9. Rail infrastructure

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This section relates to the Local Plan policies regarding improvements in railway infrastructure. The primary focus of this is on Crossrail and Crossrail 2.

9.1.2 This section does not include consideration of other transport modes, as covered by Policy CT1, which has only recently been reviewed by the Council (adopted 2014).

9.1.3 The purpose of this section is for the Council to consider those issues which relate to the provision of new and improved railway infrastructure and to ask how these issues may be effectively addressed.

9.2 Existing Local Plan policy

9.2.1 The existing Local Plan policy relating to new and enhanced rail infrastructure is set out below:

**Policy CT2 New and enhanced rail infrastructure**

The Council will require improved access to existing and planned new rail infrastructure in the borough.

To deliver this the Council will:
a. require developments at the allocated Kensal gas works site to establish a Crossrail Station, subject to approval by Crossrail Limited;

b. promote the creation of a new station on the West London line at North Pole Road;

c. protect the safeguarded route and associated land for Crossrail and the Chelsea Hackney line, including for the latter a station at Sloane Square and near Chelsea Old Town Hall on the King’s Road;

d. promote a station further west, potentially at Imperial Wharf, as part of the Chelsea-Hackney line;

e. require new development to contribute to step-free access at West Brompton Station, measures to increase the capacity of the West London line and improvements to its interchange with the Underground network, particularly at Earl’s Court and, if feasible, as part of the redevelopment of the Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre.

9.2.2 The Local Plan states that the provision of new rail infrastructure in the Borough would greatly aid various key locations in the Borough. The Reasoned Justification of Policy CT2 notes that the south west of the Borough (aided by the Chelsea-Hackney Line (now Crossrail 2) and Imperial Wharf Overground), Kensal Canalside (aided by Crossrail) and the St Quintin area (aided by a West London Line Overground station) all stood to see significant improvements in transport accessibility. This is picked up in Policy CT2 itself.

9.2.3 CT2e concentrates on step-free access but looks specifically to West Brompton and potential links to Earl’s Court. Again, this currently stops short of providing a strategic lead on encouraging improvements to access throughout the Network.

9.2.4 Policy CT2 has been successful in providing the Council with a mandate to seek improvements in rail infrastructure. This much has not changed and in reality, much of the amendments to the policy are likely to reflect minor factual and contextual changes.

9.3 Legislation, policy and guidance context

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

9.3.1 With the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the NPPF\textsuperscript{171} sets out a need for the transport system to be “balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel” (paragraph 29) and goes on to note that “in preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport” (paragraph 30). This requires

\textsuperscript{171} NPPF, DCLG, March 2012
the Council to support the provision of new infrastructure to ensure reliance on cars and taxis is reduced. This is relevant to the Kensal Canalside Strategic Site and the aspirations for a Crossrail Station, as well as at King’s Road. The NPPF also makes clear that Councils “should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice” (paragraph 41).

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking

9.3.2 This NPPG suggests that transport evidence bases supporting Local Plans “should identify the opportunities for encouraging a shift to more sustainable transport usage, where reasonable to do so” (paragraph 001).

Crossrail Act 2008 Register of Undertakings and Assurances

9.3.3 Within the Register of Undertakings and Assurances, Crossrail have provided an Assurance (540) to the House with regard to a possible station at Kensal. This stated: “The Promoter acknowledges the aspiration of the Council for a station in the Ladbroke Grove area and does not intend that the Crossrail track layout proposals in the vicinity should preclude the future provision of station platforms. The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to provide a plain line section of track where a station could be constructed”. This assurance remains in place and the safeguarding must be protected within the plan.

Regional

The London Plan

9.3.4 Within the London Plan, the Mayor acknowledges that transport plays a fundamental role in addressing a range of priorities. This strategic approach to new transport links in the capital is crystallised in Policy 6.1b by “seeking to improve the capacity and accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling, particularly in areas of greatest demand”.

9.3.5 Policy 6.4B continues by stating that “The Mayor will work with strategic partners to improve the public transport system in London, including cross-London and orbital rail links to support future development and regeneration priority areas”. This is clearly of direct relevance to Crossrail at the Kensal Canalside Strategic Site (also an Opportunity Area) but Policy 6.4B(c) also references the development of Crossrail 2, which also remains a vitally important new connection for Chelsea.

Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS) 2010

9.3.6 The Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS) forms part of the Mayor’s strategic policy framework and has relevance to the Borough. In it, the Mayor notes the importance of Crossrail in delivering significant benefits to the economy and supporting the growth of opportunity areas. Regulation 10 of The Town and

172 Mayor’s Transport Strategy – Spotlight p.114, Mayor of London; 2010
Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) requires Local Plans to have regard to local transport authority policies\(^{173}\), such as the MTS.

**Neighbourhood**

**St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan**

9.3.7 The Neighbourhood Plan correctly identifies parts of the North Kensington as suffering from poor public transport accessibility. In paragraph 5.6.4, the Plan proposes that a new station on the Overground network be positioned near the underpass link to Imperial West. Policy StQW 5a of the Plan promotes this case and the Council supports this aspiration, being very close to the North Pole Road identified in Policy CT2.

9.3.8 Following publication of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, TfL confirmed that a station near North Pole Road or Westway Circus is not feasible and cannot come forward at present.

**Summary**

9.3.9 Figure 9.1 summarises the main legislation, policy and guidance of particular relevance to this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2012</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)(^ {174})</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
<td>National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking(^ {175})</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>Crossrail Act 2008 Register of Undertakings and Assurances(^ {176})</td>
<td>Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>The London Plan(^ {177}): Policy 6.1 Strategic approach</td>
<td>Mayor of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 6.2 Providing public transport and safeguarding land for transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 6.4 Enhancing London’s transport connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2014</td>
<td>Land for Industry and Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)(^ {178}): Chapter 13: Rail</td>
<td>Mayor of London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{173}\) Transport for London (TfL) is considered a ‘local transport authority” for the purposes of these regulations and the Transport Act 2000 as it is an “integrated Transport Authority”. Whilst TfL does not produce a Local Transport Plan, the Mayor has published the Mayor’s Transport Strategy


\(^{177}\) [www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan/further-alterations-to-the-london-plan](http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan/further-alterations-to-the-london-plan)

\(^{178}\) [www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/publications/land-for-industry-and-transport-spg](http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/publications/land-for-industry-and-transport-spg)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS)¹⁷⁹</td>
<td>Mayor of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
<td>St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan with Examiner’s Recommendations¹⁸⁰</td>
<td>St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.1: Summary of legislation, policy and guidance

9.4 Evidence base

Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs)

9.4.1 The Council is committed to improving public transport for those in the Borough who currently do not benefit from good public transport accessibility. In calculating these areas, Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) are used – see Figure 9.2.

9.4.2 PTALs are Transport for London (TfL)’s means of determining relative levels of transport accessibility across London. Broadly, the PTAL scores for the Borough are amongst the highest in London. However, in parts of the north and southwest of the Borough the score is very low.

9.4.3 Using the latest update (2011), Kensal is clearly shown to be between 4 and 0 with the majority falling at 3 or below. Likewise, the PTAL is less than good on many streets in the area around World’s End.

9.4.4 In these areas there is a much higher level of deprivation. For example, the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation lists the area around Kensal as being amongst 10% most deprived in the country and the area around World’s End as being in the 20% most deprived.

9.4.5 The Borough has conducted a number of research projects to look at the financial value of a station in Kensal Canalside. In 2015, Cushman and Wakefield examined the economic impact and uplift on Kensal and a 1km hinterland.

9.4.6 The results showed that the difference in Gross Development Value was nearly £2bn over and above what could be achieved without Crossrail\textsuperscript{181}.

9.4.7 That is not to say that the site cannot come forward without Crossrail, but it certainly could not come forward at the density which could be delivered with only bus based options.

\textsuperscript{181} Development Uplift and Infrastructure Study for Kensal Opportunity Area, Cushman and Wakefield, 2015
It is clear that significant interventions are required in order to deliver regeneration and vitality.

The Council continues to seek agreement from Crossrail Limited that a station should be sited in Kensal Portobello. Since 2010, the Council has developed a more sophisticated economic and operational argument demonstrating that a station is vital for unlocking regeneration and improving employment prospects in the wider area.

Having examined the impact of other options and having worked with TfL on the alternatives to Crossrail, it is evident that non-rail options simply cannot deliver the scale of development needed to help the Borough to address London’s housing shortage.

When the High Speed Rail 2 (HS2) route with a station at Old Oak Common in Hammersmith and Fulham was announced everything changed and the option for a turn-back station at Kensal vanished. Instead, the Council needed to consider how a skip-stop station could operate and be incorporated into designs.

A whole new district of London will be built at Old Oak Common, right on the Borough boundary but at present, the only direct connection for our residents will be via the Grand Union Canal towpath.

Kensal Portobello Crossrail station must now look west as well as east. The development at Wornington Green and allocations at Kensal Canalside and Latimer make this station essential for both new and existing communities within...
North Kensington.

9.4.14 The Council has petitioned Parliament against certain elements of the HS2 Bill which would have prevented the Kensal Portobello station, including an undertaking similar to the one given in the Crossrail Act. The committee’s report is expected in 2016.

Crossrail 2

![Crossrail 2 Map]

Figure 9.4: TfL’s proposed Crossrail 2 worksites, tunnels, platforms and station entrance

9.4.15 The proposals for Crossrail 2 (formerly known as the Chelsea Hackney Line) are significant in terms of being able to deliver a new rail station in the Borough.

9.4.16 Since 2010, the safeguarded route has changed to reflect the revised engineering for the route. This engineering has eliminated the provision of a station at Imperial Wharf as the curve in the tunnel from Clapham would be too acute and too costly to deliver.
9.4.17 This was subject to consultation in 2014 when three options were presented by TfL. A station near Cremorne, a station near Chelsea Fire Station and a ‘no station’ option.

9.4.18 Transport for London is currently consulting\(^{182}\) on the details of the station and worksite location and design. This closes in January 2016. The purpose of this consultation is to provide residents and businesses with the opportunity to understand and provide comments on exactly where the King’s Road Station, and in particular the entrance, would be positioned as well as the location of any ventilation shaft required. TfL plan a more detailed consultation in 2016/17 when more engineering information is known.

9.4.19 Crossrail 2 has the potential to bring around 5,000 homes within a 10 minute walk of a rail station for the first time. This has the added benefit of providing around an additional 800,000 new jobs within a 45 minute journey time. However, local people are concerned that a new station may change the character of Chelsea and the Council will strive to ensure that the character is preserved and enhanced.

**West Brompton Station / Earl’s Court**

9.4.20 The provision of step free access and improved capacity at West Brompton is being delivered via the section 106 agreement linked to the planning permission for Earl’s Court. However, delivery of this element is still some time off. As such, inclusion within the Local Plan is appropriate.

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>WebCAT Public Transport Accessibility Map(^{183})</td>
<td>Transport for London (TfL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2014</td>
<td>North Pole Depot and Kensal Gasworks Valuation Study(^{184})</td>
<td>DTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>Development Uplift and Infrastructure Study for Kensal Opportunity Area(^{185})</td>
<td>Cushman and Wakefield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9.5: Summary of principal sources of evidence*

9.5 **Issues and options**

9.5.1 The desire to get in, out of and around the capital as quickly, sustainably as possible is high on the Mayor’s agenda and the Council must respond accordingly.

9.5.2 Within this context, the Council has identified a number of key questions, or issues, to start to inform a future policy.

9.5.3 Each question will be considered in turn. The Council has identified a number of

\(^{182}\) [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/crossrail2/october2015/](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/crossrail2/october2015/)
\(^{184}\) [www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningpolicy)
\(^{185}\) [www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningpolicy)
possible answers, or options. These may not be exhaustive, and consultees are encouraged to identify others where appropriate. The possible options are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

**Issue 1: The Council needs to ensure that the Borough is not left behind as public transport links across London and the capital improve. What policies should the Council adopt to ensure that the future needs of our residents, businesses and visitors are met?**

**Option 1**
The Council should continue to encourage new and enhanced rail infrastructure, particularly in poorly connected areas.

9.5.4 In Chelsea, the case is somewhat more implicit. This is the early stages of development for a project initially conceived some 25 years ago. We can see from the impacts of Crossrail 1 already, that the economic benefits of a station are huge. As the Council has put on record, the location around Dovehouse Green is best suited for catering not only to Chelsea’s residents but crucially, its businesses. The unquestionable success of the east end of King’s Road brings thousands of people into the area. Putting a station right in the heart of the King’s Road will give visitors the option of going east or west. Helping to keep the western end of town centre a vibrant and vital place is essential. Without Crossrail 2, there is a palpable risk it begins a period of decline.

9.5.5 With reference to aspirations to an Overground Station at Westway Circus, the Council acknowledges TfL’s position but it is still of the opinion that an additional station would improve accessibility to such an extent it should not be dismissed so swiftly.

9.5.6 Furthermore, it is clear that with London’s growing population, the Mayor should be seeking opportunities to future-proof against overcrowding elsewhere on the network caused by the scale of developments at nearby White City.

9.5.7 In spite of TfL’s objections, the Council considers that in the life of the Local Plan, opportunities may arise that merit its inclusion and consideration as the best means of tackling accessibility in this part of the Borough.

**Option 2**
The Council should seek alternatives to rail-based improvements to address public transport deficiencies in the Borough.

9.5.8 The Council must acknowledge that rail-based improvements are not the only potential solution to improving accessibility.

9.5.9 TfL has been keen to impress on the Council the merit of bus based alternatives in the north of the Borough. However, it is questioned whether the quantum of development envisaged at Kensal CanalSide would be realistic by simply extending bus routes.

9.5.10 Cushman and Wakefield’s report evidences what can be achieved and what the market might expect to deliver with just a bus-based alternative and this suggests
that this approach is undesirable.

9.5.11 However, without a committed scheme the Borough must consider the impact of a brand new urban quarter served only by buses. This kind of development would be of a lesser scale, closer to 2,000 dwellings (or less if the single carriage access cannot be improved) and would require significant improvements to cycling and walking to make the journeys to/from the site to a rapid transit link more appealing.

9.5.12 Chelsea is already incredibly well served by buses. However, a journey along the King’s Road from World’s End to Sloane Square can take more than 20 minutes. TfL envisage that a station will take between 5 and 8 years to build and the line itself will not be open until 2030.

9.5.13 Without a station, much of residential Chelsea will continue as it currently does with people using buses and cars and bicycles but around 5,000 households will still be without access to rail-based transport and will, in all likelihood, remain that way for at least another 50 years.

Do you have any other comments, issues or options (reasonable alternatives) you would like to raise regarding this section?

**Issue 2: West Brompton station**

9.5.14 The Council recognises the importance of improving access to stations from street level. At present, only Earl’s Court is fully step free with step free access at Kensington Olympia only available via the road bridge outside the station.

9.5.15 The Core Strategy currently focuses on improving step free access and capacity increases to West Brompton station as part of the Earl’s Court redevelopment. All other step-free requirements are dealt with in Policy CT1

**Option 1**
The Council should retain this specific reference to West Brompton station within the policy.

9.5.16 Keeping this reference may seem repetitive but it does stand to make the need for the provision of step free access at West Brompton a key deliverable of the Earl’s Court proposals.

9.5.17 Issues of capacity increases also prove useful in highlighting the importance of the station in the long term as part of the Earl’s Court Strategic Site.

**Option 2**
The Council should seek step-free access at all its stations as per Policy CT1 and move references to West Brompton into the revised site allocation for Earl’s Court.

9.5.18 This approach would give more balance to the Council’s ambitions for step-free access. This is not to downplay the significance of West Brompton, more to highlight the need for TfL to work with the Borough to develop a strategy for all stations. Of course, engineering solutions and the availability of funding varies for
each station, and so a degree of prioritisation will always be necessary.

9.5.19 Furthermore, issues of increasing station capacity and indeed the provision of an elevator could be included in the Strategic Site Allocation for Earl's Court where it would be directly applicable.

Do you have any other comments, issues or options (reasonable alternatives) you would like to raise regarding this section?