (and successful) in allowing town centres to adapt to the changing needs and demands of tenants by providing certainty and speed.</p> <p>However, the Cadogan are supportive of measures to control takeaways where these are not ancillary to the function of either restaurants or bars. Takeaways by themselves are relatively limited in their contribution to the vitality of town centres and indeed, unless controlled, can have a negative impact through noise and smells.</p>	<p>Planning permission is currently required for the change of use of a shop or other “business, commercial and service use” to a pub. We do recognise the contribution that such uses can have in supporting the vitality of a town centre, but do note that care must be taken to ensure that the creation of new pubs do not harm the amenity of nearby residents.</p> <p>Support to control takeaways noted. The Council does recognise the role that such uses can have upon the function of a town centre, but also the impact that even a single unit can have upon amenity.</p>
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I think that the Local Plan shouldn't be used to micromanaged development the market should decide.	Noted. The freedoms offered by the GPDO offers considerable flexibility. However, the Council does recognise that some nominally “town centre uses” may harm rather than support an

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		area's vitality, or may harm the amenity of those who live in the vicinity. A balance must be reached.
Linda Wade	<p>The Shop Front SPD needs to extend to consultation with the applicant on receipt of a new application, or prior, for a revised front elevation or signage as part of the revised Placemaking Agenda for our High Streets. There must be more emphasis on retention, restoration and enhancement and the impact on the Streetscape and how the design can contribute to the value added of the location.</p> <p>New applicants do not seem to be aware of the problems of the air con or their extraction, waste disposal, cleaning their frontages, and consultation with local residents' associations.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the value of the Shopfront SPD and will consider whether it would be appropriate to widen its remit.</p> <p>The Council recognises that a wider approach needs to be taken to support our town centres. We have set up a taskforce to explore these ideas.</p>
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	The Shop Fronts Guide SPD to be expanded into a cross-departmental document including not just architectural guidance, but also advice on planning uses, licensing requirements, T&Cs and objects on pavements, environmental health nuisances, air conditioning and ventilation plants, street cleaning and sweeping down	The Council recognises that a wider approach needs to be taken to support our town centres. We have set up a taskforce to explore these ideas. Many of these issues do not fall within the remit of the planning system, and as such cannot form part of an SPD.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	We welcome the recent changes to the GPDO giving additional protection for shopfronts in conservation areas (when shops are converted to other uses) to protect the character and activity of the area. This will need to be reflected in a new policy.	Noted. The Council has a policy which relates to shopfronts and will continue to do so.
Mozafar Amiri	Create a policy to limit the amount of hazardous activities such as smoking outside of all the cafes. Particularly on Brompton Road. They all smoke Shishas and walking past the cafe fronts (which expand all over the pavements) is a health hazard not only to pedestrians but to other cafe users. Other cities such as	The smoking of shishas is not a matter that can be considered by the planning system.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	Vancouver, Canada have successful policies that prevent smoking in such areas.	
DP9 Limited (Luke Thrumble)	It is suggested that Option 1 (which proposes to use planning conditions to restrict commercial uses) should not be adopted. A new Class E of the Use Class Order was recently introduced by the Government with the aim to support high streets and town centres. The intention of Class E, and the flexibility it provides, is to enable commercial premises to quickly adapt to changing market demands and provide a mix of retail, commercial and leisure uses. Changing from one of the named uses to another without requiring planning permission is what enables commercial premises to quickly adapt to changing market demands. Conditioning new commercial uses is not in the spirit of this intended flexibility and would place unnecessary restrictions on new retail premises and operators.	Noted. The freedoms offered by the GPDO offers considerable flexibility. However, the Council does recognise that some nominally “town centre uses” may harm rather than support an areas vitality, or may harm the amenity of those who live in the vicinity. A balance must be reached. Such an approach would allow the Council to support the Government’s primary aim or to support the vitality and the viability of our town centres.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	We may have to rethink problems of coexistence between the night-time economy and local residents, which is becoming more of an issue and truly ruining the lives of those who cannot sleep due to late closing. The pandemic has created new habits of earlier closing times; let’s consider sticking to them.	Noted. A balanced must be reached where the benefits of an evening economy to the vitality of a town centre is assessed against the need to protect the amenity of those living within the vicinity.

Residential uses within our centres

Q.8.5. Do you support us making an Article 4 direction to ensure that planning permission will continue to be required for changes of use of commercial, business and service uses to residential? If so, should the direction cover all of our town centres?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Yes, and yes.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Sandra Yarwood	Yes very much so	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Yes. It should cover the whole of Chelsea.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	We have submitted separate representations on the Council's proposals for extending a Borough-wide Article 4 Direction. For the specific StQW neighbourhood, we do not see such a Direction as helpful and have opposed its introduction in relation to this part of the Borough. We acknowledge that the Kensington Society, looking at much wider area, takes a different view.	Noted. The detailed representations received will be considered before the Council decides whether to confirm the direction.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	We support an Article 4 direction for all our high streets.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	Cadogan supports this approach.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We support the Council making an Article 4 direction.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Greg Hammond	I do support the application to take the power, but only if local policy is changed to be more flexible; more people living in a 'town centre' area are a good thing, and under-used commercial premises that were designed as dwellings (eg flats above shops) should be converted back to dwellings.	<p>Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.</p> <p>It should be noted that the A4D does not preclude the loss of the office use, only that planning permission is required. The viability (or otherwise) of a business use will be material when assessing the suitability of its loss.</p>
Kerry Davis-Head	HOTELS. AIRBNB ETC AIRBNB and similar have created numerous problems for residents adjacent to such "housing". There also seems to be a lack of supervision and intervention for any HMOs or Hostel type	The Council recognises the value that hotels play to supporting our town centres and the wider economy. We also recognise the problems associated with unregulated accommodation.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	accommodation, rubbish and noise has an impact on those living near. The lack of hotels, which on the whole are well run and conform to regulations, means visitors are forced to use unregulated lettings, with little fire safety provision.	HMOs are valued as a form of low cost accommodation, but again we recognise that a poorly run HMO can cause problems. Ordinarily it would be for Environmental Health regulations to address these issues.
The Theatre Trust (Ross Anthony)	The Trust is concerned about the impact of housing schemes created through permitted development on existing theatres and other noise-generating cultural uses. We are supportive of the use of Article 4 directions and would encourage all town centres and other important clusters of commercial activity to be covered.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	Yes	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I do not support the Article 4 direction it's an attempt to interfere with market forces and will stifle innovation.	The Council notes that the very purpose of the A4D is to "interfere with market forces." However, we are concerned that the freedom will result in the loss of class E uses, not because that use is unviable/ not needed, but merely as a reflection of the differential in value with a residential use. The A4D is seen as necessary to protect the viability of our town centres and to help the Council meet the OAN for a range of commercial uses.
Sport England (Mark Furnish)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q8.5 - Making an Article 4 direction would protect many sporting facilities from being lost to housing. It would also allow the Council to better plan and develop borough wide strategies for sport facilities with more certainty and clarity. 	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Elizabeth Ashley	Yes to all.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Yes, and yes.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Linda Wade	Yes.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Yes, and yes.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>We strongly support both propositions.</p> <p>We strongly support the Council's proposal to make an Article 4 Direction to ensure that planning consent is still required for changes of use from commercial uses to housing.</p> <p>We support the use of these powers in the higher-order centres, but particularly in local centres which may be more vulnerable.</p> <p>Town centre frontages in conservation areas should be defended</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.</p> <p>The Council concurs with the view that our smaller neighbourhood centres may be particularly vulnerable to such changes of use.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	on the basis that loss of shopfronts and the activity generated would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.	The Council can consider, as part of prior approval, the impact of a proposal on a conservation area. However, we are concerned that this would not include impact on the vitality of the area.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 8.5 Support this but think it would be better based on a more selective approach, informed by an audit of non-residential uses across the borough	Noted. The borough-wide A4D is intended to reflect the scatter of E class uses across the borough. This includes within the town centres, within the Employment Zones and beyond. It would not be feasible to identify every non-residential use separately.
David Campbell	In South Kensington, far too much residential stock has been lost to schools, offices and (recently) art galleries. This needs to be reversed.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	Yes, but see also answer to Q8.1 .	Noted.
Collette Wilkinson	Yes	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
David Lloyd-Davis	Retaining the Article 4 direction is essential.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	Yes.	Noted. The Council has made a non-immediate A4D which covers the entire borough. The Council will consider any representations received before deciding whether to confirm this later in 2022. We note that the SoS does have the power to direct us to amend or cancel the direction.
Robert Dixon	Yes. I am undecided about the geographical scope.	Noted.
Alex Mackay	Using Article 4 directions is supported but should be confined to specific areas. Losing some commercial or office space to residential has a part play in meeting housing targets.	<p>Noted. The A4D means that planning permission will be required for an office to be used as a residential unit. An office can lost where it is demonstrated that it is no longer viable.</p> <p>Our delivery of our 5 year housing supply is not dependent on the creation of additional homes through the loss of offices.</p>
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	Yes. But at the same time we must find ways to reinstate unused residential properties above shops, which is still an issue in some streets.	The Council recognises the value of filling empty homes. However this is not a planning matter as no change of use occurs. This is not to say that the value of residential homes within our town centres cannot be recognised.
Wardell Armstrong LLP for Tatton Group (Rachel Wilbraham)	Whilst we appreciate the overall aim of the Council in seeking to retain planning controls over the conversion of town centre uses to residential accommodation, we would suggest that this is at risk of being at odds with national policy objectives. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF notes the central government mandate to ‘boost significantly the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed’. The alteration in planning regulations to streamline the conversion of commercial premises to residential has been carried out in direct response to this objective.	A Council can make an A4D where it is satisfied that it meets the tests within para 53 of the NPPF, or be “necessary to ovoid wholly unacceptable adverse impacts”. We are satisfied that the A4D does meet this test, although we do recognise that ultimately the SoS has the power to cancel or amend an A4D.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Historic England (David English)	Historic England has supported Article 4 directions elsewhere in London in similar circumstances as we consider they will allow suitable assessment of the contribution of town centre buildings through the planning process to the character and vitality of the areas of the borough in question. We note that most of the areas in question are covered by conservation area designation, and there are significant concentrations of listed buildings. As a result, we consider that supporting mixed uses in your town centres are likely to benefit the continued sustainability and identity of those areas and their heritage significance.	Noted. The borough-wide A4D is intended to reflect the scatter of E class uses across the borough. This includes within the town centres..
Turley (Laurence Brooker)	Should an Article 4 direction be pursued it is considered appropriate only to the core frontages and ground floor level of town centres. Greater flexibility of use of secondary spaces including upper floors should be encouraged, including residential use, as the introduction of residents to Town Centres has proven benefits in terms of spend and creates a 'captive' audience for town centres, in support of occupiers. Again outside of Article 4, proposals should consider the introduction of residential uses on a case by case basis, subject to the occupancy and viability of individual units.	Such an approach would omit the large number of office uses which are either located immediately outside a town centre, within the Employment Zones or which are scattered across the borough. One can only consider the loss of an office to residential on a "case by case basis", as suggested, where planning permission is required. The A4D is necessary for this to be the case.

Q.8.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	You could have a policy where a B1 use affects only one or two properties in the street and should be allowed change of use to C3 so all the properties in the street conform to similar rules.	Noted. Only by protecting all (viable) offices will the Council be able to meet its OAN for office floorspace. In addition there is no reason to believe that a modest office is “unneighbourly”. To the contrary, an office use adds to the diversity of uses in an areas, a welcome characteristic of the borough.
Wardell Armstrong LLP for Tatton Group (Rachel Wilbraham)	<p>Rather than seeking to prevent the conversion of existing commercial premises, we would suggest delivering a more favourable commercial environment which is supportive of businesses through appropriately worded policy, thereby creating a more viable commercial environment and therefore an incentive to retain businesses rather than undergoing conversion to residential.</p> <p>Further, we would suggest support be lent to alternative forms of non-residential uses such as hotels and temporary accommodation. This will assist in supporting local businesses through tourism as well as enabling providing workers travelling from further afield temporary accommodation.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the value in supporting a favourable business environment. However, we also recognise that the differential in value between a commercial and a residential use will continue to drive changes of use.</p> <p>The Council supports the provision of hotels and other similar non-residential uses.</p>

Issue 2: The future nature of our town centres

Q.8.7. Do you support any of these suggested strategies for our town centres?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Yes, as regards the King's Road	Support for vision for King's Road noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	<p>Portobello Road: The results of the recent markets consultation exercise should be used to inform policy on the Portobello and Golborne markets.</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate: We question whether it is right to major on its reputation as a centre for arts and culture; this has always been an adjunct to its usefulness as a local centre for shopping and services. "Evening economy" should not be allowed to morph into a "night economy", given that the area is also highly residential. See also answer to Q3.3.</p>	<p>Portobello. Market consultation noted</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate. As a District Centre NHG has a wider role than as a service centre for its residents, important though that is. Supporting its arts and cultural uses may encourage visitors and help maintain the centre's vitality.</p> <p>Similarly, support for uses which support the evening economy can help maintain a centres' viability. This must respect the need to maintain the amenity of those living within the centre or nearby.</p>
Greg Hammond	I don't disagree with the strategies listed, but we shouldn't forget the district centres which are more numerous and used by residents.	Noted. The Local Plan will include a section which considers the role of the borough's Neighbourhood Centres.
Kerry Davis-Head	<p>NUISANCE from the night time economy Ensure you have community wardens available after 11pm. The borough is 24/7 and most ASB occurs during the hours of darkness so this needs acknowledging. Licensing and Policing are overstretched so there is no monitoring or intervention when residents have N&N problems during the early hours.</p> <p>SHOPS Shouldn't shops be balanced by the same way the old county</p>	<p>The Council recognises the importance of measures to ensure that evening uses can support the vitality of the centres, but that the amenity of local residents is protected. Licencing will be the key tool, given that panning permission is no longer required for the change of use of a shop to a restaurant.</p> <p>The nature of a shop (Class E) is not a planning matter.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>councils used to ensure high streets had a balance of premises, that there were not too many shops or one type. The Kings Rd has become a place for tourists not locals, it has changed radically. Eateries and Nail bars proliferate. All the useful utilitarian shops are out of borough in Fulham for instance. A bus ride or a car ride away.</p>	
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	<p>Support the strategy for South Kensington. It should also be vibrant and innovative, a centre of education that is accessible to all.</p>	<p>Support for vision for South Kensington noted.</p>
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	<p>No, market forces should decide.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council recognises that market forces will ultimately decide on the nature of centre. However a vision is useful as can help shape the future direction of a centre, particularly when major land owners buy into that vision.</p>
Elizabeth Ashley	<p>You are starving small neighbourhoods with investment only in priority areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has a set up a working party to consider how best to support our centres. This includes our local neighbourhood centres as well as the larger.</p>
Linda Wade	<p>Kings Road Due to the ownership being in the hands of three owners there is a clear and distinct character, which retains its architectural heritage, its spaces and its culture.</p> <p>South Kensington There is an urgent need to reclaim the area and come up with a plan that balances the needs of the residents, travellers, visitors to the museums and businesses. At the moment the plans coming forward dominant the original architecture, and the step free access is late in the day or not at all.</p>	<p>Kings Road. Noted.</p> <p>South Kensington. The Council recognises the role that parts of the centre play in meeting the needs of local people. However, any vision must reflect that the centre also serves some of London's most visited attractions. We recognise that accommodating the needs of residents, businesses, visitors and the institutions will be complicated. It is important that the vision recognises this balance.</p> <p>Kensington High Street The purpose of the vision is to recognise that action needs to be taken in a time of significant change in the retail environment. The</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Kensington High Street This is a sad reflection of the street that it used to be a destination location for shoppers. The Design Museum is a highlight but until such time as there is a resolution on the Odeon site the place lacks some of cachet that it had before and definitely requires a rethink.</p> <p>Portobello Road The results of the Market consultation will be interesting.</p> <p>Knightsbridge and Notting Hill Gate No comment</p>	<p>centre is well placed to build upon its many potential strengths. These include building upon an existing cultural offer.</p> <p>Portobello Noted</p>
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>South Kensington: South Kensington District Centre is not a “cultural destination” – but it has become dominated by a “food and beverage” offer for visitors to the South Kensington Museums (TfL Retail Survey 2017), at the expense of its role as a District Centre serving South Kensington. There is no need to “build on its strength ... as a place to eat out and meet friends”. There is an urgent need to rebalance its offer toward serving its residential hinterland. This needs a major rethink and the Council should work with the major property owner.</p> <p>Kensington High Street: This is only in part a cultural attraction, although not necessarily by residents. Some of the main attractions include that it is a key office/ employment centre, provides a wide range of services, shops, eating, leisure and entertainment. Needs a rethink on strategy.</p> <p>Portobello Road: The results of the recent markets consultation exercise should be used to inform policy on the Portobello and Golborne markets.</p>	<p>South Kensington The view that this centre is not a cultural destination, and that its function should be re-balanced to serve its residential hinterland is noted.</p> <p>In a time of rapid change the Council must support its centres to evolve in such a way as to maintain their vitality. Its role as one of London’s most visited tourist attractions is key as it does drive footfall in the centre. This is not to say that the residential service function of parts of the centre should not be recognised and supported.</p> <p>Kensington High Street. Diverse function noted. The centre, and hinterland is the largest office location in the borough.</p> <p>Portobello. Noted.</p> <p>Knightsbridge. Support for vision noted.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Knightsbridge: OK</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate: We question whether it is right to major on its reputation as a centre for arts and culture; this has always been a minor adjunct to its usefulness as a local centre for shopping and services. “Evening economy” should not be allowed to morph into a “night economy, given that the area is also highly residential. See also answer to Q3.7.</p>	<p>Notting Hill Gate. As a District Centre NHG has a wider role than as a service centre for its residents, important though that is. Supporting its arts and cultural uses may encourage visitors and help maintain the centres vitality.</p> <p>Similarly, support for uses which support the evening economy can help maintain a centres viability. This must respect the need to maintain the amenity of those living within the centre or nearby.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>In general terms, TfL CD supports the strategies for South Kensington and Portobello Road.</p> <p>South Kensington</p> <p>The current planning application submitted with our partner Native Land accords with the strategy to “build on its strength as a world class cultural destination and a place to eat out and meet friends”. It will improve access to the station (including step free access to the Circle and District Lines), improve the environment at the station and surrounding streets, refurbish the listed shopping arcade and provide new space for eating and drinking and meeting. This is, of course, in addition to the delivery of new homes (including affordable housing), jobs and beautiful buildings.</p> <p>Portobello Road</p> <p>The proposals for the ‘gap’ site on Portobello Road will enhance the street frontage and market, as well as introduce new homes to bolster the local community and provide access to green space. Importantly, the scheme has the potential to improve linkages to</p>	Support noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	Ladbroke Grove station, through which a very high proportion of visitors from the UK and around the world arrive.	
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Strategies ok	Support noted.
Mozafar Amiri	I am greatly concerned by the apparent bias in setting South Kensington as a “Cultural destination and a place to meet friends”. This statement says nothing of the quality of life of local residents. From the statement it seems that the neighbourhood is going to deteriorate into a Soho like environment with late night bars, dirty overcrowded pavements, and rampant crime. Taking the borough in that direction not only makes living here difficult but also casts a shadow on the cultural aspect of the neighbourhood.	The Council recognises the dual role of the centre. The future vision will explicitly recognise the role that it has in serving the needs of residents and well as the millions of visitors to the museums.
David Campbell	Regrettably South Kensington Town Centre is overwhelmed with restaurants, most of which are aimed at and used only by tourists. Even in the nearby neighbourhood zones, there are only a few locations that meet the strategy outlined in 8.17 Further development of restaurants and food outlets in this Town Centre should be discouraged.	Planning permission is no longer required for the change of use of a shop to a restaurant. Notwithstanding this, any vision must reflect the impact (and contribution) that many millions of visitors will have to the character of the centre, and in supporting its on going vitality.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	As general statements it is difficult to disagree with the options, but without specifics they are not particularly helpful. With regard to outdoor hospitality this is not always welcome NB that LB of Westminster is in the process of withdrawing much of the outdoor licensing which it granted during the height of the Covid pandemic.	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Yes.	Noted
Swifts Local Network: Swifts	All.	Noted

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
& Planning Group (Mike Priaux)		
Robert Dixon	Yes.	Noted
DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)	Wellcome Trust support the intention of the Council to take forward the existing policies into the new Local Plan.	Support noted.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	We must presume that the markets consultation exercise will be used to inform policy on Portobello and Golborne markets.	Noted. The Council does not intend to amend its existing policy to promote and support the borough's markets. The results of the markets consultation will be considered.
Historic England (David English)	Heritage has a strong role to play in the identity of these places. It is unclear from the short Future Direction Statements how these strategies will be taken forward. In line with the London Plan, Historic England looks forward to supporting the development of Town Centre Strategies. In the case of the Town Centres highlighted in this consultation, in our view there are real opportunities for heritage to be celebrated and enhanced, reinforcing the distinct identity of these centres.	The Council recognises the role of heritage in ensuring that our centres remain special places to visit.
Turley (Laurence Brooker)	<p>The strategic direction for the Portobello Road is noted as being “a place centred on its vibrant and distinctive street market which serves the day to day needs of those living nearby but also visitors from around the world.”</p> <p>Whilst our Client supports this description, we consider that there is potential to expand this to specifically note how a range of town centre uses will help to support and secure the ongoing and future</p>	<p>Noted. The Council recognises the role that a business sector will have supporting the vitality of many of our centres.</p> <p>Amalgamation. The Council will consider the appropriateness and practicality of a policy which seems to maintain a range of unit sizes in new Class E development.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>vibrancy of the place, ensuring activity. The vitality of the high streets and town centres has seen a surge in outdoor dining and 'twilight' economy activities during the Covid19 pandemic.</p> <p>The Employment Land and Premises Study draft ('ELPS') which currently forms the emerging evidence base for the New Local Plan, notes when considering projected forecasts of employment growth notes the "Accommodation and food services Industry also contains a number of sub-industries which are likely to be accommodated in Class E floorspace (on the food services side). This Industry is projected to see the second greatest increase in employment of around 5,100." As such, such uses and industries are not only considered to support the vitality of the town centres across the Borough, but also will support a significant uplift in employment and growth.</p> <p>We would suggest that these approaches to activity and vitality are actively taken forward in relation to the strategic direction and vision for areas like Portobello Road and emerging policies support and encourage such uses.</p> <p>It is noted that it is proposed to retain the current Local Plan Policy CF2 'Retail Development within Town Centres'. Our Client supports the need to consider the character and diversity of the town centre when considering retail development proposals. However, we do consider that the element of the policy under point b that resists the amalgamation of retail units "where the retention of the existing units contributes to achieving the vision for the centre", is overly subjective and unnecessarily restricts the potential flexibility of retail provision within town centres.</p>	

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Natural History Museum (Adam Donovan)	For the future nature of Towns, the NHM is supportive of the possible strategy for South Kensington which is to build on its strength as a world class cultural destination and a place to eat out and meet friends. The NHM requests that more clarity is provided on how the area can 'build on its strength'. This will help to clarify how development can support growth in the borough.	Support noted.
The Pembridge Association (Fiona Fleming-Brown)	<p>Some easy steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBKC should concentrate on public realm investments leading to real improvements for NHG users both commercial & residential • RBKC should resist through planning, applications which worsen the street environment and retail environment • RBKC should create a stakeholders development group: Frogmore, retailers, residents' groups, independent landlords and the Borough to develop a new NHG retail plan • RBKC should prioritise retail interests over other commercial users 	<p>The Council does, and will continue to refuse applications which worsen the street/ retail environment.</p> <p>Desire for more stakeholder involvement noted. This is not something which can form a policy within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that both the retail and the non retail commercial sector has an important role to play in supporting the viability of our town centres. We also note that planning permission is no longer required for a Class E shop to be used for any other Class E use.</p>

Q.8.8. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	<p>Earl's Court is a significant local centre for retail, restaurants, hotel, leisure and hospitality, with some cultural and historical venues.</p> <p>70% businesses responding to the RBKC & CapCO COMRES survey were in favour of a BID (Business Improvement District).</p> <p>To support our local small businesses and avoid having our local high street dominated by international chains more support is needed, for example by adapting policy to allow for pop ups in empty shopfronts and matching funds for shopfront improvements in line with the guidelines in the Shopfronts SPD.</p>	Noted. Questions of funding and pop-ups are not matters that can be included in Local Plan. However, these are ideas being considered by our Town centre taskforce.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	The Council should use its planning powers to ensure that King's Road remains a venue for small independent outlets, not just chain stores.	The Council does not have any planning powers with regard the nature of a shop. This is not a planning matter, and the change of use of one retailer to another is not development.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	<p>Cadogan supports the Kings Road Strategy but suggests the following additions:</p> <p>"The rich and iconic brand of the King's Road will be consolidated so that it remains one of London's most vibrant shopping streets. This will be supported by places to eat, activation of public spaces, greater pedestrian priority and by world class cultural destinations."</p> <p>The kings Road has benefited significantly over the last few years through the use of the Duke of York's Square and the Running Track for activities such as the screening of Wimbledon, the Chelsea Farmers Market, events associated with Chelsea in Bloom, British Antiques Dealers Association Fair and seasonal events. These are now part of the character of the Kings Road creating vibrancy and interest which support the shops and businesses</p>	<p>Kings Road. Comments noted. The Council recognises that the King's Road's strength lies on a diverse offer and not merely its retail offer.</p> <p>The Council will consider the appropriate name of its "Knightsbridge" Place. We do recognise the contribution that Sloane Street plays to this area.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>throughout the year. It is considered that the identification of these events within the text is important in its recognition of this.</p> <p>Cadogan supports the Knightsbridge Strategy, but this should be renamed Knightsbridge and Sloane Street. Sloane Street is a destination in its own right and should be recognised as such within the title.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Earl's Court has two of the portal entrances to the borough. Earl's Court has the architecture, the history, the transport links and the reputation for entertainment and culture, with the Royal British Society of Sculptors, The Finborough Theatre, as well as the Grade I listed Brompton Cemetery. There are restaurants, bars, coffee shops, and hotels and our famous garden squares providing music, film, and drama in the summer months.</p>	Noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	<p>Earl's Court is a significant local centre for retail, restaurants, hotel, leisure and hospitality, with some cultural and historical venues. It is unclear why Earl's Court should not be recognised and developed as a town centre, particularly with the new development on the horizon.</p>	<p>Earl's Court has been designated as a District Centre. It will also form part of a "place" associated with the wider redevelopment of the area.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>TfL CD agrees with Quod's representations on behalf of ECDC ie. that the Local Plan should be forward looking and also incorporate opportunities for future centres within Opportunity Areas as part of a network of centres. In particular, the vision for Earls Court to be a new urban quarter and cultural hub was set out in the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area Joint Supplementary Planning Document in March 2012. This has also been referenced in the summary vision for Earls Court in Table 3.1 of the current Issues and Options document.</p>	<p>Earl's Court has been identified as a new centre within the existing LP. The Council intends to take this forward. This will include the quantum of residential and commercial floorspace which will be appropriate.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>The scale of development expected by the London Plan for the Earls Court / West Kensington Opportunity Area and RBKC's aims for the Earls Court Area of Change will result in Earls Court becoming a new centre; a destination with its own character, identity, cultural and employment offer. In support of this, it is important that policies promote the delivery of workplace, cultural and other town centre uses in Earls Court to help create and sustain a new centre.</p> <p>It will therefore be important that Earls Court is identified as a future centre in Figure 8.1 and in future policies to support the creation and growth of a new, sustainable urban quarter.</p>	
ESSA (Barry Munday)	<p>Could include liaison with schools to use the planters for the children to maintain and heighten their awareness of the importance of greening.</p> <p>Needs to be analysed in terms of walkable neighbourhoods.</p>	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	<p>ECDC considers that the plan should be forward looking and also incorporate opportunities for future centres as part of a network of centres. In particular, the vision for Earls Court to be a new urban quarter and cultural hub was set out in the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area Joint Supplementary Planning Document in March 2012. This has also been referenced in the summary vision for Earls Court in Table 3.1 of the current Issues and Options document.</p> <p>The scale of development expected by the London Plan for the Earls Court/West Kensington Opportunity Area and RBKC's aims for the Earls Court Area of Change will result in Earls Court becoming a new centre, with</p>	<p>The scale of development on the Earls Court site is being considered in detail by the Growth and Delivery team, rather than as part of this more general response.</p> <p>The allocation does include the creation of a town centre on this site.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>its own character, identity and employment offer. In support of this, it is important that policies promote the delivery of employment, cultural and other town centre uses in Earls Court to help create and sustain a new town centre.</p> <p>It will therefore be important that Earls Court is identified as a future centre in Figure 8.1 with future policies to support the growth of the Earls Court and creation of new urban quarter.</p>	
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	<p>As stated above, our street markets may have a new status post-pandemic for shopping and leisure activities. The customs of outdoor eating – while they can be a disturbance to residents – may be worthy of continuing, albeit with strict closing times. We will not fully understand what has happened until the long-term effects of the pandemic are known.</p> <p>The expansion of the hot-food take-away business may be here to stay. We must control licencing and have tighter control of delivery drivers and premises, particularly in extraction of foul smells and emissions, which can make co-existence a real misery for those living above.</p>	<p>The role of street markets noted, and supported.</p> <p>The need to mitigate the impact of hot-food takeaways noted. The new Local Plan has a new draft policy concerning the evening economy. This is intended to ensure that town centre uses will be resisted (where pp ins required) where they have an unacceptable impact upon amenity.</p>

Q.8.9. Are any areas or parades which should be added to, or removed from an existing centre? Please be specific and explain why.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Earl's Court is missing from the list – see above.	Earl's Court forms part of the London network of centre. It has been designated as a District Centre. The Council does not intend to change this designation.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	We support the designations of St Helens Gardens, North Pole Road, and Barlby Road as the three neighbour 'shopping parades' in the StQW area. We welcome the planned investment by the Council in streetscape improvements in St Helens Gardens.	Noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	<p>We would not favour removal of any of the existing designated town centres in our area.</p> <p>We would like to see some additions. Kensington Church Steet. The northern section with its high-end antique dealers should be included in the Notting Hill Gate area.</p> <p>The shops on north side Holland Park Avenue, west of the Underground station, make up a much valued local centre and should be designated.</p> <p>Side streets. In all the town centres in our area, there tend to be shops at the beginning of the side streets that start from them. These are a valued resource and we would like to see designated town centre boundaries being expanded to include them.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The northern part of Kensington Church Street already lies within the Notting Hill Gate District Centre.</p> <p>Holland Park Avenue. These shops lie within the Holland Park Avenue Neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>As part of the review of the 2019 Local Plan the Council reviewed the boundaries of all its centres. This included expanding boundaries to include all adjoining shops. This will include the units in adjoining side streets.</p>
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Possibly Notting Hill Gate should be removed as it is ugly with poor quality shopping and is consider unsafe at night.	Noted. The Council does not intend to de-designate Notting Hill Gate as a centre. Whit it may have its issues it serves a valuable function both serving the needs of residents and visitors. It is also a major office location in the borough context.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Linda Wade	Earl's Court Road is a very fine example of a Victorian parade and through the local Shop Front initiative, and through discussion with applicants changes are being made to the shop fronts to build on the architecture much of the details being revealed under signage. So, with incremental changes there are changes and buy-in from local businesses.	Noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>We do not think that there are any areas that should be removed.</p> <p>There are areas that should be added, including.</p> <p>Kensington Church Steet. The northern section should be included in Notting Hill Gate and the southern section, south of the brief purely residential area, in Kensington High Steet.</p> <p>Westbourne Grove and Ledbury Road insofar as they are in RBKC. They should not be merged with Portobello as totally different in character.</p> <p>Shops on north side Holland Park Avenue, west of the Underground station.</p> <p>Side streets. In most town centres, there are shops round the corner in side streets. Town centre boundaries and conservation area boundaries should be reviewed to cover unprotected shopping frontages.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Kensington Church Street. The northern section is included in the Notting Hill Gate District Centre and the southern part in Kensington High Street.</p> <p>Any place vision for Portobello will continue to recognise the different character and function of the two centres.</p> <p>Holland Park Avenue. These shops already form part of the Holland Park Avenue Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Side streets As part of the review of the 2019 Local Plan the Council reviewed the boundaries of all its centres. This included expanding boundaries to include all adjoining shops. This will include the units in adjoining side streets.</p>
Mozafar Amiri	I feel the streets to the east of Brompton Road (including Walton Street, Egerton Gardens, etc.) have more in common with the strategies set out for Knightsbridge than for South Kensington. A	Noted. Walton Steet forms part of the Brompton Cross centre and does not form part of the South Kensington Place.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	boundary change would better reflect the fabric of the neighbourhoods and their local residents.	The place visions for these centres is intended to reflect the commercial element and not the adjoining residential streets, although we do note that the function of these centres is to serve their hinterlands.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	For "The Site at Lots Road" a significant open space for local amenity should be included.	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Fulham Road/ Beaufort St shopping should be protected.	These areas do form part of designated centres. However, planning permission is no longer required for a shop to change to an alternative E class "commercial, business or service use."

Commonplace comments.

Please note that these are anonymous.

Comment	Response
What about Earls Court Rd?	Earl's Court Road is designated as a District Centre.

<p>There is no mention of how any of these areas will be improved to make them more pleasant to people who live, work or play in them. At the moment they are all heavily polluted with traffic and vehicles, particularly private cars which makes simply enjoyment of going out for a sandwich or eating al fresco unpleasant.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that traffic and pollution reduces the attractiveness of some of our centres.</p>
<p>We must revitalise Portobello and Golborne markets. Knightsbridge and Notting Hill Gate are 'dead zones' that need much more imaginative planning and re-zoning. We must seriously reduce private car use and create infrastructure that will truly support and promote alternative forms of transport, making cycling / walking / buses / taxis / scooters not an also ran but a pleasurable, comfortable, safe and convenient first choice for all. We also need extensive regretting and tree planting.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that traffic and pollution reduces the attractiveness of some of our centres.</p> <p>The Council does not recognise Kingsbridge or Notting Hill Gate as “dead zones”. They remain vibrant places to visit. However, the purpose of the Local Plan review and of the High Street taskforce is to try to support the ongoing viability of all our centres.</p>
<p>This just meaningless. Is the area in need of interference by anybody is the question to ask.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Kensington High Street needs a major re-think. There are only two major shops -Whole Foods and Marks and Spencer-the rest are coffee shops and 'gyms' It's also a beggars paradise with so called 'buskers' trafficked in by East European organised crime gangs. Am also concerned at least three establishments are money laundering operations mascaraing as legitimate businesses - licensed by the Council. You need a High Street Czar to save it.</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the Local Plan review and of the High Street taskforce is to try to support the ongoing viability of all our centres.</p>
<p>A forward thinking future proof strategy that reclaims streets for people walking and cycling and using public transport should be planned and implemented. A coordinated plan across the entire borough will help improve the quality of life in and around homes and businesses alike. Making shopping and restaurant areas safer, quieter and easier to access. Introduce wider pavements with permanent alfresco zones, segregated cycling lanes and bus / transport access areas. Create environments where people can work, shop, eat, walk, cycle and get public transport in safety will improve the environment and increase footfall to those areas. Look at Denmark, Netherlands and recently at central Paris for examples of how this modern thinking is being introduced. It make urban centres safer by raising the quality</p>	<p>Noted. The Council recognises the important role of the environment in making welcoming and attractive centres which attract visitors. This is central to their ongoing success.</p>

<p>of the environment. The streets get busier and so businesses and community centres all benefit.</p>	
<p>As a chelsea resident for over 20 years I am very concerned about the impact of more traffic on local streets. Already the increase is evident and new shopping centres and making Kings road pedestrian would destroy our wonderful local area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

SECTION 9: BUSINESS AND CULTURE

Issue 1: The provision of offices

Q.9.1. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Options 1 and 5	Support for protection of existing stock of offices noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands	As shown by the map at page 101 of the NLPR document, business premises in the Borough are widely dispersed and mixed in with	The Council's Employment Land Study recommends protecting offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met. It

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
<p>Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)</p>	<p>residential areas – rather than being clustered within a few ‘major urban centres’.</p> <p>This is a characteristic of the Borough which we think will gain in importance in the coming decade but which needs to be responded to with planning policies that operate at a fine local grain. What works well in one neighbourhood will not work in all.</p> <p>On Option 1, we do not agree that a new Local Plan should continue to protect all offices. Office floorspace at locations with poor public transport and few shops or places to eat and drink does not thrive. Levels of vacant office floorspace were high in Latimer Road in 2013 when we embarked on a neighbourhood plan. They are high again now and will increase as leases fall in and the current moratorium on unpaid rents ends.</p> <p>We therefore strongly support Option 2 in the NLPR document, which recognises that there may be areas where offices are now inherently unsuitable for offices.</p> <p>Current policies in the StQW Neighbourhood Plan are in line with Option 4 which states that Allowing new homes in our Employment Zones, but only when supported by new business development, is one way of meeting our need for new offices.</p> <p>We suggest that for the future the Council should go a step further in a new Local Plan. The four separate sections in Latimer Road are part of a combined Freston Road/Latimer Road Employment Zone. This combination of locations ceased to make much sense once the Westway cut off all vehicle connections between these parts of</p>	<p>considers the main office locations across the borough, and whether each is viable in the longer term. It concludes that Latimer Road is a viable office location, with occupancy forecast to increase over the medium term.</p> <p>The Council recognises the role that Employment Zones have as remaining concentrations of business uses outside of the town centres. We also recognise the role that they can have in providing additional housing.</p> <p>The Council recognises the weight to be given to the SQWNP as will not introduce any policies that conflict with it.</p> <p>The Council does not intend to subdivide its existing Employment Zones. However, we do recognise the value of mixed use development within all our Employment Zones, including offices and workshops and retail (E class uses) as well as residential uses. The proposed policy will continue to support such types of development, but also recognise the practicalities of new development and the role that housing does have in allowing the re-provision/ upgrading/ provision of commercial space.</p> <p>We do recognise the freedoms offered by the new E class and that existing office floorspace can be lost to other E class uses without the need for planning permission. This does not nullify a vision which sees our Employment Zones as locations for office floorspace.</p> <p>There is no inherent conflict for a site/ area to fall within both and Employment Zone and a conservation area.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>North Kensington. The sections of Latimer Road designated as an EZ date from decisions when this western side of this street was transferred from LBHF to RBKC as a result of a 1996 boundary transfer. The designation of the three Employment Zones in RBKC (Lots Road, Kensal and Freston/Latimer) dates from 1998 and was consolidated in the Borough's 2002 Unitary Development Plan. This was 30 years ago and London in 2021 is not the same.</p> <p>In a 2015 submission to the Council we argued that The StQW Forum considers that Policy CF5 has become increasingly outdated and irrelevant to the future needs of Latimer Road. Parts of the policy are restrictive and protectionist, and run counter to the NPPF direction that Local Plans should 'promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas'.</p> <p>RBKC Policy CL5 was varied in the 2019 Local Plan, and now allows for the possibility of mixed use in EZs when combined with 'a significant uplift in both the quantity and the quality of the business use on the site. This is not a viable way forward for the 1980s office buildings in the street. We believe that that the Council should de-designate this part of the combined Freston/Latimer Road EZ, in the new Local Plan. The Freston Road part of the Freston EZ has proved successful at attracting and retaining major businesses. The four EZ sections of Latimer Road (mainly on the west side of the street) have not.</p> <p>During 2021, and in response to pressure from local residents, the Council has consulted on and agreed proposals for most the eastern side of the street to be added within the boundary of the</p>	

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Oxford Gardens Conservation Area. Having sections of the same street as a conservation area and an employment zone, subject to potentially conflicting policies in different chapters of a new Local Plan, makes even less sense than was the case for the 2019 Local Plan. With the introduction of the much broader E class, trying to protect offices which are just one category in the new use class seems a questionable ambition.</p>	
<p>Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)</p>	<p>Option 1: We generally support continuing to protect all offices, where planning permission is required, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no long-term future for that use. The Borough's local economy is heavily dependent on offices, and especially small firms.</p> <p>Option 5: We strongly support the Council's proposal for an Article 4 Direction so that planning permission continues to be required for changes of use of offices to residential.</p>	<p>Support for protection of existing stock of offices, where that office is viable and has a long term future is noted.</p>
<p>Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)</p>	<p>Option 1 Maintaining a range and balance of office floorspace across the Borough is critical to a mixed and balanced community. Without protection these uses will almost certainly be lost to higher value uses such as residential. Notwithstanding this, offices are likely to become a more important factor for maintaining vibrancy in town centres particularly on upper floors where there may be a contraction of retail floorspace. In this respect, it will be important that the supply of office stock is monitored carefully against demand. Maintaining strong demand for town centre office stock and investment in this use will be critical and may, over time, require the release of out of centre stock to maintain the strength of demand.</p>	<p>Support for maintaining the supply of offices noted. The increased value that offices will have in contributing to the viability of our town centres is noted. This will be reinforced by the explicit recognition that offices are a town centre use – and subject to the sequential test and, where appropriate, an impact assessment.</p> <p>We recognise the importance of monitoring the provision of office stock against demand.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We support Options 1 and 5 but not 2 or 3. We do not want residential homes built in Employment Zones.	Noted. The Council recognises the importance of maintaining a stock of offices within our Employment Zones. However, we also recognise the opportunity that an Employment Zone can have in providing additional housing, whilst maintaining the stock of office and other business uses within them.
Greg Hammond	I support Option 2 in respect of the conversion of offices that were built as dwellings back into their original use.	Noted. The ELS recommends the protection of all offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met. There is no suggestion that offices in units originally built as homes are inherently unsuitable for offices. This is a significant part of the Borough's office stock.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	Continue to protect hotel rooms and other forms of visitor accommodation across the Borough. We must make sure that we are open for business and there are places to stay when our visitors can return.	The Council will continue to protect hotels in the South Kensington Area. We recognise their value in supporting the tourist economy.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I support option 2	Noted. The ELS recommends the protection of all offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met.
Elizabeth Ashley	Option 2 Option 3	Noted. The ELS recommends the protection of all offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met. There is no suggestion that offices in units originally built as homes are inherently unsuitable for offices. This is a significant part of the Borough's office stock.
Linda Wade	Option 1 • Agree Option 2 • Disagree	Support for protection of existing stock of offices, where that office is viable and has a long term future is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	Option 3 • Offices to for VS organisations, Healthcare, community uses Option 4 • Agree Option 5 • Agree	The changes to the use classes order means that planning permission will no longer be required for an office to be used for a range of healthcare and community uses where they fall within Class E, “commercial, business and service use.”
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Option 5	Support for protection of existing stock of offices is noted
Mr (Andrew Jamieson)	This is probably out of date and needs a total review in the light of new ways of working.	The Council recognises that the office sector is in a state of flux. However the Employment Land Study did consider the need for office floorspace in this climate and does conclude that a future need for 60,000 sq m does remain. The demand and supply of offices will be reviewed over time as the Council does recognise that there is no value in protecting office premises which have no long term future as an office.
The Pembridge Association (Fiona Fleming-Brown)	6. Maker spaces/affordable workspaces: Prioritise attractive consumables at the pavement level of NHG eg bakers, pottery, artisan chocolates, craft printers. This sort of street action is very attractive for both visitors and residents. These may be “loss leaders” in terms of modest rate and rent revenue but they add missing character and life to a dull street which will drive customers to other retailers 7. Create quota/levy for tradeable low-cost workspaces from office development levy so affordable spaces can be located in clusters to create synergies in lower cost locations eg creative industries in Latimer Triangle. Create business hubs not silos.	The Council recognises that maker spaces and other E class business uses can have in supporting the viability of our centre. Specific reference will be made to maker spaces in this regard. The Council is introducing a new policy to encourage now affordable workspaces, however this is only likely to apply to new develop of a certain size where over all viability remains.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Tom Bennett	<p>I support Option 2. There are a number of types of offices, and other non-residential use properties, that we should allow automatically to convert into homes. In particular, units that were originally built as residential, but have since we converted into offices (or other uses), should automatically be allowed to convert back into residential. We should also allow a wider range of units above the ground floor to convert into residential, including units above shops. This increases the number of homes without diminishing the atmosphere of the street.</p> <p>We have a shortage of offices and homes, but it is completely arbitrary to say offices cannot be converted to homes, nor homes to offices. Homes must be the priority, and while I agree allowing blanket permitted development of offices would likely be detrimental, I think we should be identifying a number of types of office units that can automatically be converted to residential.</p> <p>Finally, we should make the offer of beautification a meaningful consideration when deciding applications for change of use. If a developer is making a significant improvement to the streetscape - particularly if he/she is removing an eyesore - that should be given weight in our decision making.</p>	<p>Noted. The ELS recommends the protection of all offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met. There is no suggestion that offices in units originally built as homes are inherently unsuitable for offices. This is a significant part of the Borough's office stock.</p> <p>The Council will consider the long term viability of an office as part of a planning application process. We recognise that there is no value in protecting an office premises which does not have a long term future as an office.</p> <p>The appearance of a building will be an integral part of a planning decision if and when planning permission is required.</p>
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1: We support continued protection, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no long-term future for that use. The evidence must be such that it is proven to be truly unviable. Too often a space is allowed to become undesirable by its condition and low maintenance. Or the market report is opinion presenting the case without applicable evidence. This cannot be the justification for the change of use. The Borough's local economy is heavily</p>	<p>Support for protection of offices noted.</p> <p>The Council does allow an office premise to be lost but only when robust evidence is provided to show that it has no long term future.</p> <p>The Council recognises the value that offices have to the vitality of our town centres. The new policies will be explicit in offices being a</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>dependent on offices, and especially small firms, whilst focused in higher-order town centres, they, especially small offices, are widely distributed throughout the Borough. New offices need to be encouraged in town centres, locations with high public transport accessibility (PTAL 4 or higher) and, small offices, in Employment Zones.</p> <p>Option 2: Oppose. Selective release of offices will need clear evidence to support it and clear criteria. This would be a one-way trip!</p> <p>Option 3: Release of offices to specific social and community uses, such as premises for voluntary sector organisations or surgeries, may be appropriate.</p> <p>Option 4: We would support business-led, mixed-use developments in Employment Zones, with additional housing but no net loss of business uses.</p> <p>Option 5: We strongly support the Council’s proposal for an Article 4 Direction.</p>	<p>town centre use and therefore be subject to the sequential test and, where appropriate, an impact assessment.</p> <p>The Council supports the provision of new offices in town centres and within Employment Zones. The Council supports offices of greater than 1,000 sq m in these areas as recognises that these are some of the few areas when proposals of this size come forward.</p> <p>The changes to the use classes order means that planning permission will no longer be required for an office to be used for a range of healthcare and community uses where they fall within Class E, “commercial, business and service use.”</p> <p>The draft Local Plan does support the loss of offices to social and community uses.</p>
GLA (Hassan Ahmed)	<p>Offices Recent evidence carried out by RBKC establishes a need for approximately 60,500sqm of office space up to 2043 (RBKC’s Employment Land and Premises Study (July 2021)). This is less than the figure of need identified in the London Office Policy Review 2017, which established a composite projection for approximately</p>	<p>The Council concurs with the view that offices are a town centre use and should be supported within our town centres.</p> <p>We also support our OA as locations where some new office development will be required.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>93,000sqm of office space up to 2041(Appendix Seven of the report). It is noted that the figure of need has been reduced by a third in light of the effects brought about by the Pandemic. Table A1.1 of the LP2021 identifies those town centres through the office guidelines that are suitable for accommodating various types of office development and this information should be noted and reflected in the draft Plan. Knightsbridge is located within the CAZ and therefore Policy SD5 of the LP2021 applies, especially in relation to prioritising office and other CAZ strategic functions as set out in part C. Opportunities for office development should be promoted in accordance with Policies SD5 and E1 of the LP2021 and further opportunities could also be explored within the borough's emerging OAs.</p> <p>The Mayor notes RBKC's concerns regarding changes of use from office to residential without requiring planning permission as a result of changes to permitted development rights and how this could lead to the uncontrolled loss of office space. To ensure that London's key business locations are safeguarded, the Mayor supports a co-ordinated approach to introducing Article 4</p> <p>3 https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/first_homes_planning_practice_note_.pdf</p> <p>Directions and has published strategic evidence to support boroughs wishing to do this4. In addition, RBKC should note Part F of Policy E1 of the LP2021 which makes it explicitly clear that the</p>	<p>Support for A4D noted.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	borough should consult upon and introduce Article 4 Directions to ensure that Kensington and Chelsea is not undermined by office to residential permitted development rights.	
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 9.1 Support Option 5 Article 4 direction	Support for A4D noted.
David Campbell	Option 2 – allow conversion within residential blocks. Also Option 3 - Allow conversion of office blocks to eg Community (affordable) houses.	<p>Noted. The ELS recommends the protection of all offices across the borough, if the OAN for offices is to be met. There is no suggestion that offices in units originally built as homes are inherently unsuitable for offices. This is a significant part of the Borough's office stock.</p> <p>The Council will consider the long term viability of an office as part of a planning application process. We recognise that there is no value in protecting an office premises which does not have a long term future as an office.</p> <p>Support for loss to affordable housing noted.</p>
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support Option 5 for designated employment Zones, and Option 3 for other areas.	Noted.
Imperial College London (Rory Newman)	Option 2 – support. Release offices in certain locations or within certain types of premises. This relates to the Government's current White Paper proposals, need for flexibility and requirements for significant evidence in order to demonstrate a lack of need for office. With proposed Article 4, clusters of office will be protected from prior approval.	<p>Support for limited release of offices noted.</p> <p>The Council notes that Imperial College does not support and A4D for Imperial's campuses.</p> <p>Where the use is not E class, the A4D will not apply. The A4D means that planning permission is required for the change of use to</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	Option 5 - refers to Article 4 - Imperial support Article 4 in relevant areas, office clusters and smallest geographical area possible. Not the Imperial campuses. The College has recently responded to the Council consultation in relation to the Article 4 and we enclosed these representations.	residential. It does not necessarily mean that the application will be refused. The Council will consider the wider benefits that a change of use could have to an institution such as Imperial when determining an application.
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 1&5 Strongly oppose Option 4. Employment zones must not be diluted.	Support for protection of offices noted. The Council does recognise that allowing the creation of housing within an Employment Zone can help deliver additional business floorspace and/or help maintain the space that already exists. The Council does not intent to allow the loss of any existing business floorspace in the Employment Zone, where planning permission is required.
Alex Mackay	Option 2	Noted.
DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)	Wellcome Trust supports the protection of office floorspace, but appreciate that a change of use to residential, particularly outside of the Borough's Employment Zone could be supported if evidence of the demand for the existing office use is provided.	Noted. Whilst the Council will protect existing business floorspace across the borough, we will consider its viability when determining a planning application. We recognise that there is no value in seeking to protect an office use when it has no long term future as an office.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	There are numerous empty offices in the borough. Some of these could be converted into creative uses by improving facilities and use of space. It seems likely that new working practices will favour creative businesses, and shared office space, after the newly embedded home working practices settle down. We support the Council's Article 4 Direction to prevent conversion of commercial space to housing without due Planning process.	The Council supports the re-use of offices to make them relevant to today's market. Shared spaces are a product which is likely to become more important in the borough. This is a E class uses which will be supported.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
<p>Frank Knight on behalf of Frasco Investment Limited. (Becky Anderson)</p>	<p>Chapter 9 – Business and Culture</p> <p>We welcome the Council’s approach in reassessing office floorspace within the Borough, and whether current office accommodation is suitable in certain locations of RBKC. It is widely reported that working practices, office requirements, occupier requirements etc are changing and it is therefore right to take a flexible approach to the protection of office space. In some locations, the protection of existing, out-dated office accommodation will not be appropriate, nor will the provision of new office space. Where a case can be made for the loss of office space, and better use of the land can be made which meets other priorities for RBKC, redevelopment of the Site should be supported.</p> <p>In terms of the NLPR options for office accommodation, we broadly support Option 1 and 2.</p> <p>Option 1 sets out that offices will continue to be protected where planning permission is required, “unless evidence suggests that there is no long term future for that use”. We support Option 1 and consider that where marketing evidence can demonstrate a continued lack of interest for office accommodation over a number of years, the site should be considered for an alternative use that helps meet a current identified need. We welcome this flexibility for the loss of office accommodation and also consider it reflects the overarching policies and objectives of the NPPF and London Plan in that it will seek to avoid long-term protection of surplus employment sites.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Study does recommend the general protection of offices and has not identified any areas, or type of premises where an office is unlikely to be viable.</p> <p>However, whilst the Council will protect existing business floorspace across the borough, we will consider a units viability when determining a planning application. We recognise that there is no value in seeking to protect an office use when it has no long term future as an office.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the current proposals for 136-142 Bramley Road. One of the factors that the Council must consider is the nature of the premises, the state of its repair and the practicality (and viability) of bringing up to a standard where it may prove lettable.</p> <p>The nature of the allocation is considered in a separate Call for Sites evidence report.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Option 2 states “release offices in certain locations or within certain types of premises”. We support Option 2 and consider that office accommodation should be released in certain locations or within certain types of premises. We agree with the commentary provided for Option 2, in that parts of the Borough are more attractive to office occupiers and consider that office accommodation should be provided in suitable locations for example within Employment Zones and within employment clusters. Where office accommodation is no longer considered suitable in certain locations, these sites should be released for alternative land uses which can help RBKC meet their requirements and policy objectives of the New Local Plan.</p> <p>As set out in our comments provided for Chapter 5 of NLPR, we consider there is no real prospect of the continued use of 136-142 Bramley Road for employment uses and therefore this should be considered for alternative land uses. Our conclusion is supported by the extensive marketing exercise that the landowner has undertaken between June 2017 and September 2021 (advertisement of the Site is ongoing). The significant cost associated with the necessary refurbishment works, coupled with the suppressed demand for office accommodation in this location, resulted in many prospective buyers concluding that the reuse of the existing building for office accommodation would be unviable. In light of the challenges associated with the continued use of the building, simultaneously planning permission was secured for the Site’s redevelopment for a purpose built larger office building in December 2016. Our client concurrently explored interest in the sale of the Site with the benefit of Full Planning Permission of comprehensive redevelopment for either an owner occupier or an</p>	

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>office developer, however this also failed to attract prospective buyers, who were typically concerned about the suitability of the location for office accommodation. As such, the site is currently vacant and in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>We consider sites such as 136-142 Bramley Road should be released for alternative land uses as there is a clear a lack of demand for office accommodation in this location. This should be reflected in the next Draft Local Plan consultation.</p>	
Savills on behalf of COMMERCIAL ESTATES GROUP (Kirsty Turner)	<p>However, Option 1, under paragraph 8.10, seeks to introduce planning conditions to restrict commercial properties. The NLPR should recognise the benefits of a flexible Use Class E, which will assist in invigorating our High Streets and Town Centres by providing businesses with the framework and flexibility to adapt to changing market conditions. The NLP should therefore resist restricting the current, or future use of commercial premises.</p> <p>In addition, Option 1, as part of paragraph 9.5, also seeks to protect office floorspace unless evidence suggests there is no long-term future for that use. As a result of Covid-19 many businesses are reducing the need for office floorspace across the nation and as such may not require an office as large as previously sought. In addition, the motivation for loss of office floorspace within a development may be to re-use the space for another use considered to provide activation to the building or increase activity and footfall to an area. Therefore, it is proposed that a range of criteria are set out to ensure that it may be acceptable to lose a certain amount of office floorspace should the proposals seek to provide more planning benefits to the site than the existing conditions.</p>	<p>The Council does recognise the benefits of the flexibility offered under class E. However, we do recognise that some E class uses, in certain locations may have a direct impact on the viability of a town centre or on the function of an Employment Zone. Conditions would only be used sparingly and when necessary.</p> <p>The Council will always consider any application in the round and whether the loss of some office floorspace may have wider benefits. We also recognise that the freedoms offered under class E will allow loss of office to those very uses which may <i>“provide activation to the building or increase activity and footfall.”</i></p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Historic England (David English)	As with our response to question 8.5 on Town Centre uses above, without prejudging the particular significance of different areas, Historic England has supported the use of Article 4 directions elsewhere in London, when these are looking to control conversions from Office to Residential and where these are likely to help protect the character and vitality of areas.	Support for A4D noted.
Turley (Laurence Brooker)	<p>Whilst the need to ensure sufficient employment provision and offices, our Client does not support a blanket protection of all offices in the Borough, as per Option 1. Such an approach is not considered appropriate in the context of the expected office demand and need in particular areas of the Borough, nor the demonstrable comparatively higher need of other land uses such as residential which should be prioritised.</p> <p>Office demand</p> <p>The Issues and Options document sets out that the Council has commissioned an Employment Land and Premises Study ('ELPS') by Icen Projects, which is currently still in draft form. It notes that initial findings suggest that there will be a need for between 50,000sqm and 76,000sqm of office floorspace by the end of the plan period, although this will continue to be reviewed and tested as the impacts of the 'return to work' following the pandemic become clearer.</p> <p>However, this need is not considered to be evenly distributed across the Borough, and we suggest that the Council considers how this need might be accommodated in different areas and re-visit the evidence for specific Employment Zone policies in their options and policy development.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Study recommends protecting offices across the borough if the OAN for new offices is to be met. It has also considered the main office locations and notes that none are no longer viable for offices.</p> <p>The Council does recognise that we are only normally likely to see the re-provision of existing office floorspace as part of larger mixed use developments, and where these developments are residential led.</p> <p>This may have implications on emerging policies concerning Employment Zones where we have required all development to be business led.</p> <p>Supporting additional housing may increase the deliverability as well as help the Council increase the delivery of new homes.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>The ELPS notes that this predicted need is based upon forecasts from Cambridge Econometrics which show that “Between 2020 and 2043, employment in RBKC will grow by 13.6% [...]. RBKC will see an employment increase of around 21,000 between 2020 and 2043”. The largest sector of this growth is predicted to take place in the Information and Communications industry, with an increase of around 7,900 jobs, followed by Financial and Business Services of around 2,500 jobs and other services and Government services, in which a number of sub-industries are predominantly office based, will also see a significant increase in employment of around 2,200 and 2,900 respectively. As such, the majority of new employment is expected to be through office based jobs. It should therefore be noted that this predicted employment growth, reliant on projected office growth, could be radically different subject to the future approach to office vs home based working following the pandemic.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this identified need, the analysis of different office areas and Employment Zones within the borough in the ELPS suggest that the demand for this office space is not evenly distributed throughout the Borough.</p> <p>Although vacancy rates from the last year are somewhat misleading as they are higher due to the coronavirus pandemic, it is noted that the Borough’s overall office vacancy rate was 3.7% in June 2021, which increased to 5.8% in June 2021. However, in the Kensal Employment Zone the vacancy rate in June 2020 was 7.29%, increased to 9.47% in June 2021. The ELPS clearly demonstrates that the Kensal Employment Zone has significantly higher vacancy rates than elsewhere in the Borough, with the</p>	

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>second highest vacancy rate of the employment and office areas (only beaten by Latimer Road Employment Zone). In addition to this, there is also a significant amount of office floorspace in the pipeline across the Borough that is not yet completed, including in Kensal, adding to the office floorspace uplift within the area.</p> <p>As such, it is clear from the emerging evidence base that the demand and need for office floorspace, which is largely dependent on the 'return to work' in the first place, is not evenly distributed throughout the Borough. This is particularly apparent in areas such as the Kensal Employment Zone where there is already significant uplift and high vacancy rates, and therefore it is clear that a Borough-wide blanket approach to office floorspace is unlikely to be appropriate.</p> <p>Prioritisation of homes</p> <p>Viability modelling results within the ELPS also indicate that redevelopment of existing industrial and office floorspace will be viable where existing floorspace is limited to 25% to 50% of proposed floorspace. Where there is a more limited uplift in floorspace (i.e. where existing space equates to 75% or more of new space), redevelopment is only viable in higher value areas and particularly where an element of residential is incorporated.</p> <p>As such, a significant number of redevelopment options on older commercial premises in need of modernising in lower value areas, will likely require a more significant uplift in floorspace and residential elements on site. This is particularly notable in lower value areas, of which, again the Kensal Employment Zone is noted as having the lowest commercial rents in the Borough.</p>	

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>As noted in the Issues and Options document, the Government's White Paper places emphasis on the provision of new homes, so that those who want to live in the Borough have a better chance of doing so. However, surplus and undeveloped land is limited in the Borough. In order to deliver much-needed housing, both in accordance with the priority of national policy direction, and to address the historic under-delivery of the Council (49% delivery in 2020 Housing Delivery Test results), it is considered that the prioritisation of office space in certain areas of the Borough such as Kensal where the need for employment provision and land values are lower, could reduce the number of homes that the Council is able to deliver, while also limit the renewal and delivery of improved and flexible commercial space.</p> <p>Policy currently requires the introduction of homes within an Employment Zone to underpin a significant uplift in the quality and quantum of office/commercial floorspace. It is suggested that this approach is revised to ensure there is no net loss of office/commercial floorspace, or the retention of a viable quantum of commercial space, to protect existing uses/floorspace but also encourage an element of housing delivery in these Zones, to help deliver sites and meet other Local Plan priorities. It is also noted that such uplifts should be considered on the basis of Net Internal Area (NIA) rather than Gross Internal Area (GIA) in order to support more efficient design and buildings</p>	

Q.9.2. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Local shared Office space is needed – perhaps one local business hub in each ward. RBKC could own and run these at an economic fee. In new developments meeting spaces for local community groups and social infrastructure are critical and must be included. These spaces need to be accessible - both economically and step free.	This is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, but a form of use which could be of considerable benefit to the local community. The Council does intend to introduce a new affordable business unit policy, but this is only likely to be relevant for a very small number of large mixed use proposals in the borough.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	If the Council is to develop a Supplementary Planning document for the Lot's Road area the priority should be the extension and enhancement of employment opportunities, not the provision of more housing.	Noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I think that RBKC should follow central government proposals for a Class E use. Chelsea does not need different rules and if allowed to continue will stifle change of use to residential and therefore less homes in the Borough.	Noted. The Council is concerned that the Class MA change does not allow a Council to consider the benefit that the loss of an E class use will have on the service it provides or the local economy, but merely is a reflection in a differential of land values.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Local shared Office space is needed – perhaps one local business hub in each ward. RBKC could own and run these at an economic fee.	This is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, but a form of use which could be of considerable benefit to the local community. The Council does intend to introduce a new affordable business unit policy, but this is only likely to be relevant for a very small number of large mixed use proposals in the borough.
Linda Wade	To support the economic recovery, start-ups, and business support there should be a business hub easily accessible, ideally with support for sole traders, self-employed creatives who need help with paperwork to trade or work in the EU. Shared office workspace with meeting rooms	This is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, but a form of use which could be of considerable benefit to the local community. The Council does intend to introduce a new affordable business unit policy, but this is only likely to be relevant for a very small number of large mixed use proposals in the borough.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>We support a review of town centre boundaries and to add to conservation areas where there are gaps along the street frontage.</p> <p>Any large development in town centres should provide enhancements to the public realm which will directly support the centres. e.g. Newcombe House, Odeon.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council carried out a review of town centre boundaries as part of the 2019 review of the Local Plan. We are not aware of any current “gaps”.</p> <p>The Council notes the contribution that the redevelopment of larger sites can on public realm and to the vitality and viability of a town centre.</p>
Earl's Court Area Action Group (Bella Hardwick)	<p>We envisage a genuinely affordable provision of space for commercial and cultural businesses in its own "quarter" on the Earls Court Masterplan site. We also would like to see the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area along with Earl's Court becoming a Creative Enterprise Zone.</p>	<p>The Council intends to include a policy relating to the provision of affordable workspace in the emerging Local Plan. We would expect this to include a contribution in the Borough's Opportunity Areas, Earl's Court and West Kensington included.</p> <p>The nature of the place being created in Earl's Court forms part of the Places chapter.</p>
David Lloyd-Davis	<p>A policy to encourage flexible/affordable workspaces for small start-up companies in hubs. The synergy between small innovative groups creates a vibrant community from which come the seeds of successful companies.</p>	<p>The Council supports the provision of flexible business workspace, and recognises the value that such uses have in creating a vibrant community.</p>
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	<p>All options except Option 4 relate to existing offices. ECDC encourages that policies should also support the provision of new offices, in centres and Areas of Growth, such as Earls Court, where office floorspace could be delivered as part of the overall commercial floorspace in the mixed-use masterplan for the site.</p>	<p>The Earl's Court allocation includes a significant amount of new commercial floorspace. The quantum will form part of this allocation, and must be of a scale which does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the vitality of our town centres.</p>
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	<p>Covid-19 shaped the way people do business and work and this will change the way people use offices in the future. This epidemic proved that many people could continue doing the same work from home, and this reduces the traffic and the number of people</p>	<p>The Council recognises that Covid19 is likely to reflect the way people work. This is reflected in our Employment Land Study which has considered hybrid working and the impact that it will have on the future need for office floorspace.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	using public transport which leads to reducing air pollution. Our approach to this issue needs to change accordingly.	

Issue 2: Light industrial uses

Q.9.3. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	<p>Option 1 Promote the provision of new light industrial floorspace as part of larger commercial developments. Lower cost workshops are needed across the Borough and can provide the premises which will provide places for local people to work. “Promoting” rather than “requiring” the provision of workshops should not jeopardise the deliverability of proposals.</p> <p>Option 2 Resist the loss of maker spaces and other light industrial uses to residential. Without policy protection light industrial premises will be lost to residential. This is a reflection of a differential in commercial value rather than any inherent weakness in the employment sector. This will only be possible if we have an Article 4 direction to require planning permission for change of use of E class uses to residential</p>	Support for both options noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Both	Support for both options noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	We think that the NLPR sets us a false dichotomy is its Options 1 and 2, when applied to Latimer Road. The StQW Neighbourhood Plan introduced the idea of this street as a good location for cultural businesses and 'makers'. 'Makers' and creatives will find their way to suitable spaces in which to work. StQW Policies LR 1, 2, and 3 provide for continued ground floor space in the street for this to happen (provided that these neighbourhood level policies are acknowledged as part of a new Local Plan). Hence, we do not see a need to choose between these two options..	The Council concurs with the view that the two options are not mutually exclusive. Support for the two options noted.
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We support Options 1 and 2 regarding Light Industrial uses	Support for both options noted.
Greg Hammond	Support both, including the Article 4 direction, as long as it is used flexibly.	Support for both options noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Option 1	Support for option 1 noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Option 1 Promote the provision of new light industrial floorspace as part of larger commercial developments. Lower cost workshops are needed across the Borough and can provide the premises which will provide places for local people to	Support for both options noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>work. “Promoting” rather than “requiring” the provision of workshops should not jeopardise the deliverability of proposals. Option 2 Resist the loss of maker spaces and other light industrial uses to residential. Without policy protection light industrial premises will be lost to residential. This is a reflection of a differential in commercial value rather than any inherent weakness in the employment sector. This will only be possible if we have an Article 4 direction to require planning permission for change of use of E class uses to residential</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1 • Agree Option 2 • Agree</p>	Support for both options noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Option 1	
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1: We support promoting the provision of light industrial workshops as part of mixed-use developments. However not limited to large developments. Side streets or mews often have light industrial units and we would support the retention of such services.</p> <p>Option 2: We would support/welcome any protection that an Article 4 Direction could provide.</p>	Support for both options noted. We recognise that an Article 4 direction is necessary if we are to resist the loss of any E class uses to residential. Planning permission is not required for changes of use within the E class.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
GLA (Hassan Ahmed)	<p>Industrial</p> <p>RBKC is located in the Central Services Area. As such, paragraph 6.4.7 of the LP2021 is applicable. This makes it clear that all boroughs in the CSA should recognise the need to provide essential services to the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and in particular sustainable 'last mile' distribution/logistics, 'just-in-time' servicing, waste management and recycling, and land to support transport functions. This should apply to all industrial sites within the borough, including both designated and non-designated industrial sites. It is clear in Figure 9.1 that RBKC has a significant number of light industrial and storage uses in the borough and these should be afforded some protection in accordance with Policies E4 and E7 of the LP2021.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the value of its remaining industrial uses, but also that as an E class use, permission will not be required to change to a light industrial uses alternative E class use.</p> <p>A warehouse is a B8 use, and general industrial a B2 use and as such planning permission is required for its loss. We recognise the value of such uses, and will resist its loss to residential uses. However, we also recognise the nature of our industrial and warehouse uses and that these are not the uses which generally prove essential services to the CAZ. It may be they offer greater benefits as office/ other commercial space.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>TfL CD generally supports Option 1, to promote new light industrial floorspace as part of larger commercial developments. For mixed-use developments, such as Earls Court, 'agent of change' issues must be considered. Light industrial uses would need to be compatible with neighbouring residential uses and therefore, it is suggested that light industrial uses in mixed-use schemes are encouraged as research and development and industrial processes uses under Class E part (g) (i and ii). This will help future proof future commercial development through supporting technological innovation and protecting residents.</p>	<p>Whilst an E class Light industrial use should be, by its very definition, "neighbourly" the Council does recognise that care must be taken to ensure that a mixed use scheme does fully address the compatibility of neighbouring uses.</p>
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q. 9.3 Support Option 2	Noted
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support both options.	Noted

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
David Lloyd-Davis	Options 1&2.	Noted
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	All.	Noted
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	ECDC support the approach set out in Option 1 to promote new light industrial floorspace as part of larger commercial developments. For mixed-use developments, such as Earls Court, industrial uses will need to be compatible with neighbouring residential uses and therefore, it is suggested that light industrial uses in mixed-use schemes should be encouraged as research and development and industrial processes uses under Class E part (g) (i and ii). This will help future proof future commercial development through supporting technological innovation. However, this should not preclude storage uses (Use Class B8) in large development sites where they can be appropriately located and as meanwhile uses.	<p>Whilst an E class Light industrial use should be, by its very definition, “neighbourly” the Council does recognise that care must be taken to ensure that a mixed use scheme does fully address the compatibility of neighbouring uses.</p> <p>We will assess any application which includes an significant B8 element on its merits, having regard to the contribution that such uses have to the site and upon its wider role as supporting the CAZ.</p>

Q.9.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Design, creative, artistic, and cultural start-ups need support and subsidised shared Light Industrial space. (The Westway Trust estate is a good example)	Contribution of these uses noted, and supported.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Compliance with central government directive to relax change of use but incorporating the latest requirements for quality of housing developments.	Noted. The Council is of the view that an A4D is necessary to allow the Council to protect well needed commercial uses.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Design, creative, artistic, and cultural start-ups need support and subsidised shared Light Industrial space. (The Westway Trust estate is a good example)	Contribution of these uses noted, and supported.
Linda Wade	Studios, light manufacturing, creative workspaces require start up space	Contribution of these uses noted, and supported.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Design, creative, artistic, and cultural start-ups need support and subsidised shared light industrial space.	Contribution of these uses noted, and supported.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	Do not limit protection or encouragement for light industrial to large developments. Side streets or mews often have light industrial units, and we strongly support the retention of such services. See response to Q9.3.	Noted. A light industrial use lies within Class E and as such planning permission is not required to an alternative E class use. The A4D is necessary if we are to resist E class uses from changing to higher value residential uses.
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	The Local Plan also needs to consider the provision of logistics / distribution throughout the borough, especially small scale B8 'last mile distribution' to serve the strong and continuing trend towards home shopping and deliveries, and also to serve local shops and other businesses.	Noted. Whilst the borough does have some Class B8 uses they are not a major component of the Borough's business sector. The draft policy will reflect the value of these B8 uses, although allow changes of use to offices or light industrial uses.
David Lloyd-Davis	A policy encouraging and supporting hubs of affordable light industrial/artisan workshops within the Employment Zones.	Noted. The role that hubs of lower cost workshops will be reflected in emerging policy. Affordable workshops will only be required for larger scale proposals when we are satisfied that they will not jeopardise the deliverability of a proposal.
Labour Group of Councillors	We must fiercely protect our Employment Zones. All too often 'commercial use' is replaced, never to be used. Grand Union Centre is a good/bad example. It used to be a thriving	Noted. The Council recognises that redevelopment of commercial sites across the borough, including within our Employment Zones, often increases rental values, making them unaffordable to those

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
(Emma Dent Coad)	workshop/office and light industrial space, home to numerous small businesses. Once developed with mainly private housing (plus open space for the use of private homes only, and poor doors round the back), a number of shops/retail spaces were provided at street level. Most remain empty after four years, creating dead space. The rent is too high for any genuine local use. This is repeated in numerous developments around Kensal.	who previously occupied the same spaces. The affordable business policy will seek to address this issue, although it will only apply to larger schemes when the provision of such space does not render the re-development unviable. Requiring new commercial space to be let on the same terms as the existing will result in very little new commercial floorspace coming forward.

Issue 3: Affordable workspaces

Q.9.5. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Option 1	Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	We support options 1 and 2. Other London Boroughs with lower land values than RBKC have operated successful policies that achieve discounted workspace in major developments. There are examples to draw on – albeit that London may well experience much surplus workspace in the immediate future with rent levels falling to ‘affordable’ levels.	Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	Option 3 The strength of demand for employment floorspace in the Borough is not sufficient to place an additional burden of discounted workspace accommodation. Questions of how much	The Borough’s Employment Land Study confirms that there is a need for affordable workspace in the borough. This also considers the impact that such floorspace may have upon the overall viability

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	discount, for which companies and for how long would create cumbersome requirements for investors, landlords and tenants which are difficult to administer and would ultimately discourage investment.	a scheme, and only recommends the provision of affordable workspace for the largest schemes.
Greg Hammond	I support the lightest touch possible (Option 3?) and the Council should definitely not go into the business of providing workspaces, except out of irreducible spare capacity in its existing property portfolio.	There are a number of possible methods of delivery of affordable workspace. The Council does not intend to run or manage any floorspace itself. A popular model is for space to be let to a third party specialist provider.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Option 3	Noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	<p>Option 1 Affordable workspaces should be provided as part of new larger scale commercial schemes. Affordable workspaces help support a sector of the industry which may not be Developers will have to include a small amount of affordable workspace as part of their commercial or mixed-use schemes. This should be at a level which does not affect the viability of the scheme. Choices may have to be taken as to what "cost" is prioritised.</p> <p>Option 2 What model of affordable workspace should the Council support? There are various models which can help deliver the provision of low-cost workspaces to be used by those who add social value. Not all will be suitable in this borough. The cost to a developer will depend on the model chosen. It will also influence the nature of the floorspace being provided and the opportunities open to those looking to occupy it.</p>	Noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Option 3</p> <p>The provision of a range of workspaces in large commercial development should be supported but there be no requirement for formally discounted space.</p> <p>If the Council is to see the need for new commercial floorspace met, it should seek to minimise any cost associated with it. New business floorspace will only be available to those who can afford market rates. This will force many to locate outside of a higher value borough such as ours</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would require a workspace strategy to determine that the relevant space provided was appropriate. I.e., if it were creative sufficient light, ventilation, and access, if it was a garage, it would require something else. <p>Option 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree 	Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted. The Council concurs with the view that care must be taken to ensure that appropriate space is provided.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Option 1	Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1: We support a diversity of provision of employment spaces within new larger-scale commercial schemes.</p> <p>Option 2: Other London boroughs must be facing the same issues – ask London Councils and the GLA.</p>	Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Option 3: Oppose the “no requirement for formally discounted space”. Without a policy it will never happen. We support developers being required to provide a range of sizes and rents in new developments.</p>	
GLA (Hassan Ahmed)	<p>Affordable workspace The Mayor welcomes RBKCs recognition and intention to make provision for affordable workspace in the borough. RBKC should note Policies E2 and E3 of the LP2021 which address needs for suitable business space and affordable workspace in London. Policy E2 requires large commercial development to consider providing space for micro, small and medium sized enterprises, while Policy E3 sets out how planning obligations can be secured to provide for affordable workspace. RBKC should recognise and reflect the differences between these types of space.</p>	<p>Support for provision of affordable workspace as part of new larger developments noted.</p> <p>Emerging policy will include support for the provision of a range of unit types/ sizes.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>The viability and deliverability of providing affordable workspaces within schemes must be taken into account in policies. We also consider that if there are viability issues, provision of affordable housing and vital infrastructure should be prioritised before affordable workspaces.</p>	<p>The Borough’s Employment Land Study considers the impact that such floorspace may have upon the overall viability a scheme, and only recommends the provision of affordable workspace for the largest schemes.</p>
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 9.5 Support Option 1 .	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 1.	Noted.
Alex Mackay	Option 3	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development	<p>ECDC support the objectives behind providing affordable workspace policies. However, it is important that provision is deliverable and considered alongside other issues on large sites,</p>	Support for affordable workspace noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Company (Steffan Rees)	such as Earls Court where there will also be viability challenges associated with affordable housing and infrastructure. Choices may need to be made to optimise priorities.	The Borough's Employment Land Study considers the impact that such floorspace may have upon the overall viability a scheme, and only recommends the provision of affordable workspace for the largest schemes. We recognise that the provision of affordable workspace will have a "cost" to a development. The combined costs of various requirements must not render a proposal unviable.
DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)	Wellcome Trust supports Option 3 for the provision of a range of workspaces within developments, rather than requiring a formal discounted space. Wellcome Trust opine that development should bring forward flexible market workspaces as part of a development proposal.	Noted. The Council does recognise the benefits of the provision of formal affordable workspace for the largest schemes.
Turley (Laurence Brooker)	<p>The need for affordable workspace is acknowledged by our Client, particularly to support start-ups, smaller businesses, creative industries, maker spaces and other businesses that provide social value.</p> <p>However, Option 1 which suggests that affordable workspaces should be provided as part of new larger scale commercial schemes is not supported as it is considered not the most appropriate way to address need and could impact on development viability, thereby de-incentivising the redevelopment and therefore revitalisation of fit-for-purpose, modern commercial floorspace.</p> <p>Instead, our Client supports Option 3 which is considered to allow for flexibility to deliver meaningful affordable workspaces in appropriate locations and developments.</p>	<p>Recognition that there is a need for affordable workspace is noted.</p> <p>We also recognise that this need is likely to be best accommodated with a small number of creative clusters.</p> <p>We do recognise that creative industries may choose to locate in older character and lower cost buildings. However, we must be pragmatic and recognise that it is only the larger proposals which are likely to be of a scale that can deliver affordable workspace without rendering a proposal unviable.</p> <p>The Council does recognise that there may some situations were a contribution rather than the provision of space may be appropriate.</p> <p>The Council will always consider the impact that the provision of affordable workspace will have upon the over viability of a scheme. There may be some circumstances when this may have an impact on the quantum of affordable housing that can be delivered. The</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>In relation to the nature of the need, it is noted that the majority of businesses that would benefit from affordable and discounted workspace are precisely the sort of smaller, creative industries that thrive best when clustered together. The draft Employment Land and Premises Study notes that “culture, media and entertainment” sectors are particularly prevalent in the borough and “when combined, these sectors make up 8.5% of RBKC’s employment compared to 6.4% for London and just 3.1% for the UK as whole, meaning RBKC accounts for 1.5% of the UK’s employment in these sectors. Sound recording and music publishing activities are particularly prominent in RBKC with 11.1% of the UK’s employment in this sector being in the Borough.”</p> <p>It is considered that it would be most beneficial for the creative industries and smaller businesses that make up a distinct character of the Borough, to be provided for in clusters rather than spread out through piecemeal affordable workspace across the Borough. Furthermore, their inclusion within larger scale commercial schemes would potentially be an unattractive option for small businesses and creative industries and stifle their development.</p> <p>As such, option 3 is our Client’s preferred option, which seeks to support a wide range of workspaces in large commercial development without a requirement for formally discounted space. This allows for flexibility of options of workspace provision that might suit different businesses and different individual locations in the Borough, providing a mix.</p> <p>We would also suggest that where affordable workspace is not considered to be appropriate or to meet the needs of the smaller</p>	<p>Council will have to consider what contribution would be preferable.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>and creative industries likely to use them, that an option is provided for developers to potentially provide for off-site affordable workspace on alternative sites that would benefit from small business agglomeration.</p> <p>In relation to the viability of providing affordable workspace on all new commercial schemes, as outlined in Option 1, it is noted that viability differs broadly across the Borough. The ELPS notes that whilst the majority of zones would be able to absorb a 10% affordable workspace requirement, this is not the case in the Kensal area (Zone F), where the market rents are significantly lower than elsewhere in the Borough. As such, it is considered that any affordable workspace policy that requires all new commercial development to provide affordable workspace (as per Option 1 if pursued) seeks to reflect the difference in viability across the Borough, so that the demand for affordable workspace can be met without unduly and unfairly placing higher pressures on areas of the Borough such as Kensal, where higher levels of provision could struggle to deliver viable commercial redevelopment, even at 10%. This could prejudice development and delivery of other planning benefits (such as potentially affordable housing on mixed use schemes) in such areas. It is considered that the delivery of affordable homes should be the priority for the Council above requiring affordable workspace on every new mixed use scheme with a commercial element. As such, our Client supports the more flexible approach to these considerations, as outlined in Option 3.</p>	

Q.9.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Empty workspaces in managed estates should be released for temporary start-ups pop-up licences (say for 6 months). See CapCo's planning proposal report on "Chemistry" using voids for pop-ups.	The Council welcomes this approach, although notes that this is not a planning matter than can form part of a requirement within a Local Plan.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Follow central Government advise on a new Class E. There is no reason that development should be compelled to provide work space, the market should decide the location of inexpensive space.	In this borough, with the land values that we have, the market alone will not provide affordable workspace. The Council must decide whether it is appropriate to use the planning system to ensure that higher value land uses cross subsidise the provision of lower cost by "desirable" uses. We can do so where these do not stop the delivery of the proposal.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Empty workspaces in managed estates should be released for temporary start-ups pop-up licences (say for 6 months). See CapCo's planning proposal report on "Chemistry" using voids for pop-ups.	The Council welcomes this approach, although notes that this is not a planning matter than can form part of a requirement within a Local Plan.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Empty workspaces in managed estates should be released for temporary start-ups pop-up licences (say for 6 months).	The Council welcomes this approach, although notes that this is not a planning matter than can form part of a requirement within a Local Plan.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Other. Allow/encourage a proportion of live/work units to suit new patterns of home working	The Council is concerned that live/work units revert, in practice, to the higher value use – a live/live unit. One should note that the use of a room within an otherwise residential property as an office will not normally constitute a material change of use that will require planning permission. The "office" element is normally ancillary to the main residential use.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	It is difficult enough to force developers to provide adequate affordable housing . I think that additional affordable work space	The Council would only require the provision of affordable workspace when satisfied that it does not impact upon the overall deliverability of the proposal.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	will not be feasible without subsidy either by Councils, the Mayor's Office or Central Government	
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	The Local Plan should acknowledge the potential for a significant employment offer at Earls Court (see the covering letter)	The allocation for the Earl's Court OA recognises the significant employment offer of the site. However, care must be taken to ensure that the quantum of commercial floorspace does not jeopardise the vitality of adjoining town centres.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	We must protect existing light industrial areas and promote the provision of new premises suitable for new light industrial use. If not we will, over time, become a dormitory borough.	The value of a range of commercial uses noted. The current E to C A4D is essential in this regard.

Issue 4: Hotels/visitor accommodation

Q.9.7. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	None of them	Noted. The desired approach is not clear? The Council does note that hotels do make a significant contribution to the local and wider economy, and as such should only be lost/ new hotels discouraged when there are good planning reasons to do so.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	Option 1: We support continuing to protect hotel rooms and other forms of visitor accommodation across the Borough, but there needs to be far more enforcement against unauthorised use of Airbnb accommodation. Policy CF9 is toothless against Airbnb and ways of strengthening should be considered.	Support for protection of existing hotels noted.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	Option 2 It is important that Use Class C1 floorspace is protected in key locations. Visitor accommodation is critical to the Boroughs economy. The release of surplus stock in specific locations (such as the Earls Court Ward) which would not undermine the visitor economy, could be positive for the delivery of other priorities for the Borough such as housing and affordable housing.	Support for the loss of hotels in areas where there is surplus stock is noted.
Greg Hammond	I support diversification as market conditions dictate (Option 3), which is how many of the small hotels came into being in place of dwellings in the first place in the 1970s. Also, by extension, I support Option 2, but the Earl's Court ward boundary is a too narrowly defined area: parts of Courtfield and Abingdon wards have the SW5 (Earl's Court) postcode and the same type of small hotel are prevalent in these areas.	Support for diversification of existing hotels noted. Support for loss of hotels where an over concentration noted.
Kerry Davis-Head	HOTELS. AIRBNB ETC AIRBNB and similar have created numerous problems for residents	The Council recognises the problems associated with the private let model of visitor accommodation. This can cause real problems,

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	adjacent to such "housing". There also seems to be a lack of supervision and intervention for any HMOs or Hostel type accommodation, rubbish and noise has an impact on those living near. The lack of hotels, which on the whole are well run and conform to regulations, means visitors are forced to use unregulated lettings, with little fire safety provision.	both in terms of losing much needed residential stock and in terms of creating anti-social and un-neighbourly behaviour. Unfortunately, planning permission is not normally required for a short term let for less than 90 days. Planning enforcement is difficult in this regard.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Option 3	Noted.
Elizabeth Ashley	Option 2 Option 3	Noted.
Linda Wade	Option 1 • Agree Option 2 • Agree Option 3 • Agree but the serviced apartments and aparthotels still require monitoring and controls	Noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Options 2,3	Noted.
Tom Bennett	I support Option 3. Some areas of the borough have an over-supply of low quality hotel accommodation. This is of limited benefit to the borough. We should make it easier for hotels to get planning to convert to residential. I don't think this will lead to a loss of good quality hotel provision, as successful hotels will not	Support for diversification of existing hotels noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	increase in value by converting to residential - though failing ones will.	
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>General comment: No-one can forecast future demand for hotels/visitor accommodation in five years' time, let alone over the 10-year Local Plan period or the 20-year forecasting period. Unlike other London boroughs, Kensington and Chelsea was forecast not to need to cater for any significant increase in bedspaces. However, it is too soon to make an informed policy choice.</p> <p>The effect of Airbnb and other short-term lets' effect on the hotel industry needs to be investigated and assessed and not ignored. The loss of housing to short-lets needs to be assessed and perhaps should be counted as a reduction in the borough's housing numbers.</p> <p>Option 1: We support the retention of existing hotels</p> <p>Option 2: What few hotels that are left would very quickly be turned into housing. Supporting evidence must be provided. The condition of the property should not be a reason for agreeing to a change of use.</p> <p>Option 3: There is already a great diversity of choice. Not sure what is mean by "new models of operations". Needs explaining.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the uncertainty with regard a post Covid-19 recovery and the need for future hotel accommodation. However, the informed expectation is that tourist level will return to pre-pandemic levels in 2024.</p> <p>The loss of permanent housing to short term lets is included as a net loss when considering the boroughs housing numbers. As such it is, and will continue to be, resisted.</p> <p>Support for protection of existing hotels noted.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 9.7 Difficult to comment without knowing more about supply and demand over the coming years. Suspect there is an oversupply in Earls Court and some relaxation is needed. This could also provide a significant amount of new housing.	Noted. There is no evidence of an expected oversupply, come 2024 when tourist numbers are expected to return to post Covid-19 numbers. We do recognise the contribution that the loss of hotels could have to the boroughs housing supply. However, this “benefit” will be at the expense of uses which can support the local and wider economy.
David Campbell	Option 2: Allow losses in Earls Court now the Exhibition Centre has gone? Provide homes for locals rather than serviced apartments for Tourists and short term stays? I strongly support Policy CF9 which restricts short term lets such as “Airbnb” and wish to see it tightened and properly regulated/enforced.	Support for loss of hotels in Earl’s Court noted. The Council recognises the problems associated with the private let model of visitor accommodation. This can cause real problems, both in terms of losing much needed residential stock and in terms of creating anti-social and un-neighbourly behaviour. Unfortunately, planning permission is not normally required for a short term let for less than 90 days.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support Options 2 and 3.	Noted.
Collette Wilkinson	None	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Options 2&3.	Noted.
Alex Mackay	Options 2 and 3.	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development	ECDC support the principles of Option 3, where new hotel and visitor facilities are supported in the Borough. ECDC considers this	The Council considers that the Earl’s Court opportunity area is an appropriate location for new hotels.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Company (Steffan Rees)	will enable new facilities to respond to future demand from new destinations, such as Earls Court and new models of operation.	
Wardell Armstrong LLP for Tatton Group (Rachel Wilbraham)	We commend the Council in recognising the key role which tourism plays in the local economy, and the importance that providing a supportive policy context will be in assisting the post covid economic recovery. We also support the Council's recognition that new platforms and tourist accommodation types such as 'Airbnb' which are growing exponentially and are able to provide a broader range of accommodation options. In relation to the options outlined under Issue 4, we would lend greatest support to Option 3 which seeks the most diverse and supportive approach to both current and future tourist accommodation.	Support for diversification of existing hotels noted.
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Hotel uses, whilst protected in most of RBKC, should be allowed to change to residential in Earl's Court reflecting changes specific to this area.	Support for loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Hotel uses, whilst protected in most of RBKC, should be allowed to change to residential in Earl's Court.	Support for loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward noted.
Linda Wade	Hotels that are struggling have the option to apply to go residential use in the Earl's Court area and no further hotel development in the ward.	Support for loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Hotel uses, whilst protected in most of the Borough, should be allowed to change to residential in Earl's Court.	Support for loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward noted.

Q.9.8. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Short Term Holiday Lets (STHL) should be Registered and Licensed according to the recommendations of the Environment Select Committee report.	Noted.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Air B&Bs are often damaging to the amenities of local residents and risk diminishing the availability of housing. The Council should try to prevent their emergence or spread	Noted. Informal forms of short term lets are very difficult to control through the planning process. However, such uses will be resisted where planning permission is required. This reflects the concern that the Council has in terms of the impact that such uses have upon the borough's housing stock and upon unneighbourly behaviour.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Retain Policy CF9 as airbnb lets are very unsatisfactory for existing occupants who are left living in properties with empty apartments and a detrimental change in the character of their buildings.	Noted. Informal forms of short term lets are very difficult to control through the planning process. However, such uses will be resisted where planning permission is required. This reflects the concern that the Council has in terms of the impact that such uses have upon the borough's housing stock and upon unneighbourly behaviour
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Short Term Holiday Lets (STHL) should be Registered and Licensed according to the recommendations of the Environment Select Committee report.	Noted.
Linda Wade	Short Term Holiday Lets are damaging the hotel business, they are also creating problems for the residents in the blocks where flats have been let out. These flats should be registered, they should be checked for fire safety, and restrictions on the number of people staying in the flats should be applied.	Noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	As regards which existing plan policies to retain: CF9: We strongly support a much tougher approach to short lets –	The Council intends to retain Policies CF9, CF10 and CF11. The Council has no plans to pedestrianise Exhibition Road further.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>if the loss of permanent homes is to be addressed. At present the scale of loss of housing is not apparent, although the Borough has one of the highest numbers of advertised short-let properties. However if there were full disclosure of the scale of “change of use” to short-lets, this would identify the scale of losses to the housing stock.</p> <p>CF10: This should be retained. CF11: This should be retained and expanded It needs to state that the residential streets surrounding the area should be protected and Exhibition Road will remain as a road and not pedestrianised.</p>	
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	The need for hotel and visitor accommodation to support future centres, such as the Earls Court site, needs to be considered.	The Council recognises the valuable role that hotels can play in supporting our town centres, including the Earl’s Court Opportunity Area.
Earl's Court Area Action Group (Bella Hardwick)	We strongly oppose allowing the loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward. We will need the hotels for the multi-purpose venue which we campaign for. If a cultural venue of some sort is approved, then we would also need the existing range of hotels which cater for all budgets. Local hospitality businesses such as bars, restaurants etc thrive on people having overnight stays which a new destination location would generate and it would lead to business owners committing to further investment in the area. It is surprising that the Council would even consider this as an option. These businesses are struggling due to the demolition of the Earls Court Exhibition Centres and the pandemic. The Council should be working with hoteliers on a post-Covid 19 comeback strategy not allowing their loss!	Support for retention of hotels in Earl’s Court noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	Is control of Air Bnb required : it is notable that other major European cities are taking action to restore properties which are under Air Bnb back to the true residential sector.	This is beyond the remit of the planning system as currently drafted. The Council will resist the loss of permanent homes to short term lets when planning permission is required.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	<p>A recent estimate stated that there are 6,000 AirBnB homes on offer. This is just one of a number of short-let agencies. Added to the long-term empty and second homes, this adds up to cc14,000 homes not lived in permanently.</p> <p>We welcome visitors but in many areas – such as South Kensington and possibly Notting Hill Gate – the needs of visitors have gained precedence over the needs of residents. Coffee shops, take-aways and souvenir shops squeeze out convenience stores and other local amenities. We need to rebalance this, or we are accepting that we are making parts of the borough unlivable.</p> <p>We need to enforce the current regulations on short lets. At one point there were 16 in a Mayor-funded building in Golborne ward. This is untenable.</p>	The Council recognises the impact that short term lets can have upon the stock of permanent homes and will resist the loss of permanent homes to short term lets when planning permission is required.
Wardell Armstrong LLP for Tatton Group (Rachel Wilbraham)	Whilst we are in overall support of option 3, we would recommend re-enforcing the role that new accommodation types (such as ‘Airbnb’) are able to play in meeting the need for hotel space. This recognition will further support the hotel and tourism sector and enable a formal policy to be devised which proactively supports and addresses the needs of this alternative to traditional hotels.	The Council does recognise the role that short term lets play. However, they can have an impact on the supply of permanent homes. As such we will resist the creation of short term let to the expense of hoes as and when planning permission is required.

SECTION 10: SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY USE

Issue 1: Types of social and community uses

Q.10.1. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Victoria Road Area Residents Association & Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>Para 10.4: Education uses should include student accommodation, such as halls of residences, where they are directly related to or an integral part of the main educational use.</p> <p>The description proposed in the second bullet in para 10.4 should be revised to read: “education uses, including primary and secondary, private and grant maintained, schools, tertiary education, including student accommodation directly related to or an integral part of the main education use; creches, nurseries and youth facilities;”</p> <p>There is a need to protect such educational uses from losses to housing.</p>	<p>Suggestion to widen the definition of education uses by including student accommodation which is directly related to or an integral part of the main education use is noted. However, this would result in large student halls associated with a named provider be considered a “social and community use”. This may have unintended consequences and is not supported. This would suggest that a “social and community” student hall would be favoured over most other uses.</p>
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	<p>SUPPORT ALL OPTIONS</p> <p>Option 1 Add a separate category of cultural uses (e.g. galleries, theatres, museums, rehearsal and dance space) into the definition. Cultural uses deliver both economic and social benefits, serving local community as well as visitors of the borough. The loss of cultural venues, facilities or spaces can have a detrimental effect on an area, particularly when they serve a local community function. Cultural uses will be protected however defined.</p> <p>Option 2 Include river-based recreational facilities as part of sport facilities</p>	<p>Support for all options is noted.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>definition. The Borough's location on the River Thames provides an opportunity for development of river-based recreational uses and this space should be recognised as part of the sport facilities definition.</p> <p>In the current definition of social and community uses, while river-based facilities fall under the sports facilities category, it is not explicitly stated. This would clarify it.</p> <p>Option 3 Add a separate category of parks and open spaces (e.g. parks, open spaces, garden squares, cemeteries) into the definition. Parks and open spaces have a community function and contribute to the wellbeing of local community as well as visitors of the borough. Parks and open spaces will be protected regardless but this would explicitly recognise the role they play for the community.</p>	
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	All of them	Support for all options is noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	We support the response of the Kensington Society including its suggestions on additions to the list of social and community uses offered some planning protection under Policy CK1	Support for all three options along with Kensington Society comments is noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	No comment	Noted.
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and	Social and Community assets should include essential Community Centres, and we support the other five uses listed as well.	Community Centres are indeed considered Social and Community Use under other "valued use" and it will continue to be the case in the future.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Businesses (Rosemary Baker)		
Greg Hammond	I support all three options for extension of protections.	Support for all options is noted.
Kerry Davis-Head	TRAINING/EDUCATION. This is mentioned, and Re training. Yet places like the old “Adult Ed” have long since morphed into centres for the young. Gone are the days of subsidies for the retired, learning skills they could utilise for volunteering or to gain work. The older sector once again squeezed out to the provinces.	Noted.
The Theatre Trust (Ross Anthony)	The Trust is supportive of Option 1 (the introduction of cultural uses into this category) for the reasons set out under 'Why?'. These uses are all covered together within the NPPF. This would not preclude Options 1 or 2 coming forward, neither of which are in conflict with Option 1.	Support for all three options is noted.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	Support inclusion of cultural amenities and parks in the category of community use (option 1 and option 3). The pandemic has reinforced how vital these places are to physical and mental health.	Support for Options 1 and 3 is noted. Cultural uses and well as parks are all uses protected by the Local Plan. Cultural uses are included in the definition of a social and community use.
Natural History Museum (Adam Donovan)	The NHM notes that one of the Options put forward is to add a separate category which includes ‘cultural uses’ under the types of social and community uses. The NHM is supportive of how this will protect cultural uses. However, it requests that there is some flexibility in regards to how strictly they are protected. Where there is additional space within a cultural institution, re-purposing to a more appropriate use should not be restricted.	Support for Option 1 is noted. Comment regarding the flexibility of Policy to allow for the loss of cultural uses where there is a surplus of use is noted. The draft local plan recognises that a cultural use is a form of social and community use.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	Options 1,2 and 3	Support for all options is noted.
Port of London Authority (Michael Atkins)	<p>To confirm the PLA supports option 2 specifically to include river based recreational facilities as part of the sport facilities definition and welcome the recognition to the opportunity for the increased development of river-based recreational uses.</p> <p>This is supported by the PLA's Thames Vision which includes the goal to see greater participation in sport and recreation on and alongside the water.</p>	Support for Option 2 is noted. Sports facilities, including river-based recreational facilities, are considered to be a social and community use.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	<p>SUPPORT ALL OPTIONS</p> <p>Option 1 Add a separate category of cultural uses (e.g. galleries, theatres, museums, rehearsal and dance space) into the definition. Cultural uses deliver both economic and social benefits, serving local community as well as visitors of the borough. The loss of cultural venues, facilities or spaces can have a detrimental effect on an area, particularly when they serve a local community function. Cultural uses will be protected however defined.</p> <p>Option 2 Include river-based recreational facilities as part of sport facilities definition. The Borough's location on the River Thames provides an opportunity for development of river-based recreational uses and this space should be recognised as part of the sport facilities definition.</p> <p>In the current definition of social and community uses, while river-based facilities fall under the sports facilities category, it is not explicitly stated. This would clarify it.</p>	Support for all three options is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>Option 3 Add a separate category of parks and open spaces (e.g. parks, open spaces, garden squares, cemeteries) into the definition. Parks and open spaces have a community function and contribute to the wellbeing of local community as well as visitors of the borough. Parks and open spaces will be protected regardless but this would explicitly recognise the role they play for the community.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1 • Agree</p> <p>Option 2 • Agree</p> <p>Option 3 • Agree</p>	Support for all options is noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Options 1,3	Support for Options 1 and 3 is noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>General comment</p> <p>Option 1: We see no objection to a separate category of cultural uses so long as Policy CF7 continues to apply, including a sequential approach (CF7c). It should include auction houses, exhibition spaces, cinemas and studios.</p> <p>Option 2: We support the expansion to cover river- and canal-based recreation.</p> <p>Option 3: Totally agree. Parks and open spaces to be mentioned with a cross-reference to Policy CR5, which must continue to apply</p>	<p>Noted. Support for all three options is noted.</p> <p>Auction houses, exhibition spaces, cinemas and studios are all currently classed as “cultural uses” and as such will be protected. For clarity this are also included as a form of social and community use.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	No comment.	Noted.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 10.1 Support options 1 and 3	Support for Options 1 and 3 is noted.
Mozafar Amiri	I agree with adding "cultural" and "parks and open spaces" to the list.	Support for Options 1 and 3 is noted.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support all three options.	Support for all options is noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 2.	Support for Option 2 is noted.
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	All.	Support for all options is noted.
Alex Mackay	(All three options)	Support for all options is noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	No comment	Noted.
Environment Agency (Hannah Malyon)	No comments	Noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.
Historic England (David English)	<p>We welcome references in the options to recognising and supporting river-based activities, and the recognition of the important function that parks and open spaces play, including the specific references to cemeteries. All of these make important contributions to the borough's heritage that merit conservation and, where there are opportunities, being better revealed.</p> <p>We also note that many of the cultural uses highlighted in option 1 will be located in heritage buildings, and in many cases these are the original uses that these buildings were designed for. In our view there is an important opportunity to draw out the overlap with the social and community uses of buildings and landscapes when considering the broader positive strategy for the Royal Borough's historic environment.</p>	<p>Support for all three options is noted. Cultural uses as well as river based recreational facilities have been included in the definition of a social and community use.</p> <p>The Council recognises the advantages of allowing uses to operate in the buildings they were designed for.</p> <p>The Council recognises the role that uses can have in supporting the historic environment.</p>

Q.10.2. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	All new developments must provide COMMUNITY MEETING places for RAs and Amenity Societies, Volunteering, Charities, and other community-based services and activities.	Noted. The provision of new social and community infrastructure is dealt in Issue 3 and the Council has proposed to require development to make a planning contribution towards creation of new social and community infrastructure based in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and, where appropriate, a local needs assessment. The Council will aim to secure new community meeting spaces whenever reasonable.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	There should be a specific recognition of pubs. Surely Community Halls should be an essential feature of viable local communities	Comment is noted. Community Centres / Halls / Meeting Rooms are indeed considered Social and Community Use under other “valued use” and it will continue to be the case in the future. The Council protects all pubs and will continue to do so.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	No comment	Noted.
Gerald Eve (Neil Henderson)	Cadogan considers the provisions of the current policy provides an appropriate balance for the consideration of social and community uses based on a criteria-based approach.	Noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	No	Noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	The suggested uses should also include COMMUNITY MEETING places for RAs and Amenity Societies, Volunteering, Charities, and other community-based services and activities.	Community Centres / Halls / Meeting Rooms are indeed considered Social and Community Use under other “valued use” and it will continue to be the case in the future. Suggestion to widen the definition and clarify that is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Linda Wade	There should be provision and protection of community meeting places.	As above.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	The suggested uses should also include community meeting places for RAs and amenity societies, volunteer groups, charities, and other community-based services and activities.	As above.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>We agree with the existing five broad categories of social and community uses but the definitions need to be provided and expanded. In particular,</p> <p>“other valued use” needs to include community halls, such as church halls and social meeting places and day centres.</p> <p>“sports facilities” should include leisure facilities such as parks, open spaces and playgrounds.</p> <p>“education uses” should include student halls of residence, which are directly related to specified academic institutions, especially if they provide meals.</p> <p>Note: Even though any losses count against housing numbers, the loss of halls of residence means that students need to find housing in the general housing stock.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p> <p>Community Centres / Halls / Meeting Rooms are indeed considered Social and Community Use under other “valued use” and it will continue to be the case in the future. Suggestion to widen the definition and clarify that is noted.</p> <p>It is proposed to include parks and open spaces as a separate category. Parks and open spaces will be protected regardless but this would explicitly recognise the role they play for the community.</p> <p>Suggestion to include student halls of residence into the “education uses” is noted. However, as noted above, the Council is concerned that including a student hall as a social and community use may have unintended consequences.</p>
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	What action if any is proposed for developing river amenities eg river/canalside walks etc, a walking route from the Site at Lots Road up past Brompton Cemetery etc. etc.	This lies outside the remit of this Local Plan, but has passed to colleagues in the relevant team. The Council does support, and will continue to do so, the Thames Path.
David Lloyd-Davis	Community meeting places for local events. Although Chelsea has a long River frontage, there is very little local recreational access.	Noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	No.	Noted.
Robert Dixon	No.	Noted.
Alex Mackay	The current policy is strong but there can be a problem when a use such as a small doctors surgery that was part of a house ends (the doctors retire) - policies have to allow a return to residential use to be simple and straight forward.	Comment is noted. However, when one doctor retires, it opens an opportunity for another medical professional to take the space over and continue provide vital medical services. It is not reasonable to directly link a land use to an individual professional who occupies its space in particular moment in time.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	No comment	Noted.
Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)	We should not allow the loss of social and community loss in any circumstances. RBKC was specifically criticised for this breach of our own policy in Kroll Report II. We must comply with our own policies! We have already lost too much community space.	Comment is noted.
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.

Issue 2: The protection of social and community uses

Q.10.3. Which of these options do you support? You can pick more than one.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Victoria Road Area Residents Association & Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	VRARA supports Option 1: Following our experience with Heythrop College, where the Council, wrongly approached the case in Use Class terms (C2) rather than use (education rather than housing), the “flexible” misinterpretation of CK1 policy could result in the loss of 155 years of educational use to luxury retirement housing with a small element of care.	Support for Option 1 is noted. The Council is aware of the issues surrounding luxury retirement housing.
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	<p>Option 1 Retain our existing approach whereby there is a presumption against the loss of any social and community use. This approach has proved successful in retaining the Borough’s stock of social capital. This lacks flexibility and can discourage otherwise suitable schemes coming forward.</p> <p>Option 2 Generally protect social and community uses, but allow their loss where we are satisfied that the loss brings forward another valued use. Such a use might include RBKC community housing This approach will protect the social and other valued uses. This may assist the delivery of community uses from unnecessary loss yet allow for flexibility and will ensure that otherwise excellent proposals can come forward.</p> <p>Option 3 Generally protect social and community uses, but allow their loss where we are satisfied that the loss will not result in a deficit in the provision of that use. The need for various social and community uses differs over time. Allowing the loss of a use no longer needed would free up that use</p>	Support for all three options is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>for others. This may result in the loss of the stock of premises suitable for social and community uses.</p>	
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Option 1	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	We support option 1. In particular, we attach importance to the sequential approach in Policy CK1.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We only support Option 1 regarding protection of such assets from a change of use which should be entirely ruled out.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Greg Hammond	Options 2/3 allow a more appropriate degree of flexibility than Option 1.	Support for Options 2 and 3 is noted.
The Theatre Trust (Ross Anthony)	<p>Option 1 - We are supportive of retention of the current approach. We do not agree it prevents otherwise suitable schemes coming forward as it should only apply where existing facilities are demonstrably surplus to requirements.</p> <p>Option 2 - We object to this approach because it is flawed. Bringing forward a much-needed use such as community housing does not necessarily constitute sustainable development if it results in the loss of a valued facility which then causes harm to the wellbeing of users. 'Excellent' is subjective and affords scope for facilities to be undermined. We would suggest the normal</p>	<p>Support for Option 1 and detailed justifications for objections for Options 2 and 3 is noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises that whilst valued, affordable housing, is not a use which should “trump” all others. It is the mix of social and community and cultural uses which makes the borough the special place that it is.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>criteria for demonstrating lack of need associated with Option 1 would be sufficient to allow for 'excellent proposals' to come forward if a facility is redundant.</p> <p>Option 3 - We also consider this approach problematic as it is potentially too permissive and affords scope for manipulation and unintended consequences. A 'presumption against loss' does not mean no loss, it means applicants must robustly and transparently demonstrate lack of continued need for a facility. It must also be considered that similar types of provision might actually cater to very different needs that cannot be absorbed by the other similar facility.</p>	
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	I don't support the article 4 direction for office use and I am concerned that control might increase rather than reduce as encouraged by central government.	Comment is noted, however this rather refers to office / business uses that social and community uses. The response is made in the relevant section.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	<p>Option 1 Retain our existing approach whereby there is a presumption against the loss of any social and community use. This approach has proved successful in retaining the Borough's stock of social capital. This lacks flexibility and can discourage otherwise suitable schemes coming forward.</p> <p>Option 2 Generally protect social and community uses, but allow their loss where we are satisfied that the loss brings forward another valued use. Such a use might include RBKC community housing This approach will protect the social and other valued uses. This may assist the delivery of community uses from unnecessary loss yet allow for flexibility and will ensure that otherwise excellent</p>	Support for all three options is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>proposals can come forward.</p> <p>Option 3</p> <p>Generally protect social and community uses, but allow their loss where we are satisfied that the loss will not result in a deficit in the provision of that use.</p> <p>The need for various social and community uses differs over time. Allowing the loss of a use no longer needed would free up that use for others.</p> <p>This may result in the loss of the stock of premises suitable for social and community uses.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree <p>Option 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree 	Support for Option 1 and objections to Options 2 and 3 is noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Option 1	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1: Strongly support: Retain sequential approach in Policy CK1.</p> <p>Option 2: Opposed: Sequential approach in Policy CK1 provides a more coherent sequence.</p> <p>Option 3: Opposed: Too much is discretionary and open to argument from developers</p>	Support for Option 1 and objections to Options 2 and 3 is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	No comment.	Noted.
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q 10.3 Support Option 2	Support for Option 2 is noted.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support Option 1.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 1.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	All.	Support for all three options is noted.
Robert Dixon	I do not have sufficient knowledge to comment.	Noted.
NHS North West London CCG (Kate Brady)	We generally support the approach to protect social and community uses. However, when considering the redevelopment or disposal of surplus NHS sites we consider that the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow the loss of a facility, or part disposal of a site, where declared surplus to requirements in accordance with service transformation and estate strategies. The redevelopment of NHS sites and the introduction of housing and other uses provides vital investment to re-invest in new and improved health facilities which are fit for purpose. This flexibility would accord with clauses F and G of London Plan Policy S1.	Comment is noted. The approach mentioned is similar to Option 3 and thus support for Option 3 is noted. The Council recognises the provisions of London Plan Policy S1. This forms part of the Borough's development plan.
Alex Mackay	Options 2 and 3. The new Plan should be able to meet needs in 5-10 years.	Support for Options 2 and 3 is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	No comment	Noted.
DP9 on behalf of WELCOME TRUST (Zoe Smythe)	Wellcome Trust supports Option 3 which allows for a loss of community and social uses where the Council are satisfied that the loss will not result in a deficit in the provision of that use. This will allow future development to come forward which could respond to a need or clear gap in the market.	Support for Option 3 is noted.
Environment Agency (Hannah Malyon)	No comments	Noted.
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.
WSP on behalf of Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust (Emily Taylor)	<p>Section 10 of the Issues and Options Consultation Document deals with social and community uses. Issue 2 is concerned with the protection of social and community uses, presenting options including: the existing approach of a presumption against the loss of any social and community use; amendment to policy allowing for instances whereby the loss is associated with re-provision or the bringing forward of another valued use; and amendment to policy for instances where loss would not result in a deficit of provision.</p> <p>Policy S1 of the London Plan provides support for the reconfiguration of services where the loss is part of a wider public service transformation and supports the release of land to fund</p>	<p>Comment is noted. Support for Option 2 and 3 is noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises the provisions of London Plan Policy S1. This forms part of the Borough's development plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	such processes (Part F(g) of the policy). Given the London Plan is now part of the Development Plan, the New Local Plan Review should allow for further flexibility within its policies for social and community uses to reflect this context. The Trust support the addition of flexible wording shown in Options 2 and 3 and suggest that further nuance is given that reflects the strategic approach to healthcare provision as support by Policy S1 of the London Plan to specifically reference public sector transformation plans or Policy S1 of the London Plan, to show conformity with this strategic document.	

Q.10.4. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Victoria Road Area Residents Association & Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	See answer to Q	Noted.
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Protect existing class use especially as relates to permitted development rights within Conservation Areas eroding their status. Class use should have been protected at the Kenway Road SW5 police office to prevent it from being converted into a warehouse for delivery services.	Comment noted. The Council does recognise that changes of use within the E class are not a form of development which can require planning permission.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Given the demand for private sector housing in Chelsea any social or community assets which come on the market will be converted	Comment noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	into luxury flats. The Council's policy should be more than a presumption against such loss but an absolute preclusion of it.	
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	No.	Noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	No	Noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Such use was not protected for the POLICE OFFICE in Kenway Road SW5 which was allowed permitted change of use to commercial retail and warehousing delivery services.	Comment noted.
Linda Wade	Given the high property values there is a danger that we lose community assets. Housing Association stock being sold off and the proceeds not reinvested in the borough resulting in a loss of housing stock. Buildings classified as being of Community Value or assets becoming too expensive to save by the community. The new class use has left few protections even in Conservation Areas.	Comment noted. The freedom offered by the PDR is noted.
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	There is a need to include in the policy the necessary provisions to protect low-value social and community uses from high-value uses, such as market housing. We are concerned, for instance, that the current definition of social and community uses does not cover facilities such as the Sheppard Trust. Kensington and Chelsea has one of the highest densities of population and the highest house prices/rents, and, left to the market, all non-residential uses, and particularly social and community uses, would rapidly be converted to high-value	Comment noted. Current sequential approach outlined in Policy CK1 does protect the social and community uses against the loss regardless the value of use.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>housing. The Council's policy, including the sequential approach used to make decisions, is absolutely essential to maintaining such uses as the community needs.</p> <p>Very few of the social and community uses are within Use Class E – and the few that are (e.g. GPs, dentists, health centres (E(e)), and creches, day nursery, day centre (E(f)), have been exempted from PDRs to housing. However, there is still a need to protect further these uses.</p>	
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	No.	Noted.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	No further comment.	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Build new social/community spaces into proposal developments.	Comment noted.
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	No.	Noted.
Robert Dixon	No.	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	No comment	Noted.
Labour Group of Councillors	Adequate space for primary care, eg medical centres with clinics for specific conditions. There is simply no space for the work some	Comment and suggestions are noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
(Emma Dent Coad)	<p>of our GPs need to carry out.</p> <p>Community space that is available and not always booked months in advance. Many funerals take place in the Stowe Centre on Harrow Road because there is nowhere big enough in Kensington and Chelsea. We need more flexible community space that is affordable to local people.</p>	
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.

Issue 3: The need for new social and community uses

Q.10.5. Do you support the option proposed?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	Option 1 Require developments to make a planning contribution towards creation of new social and community infrastructure based on the IDP and, where appropriate, a local needs assessment. The needs of a development will depend on its scale and its nature. These may be best assessed having regard to both the existing needs of those who live in the vicinity as well as the additional needs created by the occupying the new development. Needs will be identified at a borough-wide level, with the level of contribution calculated strategically. For larger strategic sites/ allocations the need for social and community uses should be identified within the appropriate allocation. Planning contributions will be sought for smaller developments.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Yes	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	No comment	Noted.
Lots Village, Chelsea Association of Residents and Businesses (Rosemary Baker)	We support Option 1 regarding the need for new assets but developers should not be allowed to provide inadequate Centres e.g. the Lots Road Power Station developers are only offering windowless basement space for this purpose! NB Lots Village has been without a Community Centre since the demolition of Ashburnham School to provide a site for the Chelsea Academy over 10 years ago.	Support for Option 1 is noted. Comment regarding adequate provision is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Greg Hammond	I support for large developments, but not for small ones as this would be a disincentive to development.	Support for Option 1 (if being implemented only for large developments) is noted.
The Theatre Trust (Ross Anthony)	We are supportive of this approach, but urge that it is made clear that the policy is also applicable to cultural facilities as referenced within Issue 1 of this section.	Support for Option 1 is noted. The Policy would apply to all social and community uses that will be included in the definition apart from the ones that benefit from PDR.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	No, it's another tax on developers.	Objection to Option 1 is noted.
Sport England (Mark Furnish)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q. 10.3 - National Policy only allows the loss of a sports facility if there is a surplus of that sport facility provision, it is being replaced by a facility of at least equivalent quantity, quantity and in a suitable location or the proposal is for another sports facility, the benefits of which outweigh the harm of the loss. Sport England Policy elaborates on National Policy but does generally have the same stance. As a result, Sport England considers that the Local Plan should support this approach which should be refined by the actions and recommendations of the emerging Sports Pitches Strategy and any robust and up-to-date Indoor/Built Sport Facility Strategy. 	Request to support Sport England approach in line with the National Policy in regards to the loss of sport facilities is noted. The Policy will be informed and refined by the actions and recommendations of the emerging Sports Pitches Strategy and any robust and up-to-date Indoor/Built Sport Facility Strategy.
Port of London Authority (Michael Atkins)	Support the option to require developments to make a planning contribution towards creation of new social and community infrastructure based on an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and where appropriate, a local needs assessment. The PLA requests to be consulted on the updated IDP at the appropriate time.	<p>Support for Option 1 is noted.</p> <p>The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published alongside the Draft Local Plan.</p>
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	Option 1 Require developments to make a planning contribution towards creation of new social and community infrastructure based on the	Support for Option 1 is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>IDP and, where appropriate, a local needs assessment. The needs of a development will depend on its scale and its nature. These may be best assessed having regard to both the existing needs of those who live in the vicinity as well as the additional needs created by the occupying the new development. Needs will be identified at a borough-wide level, with the level of contribution calculated strategically. For larger strategic sites/ allocations the need for social and community uses should be identified within the appropriate allocation. Planning contributions will be sought for smaller developments.</p>	
Linda Wade	<p>Option 1 It is understood that S106 should be delivered within the ward of the works. CIL is presumed to be applied borough wide. There needs to be consultation on what local priorities are and whether they can be incorporated such as with the Earl's Court development the upgrading of St Cuthbert and St Matthias school, the creation of a connecting point between St Cuthbert's Church and the new development, so that it can actively respond to the development and not merely be a decorative placemaker. These integrator buildings will be essential for the creation of the new neighbourhood and community building. A Day Centre for older residents in the centre of the borough to support good physical and mental health and wellbeing. The development of a facility such as New Horizons, Cadogan Street in the centre of the borough.</p>	<p>Comment is noted. A proportion of CIL is apportioned as Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL). This is a percentage (15%) of CIL received from development in an area and is to be spent on local priorities identified by local communities and agreed by Ward Members. The community priorities have been identified through borough wide consultation with ward residents. Suggested priorities were initially developed from the document entitled 'Our Council Plan' which was published on 28 March 2019 (the Council Plan) and the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 (R123) list. The full list of ward priorities can be found in RBKC Community Infrastructure Levy: Neighbourhood CIL - Community Priorities Report published in June 2020.</p>
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	Yes	Support for Option 1 is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>Option 1. We agree in principle with seeking contributions toward social infrastructure. However, we have not seen much that has been delivered by this approach (and CIL has not delivered to areas of the borough most in need). It is important that the money be ring-fenced for community use.</p>	<p>Support for Option 1 is noted. Neighbourhood CIL is a proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy and is to be used on local priorities and spent in consultation with the local community. There is greater flexibility on the range of items NCIL can fund, it is administered on ward basis through a bidding process with Ward Councillors deciding which bids are awarded funding. The NCIL approach was agreed through a Key Decision in July 2020. Funds that have not been allocated to projects by ward Councillors roll forward to the next bidding round. Further detail of the NCIL process is available in the Community Priorities Document at www.rbkc.gov.uk/ncil</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	<p>TfL CD supports the intention of Option 1 for developments to make appropriate and proportionate planning contributions towards social infrastructure. Funds received by the Community Infrastructure Levy should also be used to provide social and community infrastructure.</p> <p>The emerging masterplan framework for Earls Court will need to optimise the development of the site in order to achieve the site's development potential and deliver social and community infrastructure. A co-ordinated approach to delivering social and community infrastructure across the site on land within both RBKC and LBHF is required. Viability considerations will need to be balanced in order to provide the full range of benefits including affordable housing, improved infrastructure and new employment space within a deliverable scheme.</p>	<p>Support for Option 1 is noted. The comment regarding the Earl's Court Development and the contributions the scheme would make to the social and community uses is noted. The Council agrees that a co-ordinated approach between two Councils is required to achieve the best outcomes.</p>
ESSA (Barry Munday)	Q10.5 . Support this option	Support for Option 1 is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	I support the option.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
375 Portobello Road Residents' Compact (Ms Jones)	We have run out of time to address these aspects of the Local Plan. More time would be appreciated.	Noted.
David Lloyd-Davis	Option 1. How can this be administered transparently?	<p>S106 Planning contributions are required from qualifying development under existing local plan policy C1 and the adopted Planning Contributions SPD. This sets out the standard obligations and charges that will be frequently sought. The s106 planning obligations must meet legislative tests. Some developments may require a specific form of mitigation to be acceptable in planning terms and mitigate all site-specific impacts; and these are determined on a case by case basis. There may also be cases where infrastructure provision necessary to make a development acceptable cannot be delivered on site, in which case the Council will expect off-site contributions, whether as alternative provision or a commuted sum. Developers are required to provide the agreed contributions through legal agreements.</p> <p>Neighbourhood CIL is a proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy and is to be used on local priorities and spent in consultation with the local community. There is greater flexibility on the range of items NCIL can fund, it is administered on ward basis through a bidding process with Ward Councillors deciding which bids are awarded funding. The NCIL approach was agreed through a Key Decision in July 2020. Funds that have not been allocated to projects by ward Councillors roll forward to the next bidding round.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		Further detail of the NCIL process is available in the Community Priorities Document at www.rbkc.gov.uk/ncil
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	Yes.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
Robert Dixon	Yes.	Support for Option 1 is noted.
NHS North West London CCG (Kate Brady)	<p>We welcome the reference in paragraph 10.12 to the preparation of an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will set out the type of infrastructure required to support development in the Borough.</p> <p>We support the option for developments to make a planning contribution towards new and improved social and community infrastructure, including healthcare infrastructure based on requirements in the IDP and NHS estate strategies. Larger strategic sites offer the opportunity for new in-kind facilities, but new provision needs to be carefully planned and designed to avoid the under-utilisation of space, and to ensure that a new facility is affordable. We support the use of financial contributions from smaller sites.</p>	Support noted. The Council has initiated dialogue with NHS Clinical Commissioning Group and is awaiting information to update the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	<p>ECDC supports the intention of Option 1 for developments to make planning contributions towards social infrastructure.</p> <p>However, any contributions should pass the tests set out in paragraph (2) of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). Furthermore, funds received by the Community Infrastructure Levy should also be utilised to provide social and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Support for Option 1 is noted.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the CIL regulations.</p> <p>The Council is aware that any CIL contributions must not hinder the delivery of a proposal.</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
	<p>The emerging masterplan framework for Earls Court will need to optimise the development of the Site to achieve the Site’s development potential and consider a co-ordinated approach to delivering social infrastructure across the Site and land within both RBKC and LBHF, whilst also balancing viability to provide the full range of benefits from affordable housing, improved infrastructure and new homes and employment space. Therefore, ECDC consider it is vitally important that any planning contributions for Earls Court should be balanced against viability considerations to ensure the proposals are deliverable.</p>	
<p>Labour Group of Councillors (Emma Dent Coad)</p>	<p>There seems to be zero accountability for developers who omit the agreed contributions – in buildings or financial – towards social infrastructure.</p> <p>The implementation of NCIL contributions around the borough is chaotic. How is it promoted? In Golborne ward applications came in for singing classes! There were no applications that were compliant – zero. A terrific waste of money and a wasted opportunity.</p>	<p>S106 Planning contributions are required from qualifying development under existing local plan policy C1 and the adopted Planning Contributions SPD. This sets out the standard obligations and charges that will be frequently sought. The s106 planning obligations must meet legislative tests. Some developments may require a specific form of mitigation to be acceptable in planning terms and mitigate all site specific impacts; and these are determined on a case by case basis. There may also be cases where infrastructure provision necessary to make a development acceptable cannot be delivered on site, in which case the Council will expect off-site contributions, whether as alternative provision or a commuted sum. Developers are required to provide the agreed contributions through legal agreements.</p> <p>Neighbourhood CIL is a proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy and is to be used on local priorities and spent in consultation with the local community. There is greater flexibility on the range of items NCIL can fund, it is administered on ward basis through a</p>

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
		bidding process with Ward Councillors deciding which bids are awarded funding. The NCIL approach was agreed through a Key Decision in July 2020. Funds that have not been allocated to projects by ward Councillors roll forward to the next bidding round. Further detail of the NCIL process is available in the Community Priorities Document at www.rbkc.gov.uk/ncil
Environment Agency (Hannah Malyon)	No comments	Noted.
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.

Q.10.6. Do you have any other options to suggest?

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
The EARL'S COURT SOCIETY (SPALDING)	More health, mobility, and well-being community premises for elderly, disabled, chair-bound and isolated single-person and single-parent households (50% of RBKC) Creches and nurseries with outdoor play space are needed to support the younger generation and to enable young parents to train and take up paid work.	Comment is noted.
Chelsea Society (Paul Lever)	Where a Social Centre has been lost to a local community as a result of a site being demolished, for example to make way for a new school as was the case in Lots Village, the Council (owning over 450 properties in RBKC) should give priority to replacing such a loss, rather than leaving it to a developer years later to offer nothing more than windowless basement space.	Suggestion for the Council to take a more pro-active approach regarding the provision of social and community uses is noted.
Ladbroke Association (Sophia Lambert)	No.	Noted.
Grove and Company (Roger Grove)	No	Noted.
RBKC Earl's Court Ward (Malcolm SPALDING)	More health, mobility, and well-being services in Community premises for elderly, disabled, chair-bound and isolated single-person households (50% of RBKC)	Comment is noted.
RBKC Councillor (Hamish Adourian)	More health, mobility, and well-being services in community premises for elderly, disabled, chair-bound and isolated single-person households.	Comment is noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	<p>We welcome the proposed review – we would like to be engaged in this analysis, assessing need and identifying opportunities for improving access to local social infrastructure and the identification of sites.</p> <p>Strategies for social infrastructure should be integrated with efforts to deliver accessible/walkable/sustainable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Some infrastructure, such as primary health facilities need to have a strategy for their location in ten years’ time, some perhaps sooner, and, if possible, to identify locations.</p> <p>Some facilities may need to be delivered within major developments, such as in Opportunity Areas (Kensal Canalside and Earl’s Court). Leaving them to be delivered, such as has happened for the Warwick Road sites, has not proved effective. The argument that the housing is not sold to families is not acceptable. As time passes these units may become family homes (we hope) and the infrastructure for family living will not be there. We need to plan for long-term use of the homes and not just investment opportunities. Playspace should be required of the developer’s expressed target group. The council needs to apply its policy on this much more strictly so as to take account of future needs.</p>	<p>Welcome of review noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the provision of social infrastructure will form part of long term strategies for providers. The council is working with the providers to establish their needs.</p> <p>The OAs will be expected to provide a number of associated facilities. These will be set out in the relevant allocation.</p>
TfL (Brendan Hodges)	No.	Noted.
Worlds End Studios Ltd. (Ian Wiesner)	No further comments.	Noted.

Respondent Name	Comments	Council response
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mike Priaulx)	No.	Noted.
Robert Dixon	No.	Noted.
Quod on behalf of Earls Court Development Company (Steffan Rees)	No comment	Noted.
Savills on behalf of Thames Water (Nicola Forster)	N/A	Noted.