

Local Plan Partial Review Issues and Options Consultation Summary



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

Section 2: Vision and strategic objectives

Issue 1: Vision and strategic objectives

Question 1

Is the existing Local Plan's vision (see section 2.2) appropriate in guiding the Local Plan Partial Review? If not, what changes should be made?

14 responses. Key points:

Suggested additions to the vision:

- Increase quantum of housing
- Prioritise residential use over others
- Avoid absentee owners
- 'Build on success' sounds too complacent with the existing environment
- Support and protect national and international cultural institutions
- Heritage of the future e.g. post-war buildings
- Stimulating regeneration in North Kensington whilst ensuring the settled community retains the right to remain in the area

Question 2

Are the existing Local Plan's objectives (see section 2.2) appropriate in guiding the Local Plan Partial Review? If not, what changes should be made?

20 responses. Key points:

- Need to meet housing targets
- Emphasise completions rather than just approvals
- "Keeping life local" sounds NIMBY
- "Renewing the legacy" sounds vague and ambiguous
- Support and protect cultural institutions
- Transparency and accountability in development, especially for publicly owned land
- Air quality
- Sustainable development encompasses economic, social and environmental (including historic environment) issues – need positive strategy for heritage
- "Improving travel choices to reduce car dependency" discriminates against car owners
- Promotion of river-based transport and river bus

Question 3

Is the existing Local Plan's Key Diagram (see Figure 2.1) appropriate for the Local Plan Partial Review? If not, what changes should be made?

15 responses. Key points:

- Add in Strategic Sites e.g. Pembroke Road / Warwick Road, Barlby / Treverton Estates, Silchester East and West
- Existing Key Diagram is trying to show too much on one map, too generic and too complicated
- Do not include Conservation Areas
- Include South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area
- Support for Kensal Gasworks as a regeneration area and broad location of development. Needs a special allocation in its own right on the Key
- Support for new Crossrail station at Kensal
- "Possible new centre" at Kensal Gasworks should be made more certain
- Extend Central Activities Zone (CAZ) westwards to cover Kensington High Street to the Design Museum
- Needs to be at a larger scale with a base map

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

6 responses. Key points:

- Mayor of London supports the vision, objectives and key diagram
- Need to recognise changes in national planning policy
- Need to increase housing target and supply
- Need to reduce retail and office supply as this attracts non-residents
- Too full of "corporate speak"
- Site-specific SPDs should be produced well in advance of any planning application determination

Issue 2: The duty to cooperate and neighbourhood planning

Question 1

Is the existing Local Plan's definition of strategic objectives and strategic policies (see above, section 2.2) fit-for-purpose for the duty to cooperate and neighbourhood planning? If not, what changes should be made?

4 responses. Key points:

- Current approach in Local Plan is workable in defining 'strategic' priorities but could use a different font colour or typeface
- Use NPPG advice on what is 'strategic'

Question 2

Should some policies be considered strategic in their entirety? If so, which ones?

4 responses. Key points:

- Housing
- Protection of social and community facilities: doctors' surgeries, dental surgeries, schools and needs of ageing population
- Protection of offices
- Policy supporting Crossrail 2 is strategic
- Policy CF7 Arts and Cultural Uses
- Policy CF11 South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area
- Policy CP1 Quanta of development
- Policy CF5 Location of Business Uses
- Policy CH1 Housing Targets
- Policy CH2 Housing Diversity
- Policy CE3 Waste
- Policy CE2 Flooding
- Policy CE1 Climate Change
- Policy CR5 Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways
- Policy CF7 Arts and Cultural Uses
- Policy CF8 Hotels
- Policy CF1 Location of New Shop Uses.
- Add a new strategic policy on the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' as required by the NPPF

Issue 3: Quanta of development

Question 1

Other than those topic areas set out above (which are dealt with separately in the corresponding sections of this consultation document), what other changes should be made to Policy CP1 'Quanta of development'?

11 responses. Key points:

- Existing Local Plan housing target of 585 dwellings per year needs increasing (to reflect the London Plan housing target of 733)
- Housing target should reflect qualitative measures e.g. affordable housing tenure and size
- Housing target should be referred to as a minima
- Should allow increased height of buildings for housing rather than allowing basements
- Objectively assessed need for all uses should be reviewed

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

2 responses. Key points:

- Policy CP1 should focus on the housing target
- Policy CP1 does not need to have retail and office quanta – this should be left to the market

Issue 4: Planning enforcement

Question 1

Are there any particular issues that a Local Enforcement Plan should address?

10 responses. Key points:

- Litter, dog excrement
- Cycling (e.g. through red lights, on pavements etc)
- Enforce within a specified number of days
- General support for a Local Enforcement Plan to enforce in a proactive way
- Monitor implementation of planning permissions
- Investigate alleged causes of unauthorised development
- Take action where it is appropriate to do so
- Ensure adherence to CTMPs
- Fines which dis-incentivise unauthorised development
- Tackle buy-to-leave
- Avoid temptation to justify enforcement through planning policy
- Enforcement should be proportionate to the issue concerned
- Should use other legislative controls before planning enforcement
- Strong support for the recent “increase in enforcement”