

# Local Plan Partial Review Issues and Options Consultation Schedule



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA

## Section 3: Places

**Issue 1:** The policy context for the Places chapters has changed since the Local Plan was originally adopted. The Council needs to consider whether to update the Local Plan to reflect the emphasis on the delivery of sustainable development and how this could be best achieved through continuing to focus on specific Places

**Question 1:** Should the Place chapters be retained or removed? Please give reasons.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	Specific changes to enhance each area should be considered, as these can be used to address existing bottlenecks(congested tube stations); existing shortages(GP practices; dental; etc);lack of schools in certain areas; lack of sports facilities/community centres; and so on.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained. They will seek to identify the unique characteristics of the many neighbourhoods and centres that make up the borough and the specific issues that these areas each face.
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	Retained, each "Place" has a special characteristic they are the equivalent to small towns or large villages in the countryside and retain an individuality that resents broad brush policies.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained. They will seek to identify the unique characteristics of the many neighbourhoods and centres that make up the borough and the specific issues that these areas each face.
Norland Society (Clive Wilson)	Places chapters should be maintained: the more specific the plan can be, the more useful. Need to ensure they assist in delivery of sustainable development in whatever form it might take, with a clearer indication of what might be acceptable.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
Sonia Richardson	Should be retained-a useful way at looking at the borough though the links between different areas must always be considered and strengthened	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
Port of London Authority (Helena Payne)	2) Places, Open Space, Waterways  It is noted from the consultation documentation that Kensington & Chelsea has a number of valued open spaces and waterways, and the PLA would seek to encourage the enhancement of the Borough's waterways for leisure and recreational use, where appropriate. The London Plan 2015 identifies waterways, such as those rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs, as linear open spaces, and as such considers the opportunities provided by water spaces as being important for sport, recreation and visual amenity, all of which contribute to health and wellbeing. As discussed above, the London Plan promotes the use of the waterways for leisure, passenger and tourist traffic and the transport of freight and	Agree – to address this the Council has settled on a format which sets a vision, principles and priorities for a places with a delivery section for how these will be achieved. Site allocations, which set out infrastructure needs, will sit within the

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>general goods. Given the importance of waterways to the Borough, it is considered important to continue to protect and enhance these spaces through appropriate policies.</p> <p>The suggestions made within the 'Places' submission stem from the emergence of national and government policy change. Place chapters within the Local Plan may, it is suggested within the consultation documentation, be more effective if they change from following a template based Borough-wide planning policy objective to identifying specific changes required to enhance each area and how these can be delivered. This could entail each place chapter focusing on identifying, for example: - infrastructure requirements – transport, social and community facilities. This may be an appropriate way of dealing with development affecting the Thames, or indeed, the safeguarded wharf. It is noted that there are reasons why having bespoke planning policies for individual places may not be appropriate, however there may be an exception, possibly for developments close to the river and the need to specifically consider the use of the river as an alternative means of transport. The PLA would like serious consideration given to this type of Policy, which would be in accordance with the provisions of the London Plan and NPPF.</p>	<p>place chapter to make clearer the site specific proposals and how that links and helps deliver the place visions.</p>
Roy Burns	Place chapters should be retained as they are important, for example for south Kensington, in defining the ways forward.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	<p>Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.</p>
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>The Place chapters - including chapter 12 - South Kensington - should be retained.</p> <p>This is because they contain a planning context for identifying the area's local distinctiveness and hence planning policy needs for the delivery of the vision for the area with overarching localised policies to be applied during the plan period set within the plan's wider strategic policy context.</p>	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	The Place chapters enable a strategic overview of planning for an area as whole and should be retained	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (Indigo Planning)	The Places and Allocations Chapters should be combined into a single chapter to avoid repetition and to ensure a more consolidated approach to policy provision for the site allocations.	Noted. The Place chapters will be consolidated to include the Strategic Site Allocations.
Natural History Museum (Kevin Rellis)	<p>It is our view that the Place chapters are useful in establishing the strategic framework for the development of a defined area. In the case of South Kensington, the area has a set of unique pressures and opportunities which are best reflected in a distinct chapter.</p> <p>The area is also subject to continual change and a number of major capital projects which should be reflected in local policy.</p>	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained and the issues for south Kensington have been addressed in

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		the South Kensington place.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	<p>The Local Plan will be simpler and easier to use if the Place and Site Allocations chapters are merged. They should be retained, with modifications.</p> <p>Beyond this, the chapters should emphasise to the reader (perhaps for every chapter) that detailed development management policies are set out in subsequent sections.</p>	The document needs to be read as a whole.
Christie's South Kensington (Francesca Filippini Pinto)	The Place chapters enable a strategic overview of planning for an area as whole and should be retained.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.
Christian Durie	Definitely update. It was distressing having tried to prepare for one meeting to be told that ALL the papers we had were Out of Date.	The Place chapters will be updated with current information as part of the review.
Kerry Davis-Head	They need updating Lots Village is now a place	The Lots Road/World's End Place chapter refers to the recently designated Lots Village Conservation Area.
Austin Mackie Associates Limited (Private Clients)	There is no harm in a plan identifying spatial or other characteristics as part of the context for policy. However, existing Policy CP3 is about as vague as any policy could get !	Noted
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust (RBHT)	Retained and site allocations should be referenced but then addressed in more detail in a separate chapter.	After careful consideration of the responses received, the Council felt that the site allocations were very closely linked to (and in some cases vital in achieving) the vision within the places. Given this close relationship it makes sense to have the allocation within the same chapter
Ilchester Estates (Todd Buchanan)	Retained. As a historic landowner in the area with holdings on Kensington High Street Ilchester Estates are embarking on a strategy to create a vibrant local neighbourhood shopping parade on Kensington High Street between numbers 240 and 296. The existence of the chapter helps to raise the profile of Kensington High Street and the importance of neighbourhood shopping parades such as Holland Quarter.	Noted. The Place chapters will be retained. The 'Holland Quarter' is not a land use designation per se but rather a branding exercise. It is not appropriate to include in the place

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		chapter.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>The place chapters should be retained and improved by having a more concrete vision and strategy, with priorities and timescales, place-specific policies and a clear indication of what the Council will do.</p> <p>They need to be more demonstrably policy rich and, where possible, site specific rather than shaped solely by the application of non place-specific development management policies. This could improve the effectiveness of the plan.</p>	<p>Agree – to address this the Council has settled on a format which sets a vision, principles and priorities for a places with a delivery section for how these will be achieved. Site allocations will sit within the place chapter to make clearer the site specific proposals and how that links and helps deliver the place visions.</p>
Savills (Aimee Squires)	<p>In response to Question 1 we support the retention of the Places chapters, on the basis that the existing strategic policies provide guidance and support on the retention and promotion of the individual characteristics which make up each of the 'Places'. With specific regard to Earl's Court, the existing strategic policies and supporting paragraphs correctly seek to encourage new residential-led mixed use development along Warwick Road.</p>	<p>Noted. The Place chapters will be retained.</p>
Cllr E Dent Coad	<p>Retain. While planning should be considered borough-wide, there are very different issues to be tackled where inequality in health, education, income and work opportunities continue to prevail and in some cases are worsening.</p>	<p>Noted. The place section allows for a spatial vision that can responds to the distinctive issues, strengths and challenges within each of the borough's identified neighbourhoods. The Place chapters will therefore be retained.</p>
Anne Swift	<p>The chapter has been It has been useful as a stark reminder that a lot has been promised but very little has been done to help antique dealers.</p> <p>See Chapter 7.1.6 CV 7: Portobello Road has not been overrun by identikit multiples – but by tourist tat outlets! Particularly in the antique section</p>	<p>The importance of Portobello Road for the antiques trade is reflected in the updated Portobello Road vision. The Council can only exercise control and influence through powers set out in national legislation. The planning system does not allow us to exercise control where there is no change of use.</p>

**Question 2:** Do you consider the Places have proved effective in the delivery of their visions? What could be done to improve delivery?

Name	Comments	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>Not really.</p> <p>I have been a resident for over 20 years, and the quality of life has declined significantly in every area. The streets were far cleaner; far less congestion on public transport; far fewer food outlets; far fewer non-residents who have no lasting "stake" in the borough.</p> <p>I have had to change GP and dental as these closed because of rental costs. The parks are filled with detritus which is left all night as an attraction to the rodent population- why are the rubbish bins in the parks not emptied in the evenings??? The plaza of our town hall, is covered in rubbish in the warmer months(also left all night).</p>	<p>The Council has received overwhelming support for the retention of place chapters as they are a way to set a positive vision for the Borough's neighbourhoods to ensure that development bring benefits to residents, workers and visitors.</p>
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	<p>No.</p> <p>Resident Associations connected with 'Places' should play a bigger part in producing the 'vision' in the first place, rather than having to fight a rearguard operation once the vision has been introduced.</p>	<p>The first stage in the Local Plan Partial Review was an 'Issues and Options' consultation (Dec 2015 – Feb 2016). Workshops were held to discuss the vision and strategic objectives, 'places' and site allocations. Residents' and Tenants' Associations, local businesses, ward Councillors and other stakeholder groups were invited to take part and input into the review of these chapters and topics. This was in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out its policy on stakeholder engagement, and para 155 of the NPPF.</p>
Sonia Richardson	<p>Lots Road-Chapter 18-we are beset by major developments-the Lots Road Power Station, Thames Tideway, Chelsea Creek, possible new Extra Care Housing ob Lots Road Roundabout. How are we as local residents going to live our lives while all this is going on? How will the Council support us?</p>	<p>The impact to residential amenity is a key consideration when considering planning application. Every effort is made to mitigate any potential impact. There may be some short term disruption due to construction works but development will bring long term benefits to the area and residents.</p>
Roy Burns	<p>Delivery can be improved through closer liaison with the relevant Resident Associations and through the Council and Councillors calling Public Meetings.</p>	<p>The Council organised a number of public meetings during the Issues and Options Consultation and will do so again when the draft policies are</p>

Name	Comments	Council's Response
		published. Details of these are published on the Council's bulletin. Sign up for more details.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.
Jo Poole	No. The designs being built are very much of a modish style which will date quickly and do nothing to promote or retain the fine grain of the borough's existing streetscapes. It takes no account of pre-existing conditions. The designs must strive for genuine quality and longevity rather than to look good in a sales prospectuses.	The Local Plan has a specific policy in Chapter 34 that relate to design quality and context and character (CL1 and CL2). These require high quality design (CL2). Policy CL1 Context and Character.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	It would be helpful for these Place chapters to specifically outline how what is set out interacts with the development management policies (i.e. where and how does that fact that a development site is in a Place mean that a different planning policy position should be applied). Without this clarification the role of the Place chapters will confuse. As things stand they seem to have an unclear status.	We have tried to address this point by structuring the places into two categories one of which is termed 'areas of change' where large development sites will mean significant changes. The site allocations have been put into the relevant places chapters to make the relations between the place visions and site allocations clearer.
Christian Durie	Need an explanation of the difference between a 'site' and a 'place'. (Is this all really for normal people who read and write English?)	Specific 'site' allocations sit within wider 'places'. Sections 4.5 and 4.6 of Chapter 4 Spatial Strategy define the terms 'site' and 'place' and how they are used subsequently in the Local Plan.
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the

Name	Comments	Council's Response
		Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.
Cllr E Dent Coad	We must find ways to stop developers wriggling out of their commitments to infrastructure, affordable housing (which must be affordable, ie 30% of net income not 50%), and other local facilities such as health, education, transport and work opportunities.	The Council seeks to deliver these public benefits and ensure that the infrastructure needs arising out of new development are met.
Anne Swift	Yes, each section is different, but our communal vision must remain the same: to maintain diversity.	Support noted.

**Question 3:** Do you consider it appropriate to include site allocations within the Places? Would it be appropriate to have a single 'Places and Allocations' chapter?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	Yes.	Noted. The Place chapters will be consolidated to include the Strategic Site Allocations.
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	We think that SPDs are as good a way of dealing with 'sites' as any other way.	<p>National Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities should ensure that the policies in their Local Plan recognise the diverse types of housing needed in their area identifying specific sites for housing to meet their anticipated requirements.</p> <p>Local Plans should <i>allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate</i> (para 157 NPPF).</p> <p>Supplementary planning documents should be prepared only where</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		<p>necessary and in line with paragraph 153 of the NPPF.</p> <p>They should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan.</p>
Sonia Richardson	not sure	Noted. Further detail needed as to why this approach is not favoured.
John Eagle	The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment. I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed	Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>Site allocations should be identified within the Places chapters as this identifies areas of potential major change.</p> <p>There should be separate chapters for each Places and not a single Places and Allocation Chapter</p>	Noted. The Place chapters will include the Strategic Site Allocations that are relevant to each Place.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	It is useful to have site allocations included within Places to enable a strategic overview of planning issues and aspirations within one location.	Noted. The Place chapters will include the Strategic Site Allocations that are relevant to each Place.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	Please see comment above.	
Christie's South Kensington (Francesca Filippini Pinto)	It is useful to have site allocations included within Places to enable a strategic overview of planning issues and aspirations within one location.	Noted. The Place chapters will include the Strategic Site Allocations that are relevant to each Place.
Kerry Davis-Head	No. Separate them	Noted. Further detail needed as to why this approach is not favoured.
Austin Mackie Associates Limited (Private Clients)	Yes, many site allocations are an inherent element of the place-making / delivery strategy for an area.	Noted. The Place chapters will include the Strategic Site Allocations that are relevant to each Place.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust (RBHT)	No, see response to question 1 above.	See response above.
Barton Willmore (Paul Newton)	Issue 1 – Question 3 (Places & Allocations) 8. We consider that the Places and Allocations Chapters should be combined into a single 'Places and Allocations' Chapter.  9. This will provide a more appropriate basis for specific site allocations to be understood in the context of the relevant 'Place'. It will also avoid unnecessary duplication as evidenced in the Consolidated Local Plan (CLP), as well as in the detailed references to the Opportunity Area / Site and wider aspirations in proposed Chapter 3 (and particularly the proposed Crossrail Station) compared with the relatively limited detail in Chapter 4 (Site Allocations).	Noted. The Place chapters will include the Strategic Site Allocations that are relevant to each Place.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	Question 3: No	
Savills (Aimee Squires)	In response to Question 3, we consider it would be appropriate to include site allocations within the 'Places' chapter, but that this should be done on a Place by Place basis rather than as a single chapter. This would provide better guidance towards the development of specific sites for specific uses within each Place, which would then contribute towards the strategic aims for that 'Place' as well as towards the Council's strategic land use and growth objectives.  In terms of further comments, issues or options, paragraph 10.3.12 states 'there are significant new housing projects at 100 West Cromwell Road alongside Tesco.' We support that the site is an appropriate place for significant new housing projects, however, these projects have not yet been brought forward.	Agree- this is the approach we are taking. The sites at Warwick Road are allocations.

**Question 4:** The current site policies have been framed in a very generalised way. Do you think they should be clearer about what they are seeking to achieve and how this will be delivered?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	Absolutely.	Noted
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	Identifying sites with specific 'vision' seems a reasonable way to meet current needs. As long as each site has a review every 2 years to see if the 'vision' needs to change to reflect changing circumstances.	The Council is committed to reviews where changes in circumstances dictate that this is necessary.
Norland Society (Clive Wilson)	See Q 1 above	
Sonia Richardson	Yes, looking back at what was written a few years ago	Agree – to address this the Council has settled on a format which sets a vision, principles and priorities for a

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		places with a delivery section for how these will be achieved. Site allocations will sit within the place chapter to make clearer the site specific proposals and how that links and helps deliver the place visions.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	We will try to address this issue but for the draft policy consultation but there are certain legal requirements that the Council must adhere to.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>Policies should be generalised setting out the key priorities for the Place.</p> <p>However there should be cross references to other relevant, detailed policies of the local plan of particular issue/relevance to the respective Local Plan Place chapter.</p>	This is difficult to achieve in a local plan. The council often produces site specific SPDs to achieve this where large sites are likely to come forward for development.
Jo Poole	YES. They should be as clear as possible and give the maximum amount of information about all sites and policies so that the borough can really engage with its residents. These policies should promote dialogue rather than hinder it.	We are committed to engaging with residents throughout all stages of the local plan process.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	Please see comment above.	See response above.
Kerry Davis-Head	Needs clarification	Noted
Austin Mackie Associates Limited (Private Clients)	Yes, policies such as CP3 and CP4 are extremely vague. However, unnecessarily restrictive policy should be avoided.	Noted.
Ilchester Estates (Todd Buchanan)	Yes. The Estate would like map to highlight the existence of Holland Quarter between 240 and 296, Kensington High Street.	See comment above.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	Question 4: Yes	Noted
Anne Swift	Yes – to create stronger links with landlords in the antiques section, i.e. include them in the distribution of the market newsletter	Noted.

**Question 5:** Are there other aspects of Place shaping, which can be delivered through land use planning, that should be included?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	The Council should pressure TFL;NHS; Public sector entities that have unused or scarcely used land in the Borough to give this up to the council for development of housing; Schools; community centres; etc.	Where sites are available the Council is promoting development to housing. For example, the Chelsea Farmers' Market site is an NHS site that has been allocated for development.
Sonia Richardson	Effects on quality of life of developments-traffic, noise, air pollution, access-I am thinking fall these aspects in relation to Lots Road developments	These issues are addressed through a number of specific policies within the plan.
John Eagle	The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.  I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed	We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	Proposed transportation improvements that might be proposed by providers of rail and road infrastructure during the plan period.	New rail infrastructure is already addressed in policy CT2.
Christian Durie	Place shaping?	Place shaping is a term generally used to describe a collaborative process of improving how areas function. It has been defined as 'the creative use of powers and influence to promote the general wellbeing of a community and its citizens'.
Kerry Davis-Head	All future plans should be included. Even at the last consultation session we were "encouraged" to think a certain area could be a walk way, but have since discovered there are plans to massively develop the space. This would have been known and could have been put on the provided map	Information comes forward through the policy process as developers recommend sites for development for instance. The draft policies will provide the most up to date picture to all stakeholders to comment on.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	Question 5: • Improvements to the public realm,	Many of these elements are already picked up in the place maps. Once

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• managing the mix of uses going further than Policies such as CF5</li> <li>• identifying the elements of the place which provide critical mass and identity</li> </ul>	the draft place chapters are published I encourage you respond if you feel we have missed any important information in particular places.
Cllr E Dent Coad	See above. Creating a 'place' entails providing for all the daily needs of residents within reasonable walking distance as well as providing for all ages and physical abilities.	I agree.
Anne Swift	<p>Better signage to the Portobello market from Notting Hill to the underground station via Kensington Park Road.</p> <p>The double tier pedestrian footway from the Notting Hill underground station on the west side of Pembridge Road is lethal on Saturdays.</p>	<p>Better signage is a priority for the Notting Hill Gate / Portobello place.</p> <p>The issue of pedestrian access at NHG is an issue that is addressed in the NHG supplementary planning document</p>

**Question 6:** Should there be bespoke detailed development management policies for a particular Place? Can you explain how this might be helpful?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>High street Kensington station needs such a plan.</p> <p>TFL is content to do nothing until some disaster occurs, and then there will be much wringing of hands; demands for an enquiry etc while there is an obvious , and glaring safety problem that is evident to anyone using the station. The mini-mall that houses the station is also filled with eateries that have kitchens; ovens; flames; electrical outlets etc- are these fire inspected? I see no fire extinguishers etc in this mini mall; pedestrian traffic is immense all the time in/out; there is even a massive flower stand that has been allowed to block most of one passageway, and a stand selling cupcakes in the station hall reducing the available space for passenger to safely enter/exit the station hall.</p> <p>Are the managers aiming for a single file in/out flow of users by these constant encroachments on the available space?</p>	These are issues that should be addressed to the owners of the mall, the flower stall has closed.
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	<p>Yes:</p> <p>If more educational accommodation is required for a 'Place' this policy should be explained for that 'Place' to prevent the educational site becoming over-run with non educational development. And it should be reviewed every 2 years to upgrade the vision to reflect changing circumstances.</p>	<p>The need for new school places is, to some degree, dependent upon what new development comes forward.</p> <p>The educational requirements are for potential new development is addressed in the site allocations for big sites.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Norland Society (Clive Wilson)	Yes, should be part of Neighbourhood Plans	The Council is supportive of Neighbourhood Planning and will work with groups wishing to progress a Neighbourhood Plan and provide planning policies for their area
Sonia Richardson	Yes, interns of negative impact of local residents and people using the area	Development brings long term benefits as well as short terms disruption. The place chapters seek to set a positive framework to maximise public benefits for new and existing residents and workers.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	No - detailed development policies should be given in land use specific chapters and policies in the Local Plan.	Noted. Detailed development management policies are proposed to remain in the land use specific chapters in the Local Plan (Chapters 30-36)
Jo Poole	The default position should be to preserve what is already extant. The council's keenness on the scorched earth school of regeneration does not serve the borough or its longstanding residents well, playing into the pockets of the developers and foreign markets that we do not benefit from.	The Council policy position on social and community use (which includes educational uses) is to protect what we already have. Individual cases are balanced against this starting position.
Cheyne Walk Trust (David Waddell)	<p>Sec 3 Places Q 6</p> <p>As stated in response to Q1. Vision, the CWT considers that Chelsea Riverside should be considered as a 'Place' in its own right in order to bring appropriate focus to fostering and protecting its unique heritage and amenity qualities. These are well described in the River Thames Conservation Area Statement which is not referred to anywhere in this Local Plan Partial Review. We wish to see this clearly referenced in order</p>	Agree with the need to reference evidence base documents such as the conservation area proposal statements and the new draft policies will add a reference section. We

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	to assist compliance and to protect this key area of the borough.	currently have two places in Chelsea riverside Lots Road/ worlds End and Kings Road. Please respond to the next consultation if you feel this does not adequately reflect residents' views on the 'places'.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	This would be helpful in instances where it may be more appropriate to set out a more nuanced approach, at Kensal Gasworks for instance. It will be important though to ensure such nuances are acknowledged in both Place and development management policies, so there is no confusion.	Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area is an important part of the Kensal place chapter and this chapter also includes the site allocation.
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	Comment not specifically related to Place chapters. It is noted that the Local Plan is a large document. It was separated into topic areas in order to be to more easily navigable for those wishing to comment.
Austin Mackie Associates Limited (Private Clients)	Only where the evidence base and wider development plan strategy justifies.	Noted.
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust (RBHT)	Yes. Kings Road as a locality and its immediate environ also include significant nationally and internationally important social and community uses and in particular hospitals and other medical research related facilities which should be supported in their retention, consolidation, expansion and/or enhancement.	The Council is allocating the Chelsea Farmers' market site for development with a specific policy. The King's Road is a recognised place. The draft place chapter for King's Road sets a vision, principles and priorities.
Gerald Eve obo CEL - Cadogan Estates Ltd (Neil Henderson)	In respect of the King's Road/Sloane Square area, it is not considered that there are any specific issues pertinent to this area that cannot be appropriately dealt with by the more general policies contained with the Plan. Therefore, it is not considered that detailed development management policies are necessary for the King's Road/Sloane Square area specifically.	Noted.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	Question 6: Yes	Noted.
Cllr E Dent Coad	Taking local need as a starting point, and not as an 'add-on' to the brief which the developer will then treat as a hindrance and work to avoid.	The local plan is predicated on a strategy to meet identified needs, particularly in relation to housing

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		need within the land available and where viability allows.
Anne Swift	1. RBKC lobby to change use class order to help antique dealers 2. Reduced business rates for arcade owners who rent out units in their arcade only to antique dealers	The Council has lobbied to change the use classes order but the ultimate decision is for national government to make. Business rates are not a planning matter.

**Question 7:** Are there instances where a more flexible or creative approach to the delivery of sustainable development could or should be taken within the Place chapters?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
John Eagle	The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.  I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed	We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.
Jo Poole	All development should be as sustainable as possible, in all ways. This includes the demolition of well built existing structure as well as ecological, financial and ethical sustainability.	Agreed.
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	Noted. Printed copies are available to view at local libraries during the consultation period.
Cllr E Dent Coad	As above, it depends on local need. In Brompton and Hans Town there are fewer requirements for health facilities – in one area health deprivation is 0%. Whereas in other areas, eg parts of Golborne and Dalgarno, Henry Dickens estate, health deprivation can be as high as 60% or worse. These are not 'anomalies' they relate to residents with appalling life chances and life expectancy as low as 64 years. We must do better and view 'sustainable development' as a way of improving the lives of existing residents.	We are working with the Primary Care Trust to understand the health needs in the area. When we have determined what the health infrastructure requirements are we will seek to address any shortfalls where they are identified.

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

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>While the Council has finally, and successfully tackled the question of Earls Court through a wonderful development plan that will de-grot this area, the next step is clearly to do the same at Olympia. The "exhibitions" using this facility could easily be moved to the Excell or other. Olympia should be re-developed to provide much needed housing in the Borough.</p> <p>Nowhere does the proposed plan mention Olympia. Please do not wait another 20 years to do something.</p>	<p>The owners of the Kensington Olympia have not indicated that they wish to redevelop the site. A development plan for that area would therefore be premature. Olympia is not in the Royal Borough.</p>
Sonia Richardson	<p>We need Crossrail in Chelsea. Lots Road residents need to be assured that their lives will not be made a misery as a result of a conjunction of major building works which are imminent and that damage to our quality of life and properties will be compensated for as necessary</p>	<p>The Council is lobbying hard to deliver a Crossrail station to meet the needs of residents in areas such as Lots Road.</p>
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	<p>We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.</p>
Constant Touch Network (Piers Thompson)	<p>My first observation is that this consultation period, just over two months, taking in Christmas, has been a very short time to digest the two crucial documents and to formulate a response. I am a resident within the Silchester Red Line of Regeneration, and have forced myself to take the time to do so, but matters of such strategic importance should not come down to a battle between the planners and the potentially dispossessed. For instance, I know that many residents of the St Quentins Estate have grave reservations about sustained redevelopment immediately to their south (you could tell by the number who came to meet the architects at Latymer Christian Centre). This has simply been too short a period, with a minimum of marketing and communication on the Council's part, for ordinary people with jobs, kids and messy lives, to respond. To the layman, the language of the Partial Review, and particularly of the Response mechanism, is bewildering gobbledygook and seems aimed at the planning professional or the property developer.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council have already embarked on a separate consultation about the specifics of the Silchester Plan. 1) Since the Local Plan has yet to be adopted, and individual projects are supposed to dovetail with the Plan, this seems a bit previous. 2) For most people, this is totally confusing.</p> <p>As someone who has lived in Silchester for over 10 years, and has been resident of RBKC all my 56 years, I take issue with the vision for Latimer, that it 'will have been rebuilt to a new street pattern...' I do not understand why the Council is so keen to take a wrecking ball to a tight knit community of well built housing where everyone knows their neighbour. Part of this seems to be connected with a very subjective view of architecture that looks down on 60s modernism and the whole concept of council estates. The negative picture painted of our neighbourhood in the Plan is not one that my neighbours or I would recognise. The possibility of refurbishing the current buildings does not seem to have been considered. That may have something to do with the staggering incompetence of the KCTMO (on the few occasions I have had to deal with</p>	<p>This is length of consultation was two weeks longer than the standard timeframe to take account of the fact that the consultation went over Christmas. It was an additional consultation round which is over and above the requirements of the local plan process. There will be a further two rounds of consultation as well as an examination in public in which to express views and influence the Latimer chapter of this plan.</p> <p>You will see that the allocation for the particular housing estates within the draft policies leaves open the possibility of few homes being built and no final decision on which option (maintain, refurbish, in fill development or comprehensive</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>them).</p> <p>[The TMO has spent the last four weeks landscaping Bramley House next door to me, starting up with jackhammers at 8am each morning. Not only did they not inform me of this work, but neither have they responded to an official complaint].</p>	<p>redevelopment) has been taken at this point. Refurbishing is one option being assessed and considered by the Council.</p>
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	No further comment	Noted.
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	<p>On the Portobello Road 'Place' it was clear from the discussion group held that there was strong support for the Council supporting the provision of improved connections for pedestrians between Portobello Road, Westbourne Grove, All Saints Road and Golborne Road and Ladbroke Grove. This will significantly benefit residents, workers and visitors alike.</p>	<p>Agreed – this is set out as a priority within the draft place chapter.</p>
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	<p>These are available at public libraries during the consultation period.</p>
Deloitte (Imperial College London)	<p>Section 3 "Places"</p> <p>Chapter 12 South Kensington  South Kensington covers part of Imperial's South Kensington campus and the College is a key stakeholder in the area. Imperial supports the Council's intention to take forward its vision for South Kensington in 2028 in Policy CV12 for 'a wide range of world class institutions connecting the science and art of the past, present and future.' As one of the world-renowned institutions in the area, Imperial has a special role to play in achieving to this vision.  Positive progress has recently been made in the area including the implementation of the Exhibition Road public realm improvement scheme. Figure 3.8: South Kensington as shown in the existing Local Plan also identifies improvements to Imperial College Road 'as a pedestrian and cycling route that links with the cycle route in Hyde Park.'</p> <p>Imperial supports the retention of the policy aim for South Kensington in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 16 Notting Hill Gate  Imperial acknowledges that there is an adopted SPD for Notting Hill Gate. Imperial supports the proposals to improve the pedestrian environment at Notting Hill Gate.</p> <p>Chapter 17 Fulham Road  Imperial supports the aims to improve linkages across Fulham Road to the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital. However, the Local Plan should explicitly recognise the important role and service that the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital and Imperial Campus provide to the Fulham Road area. The Fulham Road Places Chapter should be amended to say that the Council supports the consolidation and expansion of health uses in the area, especially hospital uses, given the location of an important institution as the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital and Imperial campus.</p>	<p>The draft South Kensington place chapter vision recognises the importance of the institutions present there such as Imperial College.</p> <p>Support for NHG SPD noted.</p> <p>Fulham Road place has not been brought forward in the draft policies. It was an area where very little new development was expected and it was not of a scale or importance to be considered an area of national or international importance. This is not to say the retail function or health uses are not important but these are protected by more general policies within the local plan.</p>
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	The Society strongly supports the retention of the Places chapters in the Local Plan	Support for places noted.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
)	<p>Without the section on Places the Local Plan risks being nothing more than a very broad vision that refers to the Borough as a whole and a set of development management policies which largely lack a spatial dimension since they apply across the Borough and a few allocated sites. The Places provide the spatial and the placemaking dimension to the Local Plan – without it we would not have got much further than the UDP. The challenge is to make the content meaningful, be treated as policy and provide a clear framework for the application of the development management policies. There needs to be more place-specific policy in the place chapters – in the boxes not just the reasoned justification/text.</p> <p>Since 2010 there have indeed been many changes to the planning system. The NPPF totally lacks any spatial dimension, indeed, the Government has made clear that how and where development takes place is a matter for Local Plans. All of the onus on producing a vision and strategy for the spatial development of the Borough is the responsibility of the Borough. Indeed the NPPF does not acknowledge the existence of towns and cities, the most appropriate patterns of development – it sees all of this as the substance of Local Plans and local choice. Even the London Plan does not really deal with places, other than the CAZ, town centres and specific spatial designations. The Local Plan needs to provide a vision, strategy and policies for places.</p> <p>The Society therefore agrees that the Places chapters need to improve their effectiveness at delivering the vision of the Local Plan, as well as specifying what development would be acceptable and how this links with the wider area. We agree with the prospectus, but are not sure that this is used effectively or whether this does feature in the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>We agree with making a closer connection between site allocations and Places. The Places chapter need to be made more policy rich and give them more weight within the plan because they are linked directly to delivery of the vision. The Council's proposal in para 3.1.8 seems a sensible way forward – we need to experiment in terms of what would best relate policy to delivery.</p>	<p>We have set a new format for the place chapters to improve the place making spatial elements of the chapters. I look forward to seeing your comments on whether it has addressed these points.</p> <p>The places and site allocations have been amalgamated.</p>
Greater London Authority Development (Stewart Murray)	<p>Places and Site Allocations</p> <p>The Mayor agrees with the borough that there is merit in combining the places and site allocations chapters into one to ensure the Local Plan review takes a co-ordinated approach, in line with the spirit of integrated spatial planning. How an area evolves will be influenced by the number and nature of site allocations within an area as well as incremental change. This element of the document will need to contribute to the borough's evidence of how it will meet and seek to exceed its minimum housing supply target set out in policy 3.3 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed - the places and site allocations have been amalgamated.</p>
Earl's Court Partnership Ltd (ECPL)	<p>An overall statement to all questions under Issue 1 should be prepared. It would be useful to have a clear vision for each place to guide appropriate development. Could be combined, or at least reference, allocations in the document.</p>	<p>Agreed – a vision is essential to guiding development. The allocations will</p>
Anne Swift	<p>Diversity is the key to the success of the Portobello Market!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
The Chelsea Society (Michael Stephen)	<p>PLACES</p> <p>The character of the river frontage and the immediate hinterland must be preserved, and access to the river improved. The views of the river and from the river should be preserved and enhanced.</p> <p>The Society considers that the River should be a "Place" in its own right, in order to bring appropriate focus to fostering and protecting its unique</p>	<p>Agreed – this is reflected in the vision for riverside places such as Lots Road / World's End.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>heritage and amenity qualities. These are well described in the River Thames Conservation Area Statement which is not referred to in the Local Plan Partial Review. The whole of Chelsea Riverside from the LBHF boundary to the Westminster boundary should be designated as a "Place" and should be treated as a single area of consideration under CR5 Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways and be given more than incidental consideration. We wish to see this clearly referenced in order to assist enforcement and to protect this key area of Chelsea.</p> <p>The character of Chelsea is largely derived from its buildings and open spaces. No buildings should be permitted to rise above 6 storeys, and high quality design should be insisted upon.</p>	<p>The Council carefully considered this option. The conclusion was that areas such as Lots Road/ World's End and King's Road / Sloane Square were sufficiently different with different issues / challenges to warrant their own individual treatment. Please respond to the next round of consultation if you disagree.</p>

**Issue 2:** To improve delivery and to ensure genuine spatial planning, how might the current Places chapters be amended to reflect these aims?

**Question 1:** Are there some existing Place chapters that should be removed or amalgamated? Can you give reasons for amalgamation, giving a geographical area, or if to be removed, can you give your reasons?

[Kensal, Golborne Trellick, Portobello / Notting Hill, Westway, Latimer, Earl's Court' Kensington High Street, South Kensington, Brompton Cross, Knightsbridge, King's Road / Sloane Square, Notting Hill Gate, Fulham Road, Lots Road / World's End]

Name	Comments	Council's Response
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	<p>Amalgamate South Kensington and Brompton Cross: because they are so close, what happens in one should happen in the other.</p> <p>Get rid of Fulham Road as a "place" as it is too long to have an individual identity.</p>	<p>Agree – both these points have been taken forward.</p>
Roy Burns	<p>Brompton Cross should be subsumed into South Kensington. There is an urgent need for the commercial area of Gloucester Road, i.e. around the Underground Station and including the Holiday Inn hotel, to be designated a distinct Place.</p>	<p>Agree that Brompton cross / south Kensington could be amalgamated this has been taken forward in the draft policy.</p>
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	<p>We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.</p>
Cheyne Walk Trust (David Waddell)	<p>Issue 2 Question 1 Places</p> <p>Lots Road/World's End is treated as the triangle bounded by the ECOWS, the River Thames and the inter borough boundary. This serves to isolate it from the remainder of Chelsea Riverside and thus constrain coherent and constructive debate about the integration and relationship of this "place" to the other parts of Chelsea Riverside, in particular the adjacent zone of the Thames Chelsea Bank.</p>	<p>Agree that this is a risk. To address this we have sought widen the scope of the place to address what is going on in Hammersmith and Fulham and further east along King's Road and to</p>

Name	Comments	Council's Response
		show this on the updated place map.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>Chapter 5: Kensal:</p> <p>There is a case for treating 'Kensal Canalside' (the Gasworks site) as a place in its own right and one which looks westwards to Old Oak - in terms of connectivity and future development. Given that planning for the Gasworks site is moving very slowly, with little advance since 2010, including this area in the same RBKC 'place' as Kensal Road/Trellick (where development is happening apace) is unhelpful.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Westway</p> <p>Some rethinking is needed here – Westway Development Trust's proposals have not been agreed with the community.</p> <p>The current approach of treating the 23 acres managed by the Westway Trust as a single 'place' in its own right needs some rethinking. Coupled with the preparation of the Westway SPD (in which the Trust was allowed to play a major part) this 2010 Core Strategy demarcation of a east/west 'place' that runs across the borough has had some unhelpful consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it has encouraged the Westway Trust to focus on what it sees as 'our land' in a relatively isolationist fashion. Coupled with what many surrounding communities see as an over-commercial approach to the management and development of land held 'in trust' for local people this has led to a near breakdown in relationships with sections of the surrounding community in 2015.</li> <li>• The Westway 'place' boundary divides areas such as the Silchester East and West and other parts of the 'Latimer' place from the area to the immediate north (Latimer Road and the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood, now likely to become effectively a 15th 'place' in the Local Plan assuming success at referendum.</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 9: Latimer:</p> <p>Thought needs to given the boundaries of the current Latimer and Westway places (and to the name given to the former, which causes confusion amongst residents and businesses as it does not include the Latimer Road part of the Freston/Latimer Employment Zone).</p> <p>Chapter 13: Brompton Cross</p> <p>Delete</p>	<p>Kensal Canalside is a very significant part of the Kensal place chapter. Planning the site is progressing as the DIF and Transport studies demonstrate. Trellick/ Edenham site is now situated in the Golbourne place.</p> <p>The Westway is no longer its own place treated in isolation and is now considered on the basis of how Westway land within each identified place contributes to that place's vision.</p> <p>The Latimer place chapter includes reference to the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Area and the Latimer / Freston Road Employment Zone.</p> <p>Agreed- this had been done for the draft policies.</p>
Kerry Davis-Head	<p>Separation of Lots Road from Worlds End. Amalgamation of Worlds End with Kings Road</p> <p>Comments relate to the chapter currently called Lots Road/Worlds End (chapter 18)</p> <p>Lots Road needs renaming as Lots Village and the chapter needs splitting to make Worlds End a separate item as attempts to open up and integrate both areas have failed, IE the big lottery has focused just on Worlds End and suggestions to replace the barrier walls with railings rejected. The items relating to Worlds End should be combined with Kings Road instead.</p>	Disagree – World's End is a largely residential estate much like Lots Road and is different in nature from the commercial character of King's Road.
Deloitte (Imperial College London)	Imperial Response: Imperial does not consider that the South Kensington area should be removed or amalgamated. The South Kensington area	Agreed- The South Kensington place

Name	Comments	Council's Response
	is rightly recognised as an international destination where the Council's vision is to enhance its reputation; therefore its position in the Local Plan should be protected.	is retained in the newest draft policies.
South Kensington & Queen's Gate Residents Association (Caryl Harris)	<p>Green Spaces</p> <p>Some time ago the Science Museum put forward plans to convert the small green section on the corners of Museum Lane and Exhibition Road, to site yet another café/kiosk which all the residents associations strongly opposed. Fortunately after local pressure was exerted the Museum withdrew the application. The Council's protection of this and indeed all green spaces for the public use is of paramount importance. We are delighted that good use of the NHM lower lawn areas and Wild Life Garden is now seen as invaluable space for the Natural History Museum visitors and residents alike, and can be seen in their new renovation plans for the museum. Obviously some institutions are taking notice of the residents concerns about loss of garden squares and green areas.</p> <p>South Kensington Station - link to Brompton Cross</p> <p>Turning to the area around South Kensington Tube Station we have already expressed our views concerning the overcrowding, not assisted by the revised traffic flow around the station. Nor do we feel that Pelham Street requires any more retail on the southern side of this beautiful, classic London Street and nor indeed a pedestrianisation. This narrow street needs to be a single one-way street in a southerly direction to Brompton Cross. There is ample room especially for buses, in Sidney Place to accommodate traffic heading north as the contra flow to this simple plan – suggested many times to the Town Hall.</p> <p>The Station is now progressing well in its redevelopment, despite several over ambitious and ugly suggestions to this historic destination. And we are encouraged by the consultation currently underway with TfL to develop a station design that is both appropriate, step-free and sympathetically designed, maintaining and adding to the historic values of this iconic site. We are fortunate to have some very well informed other local residents association chairmen, like Sophie Andrea who has enormous experience in preserving and enhancing listed buildings. We would also include the Museum link/tunnel within this development, as this too is under full consideration and discussion.</p> <p>In conclusion, we consider that revisions to the Plan should include a greater emphasis on the protection of local residential amenities and the historic beauty of this area. And although we appreciate the need to cater for the 40 million visitors that arrive at South Kensington Station, it should not be to the detriment of those that live and work around this beautiful heritage area.</p>	<p>Striking a balance between the needs of residents and visitors in South Kensington is a key aspect of the place vision.</p> <p>Agree – this has been brought forward in the draft policy.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Gerald Eve obo CEL - Cadogan Estates Ltd (Neil Henderson)	In respect of the King's Road/Sloane Square, it is considered that this should remain a Place Chapter in its own right and should not be amalgamated with other areas. It remains a unique location which requires its own vision to define it. Amalgamating this area with other areas would confuse this objective.	Agreed – King's Road/ Sloane Square has not be amalgamated with other areas.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>The main points from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having a chapter devoted to the Kensington High Street is absolutely essential, because it brings together and provides a bridge between the high-level vision and priorities of the Local Plan and the policies for the main subject areas. It essential in order that local people can understand the implications of the Local Plan for their community.</li> </ul> <p>Question 1: Place chapters to be removed</p> <p>Brompton Cross – Delete: This is not so much a place but a branding exercise or marketing tool – it is an in-between Place with little substance or</p>	<p>Agreed – High Street Kensington has been retained.</p> <p>Brompton Cross has been subsumed</p>

Name	Comments	Council's Response
	<p>presence. Unlike other higher-order centres, no one regards this as the focus of their community. It is a short stretch of Fulham Road with shops but no sense of place, nor any opportunity for expansion or change. It is solely a marketing tool with very little to do with place making, guiding development or requiring any place-specific policies.</p> <p>Earl's Court: Reduce the size of this Place: As the Warwick Road sites are built out and the public realm improvement completed, the area north of West Cromwell Road could be deleted from this area – there will be no new activity or development and will not any real sense of identity as it will be an area of little interest or connection with the wider area.</p>	<p>in the South Kensington Chapter.</p> <p>Not all the Warwick road sites have been built out and others are likely to come forward such as the Warwick Road Estate and 100a West Cromwell Road. For that reason we have included these sites in the Earl's Court place.</p>
Cllr E Dent Coad	While planning should be considered as a joined-up process, we do not have an issue with Places being considered separately.	Noted.
Anne Swift	See above	See response above.

**Question 2:** Are there other areas in the Borough that should be considered? Please give reasons for your choice together with an indication of the geographical area to which you are referring.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>Holland Park area needs a tube station which is in Zone 1.</p> <p>It is ridiculous that TFL continues to penalise Holland Park residents, while extending Zone 1 Eastwards.</p>	This is an issue to raise with TfL.
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	Add The Boltons as a place going north from Fulham Road up to Old Brompton Road and west as far as Redcliffe Gardens and east as far as Drayton Gardens. Or include it with South Kensington.	There are no hard boundaries for the places. However, they are organised by two themes – areas where development is likely, and areas of particular national and international reputation. The Boltons does not easily fit into either category.
Norland Society (Clive Wilson)	Why not place chapters for each Conservation Area?	Conservation areas boundaries are drawn in relation to historic factors such as architectural style or development history. This approach would not allow for other equally important issues such as business

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		uses, town centres, possible future development sites, the cultural and social understanding of areas to be considered. The factors that lead people to define an area as a particular place are varied and a focus on one particular factor to the exclusion of all others is too reductionist an approach.
Roy Burns	See above re Gloucester Road.	See response above
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.
Jo Poole	<p>The Boltons, Holland Park and other areas of incredibly low housing density.</p> <p>A neighbourhood centre on Kensington Gore to serve Albertopolis.</p>	There are no hard boundaries for the places. However, they are organised by two themes – areas where development is likely, and areas of particular national and international reputation. The Boltons does not easily fit into either category.
Cheyne Walk Trust (David Waddell)	<p>Issue 2 Question 2 Places</p> <p>The whole of Chelsea Riverside from the LBHF boundary to the WCC boundary should be designated as a "Place"</p>	The Council carefully considered this option. The conclusion was that areas such as Lots Road/ World's End and King's Road / Sloane Square were sufficiently different with different issues / challenges to warrant their own individual treatment. Please respond to the next round of consultation if you disagree.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>Question 2: Additional places:</p> <p>Chelsea Medical Quarter: This is a new concept – soon to be the subject of an SPD fostering its development as a world-class medical facility</p>	The Council has explored the possibility of producing a

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	embracing the Royal Brompton, Royal Marsden and institute for Cancer Research, etc. This needs planning, coordination and official recognition. See Potential New Site Allocations: Royal Brompton/Chelsea – need to change the name.	supplementary planning document to bring forward a vision for the Royal Brompton sites.

**Issue 3:** Progress with delivery of the Place chapters

**Question 1:** Do you have any comments that you wish to make at this stage regarding details in individual Places?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Kensington Society (Michael Bach )	<p>Kensington High Street</p> <p>The chapter needs to have place-specific policies included in the policy box, not just mentioned in the reasoned justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not just a shopping centre, but a town centre and focus for the Community: The existing chapter presented the High Street almost entirely as a shopping destination competing with other high-order centres rather than as a town centre containing not only shops, but major offices, leisure and tourism facilities, but, just as important as all of these, it was focus for the whole community because of public and community services, such as the town hall, library, post office, pharmacies, banks and local employment opportunities. The vision needs revising to reflect this.</li> <li>• The chapter should give clear policy guidance on the future of key facilities, such as the post office - the post office moved from a Royal Mail building next the Odeon and new premises leased for 10/15 years from 2012 – the High Street will need to keep a post office. We should be planning now for the replacement of this key social and community use.</li> <li>• There is insufficient wayfinding material and interpretation material – signs, plaques and literature – to inform visitors and residents about the range of attractions and activities in the High Street</li> <li>• Step-free access to High Street Underground is a very high priority</li> <li>• Clearing the clutter – a further round of reducing the number of telephone kiosks, including those attached to advertisement panels, and removal of the derelict Infopoint.</li> <li>• Cycling – although strongly supportive of cycling, we would be opposed to a Mayoral Cycle Superhighway and any further Mayoral Cycle Stations in the High Street – if this were proposed.</li> <li>• Strong concern about impact of allowing change of use, especially: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- changes of shops to coffee shops, cafes and restaurants that might happen as a result of Design Museum</li> <li>- changes of shops to estate agents, such as in Kensington Church Street</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Council's approach is to have an overarching policy which ensures that development meets the visions, priorities and principles set out in the places chapters. This approach reduces the repetition in the current plan between the vision and the CP place policies whilst providing a policy hook to ensure development management colleagues to be able to use the contents of the vision as a framework to negotiate with developers.</p> <p>The vision for High Street Kensington has been altered to reflect its role as a cultural destination and well as a centre serving residents' needs.</p> <p>Improved wayfinding and reducing clutter are priorities within chapter.</p> <p>Cycling – noted this is TfL and GLA initiative.</p> <p>Change of use – the policy protecting the retail uses within designated centre</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>The Council should consider removing these freedoms to change use using Article 4 Directions to stop excessive concentrations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to review secondary frontages to see whether some could be reclassified as primary frontages – in the west to include Waitrose and shops on north side west of Holland Green and in the east between 1 and 35 Kensington High Street</li> <li>• More attention needs to be given to enhancing the spaces in and around the High Street including in front of the Odeon, the Design Museum, the former Vestry Hall (now Bank Melli), the spaces off Kensington Church Walk, in front of St Mary Abbots and within the future Lancer Square scheme</li> <li>• Need for places for people to sit and enjoy just being in the High Street. More benches are needed on the north side of the High Street between Kensington Church Street and Holland Park, perhaps a couple for each block. This would greatly improve the High Street as a place where older people can stop and rest.</li> <li>• Better management of the street, especially east of Kensington Court Passage to get rid of A-frames and other footway obstructions and tackle unauthorised shopfronts and secure compliance with disabled access.</li> <li>• Greater promotion of the High Street and its history</li> <li>• Retaining Heythrop College as a tertiary education use plus student accommodation</li> </ul>	<p>remains in Policy CF3. Consideration of article 4 directions is a separate process outside of the LPPR.</p> <p>Frontages – this has been taken forward as part of the LPPR.</p> <p>Many of these areas have been highlighted as priorities within the place. The delivery section raises the prospect of neighbourhood CIL as a funding source.</p> <p>This is picked up within the principle of reducing street clutter.</p> <p>Agree - Promoting KHS is dealt with in delivery section of the chapter.</p> <p>Heythrop – the Council has produced an SPD for the site to guide development. Tertiary education would be acceptable at the site in policy terms but the eventual use will depend to some degree on the intentions of the eventual owner of the site.</p>
Ann Kutek	<p>Ref: Earl's Court.</p> <p>Following the demise of Earl's Court exhibition as an economic powerhouse and a destination of international repute for over 100 years, the considerations that should feature uppermost in the plan are these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feasible economic activity</li> <li>- Quality of life for residents and visitors</li> <li>- Maintenance of heritage links</li> <li>- Acceptance of life style revolution</li> <li>- Allowance for error, delay and perhaps learning</li> </ul> <p>The temptation and the current reality is to centrally manage the regeneration through masterplanning. This involves parachuting in ideas, technologies and people from elsewhere. This approach is currently land/architecturally-based. The fault line lies with the level of actual integration with existing assets, be they activities, people or infrastructure. See the "errors" committed by LB Lambeth in the 1970s in</p>	<p>The vision, principles and priorities for Earl's Court draft chapter address the key themes you outline. In particular, managing change after the exhibition centre and ensuring the quality of life for residents. I look forward to your comments on the draft policies.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>regenerating swathes of Stockwell and Angell Town. Forty years on, the social and economic fall-out has been unfortunate for all concerned.</p> <p>Earl's Court is largely a traffic island with some of the most polluted air in the country and dangerously over permitted levels. One of the virtues of the Earl's Court exhibition's acreage was that there was no through traffic and attendances by public transport mitigated pollution. The current plan, giving priority to cars will spread movements and pollution over a wider area.</p> <p>Since priority is also being given to a massive expansion of residential units over the two boroughs with a time line of up to 20 years, it is difficult to conceive of an economic activity, other than building, let alone continuity for a world brand in this area. The likeliest solution will be the importation of international corporates who are most able to shoulder the economic risk and whose tax affairs are usually arranged beyond these shores. Earl's Court as a destination is dead; unless, that is, 19th century thought and management processes alter.</p> <p>We already know that planning and enforcement roles are being outpaced and neutralised by the plethora of consultancies employed by powerful stakeholders, this also undermines any possible effects of consultation on the ground. This puts the quality of life in Earl's Court and environs in the balance.</p>	
TfL (Lee Campbell)	<p>Places: South Kensington</p> <p>Place chapters are included in the adopted Local Plan (2015) and TfL supports the retention of this approach in the draft plan. It is essential that planning policy takes into account the local context and supports the distinctive characteristics of an individual area.</p> <p>TfL considers that the South Kensington Place chapter should be retained and not removed or amalgamated. South Kensington is a unique and important part of London and requires careful consideration to manage the conflicting users and interests, whilst still delivering growth.</p> <p>South Kensington Station is central to the Place area and TfL is an important stakeholder. TfL supports the vision for South Kensington outlined in Policy CV 12 and considers that area based development management policies should be encouraged to help deliver this vision. TfL however requests that the vision is updated to reflect the need to deliver growth and support development opportunities in South Kensington without undermining the distinctive quality of the area.</p> <p>TfL notes the 'progress to date' for the South Kensington Place area. In particular, TfL notes paragraph 3.3.34 regarding works to South Kensington Station, which is copied below for reference.</p> <p>"3.3.34 Proposals to upgrade the station including: new escalators to the Piccadilly Line; reopening the disused eastbound District and Circle Line platform; and provision of step free access are being progressed by Transport for London. Planning applications are likely to be submitted in 2016."</p> <p>TfL confirms that this statement is accurate. It should however be noted that the works to South Kensington Station will be delivered in separate phases. TfL plans to deliver capacity improvements to the station from 2017, the first phase of which will be subject to a listed building application</p>	Agreed – South Kensington Station will be retained.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>to be submitted in 2016.</p> <p>TfL is undertaking a detailed feasibility study for development around the station. Further details are contained below in TfL's response to the 'call for sites'. This development opportunity is being developed in close consultation with the Council and with local stakeholders at regular Community Working Groups.</p> <p>TfL notes Figure 3.8 of the draft plan, which includes the adopted South Kensington proposal map. This map identifies the station at South Kensington as a 'potential development opportunity'. The supporting text (paragraph 12.4.3) in the Local Plan (2015) also states that: "South Kensington Station could have retail development at ground floor including along Pelham Street with office and or residential above."</p> <p>TfL supports the retention of an amended Figure 3.8 in the draft plan. First, TfL requests that the South Kensington Around Station Development (ASD) opportunity is identified in accordance with the enclosed red line plan and development aspirations submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites'. Second, it requests that the plan is clearer about the extent of the listed station. The area identified as a listed building should exclude the Bullnose, 20-32 Thurloe Street and the Pelham Street frontage.</p>	<p>The Council supports the redevelopment of the South Kensington site and is actively engaging with TfL on this matter. It is considered, due to the constrained nature of this site, that the best route for development is via pre-application discussion and a planning application rather than a site allocation.</p>
Bilfinger GVA (Thomas Edmunds)	<p>'Places'</p> <p>These representations focus on 'Notting Hill Gate Place' in respect of the Newcombe House site, but the comments are intended to be read in the round with regards to how emerging policy should be formulated to ensure flexibility, and to avoid a prescriptive approach to plan-making. We have previously made representations on the Conservation and Design chapters of the Local Plan, and the Notting Hill Gate SPD, both now adopted.</p> <p>With regards to the latter, the outcome of the Notting Hill Gate SPD was ultimately disappointing on the wider public realm improvements for this identified 'Place', and it is considered there is the opportunity to promote aspirational and exciting proposals that support the vision and objectives of this chapter.</p> <p>Turning to the Notting Hill Gate Place chapter and this consultation, we support the retention of this Place having its own dedicated chapter.</p> <p>Strategic Objective CO5 of the Consolidated Local Plan July 2015 is to 'renew the legacy' of the Borough, that is to "pass to the next generation a Borough that is better than today, of the highest quality and inclusive for all." Supporting this objective are a number of site specific visions, including that for Notting Hill Gate (CV16) which states that "all development will be of the most exceptional design and architectural quality, creating a 'wow factor' that excites and delights residents and visitors."</p> <p>The Local Plan sets out the Council's objective for the regeneration of the Notting Hill Gate area, with the supporting text stating at para.16.3.7 that the redevelopment of Notting Hill Gate presents the Council with the opportunity to correct the mistakes of the post-war period, and create a new distinctive identity of lasting value to future generations. The Council recognises that the redevelopment of Newcombe House, a designated eyesore, will act as a catalyst for such regeneration and para.16.3.8 states that "The Council will adopt flexible planning standards to bring about</p>	<p>The Council has chosen to amalgamate the NHG with the Portobello place. This is in part a result of NHG's key role as a gateway to the Portobello Market. However, the vision for the place makes clear the important NHG has as an office and district centre in its own right. The NHG SPD deals with NHG separately and in isolation and provides further detail to guide development.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>the redevelopment of Newcombe House as a catalyst for regeneration of the wider area."</p> <p>Issue 1 Question 7 asks whether there are instances where a more flexible or creative approach to the delivery of sustainable development could or should be taken within the Place Chapters.</p> <p>The Newcombe House site provides the only opportunity to deliver a meaningful new public space in the Notting Hill Gate area, and provides the opportunity to deliver step-free access to the underground station.</p> <p>The replacement of a tall building at Newcombe House with a building of additional height is appropriate subject to testing in key townscape views, the quality of the proposals, and the overall community benefits.</p> <p>These are examples of site-specific factors that should be given sufficient weight when assessing development proposals, and the package of uses that come forward for this site.</p> <p>A flexible approach to identified 'Places' – but which includes details and specific details on how a defined key part of the Borough can be regenerated – is consistent with the adopted Vision for these areas, including Notting Hill Gate, and will ensure that proposals can be viably and feasibly brought forward in the short to medium term. The proposals will assist in providing Notting Hill Gate with a 'function and identity', as sought by the overall vision.</p> <p>With regards to Newcombe House, we note paragraph 16.4.7 of the Local Plan sets out one of the output indicators that will be used to monitor the Vision:</p> <p>"What benefits has major development, including the redevelopment of Newcombe House, brought to the wider area?"</p> <p>Having regards to the proposed policy formulation set out by Issue 1 Questions 1-7, the 'Places' policies need to ensure sufficient flexibility for the vision(s) of these 'Places' to be delivered. The wording of any policies in respect of 'Places' needs to be consistent with the wider document, whilst at the same time contain sufficient detail to be effective in delivering the vision(s).</p> <p>In this regard, in respect of Newcombe House and its role in the Notting Hill Gate Place chapter and in delivering the vision, the site is ideally suited to a high quality mixed use development providing a range of land uses – including housing, offices, retail, a surgery – and in facilitating the delivery of step-free access to the underground station below. It provides an opportunity to open up the currently impermeable site to create a new and publicly accessible destination to Notting Hill Gate, to optimise the use of this highly sustainable site, and acting as a catalyst for regeneration of the wider area.</p>	<p>This is an approach we have adopted. The place chapters set out principles and priorities for identified places. This forms part of the development plan and therefore is the starting point for determining development proposals but discretion is possible where other relevant material considerations dictate such a departure from policy.</p>
Penny Laughton	CHAPTER 16 – NOTTING HILL GATE	

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>16.1.1 Value judgment: little of the immediate area around the tube station comprises 'a high-quality Victorian townscape.'</p> <p>16.1.5 Value judgment: RBKC denigrates postwar buildings whilst praising the Victorian ones – these are value judgments and as such are out of place in such a document.</p> <p>16.1.9 Public Art: over the years the art installed has been of dubious quality and been at best a sticking plaster – the processes and management should be overhauled.</p> <p>16.1.10 Resolution of issues: it would be entirely wrong to approach the resolution of the issues facing this area outside the planning system.</p> <p>16.2 Retail vision: given that the footfall is largely either local or 'tourist transient' it will be hard to implement the vision described, the first group demanding useful shops and the second places to eat/drink; what exactly is in the Council's mind; surely it is landlords who will dictate who is based in the units.</p> <p>16.3.4 It is odd that the council mixes offices and arts in the same paragraph – these are entirely different topics that deserve their own space.</p> <p>16.3.7 Value judgment: 'the mistakes of the post war period'; it could easily be argued that the existing townscape, with its mix of old and new, already gives the area its distinct identity, with Notting Hill Gate and Trellick Tower topping and tailing the district.</p> <p>16.3.8 Iconic: a rather lazy, and some would say now outmoded short hand – what does the council actually mean?</p> <p>16.3.9 Value judgment: it is debatable that Newcombe House is an 'eyesore'.</p> <p>16.3.13 Vehicle dominance: reconfiguring the public realm sounds worthwhile, but does not tackle the roots of the issue, which is having too much traffic in London overall that feeds into Notting Hill Gate; with other local councils and elected representatives, RBKC, our councillors and MP should actively lobby both the London Assembly and our national government to address this issue so that weight of traffic and pollution are tackled in the short, medium and long term. The "'iconic" identity' that the council suggests is clearly not a solution. Additionally, it is distinctly odd that the idea of a Green Corridor is excluded (see justification in Chapter 6, 6.3.25).</p> <p>16.3.15 Tube station: if any changes to the tube station are made, at least one set of escalators (one for up and one for down) and a lift should be incorporated into the scheme to bring the station up to C21 standards providing access for the less mobile.</p> <p>16.3.16 Retail: we already have three supermarkets on Notting Hill Gate – why is a 'food store' suggested? (and see 16.4.7/5); in addition, RBKC should give as much emphasis on independent shops in this location as they have in the Vision for Portobello Road (currently independent shops dominate - chemists, wine merchants, farm shops, hair dressers, etc)</p> <p>16.3.19 Refurbishment of Camden Towers: Given the radical and unsympathetic re-fenestration granted to Jamie Oliver (now closed), there are grave concerns about what the council will allow.</p>	<p>The text for the Notting Hill Gate / Portobello chapter has been altered dramatically from the existing text and these points are now moot.</p> <p>This is true within the same use class. However, the Council can exercise control of change of use through the planning system (shops, café)</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This reference has been removed.</p> <p>There is a general push at all policy levels to encourage and deliver a modal shift from car use to other more sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and increasing public transport.</p> <p>Step free access to the tube station is set as a priority for the new policy draft.</p> <p>Many of the detailed comments on the text have been considered. The Council has settled on a more streamlined format. We welcome your feedback on the new format and the contents of the chapter.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>16.3.19 Environmental limits: see comments under 16.3.13 – if you don't tackle traffic, you cannot improve the quality of air; RBKC should measure and publish air quality of the main arteries in the borough on its website, including at Notting Hill Gate.</p>	
Edward Daffarn	<p>Community response to Chapter 8 and 9 RBKC redevelopment of "this place"</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>We, the undersigned community members of "this place" question the use of terminology in Chapter 8 and 9 of the redevelopment plans.</p> <p>Both Chapters refer specifically to the Lancaster West Estate without once naming it. What is the reason for this? Please name the other estates targeted. We are aware of Council plans to reduce social housing through a phased strategy and planning framework ahead of the government Housing Bill which has not yet passed through the Lords. The vulnerability of the tenant/landlord relationship and economic disadvantage are clearly seen as something to be exploited by a local Council whose job it is to serve the local area. With reference to: 02 February 2016 18:30 Special Meeting of Housing and Property SC with Public Realm SC in Committee Room 2 - no agenda or other documents available on RBKC website. Details at the end of the document shed light on the Councils plans.</p> <p>The reasons given (Chapter 8 and 9) for targeting the estate are: 1) reinventing the traditional urban street pattern which has been ignored and reinstating a traditional street pattern while 2) creating more direct access between Bramley Road and Ladbrooke Grove, and 3) direct road access to Sports Centres. 4) The construction quality of these buildings is also referenced:</p> <p>The Council seems unsure whether it will be reinventing (9.1.5) or reinstating (9.3.3) the traditional urban street pattern. It is impossible to do both –either the Council is reinstating the traditional plans, in which case we would like to see the old street maps that the Council will be working with, or reinventing and creating something completely new, in which case the community wishes to be actively involved in the feasibility work, the planning framework and masterplan as stated in (9.3.5).</p> <p>This document will demonstrate that the reasons 1)-4) are not justifiable. Direct access between Bramley Road and Ladbrooke Grove was achievable during the initial phase of the development (the Academy and Sports Centre) but the Council blocked this access despite repeated appeals from local community members (9.3.2 &amp; 9.3.3). Reinventing the traditional street pattern is flawed. More direct road access to Sports Centres is unnecessary (9.3.3), undermines the Councils commitment to (8.3.18 &amp; 9.3.19) and initiatives set out in the Air Quality Action Plan. The targeted estate is a great example of excellent construction and deliberate neglect. We hold the TMO to account on the continued lack of maintenance of the Lancaster West Estate, which amounts to deliberate sabotage of existing housing stock and misuse of public resources.</p> <p>Chapter 8 Westway</p> <p>8.1 Introduction</p> <p>8.1.8 We question the definition of Westway Trust as a community based regeneration organisation. The community is currently fighting to be involved with the Trust's plans to regenerate the area.</p>	<p>The text for the Westway and Latimer text has been significantly amended for the adopted 2010 core strategy text to which you refer.</p> <p>The Council is not proposing to allocate Lancaster West Estate for any further development in this review. The Council is reviewing options for estate regeneration in Silchester, Barlby and Treverton and the Warwick Road Estate. The draft policy for Estate Renewal guarantees that all existing tenants have an opportunity of a new home that meets their needs, with those wishing to stay in the neighbourhood being able to do so.</p> <p>The options are under consideration are 1) continued maintenance 2) refurbish existing estates 3) to in fill development where land is available 4) comprehensive redevelopment. No final decision on what options to pursue has been taken.</p> <p>This text has been removed</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>8.1.10 Can the Council please define "consolidating the sports facilities..." as we now know the Westway Sports Centre is being taken over by a private company. This means the loss of what was a community resource and the youth services housed there.</p> <p>8.1.11 Improved access via an underpass is much needed but can the Council elaborate on the "proposed" development at White City? This development has been underway since early 2015.</p> <p>8.1.12 The community would like to highlight the "charitable and community activities under the Westway," accessibility to funding of these activities needs to be addressed and we would like The Trust to provide a detailed breakdown of its property portfolio and the income earned from it.</p> <p>8.2 Vision CV 8 Vision for the Westway in 2028 We question the council in their use of the term, "oppressive negative influence," to describe the flyover. This was not a problem when it was deliberately built in a curve that overshadowed a previous slum area. We are aware that now the area is a desirable place to live this issue is being addressed. The Council's Vision highlights the fact that economic disadvantage disempowers communities and this vulnerability is then exploited by socially irresponsible, unscrupulous practice.</p> <p>8.3 Priorities for action 8.3.1 We request a copy of the Strategic Objectives. Renewing the Legacy and An Engaging Public Realm –we would like to request a detailed description of the Council's understanding of what the Legacy of the area is and how they intend to renew it. We offer involvement on this. 8.3.2 With reference to the legacy of the Westway as a "hostile" one to its 'host' neighbourhood –is this the legacy the Council wishes to renew? We suggest this section needs looking at and re-wording. We request more information on the fund for community safety and public art improvements. We object to any large amounts spent on corporate art and would like to oversee the spending of any budget in this section and the employment of local young talent.</p> <p>8.3.3 We welcome the celebration of the engineering structure of the Westway, 'hanging gardens' and units as a piece of public art. We want to ensure employment of local people and companies such as Mind at Meanwhile Gardens to oversee this.</p> <p>8.3.4 Improvements to existing gardens, especially the maintenance of Maxilla Gardens, are much needed. Again we want to ensure local employment and involvement in this.</p> <p>8.3.5 High level advertisements need to come down and we are behind the council on this one. We would like a breakdown of the revenue generated by public advertising in the area and an account of where this has been spent.</p> <p>Better Travel Choices 8.3.7 The creation of an underpass behind the Sports Centre will impact on the Stables, businesses on Stables Way and the Travellers Site. We would like to negotiate how this can be done while still retaining and incorporating these traditional landmarks that make the area what it is.</p>	<p>This related to consolidating sport facilities at the western end of the Westway Trust land.</p> <p>White City extension has planning permission and development is beginning.</p> <p>This is a matter to raise with the Westway Trust</p> <p>The land under the Westway is now considered within the specific places it dissects rather than being treated in isolation as a place in its own right. The text has therefore been removed. In relation to the broader point the Council have outlined a series of principles and priorities for the Latimer area and we look forward to your comments on it.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not information that the planning department has.</p> <p>This would have been considered as part of any specific planning application.</p> <p>Any new applications for illuminated hoardings are published on the weekly list. You can sign up to receive</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Fostering Vitality</p> <p>8.3.9 We request information on any proposed illuminated advertising hoardings.</p> <p>8.3.10 A new supermarket is needed and we would like to oversee the setting up of a Community Food Collective. This would not only employ and empower local people, provide food at a lower cost, but could also become a community hub through which further services could be provided.</p> <p>8.3.11 We request information on licenced premises. The loss of many local pubs has eroded sections of community life, arts and culture. There is a place for well-run licensed premises.</p> <p>8.3.13 We request information on the Golbourne Road feasibility study and potential improvements for this area as our local high street.</p> <p>Keeping Life Local –please define who will benefit from this with reference to the decisions taken at the Special Meeting on 2/2/2016? Which specific groups in terms of home ownership, income bracket, ethnicity and postcode –target groups and monitoring is required here.</p> <p>8.3.15 We request information on the school proposal at the Maxilla Nursery Site.</p> <p>8.3.16 Further youth facilities, opportunities, support and employment are an immediate necessity, but as the Council knows we will be seeing the back of some of these much needed services housed at the Westway Sports Centre.</p> <p>Requesting Environmental Limits</p> <p>8.3.18 We require further information on how the Council is tackling pollution.</p> <p>Diversity of Housing</p> <p>8.3.20 We require further information on the term, "perception of community safety," and the wisdom behind using this term directly after the sentence, "land south of the Westway is predominantly post war social rented housing estates." This seems suspiciously like playing to stereotyped safety concerns around council estates within proposed plans that affect tenants living on council estates. Post-war council and social housing are some of the best built housing in London. As the Council knows building regulations have been relaxed and a1960's council build is of higher standard than the luxury flats going up today. Like all buildings regular maintenance is needed, therefore lack of maintenance is deliberate sabotage of existing housing stock. This is a deliberate misuse of public resources. We would like to know how the, "better functioning of these residential areas," is perceived by the Council and what this will mean to residents.</p> <p>8.3.21 Improvement to the travellers sites and additional sites will be considered when those affected have been properly consulted and involved in the planning.</p> <p>8.4 Delivery</p> <p>Development Management</p> <p>8.4.1 We require Development management policies and details of the "place shaping policy"</p>	<p>notifications in your area.</p> <p>Also available on the weekly list.</p> <p>This is available on the Council's website:  <a href="https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/managing-traffic-and-transport/golborne-road-consultation">https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/managing-traffic-and-transport/golborne-road-consultation</a></p> <p>Keeping life is a strategic objective to ensure that social and community uses as well as local retail uses are available to meet the needs of local residents. All the Council's policies undergo an equality impact assessment to understand the impact on minority groups. This will be consulted on with the draft policies.</p> <p>The Council's approach to air quality is set out here:  <a href="https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/air-quality-reports-and-documents">https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/air-quality-reports-and-documents</a></p> <p>This wording has been amended.</p> <p>Noted – we are working with travelling communities to understand their needs.</p> <p>These are set out in the draft policies</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Quantum of development –what does this mean?</p> <p>8.4.2 We want more community use developments that will become business opportunities and generate income for local communities and by local communities.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs</p> <p>8.4.3 We would like full community involvement in this process. Details of DPD</p> <p>Future plans and documents</p> <p>8.4.4 Details of SPD</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <p>We would like details of the current situation so we can assess the Council monitoring process.</p> <p>8.4.8 Quantum of development Details of CP1</p> <p>8.4.9 Infrastructure Details of Infrastructure Delivery Plan and place specific infrastructure</p> <p>8.4.10 Future plans and documents Copies of Council annual monitoring report in autumn.</p> <p>Pic: Westway Stables Riding School. We question the use of this photo in reference to the ongoing battle with Westway Trust to keep the Stables running, and the treatment of Sarah Tuvey, longstanding service provider and tenant, by the Trust.</p> <p>Chapter 9 Latimer</p> <p>9.1 Introduction</p> <p>9.1.3 &amp; 9.1.5 if the council intends to "reinvent the traditional urban street pattern" how did the existing estates 9.1.3 "ignore the long-standing patterns of finely grained buildings"? How did they impose a new hierarchy, and how will this be avoided in any new plans as the local community feels the redevelopment plans are an imposition? We would like details of the questionability of the construction of said buildings which are not named but, as previously stated, we are aware the plans refer to Lancaster West. The TMO has refused to spend money on the maintenance of these buildings squandering precious resources due to strategic lack of (minimal) investment. We request that the other estates also affected are named now. The slippery language used is very much in question here.</p> <p>9.1.4 The running of Westway Sports needs to stay within the community. Plans to contract it out have not been transparent.</p> <p>9.2 Vision</p> <p>CV 9 Vision for Latimer in 2028</p> <p>"Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern, guaranteeing all existing tenants the opportunity of a new home –and further homes to rebuilt".</p>	<p>The amount of development that will take place over the plan period.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs are set out in the Reg 123 list. The council is looking at how it can actively engage with the community to determine where neighbourhood CIL money might be spent on local projects.</p> <p>This will be updated with the draft policies.</p> <p>Noted. The photos are likely to be updated in the next round of the LPPR.</p> <p>There are no plans to re-develop Lancaster West Estate or allocate it for development in the LPPR.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>This contradicts previous statement 9.1.5. As the Council plans intend to reinvent traditional street patterns they will also be ignoring the current long-standing street patterns of Lancaster West Estate. Obviously we are aware the Council is referring in a veiled way to the curving roads surrounding the Estate. There is also a complex one-way system behind Holland Park tube station, a break in the middle of Portland Road, and the same at the end of Walmer Road so there is no road access onto Pottery Lane and direct connectivity to Holland Park Road. This is not a traditional street pattern and is very confusing. Will the council also be addressing this issue? Or is it only the areas of social housing that will be affected? –we understand home owners will not be as compliant as tenants so believe the plans tackling social housing take advantage of the vulnerability of the tenant/landlord relationship. This relationship is something that council and social housing groups traditionally honoured. We question the wording of, "guaranteeing all existing tenants the opportunity of a new home." This does not guarantee a new home but the opportunity of one, and some tenants want to stay in the homes they have been living in all their lives.</p> <p>9.3 Priorities for action</p> <p>9.3.1 Again a copy of the Strategic objectives is requested</p> <p>Renewing the Legacy and An Engaging Public Realm –again we would like to request a detailed description of the Council's understanding of what the Legacy of the area is and how they intend to renew it. We offer involvement on this.</p> <p>9.3.2 Regarding the removal of traditional street pattern and very confusing streets following post-war developments. Is the council predicting increase outside traffic to the area? It is difficult to see where this would come from as the area is bordered by the Westway to the North and West. The area is familiar to locals and those who work, trade and deliver in the area.</p> <p>As previously detailed the street system between Holland Park Avenue and Ladbrooke Grove is also very confusing.</p> <p>There are direct pedestrian links to both of the Sports Centres, encouraging people to drive to their local Sports Centre defeats the purpose of the visit and contradicts points 8.3.18, 9.3.19 &amp; the Air Quality Action Plan.</p> <p>Links to Ladbrooke Grove could have been improved as there was space for a road, along the wide pedestrian route and drive way, running by the side of the tube tracks. The recent Academy has now blocked access via this route ignoring residents concerns. What exactly are the Councils ground plans? We realise the Council is working to a blueprint that must have been formulated some time ago. Why has this not been made available to the people who will be affected by it? It seems the Council is consulting local people only on the plans you want us to see. If access is the reason for bulldozing the Lancaster West Estate access could have been worked into the development of the new Academy and Sports Centre.</p> <p>9.3.3 The issue of proactive planning and improved connectivity within the area to Ladbrooke Grove. Has the Council done a survey of local residents and identified problems with connectivity in the area? Why was the issue of connectivity not addressed during the planning of the Academy and Sports Centre? How is it possible to reinstate a traditional street pattern that has not been in existence since the post war period. The Lancaster West Estate was built in the 1970's, at a time of "austerity" why is it government policy to knock down council housing that is less than 50 years old?</p> <p>9.3.4 Previous plans have talked about improving provision of accessible public open space while taking away the beautiful gardens around Grenfell Tower. Is it possible the Council is making reference to the gardens Lancaster West is built around?</p>	<p>This vision has been re-written.</p> <p>The Council's position on estate renewal remains a "guarantee that all existing social rented tenants have an opportunity of a home that meets their needs, with those wishing to stay in the neighbourhood being able to do so"</p> <p>This is set out in the draft policies.</p> <p>This is set out in the setting the scene section of the draft policies.</p> <p>Reinstating a traditional street pattern brings many benefits including improved permeability, better natural surveillance on the street. The Council is seeking to improve the public realm in Latimer where possible. These post war housing developments were characterised by contemporary built forms that largely ignored the long-standing patterns of finely-grained buildings, streets and spaces and imposed a new hierarchy based around largescale buildings. Streets were blocked off, footpaths were moved above ground level and open space segregated into off-street parking, grassed plots and tarmac playpens. Buildings lost their close connection with the public realm, losing the traditional relationship between homes and the street.</p> <p>There are no plans to re-develop the Lancaster West Estate. The Council is looking at options of potentially increasing the number of homes on three specific Council estates (Silchester, Barlby and Treverton, and Warwick Road). No decisions have been taken yet in relation to whether this will</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>9.3.5 We would like to see the results of the feasibility work and applaud the Council on their initiative in a planning framework and masterplan to be prepared with the active involvement of local people. This document is part of that process and we intend to facilitate an inclusive community-wide process.</p> <p>9.3.6 Freston Road Garages, 63 affordable units and the children's centre. Details of costs and sales and where profits will be going.</p> <p>9.3.9 We request more information on the review of various housing options. Existing tenants currently live in fair to good quality homes. We question the wisdom in the provision of additional private housing on Council-owned housing estates as a way of raising funds to provide good quality homes for existing tenants. As we are aware, from the Wornington Estate development, private housing pushes out existing tenants. Keeping Life Local –tell this to the tenants of the Wornington estate who were pushed out of their local community to make way for a 60% private housing estate and with reference again to recent Special Meeting 2/2/2016. Again monitoring is required here.</p> <p>9.3.11 a new neighbourhood shopping centre is needed in the local area. It is the perfect opportunity to set up a Food Collective. A shop run by and for local community members, buying bulk items and packaging food on the premises. This will provide jobs, work experience and further services as part of a locally controlled centre.</p> <p>Respecting Environmental Limits</p> <p>9.3.19 we would like to see how the Council supports initiatives set out in the Air Quality Action Plan and what new design solutions have been proposed. We have some suggestions regarding the improvement of air quality in the area.</p> <p>9.4 Delivery</p> <p>Development management</p> <p>9.4.1 We request Development management policies Chapters 30-36. Please define the place shaping role in a planning process and place shaping policy. What is a place shaping policy and why is it required for Latimer Road?</p> <p>Policy CP 9 Latimer</p> <p>The community wishes to positively contribute to regeneration of the area, we require the Council to define how development can prejudice long term regeneration. How does the council see the role of the employment zone being undermined? Please define. The community wish to support the role of the employment zone as a necessary aspect of local life and economy.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs</p> <p>9.4.3 "co-ordinating of health premises to better align service provision." We question the wording on this point and ask for clarification and specifics.</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <p>9.4.5</p> <p>1. "significantly improve the area's legibility." Further definition of terms please.</p> <p>3. Visual improvements. Budget and definition.</p> <p>4. Improved provision/quality of open space improved. Definition</p>	<p>amount to; no development at all, refurbishing the existing stock, infilling where land is available (similar to the approach at Silchester/Freston Road Garages) or comprehensive redevelopment.</p> <p>This will be published alongside the draft policies.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is set out here <a href="https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/air-quality-reports-and-documents">https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/air-quality-reports-and-documents</a></p> <p>Agreed the Council will ensure that employment floorspace is protected or increased within the employment zones.</p> <p>The council is working with the West London Clinical Commissioning group to understand the needs in the area to ensure there are sufficient health facilities within the area.</p> <p>These have now been updated. Legibility refers to the ability of people to read the townscape and navigate it</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>and assessment process.</p> <p>5. new local centre. Specifics and definition</p>	<p>easily.</p>
<p>Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners (NLP) (Simon Slatford)</p>	<p>Section 3 Places</p> <p>Chapter 5 'Kensal' of the Consolidated Local Plan 2015 sets out the Council's overall Vision for the Kensal Gasworks site. St William has no issue with the 'Places' sections being retained within the emerging Local Plan, and is supportive of the Council continuing its campaign for Crossrail on the site. The 'Places' section must be in accordance with policies and the justification text in the wider Local Plan and our comments in respect of the Kensal site allocation below will apply.</p> <p>Section 3 of the current consultation document revisits this policy and notes that the Council consulted on Issues and Options for an SPD for the Gasworks site in 2012. However, due to the uncertainty of Crossrail, the SPD has not been progressed. The Council's reservations about preparing an SPD with no clarity on Crossrail is understood, however we submit that the Council should be working with landowners to optimise this site with or without Crossrail. St William would therefore encourage the Council to recommence preparation of the SPD so as to provide further clarity on the key development issues relating to the site and to ensure a comprehensive regeneration of the Gasworks site. St William would welcome the opportunity to be fully engaged in that process.</p> <p>On this issue, we note that Figure 3.1 of the consultation document indicates potential connections across the railway lines and canal. The practicalities of a bridge across the railway line to the south of the Gasworks site should be fully explored with landowners and rail operators. The merits, viability and ultimate deliverability of a bridge over the railway will be an inexorable function of the overall scale of development achieved on this site.</p> <p>The potential links from the site across the canal to the north are highly questionable. We note that the access would link through to the Kensal Green Cemetery but this is owned by a third-party and, therefore, there is no public right of way. Further, we understand that the Cemetery Trust may not allow 24 hour unfettered access across their land. Therefore unless the circumstances pertaining to the operation of the cemetery change, then a bridge connection over the Canal could not perform a meaningful public benefit sufficient to merit its provision. It is requested that any reference to the provision of a bridge link across the canal is heavily caveated with reference to unfettered access across the cemetery first being established.</p> <p>In light of the above, St William would suggest that Figure 3.1 and the policy text should be updated to state that the delivery of a bridge over the railway line should be explored, but that the viability of its delivery must be related to the overall scale of development achieved on the Gasworks site. Likewise, the deliverability of a bridge over the canal should be referred to as being dependent on unfettered access through the cemetery site. These amendments will provide clarity within the policy.</p> <p>Policy CV5 sets out the overall Vision for Kensal up to 2028. Whilst this Vision is supported, as set out in detail below, it should be made clear that the regeneration of the Gasworks should not be tied to the delivery of a Crossrail station. This is an ambition for the Borough, and is supported by St William. Nevertheless, encouragement must be given to the viable regeneration of the Gasworks site, irrespective of whether Crossrail comes forward on the site. The Local Plan should, therefore, be clear on this point and avoid any uncertainty for landowners and</p>	<p>Support for places and Council's approach to getting a Crossrail Station noted.</p> <p>The Council is fully committed to delivering an SPD for the Kensal site and working with landowners to deliver the site.</p> <p>This is explored in the Kensal Canalside Transport Study.</p> <p>The Place chapters are to a certain degree aspirational in looking to achieve the best possible improvements for a particular place. An agreement is still possible to deliver at least partial or full access via the cemetery and therefore this should remain.</p> <p>The Kensal Canalside DIF study demonstrates how a Crossrail station would improve the viability of</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>developers by implying in any way that the regeneration of this major brownfield site is linked to the delivery of a Crossrail station. The suggested amendments to Policy CV5 also take into account the policy changes in respect of the NPPF and FALP and the requirement to significantly boost housing supply.</p> <p>CV5 should therefore be updated (changes underlined) to state:</p> <p>"The gasworks sites will have realised their potential and developed into a thriving and valued community in North Kensington. Along with residential development, there will be job creation and regeneration benefits which could be enhanced by a Crossrail station that could connect North Kensington with Central London and beyond. Well-connected, high density, mixed-use and environmentally responsive developments will have populated the sites. Better use will have been made of the canal and its towpath and a minimum of 3,500 dwellings, with offices/employment uses and a range of community facilities will have been delivered. The area will also have been knitted into the surrounding urban fabric and the development, taken as a whole, will have provided a successful precedent for the remainder of the borough. Development in the employment zone, the scale of which has been subject to Crossrail or other appropriate public transport improvements, will support its function as a vital and valued asset for small and medium industries and the cultural and creative sector in particular."</p> <p>Policy CP5 Kensal states:  "The Council will ensure the long term regeneration of Kensal by requiring development to positively contribute to the regeneration and environmental sustainability of the area, and resisting development which prejudices long term regeneration opportunities and which undermines the role of the employment zone."</p> <p>The Council acknowledges at Paragraph 3.3.6 of the consultation document that the Kensal Gasworks site is "the last remaining major brownfield site in the Borough without planning permission". It is a strategic site that has the potential to deliver a significant amount of the Borough's housing supply over the next ten years. It is therefore vital that the Council's approach to emerging Local Plan Policies secures the optimum delivery of new homes together with a balanced component of employment, infrastructure and community space.</p> <p>St William fully supports Policy CP5, but would request that further to the above, it is made clear that there must be comprehensive regeneration of the Gasworks site to ensure that the full package of necessary mitigation and community benefits can be brought forward by all landowners together, to ensure delivery. This wording should be repeated in the Site Allocations text below.</p> <p>In respect of similar regeneration schemes on former gasworks sites, St William would like to bring to the Council's attention the recent Southall Gasworks site. This scheme was subject to a CPO Inquiry where the Inspector made the following comments: "The policy context, most recently in the OAPF, supports the concept of the redevelopment of the site as a whole, so as to achieve a critical mass of development such that the wider benefits can come forward". The Inspector went on to state that "...a partial redevelopment would be a waste of a major regeneration opportunity." The Inspector's comments further support our Representations and the requirement for the Council to ensure a comprehensive regeneration of the Kensal Gasworks site via emerging policies.</p>	<p>development on the site.</p> <p>CV5 has been rewritten. It is a vision and as such is aspirational and seeks to deliver the best possible future outcomes for the Kensal site, which is the correct approach. The plan makes provision for contingencies for delivering development on the site if a Crossrail station is not achieved.</p> <p>Quanta of development is addressed within the site allocation for Kensal.</p> <p>The principle of comprehensive development of the site is set out in the site allocation policy CA1(f). We would welcome your comments on the draft text.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>Question 2: Have they proved effective in delivering the vision? What would improve delivery?</p> <p>The chapters about various places, such as Portobello/Notting Hill, Notting Hill Gate, Kensington High Street, South Kensington and Earl's Court, need to be reassessed and strengthened to be more effective in shaping their future.</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate: how useful was the place chapter in articulating the SPD? Did it help bring forward development and articulate the public realm strategy? It did not get into enough detail, even in areas where the mix of uses was developed in the Fostering Vitality chapter.</p> <p>Kensington High Street: this was tested at the Odeon Inquiry – whether some quite precise statements in the reasoned justification amounted to policy. The vision was criticised as being only about retail rather than a more rounded offer. (See separate comments)</p> <p>South Kensington: This place chapter is now largely out of date, fixated with matters north of Cromwell Road and has proved to be unbalanced – dominated by the interests of the Museums and main land owners, skewed toward meeting the needs of visitors and insufficient emphasis on the permanent resident community. This has led to a wholesale changes geared to catering for the needs of visitors at the expense of the local community. This place chapter needs rebalancing, a much fuller treatment of how to revitalised the district centre to provide a better offer for the local community. Failure to rectify the current imbalance might need a neighbourhood plan to provide the fine-grained detail and rebalancing that is needed. (See separate comments)</p> <p>Earl's Court: This needs to be completely overhauled to reflect the way that the Earl's Court/West Kensington Opportunity Area and the associated planning permissions will influence the development of the area and to reinstate Earl's Court as a district shopping centre. Earl's Court needs a new role and be repurposed.</p> <p>Brompton Cross should be dropped – this was never more that a marketing concept or an attempt to create a "brand" – it never had general acceptance as a place. Overall, there is a need to identify the most important elements of the vision for the place and help make sure these are delivered. The place chapters need to be more specific about place-specific policies and proposals rather than rely on general statements in the reasoned justification. The content needs revisiting to see if they are sufficiently concrete to give strong guidance on the direction of travel.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>High Street Kensington vision has been expanded to focus on the changes the Design Museum might bring.</p> <p>The vision for South Kensington has been re-written and emphasises the need for balance between local and international roles.</p> <p>This chapter has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>This has been done.</p>
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>No comment in respect of the effective delivery of the existing Places visions.</p> <p>To improve delivery for the vision South Kensington, Chapter 12 needs to be updated to reflect the area's projected needs in the plan period and the areas indicative plan needs to be updated to identify area specific planning policy zoning designations and site allocations/proposals.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Map has been updated. We welcome your comments on the changes.</p>
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	<p>Many of the elements within the South Kensington chapter have been delivered, however progress on South Kensington station has been very slow. To achieve more, the aspirations for the station and pedestrian tunnel need to be strengthened from desirable to essential.</p>	<p>The Council is working with TfL to deliver development at south Kensington station.</p>
Christie's South Kensington	<p>Many of the elements within the South Kensington chapter have been delivered, however progress on South Kensington station has been very</p>	<p>The Council is working with TfL to deliver development at south Kensington</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
(Francesca Filippini Pinto)	slow. To achieve more, the aspirations for the station and pedestrian tunnel need to be strengthened from desirable to essential.	station.
Gerald Eve obo CEL - Cadogan Estates Ltd (Neil Henderson)	<p>Specifically in relation to the vision for King's Road/Sloane Square, it is considered that the current vision set out in Policy CV15 still remains a relevant and appropriate vision. The King's Road maintains its position as London's most iconic and vibrant shopping street with a lively and diverse mix of shops, restaurants and world class cultural attractions. It is essential that this remains a core aspect of any future vision. Similarly, it is important that there continues to be an objective to provide a range of both independent and high quality multiple retailers as well as a range of day to day shops which meet the needs of local residents.</p> <p>CEL (Cadogan Estates Ltd) have sought to build on the success of its existing landholdings along the King's Road and Sloane Street by identifying a careful balance and appropriate mix of retail tenant composition. Importantly, the Estate has made significant investment in a new piece of townscape between Sloane Street and Pavilion Road which will build upon the strength and offer of the identified retail area. This will not only provide for a range of new modern retail units fronting Sloane Street but importantly, will extend the existing retail frontage along Pavilion Road with a range of smaller shops that will accommodate independent retailers to meet the day to day needs of local residents.</p> <p>Separately, the Estate has worked closely with RBKC and local residents to establish new plans for the redevelopment of the Curzon Cinema site. This will maintain all of the uses that currently exist on the site but will provide them in a new development which allows greater flexibility for tenants to meet the needs of their customers and their businesses.</p> <p>It is considered that these two major schemes, together with the continual upgrade and diversification of the Estates' portfolio along the King's Road, fully support and build upon the Council's vision for this area.</p> <p>Finally, it is important that the vision maintains its support and celebration of the unique range of cultural activities that the area has to offer in terms of theatre, concert and gallery events. It is considered that this remains a relevant and appropriate aspiration for the area.</p>	<p>Retail remains at the very core of the of the King's Road vision. It is difficult to control changes of use within the same use class through the planning system.</p> <p>The Council recognises the important role Cadogan Estates has in delivering the vision within King's Road and Sloane Square.</p> <p>The importance of the cultural offers in this area is reflected in the new vision for the area.</p>
Jane Whewell	<p>LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW: SOUTH KENSINGTON</p> <p>I was very sorry not to be able to attend the meeting last week at the Science Museum to discuss the partial review of the Local Plan due to a clashing meeting at Westminster Council.</p> <p>I am however keen to respond to the consultation as the text on South Kensington causes me and my fellow residents a number of concerns. In particular, the text and questions in relation to South Kensington have inherent assumptions which do not in fact reflect the facts and do not recognise – nor assess the impact of - the profound transformation that has already taken place in South Kensington over the last 3 years. The text assumes more cafes/restaurants are needed without making any assessment of the impact of the huge number of new café/restaurants which have sprung up in the last 3 years, nor does it take account of the large number of new/expanded café restaurants which are already under construction.</p> <p>First, we would wish to oppose the Council's suggestion that the Council might "relax its percentage based policies in parts of the South Kensington District Centre to reflect its role in serving those visiting Exhibition Road and the Museums"</p> <p>This question has inherent bias (in favour of visitors and the Museums) and fundamentally misunderstands the importance and the role of South</p>	<p>The amended place text makes no reference to the need for more cafes/restaurants.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Kensington – which serves local residents as a key district hub. South Kensington is a profoundly residential area The emphasis in the question on visitors is inaccurate (statistics show only 50% of users of the station are visiting local institutions/Exhibition Rd) and misplaced and damaging to residential amenity. In our view the balance between the needs of visitors and the needs of residents (who elect local Councillors and pay Council taxes) in the current policy is already seriously tilted unfairly and unjustifiably against the needs of residents and residential amenity.</p> <p>As highlighted above, Para 6.5.21 also does not recognise – far less assess - the impact of the profound transformation in the area the previous policy has delivered in the last 3 years which has seen shop after shop convert to cafe/restaurant. The 'practicalities' and needs of Museums and visitors are already more than met – and indeed more cafes are on the way with the Museums building new / expanding cafes inside their buildings (the V&amp;A, Natural History Museum and Science Museums). There is already a glut of places to eat, drink and buy a souvenir and the Council policy has facilitated this change despite local resident concerns. What is needed is retail A1 use shops where local residents and workers (and probably visitors too) can buy fresh ingredients/a newspaper/a pint of milk/visit a bank.</p> <p>We disagree with the suggestion that “The Council could relax its percentage based policies in parts of the centre to reflect its greater ‘service’ role and reinforce the role of the remaining centre as serving the needs of the local populous. Do you agree?”.</p> <p>The needs of local residents cannot be filled by Old Brompton Road, Bute Street and the western end of Harrington Road (which are not local to those in eg. Thurloe Square, Thurloe Street, Exhibition Road etc. ). It should also be noted that Old Brompton Road, Bute Street and the western end of Harrington Road have also seen shop after shop convert to café/restaurant so there is only limited A1 left.</p> <p>Place Policy Needs to assess and take account the Negative impacts of Café/Restaurants on the Area</p> <p>A key aspect of the area which the text also fails to take into account is the ‘cost’ (in a broad sense) of the changes to date and the changes now proposed. The increase in the number of cafes and restaurants in this area has resulted in a significant increase in the area in litter, vermin, noise, late night street drinking, vagrancy and street dirt. All this has a very significant cost - which is borne by residents and tax payers. The Council has been paying we believe some £30,000.00 a year in increased street cleansing costs in Exhibition Road alone to clean up after the litter and grease and dirt left on the street by café/restaurants, the police have been using ASBOs against street drinkers (and have cited the increased numbers of cafes/bars as the cause of increased vagrancy and street drinking) and the Council have had to increase litter collections in the area and regularly call out the enforcement team to enforce the licensing and street furniture rules. All this costs the Council – and thus Council tax payers - money. Residents have had to suffer the noise and disruption all this causes – not to mention the vermin and litter. The place strategy needs to take these ‘costs’ into account – and assess their impacts – before considering increasing these costs by increasing the number of café/restaurants.</p> <p>Over-Crowding</p> <p>The Place policy also fails to take into account the sheer scale of overcrowding already in the area - something which increasing the number of café/restaurants will make far worse.</p> <p>South Kensington is already dangerously overcrowded– with the tunnel having to be closed regularly due to overcrowding and people walking into the road in Exhibition Road due to lack of space on the pavement. The idea of allowing more café/restaurants (with their queues of people waiting for their table/coffee/takeaway and inevitable applications for external tables and chairs) in what is already a packed and busy</p>	<p>South Kensington serves a dual function in serving the needs of residents but also being at the centre of a cultural destination that attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors a year. The vision stresses the need to balance these two functions.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Council's policy to protect retail uses within designated town centres remains in place and that remains the policy starting point for any change of use applications.</p> <p>The chapter has been re-written.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>thoroughfare is frankly worrying. Encouraging café/restaurants in the narrow listed station arcade (the main entrance and exit for the millions of station users – and all station users when the tunnel is closed) and in the street directly north of the Station Entrance is seriously misplaced. This area needs to be kept clear to allow station users safe exit and egress.</p> <p>We also note that the south side of the block to the north of the station is broadly currently in office use. We would oppose the loss of still more small offices in the Borough – which this change in policy would facilitate.</p> <p>The text also does not take into consideration how deliveries would be made to these new areas – the combination of delivery lorries and pedestrians is a dangerous one – particularly in narrow streets that are already overcrowded.</p> <p>Street Markets – for all the reasons listed above we would also oppose the encouragement of street stall and street markets in the area in and around South Kensington (apart from in Bute Street) – and indeed ask that the place policy text in relation to markets be amended to take account of over-crowding issues in this place to discourage markets in this area.</p> <p>Finally, we note that the proposed changes and their specific locations would appear significantly to benefit only a small number of specific landowners – to the detriment of other commercial landowners in the immediate area. Such a proposed change is anti-competitive and detrimental to public policy. It would also see a significant transfer of benefit from the public to the private sector with the public sector (and residents) bearing all the costs and gaining no benefit. This is not appropriate.</p> <p>Northern Section of Exhibition Road (north of Cromwell Road) in the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  We would ask that map/s be amended to take account of and indicate the large number of local residents – some 130-140 households) who live in Princes Gate Mews and in Exhibition Road (opposite the Science Museum) in the Royal Borough. The ‘obliteration’ of residential uses from Council maps of this area has been a persistent source of difficulty for local residents as even Councillors - let alone local institutions and planners - assume there are no residents in the area as a result. The map currently designates the location of our homes as solely a cultural area – it is not. It is very much in dual use!</p> <p>Prioritisation of the provision of Class A1 retail and other town centre uses on suitable sites in order to meet an identified need.</p> <p>We would oppose the Council’s suggested process for seeking to “ ‘allocate’ these sites for new retail development, whether stand alone or as part of a wider mixed use proposal. ‘Allocation’ rather than ‘identification’ would include a degree of compulsion – were the site to come forward for development in the future.” The suggestion that “a Council should only allocate land for a town centre use when it is satisfied that the proposed used is viable, and indeed that there are no suitable sites within a designated centre.” rules out open, genuine prior local consultation on land use and thus gives far too much control to the Council and to developers and an insufficient role to residents who could be profoundly impacted by such proposals.</p> <p>Conclusion  The Local Plan Policy CF3 states “The Council will secure the success and vitality of our town centres by protecting, enhancing and promoting a diverse range of shops and by ensuring that these uses will be supported, but not dominated by, a range of complementary town centre uses”.</p>	<p>Agree- the Council’s Policies are very robust in seeking the protection for this use.</p> <p>There are no references to street markets in the text.</p> <p>The Strategic Cultural Area designation does not include Princes Gate Mews and Exhibition Road opposite the Science Museum. This is shown as a residential area on the map.</p> <p>The Council’s policies would seek to protect A1 retail.</p> <p>The only site that is being allocated within the South Kensington area is the car park at Harrington Road. Allocation does not require development.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Para 6.5.16 states “ The Council takes the view that the strength of its centres lies in the diversity of uses taking place within them. This includes a critical mass of shops to encourage shoppers into a centre; supporting social and community uses; banks and building societies to serve the wider needs of those visiting the centre; and supporting a range of restaurants, cafes, pubs and bars encouraging visitors to linger and to help provide activity in the evening. To this end Policy CF3 of the Local Plan sets out what types of use will be appropriate in different parts of a centre. In essence 80% of units within the primary shopping frontages of the higher order centres should remain in shop uses, this dropping to 66% in the secondary areas.”</p> <p>The Council has given no justification (other than an inaccurate statement of the usage of South Kensington by and needs of visitors) for dis-applying this policy at South Kensington – and has made no assessment of the significant costs to the area, residents and Council of the current policy’s impacts. We ask that the Local Plan Policy CF3 as drafted be applied in full at South Kensington and that the Place Policy be amended to reflect that there is no longer a need to “encourage cafes and restaurants” – as they are already dominant almost to the exclusion of other uses.</p>	<p>The chapter has been re-written we would welcome you comments on the draft.</p>
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	South Kensington place policy needs updating to reflect work completed and forthcoming proposals.	Noted- text has been updated to reflect changes since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2010.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>The Place chapters - including chapter 12 - South Kensington - should be retained.</p> <p>This is because they contain a planning context for identifying the area's local distinctiveness and hence planning policy needs for the delivery of the vision for the area with overarching localised policies to be applied during the plan period set within the plan's wider strategic policy context.</p>	Agreed – it will be.
Brompton Association (Sophie Blain)	<p>LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW: SOUTH KENSINGTON</p> <p>We very much appreciated having an opportunity to discuss the partial review of the Local Plan with you and your colleagues last week at the Science Museum. I am aware that you took a lot of notes on the evening but I thought it might be helpful if I summarised our key concerns. In our discussion we started with issues at the north of the South Kensington area (the Museums) and worked south. I am following the same methodology in this letter.</p> <p>We discussed the Natural History Museum's ambitious, and in our view inspirational, plans and I was delighted to hear Graham Stallwood affirm to us that the Borough is in broad support of the scheme. This is not the impression we have gained of late. We understand that the scheme did not fare well recently at the Council's Design Review Committee and we have heard that there remain concerns amongst officers that the scheme does not readily fit within the SPD. In relation to the former, we have real concerns about the objectivity of the Design Review Committee and we have concerns that it comprises architects and other design professionals who live outside the Borough and who are thus unlikely to be aware of local concerns and views or indeed the unsatisfactory recent history which led to the adoption of the SPD. In relation to the latter, we would reiterate what we said at the meeting, namely that the SPD is now out of date. It was produced at a time when the Museum was coming forward with numerous back-to-back planning applications for temporary structures within its grounds – particularly on the East Lawn - which were aimed at raising income for the Museum rather than being carefully considered as part of the Museum's overall purpose and mission.</p>	<p>The Design Review panel is only advisory it is up the Council determine the merits of planning applications.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>For quite a number of years the East Lawn was subjected to the mini-city of portakabins twice a year for London Fashion Week, and the Ice Rink and associated Christmas Fair filled the same space with unsightly little timber huts which looked as though they had wandered in from a garden centre. In the summer off the peg tented structures appeared. Each and every one of these activities and the poorly designed structures which accompanied them did not, in our view, respect the setting of the Grade I building, one of the most important historic buildings in the Borough. We were also faced at that time with the Museum's management wanting to expand and facilitate these kinds of temporary income generating activities by seeking to concrete over the East Lawn and removing all the grass. The SPD was prepared in order to give some kind of framework within which the Museum might bring forward temporary planning applications. Today, however, we have a long term proposal, designed by distinguished architect and landscape architect, Niall McLaughlin and Kim Wilkie, which is designed to meet the needs of the Museum in the C21st.</p> <p>With regard to the northern section of Exhibition Road, we feel that the existence of numerous residents in the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in Exhibition Road and in the cul-de-sac off it, Princes Gate Mews, (these two areas contain over 120 households) needs to be properly acknowledged together with the need to protect their amenity.</p> <p>Green spaces need to be protected. This includes the grassed areas at Museum Lane between the Science Museum and Natural History Museum. Not so long ago the Natural History Museum tried to obtain permission to remove this grass and to pave most of the area in order to facilitate the location of a food kiosk and outdoor eating area. This Association together with other groups sought to get this area declared as having "Village Green" status. Although legal action to achieve this did not succeed, the Museum withdrew its plans. The protection of this green space for the public should be reflected in the revised Local Plan so that unsympathetic proposals do not come forward again.</p> <p>Further south, we are anxious to see the Yalta Garden improved. This site sits immediately to the east of the Ismaili Centre and is opposite the V&amp;A. It is highly visible in long views along Cromwell Road to the west. At present it is a mess. Together with the Thurloe Residents' Association, the Brompton Association secured a CLLL grant from the Borough to draw up a new design. Renowned landscape architect, Kim Wilkie, has prepared plans (see enclosed booklet) and we now look to the Borough to help ensure that these plans are brought to fruition. The setting of both the V&amp;A and the Ismaili Centre will be enhanced as will the general appearance of the Cromwell Road in this area. There is warm support for these proposals from our members.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the Museums using their exterior facades for advertising, whether for sponsors or for exhibitions and the like. We have had issues with both the Natural History Museum and the V&amp;A in this regard (the former projected advertising on its Grade I listed façade until the Borough reminded the Museum permission was required). Last year, the Borough agreed with local associations that the light feature proposed for the front of the V&amp;A in association with an exhibition should not be permitted. Planning permission was refused. We know that the V&amp;A has current plans to erect a substantial bridge structure in connection with a forthcoming exhibition on engineering. We do not consider that this type of advertisement (for this is what it is) is appropriate in front of any of the museums or other institutions in South Kensington. We urge that the Local Plan review makes it clear that the world famous architecture and settings of these important buildings are protected and not blighted in this way.</p>	<p>South Kensington serves a dual function in serving the needs of residents but also being at the centre of a cultural destination that attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors a year. The vision stresses the need to balance these two functions.</p> <p>Re-landscaping Museum Lane has been identified as a priority.</p> <p>This has been identified as a priority</p> <p>Any application for advertisements at the museum site will be assessed on its own merits taking into account the firm policies within the plan.</p> <p>The Royal Borough has a very high</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>To the east of the museums, we feel that the green spaces which comprise the churchyard of Holy Trinity Brompton (open to the public) and the private garden at the rear of the Brompton Oratory should be acknowledged. The views across these two gardens from the north with their handsome plane trees is very important. Equally, we feel that the Plan should make reference to the listed terraces of Brompton Square. This is an important residential area. Unfortunate development at the rear of the west side of Brompton Square should be resisted because the rear elevations of these houses are highly visible from both the churchyard of Holy Trinity Brompton and from Cottage Place. We are aware that the Ministry of Defence has sold the substantial site between the south end of Cottage Place and Brompton Square which contains the former tube station.</p> <p>Development proposals are likely to come forward. The frontage along Brompton Road was carefully designed by the Architects Department of the former GLC in the 1960s when Brompton Road was widened and the existing buildings (including part of Brompton Square) demolished. The new buildings were designed to fit in with Brompton Square by being designed in a neo-Georgian style. This was very remarkable at that time when new developments tended to be wholly insensitive to context. We believe the quality of this block should be acknowledged and the need to protect the architectural character of Brompton Square recognised in the event of new development proposals coming forward.</p> <p>Turning to the area around South Kensington tube station and the lower end of Exhibition Road, we would firstly urge that the amenity of residents be acknowledged. The existing Local Plan is heavily weighted in favour of tourists and commerce. The amenity of residents is barely mentioned.</p> <p>We are very concerned indeed that the Borough is considering lifting restrictions on A3 restaurant uses in the area. There are already too many cafes and restaurants and Borough residents for example in Thurloe Square rely on shops at the station to purchase goods such as milk and newspapers. Harrington Road and Old Brompton Road are too far away to serve residents and it simply inaccurate to say that this area is just used or is just useful to visitors. 50% of those using South Kensington are not visitors. Residential amenity needs to be protected by requiring the number of cafes to be limited as is the policy in the rest of the Borough.</p> <p>We believe that the Local Plan should overtly encourage the protection of small shop units which characterise the area. This is particularly the case along the south side of Thurloe Street, in the station arcade and around the bullnose. The loss of small units and their replacement by larger units would damage the village quality that makes South Kensington special and fundamentally different from places like Fulham Broadway.</p> <p>However, we are not persuaded that Pelham Street, which is extremely narrow, is a suitable location for shops. Nor do we consider it desirable that this street be seen as providing an opportunity to link the shopping area of Brompton Cross with South Kensington. The highly graded (Grade II*) terraces of the Pelhams on one side and the handsome (Grade II) listed terraces of Thurloe Square would be spoiled if Pelham Street became a retail street. So too would the amenity of those residents living on the southern side of Pelham Street.</p> <p>In relation to TfL's ongoing ambitions to redevelop the tube station, we urge that the Local Plan emphasises that the tube station is listed and in a Conservation Area and that any proposals for development need to be conservation-led and therefore modest. For far too long TfL has harboured unrealistic development ambitions. The text in the current Plan at 12.3.9 which states that "an appropriate and sympathetically designed development could be introduced at and over the station" gives far too much encouragement to the kind of overly dense and</p>	<p>quality historic townscape. This is reflected by the fact that 76% of the Borough is designated a conservation area. Under these circumstances, it very difficult to take an approach that singles out particular residential streets as this would suggest that other were not as worthy of protection, which is not the case. We have strong borough wide policies to preserving existing character and architectural interest.</p> <p>The chapter has been re-written.</p> <p>These are difficult issue for planning to address since often they do not require planning permission.</p> <p>Amalgamation of shops does not require planning permission.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council will work with residents and TfL to deliver a development that is best suited to the site. Any proposal for this site will have to address and respect the</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>unsympathetic redevelopment proposals such as we have seen in the past.</p> <p>In the section entitled Monitoring at no. 6 it states "Has South Kensington Station been redeveloped?". The issue is not about redevelopment. The Council should not actively be promoting redevelopment but should be encouraging a sensitive approach to the listed station with improvements to capacity and the provision of step free access. This sentence should instead read: "Has capacity at South Kensington Station been improved and has step free access been provided?" . I attach the pre-planning advice letter from last October which TfL kindly let us see which suggests that the Borough is at last beginning to see the merits of protecting the listed buildings and the buildings in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The block to the south of Thurloe Street makes a significant contribution to the Conservation Area. It should be retained and refurbished and the shop fronts and entrances to the flats above should be restored. So too should the original shopfronts to the listed station arcade (designed by George Sherrin) and around the bullnose. A sensitive restoration of shop fronts would significantly enhance the character of the area. We attach a drawing by conservation architect Peregrine Bryant showing how these should look. We also enclose a copy of our booklet on South Kensington Station which demonstrates how greater capacity at the station and step free access can be provided without recourse to redevelopment. TfL seems to have taken some of this on board in the last year and is, as you will know, now progressing station capacity improvements with step free access intended to follow.</p> <p>The pedestrian tunnel needs to feature in the Plan. This, too, is listed and of very considerable historic importance. However, with sensitive design and cleaning it could be made very much more attractive.</p> <p>In relation to the area more generally, we urge that street clutter be avoided and both in Exhibition Road and Thurloe Street that the temptation to hold street markets and other similar events be resisted. This is because of the dense residential neighbourhoods all around and the need to protect residential amenity. Keeping close control of Tables and Chairs Licenses is an important part of protecting residential amenity as is maintaining restrictions on hours of operation.</p> <p>To conclude, we consider that revisions to the Plan should include a greater emphasis on the heritage of the area and the need to protect it, and a greater emphasis on the protection of residential amenity.</p>	<p>heritage designation on the site.</p> <p>Monitoring will concentrate on recording progress in delivering the vision, principles and priorities identified in the chapter.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council is actively in discussions with TfL to deliver these benefits.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is addressed within the appropriate conservation area appraisals, which are referenced in the new place chapter.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Earl's Court Partnership Ltd (ECPL)	<p>Para 3.3.28</p> <p>Suggest text changes to the paragraph, noting that the SPD was prepared in collaboration with LBHF, GLA and TfL. Note that it was adopted. Need to significantly expand the final sentence to provide additional context to what has taken place on the site to date, i.e. what works have commenced under permissions granted.</p>	<p>The place chapter has been updated to reflect what has happened since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2010.</p>
Victoria Borwick	<p>Traffic - I do not understand why we allow people to park on a single yellow line near the "Israeli embassy" it is the narrowest pinch point coming along from the East to the West on the high street and I have never understood why some bits of the high street are double yellow lines but we don't have them there, and people park whilst waiting for the Royal Garden Hotel and other restaurants nearby, often bringing it down to one lane, which does not work. The rest of the high Street works well, except this particular stretch.</p> <p>Local amenities, I believe we should seek to preserve: doctors, dentists and local shops that provide services, otherwise we shall not be a community. We also need to maintain commercial premises for offices and retail, so that people can get employment</p> <p>The most important anchor for a community is the local school, If people have a good local school, then it encourages people to live there not just "investment purchasing" . I therefore support keeping the "educational use" in Heythrop college site, I think it would be a fantastic opportunity to provide a local school, either independent or state, to maintain the local community feel. We should encourage all schools as this means that people actually live in the community as they want their children to go to school here</p> <p>I do not see the need for more public art in the High Streets of the Borough</p> <p>I would not welcome digging up our High Street for a cycle lane, I think the shared space we have in the High street of all the vehicles means that people have to take care and respect all users.</p>	<p>This is an issue for TfL and our highway department rather than for the Local Plan.</p> <p>Medical facilities are protected under Policy CK1 of the plan whilst shops are also protected whether they are within a designated town centre or not.</p> <p>Such a use would be acceptable in principle provided it can be demonstrated that access constraints can be overcome and traffic movements managed.</p> <p>This would be a TfL and GLA initiative. There are no plans for this.</p>
Savills (Aimee Squires)	<p>Places – Earl's Court</p> <p>The site is situated within the Earl's Court Place which generally comprises the area between Kensington High Street to the north, Lillie Road to the south, Earl's Court Road to the east and the west London train line to the west.</p> <p>Policy CV10 (Vision for Earl's Court in 2028) sets out the overall vision for the Earl's Court area. This policy states –</p> <p>The western edge of the borough will be reintegrated with the Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre so that the centre is able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban village' environment which local residents can enjoy.</p> <p>Crucial to this is reducing the impact of the one-way system on residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport users,</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>preferably by returning the one-way system to two-way working or other significant environmental improvements. The function of the centre will be reinforced by improved links to the Exhibition Centre, which should be developed for mixed uses with a significant convention, exhibition or cultural use. Earl's Court site will therefore retain its important London-wide role as a distinctive cultural brand, but also transformed into a new vibrant urban quarter. New residential-led mixed use development along Warwick Road will further reinforce this urban quarter, which will include new open space and a new school. The area will continue to offer a wide range of residential accommodation and will include community infrastructure to support local life. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements to Cromwell Road, Warwick Road and Earl's Court Road will transform the environment, making it more pleasant for pedestrians and residents, marking the arrival of the A4 in Central London.</p> <p>The following paragraphs specifically mention 100 West Cromwell Road – Paragraph 10.3.10 – Community facilities will be provided as part of the developments on the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, at 100 West Cromwell Road and the Warwick Road sites, including a new primary school at the northern end of Warwick Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.12 – Earl's Court must retain the diversity of housing tenure, which it currently enjoys. Residential development in Earl's Court must deliver a mix of housing to reflect local and borough-wide need. There are significant new housing projects at 100 West Cromwell Road alongside Tesco, and further north in Warwick Road. Guidelines have been prepared for the Warwick Road sites.</p> <p>The following paragraphs address the area surrounding the subject site –  Paragraph 10.3.3 – Pedestrian movement across West Cromwell Road will be improved, particularly at the junction with Warwick Road, as well as improvements to the pedestrian environment on Warwick Road north of West Cromwell Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.14 – The sites located in Warwick Road will have an important role in providing public open space, an improved streetscape and community facilities.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.15 – There are also plans to transform the environment in West Cromwell Road, introducing avenues of trees, and bringing significant improvements to the pedestrian environment in Warwick Road.</p> <p>Policy CP10 states – The Council will ensure an attractive 'urban village' environment in Earl's Court by supporting improvements to the public realm, pedestrian environment and open space. The Council will resist development proposals which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and compromise delivery of the vision.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.4.2 addresses the quantum of development within the Earl's Court area and identifies two strategic site allocations including the Warwick Road site. This paragraph states that – The Warwick Road sites are allocated for 1,600 homes overall. Within the Royal Borough, therefore, the Earl's Court is expected to deliver a minimum 2,100 homes during the lifetime of this plan.</p> <p>As part of the Local Plan Partial Review, the Council has provided an update on the progress that has been made in bringing forward the</p>	

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>strategic aims for Earl's Court. Paragraph 3.3.28 of the Local Plan Partial Review Document states –A Supplementary Planning Document was produced for redevelopment of the Opportunity Area including the part of the site in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. Redevelopment has received planning permission and is underway. Some of the Warwick Road sites have been built out.</p>	
Penny Laughton	<p>CHAPTER 7 – PORTOBELLO/NOTTING HILL</p> <p>7.1.4 Multiple retailers: 18% is a very high percentage compared with 10 years ago suggesting the direction of travel which should leave no room for complacency.</p> <p>7.2 Vision: it is strange that RBKC state that the mix of shops in Portobello road, including the antiques arcades, should remain whilst admitting to having little power to control the landlords (see 7.3.10 &amp; 11).</p> <p>7.3.5 &amp; 6 Marketing: as part of their support, RBKC should actively engage in the marketing of all aspects of the market, including the antiques aspect as this is potentially the most vulnerable; 'a sustainable long-term future' includes access for independent retailers and thus costs to them.</p> <p>7.3.8 Street lighting: RBKC should 'move with the times' (7.3.6) adopting and elegant and modern system, rather than an 'olde worlde', sub-Victorian option (and see Chapter 6).</p> <p>7.3.13, 14, 15 Protection of antiques centres: I support the council's initiatives to better protect the antiques centres 100% as well promoting smaller, more affordable, units, all while resisting unit amalgamation.</p> <p>7.3.17 Shop fronts: control of shop fronts is vital, but the council failed catastrophically in the case of Jamie Oliver on Notting Hill Gate; multiples should not be given grants; clear guidelines should be produced and implemented if they have not already done so.</p> <p>7.3.23 Environment: mention of air pollution monitoring and amelioration should be included.</p> <p>CHAPTER 6 – GOLBORNE/TRELLICK</p> <p>6.3.7 This paragraph is too long, covering too many topics.</p> <p>Street lighting: RBKC should adopting and elegant and modern system, taking a leaf out of Erno Goldfinger's book, rather than an 'olde worlde', sub-Victorian option; take care when considering the nature of the speciality market. In adopting 'New heritage style streetlights' for Golborne Road RBKC is mistaken.</p> <p>Artwall: give over to London street art to encourage a younger demographic (employ a specialist curator or gallery – not a council committee! - to manage a changing display; every 6 months white wash the wall for the art to be renewed so that people re-visit)</p>	<p>The chapter has been re-written.</p> <p>The vision for Portobello / Notting Hill Gate has been amended.</p> <p>This is a statement of fact in relation to changes of use within the same use class.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Facia signage and shop front alterations requiring planning permission will be assessed on their merit taking into account the Council's policies on protecting the character and heritage assets. Amalgamation of shops does not require planning permission. We are proposing to develop specific shop front guidance for Portobello Road.</p> <p>Air quality is a borough wide issue and best addressed in a general policy. See policy CE5.</p> <p>The Council has sought to reduce the information</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is an issue that could be taken up with public art panel.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Sotir Ted	<p>Sarah Palmer of Edwardes Square forwarded to me the neighbourhood planning document chapter 11 --Kensington High Street. I read the chapter and am supportive of the initiatives and the long term planning to enhance the viability of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>The report on page 7, item 11.1.7 notes the great success of the 'Significantly improved pedestrian environment following streetscape improvement'. Everyone who lives in the neighbourhood or visits the area would agree on the success of this feature.</p> <p>As more development increases to the west of the Odeon movie theatre project, and in particularly 375 Kensington development and school initiative, there in another strip of street that would greatly benefit from extending the streetscape further west. The space to target on KHS is between west side of Edwardes Square (Road) and to Warwick Gardens. It is a stretch of road approximately 200 meters long.</p> <p>This area would be well served by a better streetscape and some trees planned in the middle. The benefits would include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To keep traffic to same pace down the whole length of KHS.</li> <li>2. To continue to provide turn lanes for east bound traffic turning into: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Saint Mary's Abbot's Place</li> <li>b. Edwardes Square (road, west side)</li> <li>c. Earls Terrance</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. To help extent the business/shopping district further to the west</li> <li>4. To help encourage more pedestrian traffic to these area and better support the increased flow</li> <li>5. To better connect 375 Kensington development and the new school to KHS</li> <li>6. To improve the general look and feel of the KHS. This section of road looks out of context with the rest of KHS to the east.</li> </ol>	<p>The Council recognises this as a priority in the amended place chapter. See Section 11.4</p>
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (Indigo Planning)	<p>We write on behalf of our client, Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, to submit representations in relation to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan Partial Review – Issues and Options document, currently out for consultation.</p> <p>Sainsbury's operate two supermarkets (Cromwell Road and Ladbroke Grove) and nine convenience stores in the Borough. As a result, Sainsbury's are keen to be involved in the Local Plan process. In particular, their Ladbroke Grove store is located in the Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site, which is identified in the London Plan as an Opportunity Area and also allocated in the Adopted consolidated Local Plan 2015 for major mixed use development. Sainsbury's are working with Ballymore, the landowner of much of this strategic site, to deliver a major mixed use scheme to regenerate this site.</p> <p>Local Plan Partial Review – Issues and Options</p> <p>Reference is made at Figure 1.4 and paragraphs 3.3.8 and 4.3.3 to the Kensal SPD where it is noted that Issues and Options were consulted on in 2012 and that no further work will be progressed on the SPD until there is certainty over the question of the delivery of a station at the site. Our view is that an SPD should not be a pre-requisite to the delivery of this site given that a site specific policy can provide the appropriate level of guidance. The debate about the delivery of the station will evolve outside the Plan process and policy should be flexible enough to allow options to progress the delivery of development rather than unnecessarily delaying it. We consider that a suitably flexible policy will be sufficient to guide</p>	<p>The Council is working proactively with landowners to deliver an SPD and ensure that the site is comprehensively</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	the delivery of this key site and that there isn't a need for an SPD.	redeveloped.
Christian Durie	<p>For SW10 - Lots Road /World's End area to keep rates and Council retail rents reasonable so that the cohesive and useful shops in that area can continue to support the residents of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Keep Green spaces.</p> <p>Encourage buildings no higher than the traditional Chelsea ones.</p> <p>Social housing to be protected so that workers can be near jobs. Look to proving Care Homes so residents can stay in area.</p> <p>Re Chapter 18 - Lots Road/World's End  Keeping Life Local: There are many strange assertions such as the shops by World's End are not "fulfilling their potential". That a higher-quality supermarket is needed - surely that is a decision a retailer will make not the Council? There are many supermarkets from Tesco x2, Sainsbury's x2 M&amp;S, Co-op and Waitrose all within walking distance. The big Sainsburys in the Bluebird failed for lack of 'footfall'. It says we need better 'health facilities' - We have GPs x2, Dentist and Chemists x3, So what is lacking? :</p>	<p>This is not an issue the LPPR can address.</p> <p>Noted and supported by policy</p> <p>Our evidence base suggests that there are very few areas where tall buildings will be acceptable in the borough.</p> <p>Supported in the plan.</p> <p>The wording has been amended in the new policy with these references removed.</p>
Deloitte (Imperial College London)	However, the Local Plan should explicitly recognise the important role that Imperial has in contributing to the success and attractiveness of South Kensington. The South Kensington Places Chapter should be amended to say that the Council supports the consolidation and expansion of educational uses in the area, especially higher education and university uses, given the location of a globally-renowned institution like Imperial in South Kensington.	The importance of Imperial College to the area is specifically referenced at 13.4 of the draft plan.
Cremorne Residents' Association of Lots Village (Martyn M.Baker/ Davis-Head)	<p>These are comments on Chapter 18 : Lots Road/World's End ( The RBKC Consolidated Local Plan 2015 ) on behalf of the Committee of Cremorne Residents Association of Lots Village (CRALV).</p> <p>This Place Chapter has been a useful "road map" and it should be retained once suitably updated.</p> <p>PROGRESS over the last five years since 2010 has been disappointingly slow, and this should be reflected in the updating because : -</p> <p>Ten years ago the Secretary of State overruled the Planning Inspector and gave planning permission but the developers have yet to get beyond the demolition phase in redeveloping the strategic Lots Road Power Station site in Chelsea. So no Section 106 money has become available and no matching funds from RBKC to help overcome the impact of blight (created by a derelict, roofless power station) by improving the neighbourhood.</p> <p>A community centre within the Power Station to replace that lost when Ashburnham School was demolished to make way for the Chelsea Academy has yet to materialize, and the Academy itself has not become a local facility for the community as a whole.</p> <p>No progress has yet been made in completing the Thames Path from Cremorne Gardens through to Chelsea Creek.</p> <p>No moves have been made to improve accessibility by perhaps installing pedestrian lights at the zebra crossings between the World's End</p>	Support noted.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Estate and Lots Village, or by installing a suggested crossing half way down Edith Grove.</p> <p>The Council's aim (18.3.11 ) of "returning the one way-way system to two-way working" has not been realized although we do not know the terms in which RBKC may have pursued this with TfL, nor the grounds on which TfL may have declined to pursue or at least investigate this positive proposal; we have received no feedback and no local consultation process has taken place despite the high volume of heavy polluting traffic and long tail backs particularly at weekends. This aim should be re-emphasized in the updated text as a key priority.</p> <p>We are of course very pleased that much of Lots Village has become a Conservation Area and believe we can build on this. In particular the VISION for this area should now be strengthened to :-  foster recognition of the Thames as a major amenity, and aim to make the waterfront more available for all to enjoy revitalise not just protect Cremorne Gardens and Westfield Park as essential public recreational space in this densely populated Ward, and manage the increased demands now made on them create a new Green Way following the track of the Kensington Canal up from the Pound site to Stanley Bridge and beyond ,following the commitment in 18.3.5 to give consideration to "the creation of new open space" replace the giant advertising hoardings with Green Walls at the junction of Lots Road with Cheyne Walk to benefit air quality and make the entrance to Lots Village once home to extensive market gardens and now in need of more tree planting reinforce Chelsea Design Quarter as a major cultural and employment asset within Lots Road Employment Zone</p> <p>THE TEXT on pages 109,111 and 112 needs some SPECIFIC UPDATING as follows : -</p> <p>18.1.2 needs the words " on the A3220 one-way system and the A308 " added after the words "The high volume of traffic"</p> <p>18.3.2 needs to be updated to explain the Conservation Area has now been established</p> <p>18.3.6 needs to say that Cremorne Gardens and Westfield Park have been awarded Green Flag status; the Cremorne Riverside Centre has been built on part of the Gardens ; and in January 2015 English Heritage declined to designate the Gardens as fit to be added to the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>18.3.7 needs to recognize the Council's valuable support for better local shopping facilities,as reflected in an excellent range of practical/functional retail outlets along the south side of King's Road West between Beaufort Street and the modernised Co-op on the corner of Edith Grove.</p> <p>18.3.9 needs to acknowledge that Chelsea Academy has yet to become "an important local facility" for the local community as a whole.</p> <p>18.3.11 needs to explain that bus routes in the neighbourhood have been very much improved and the West London Line has achieved increased capacity through longer trains and increasing frequencies. References to a Chelsea-Hackney line potential interchange with the West London Line should be deleted as the Council has written to TfL to rule out the earlier option of a station in West Chelsea on Crossrail 2.( Also delete reference at 18.4.4)</p>	<p>This remains a priority within the draft policies.</p> <p>We have developed a vision for Lots Road / World's End with principles and priorities for the area, which takes in many of the aspects of the vision outlined here.</p> <p>The new conservation area designation is represented on the map and referenced in the context section of the amended text.</p> <p>The aim of the updated place chapters is to reduce repetition and streamline the text to ensure it is legible and accessible. As a result large amounts of contextual information is being avoided.</p> <p>This is a point brought out in the King's Road place chapter and it is made more generally in the Fostering Vitality chapter and policies.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed – TfL have no plans for a Crossrail 2 station in West Chelsea.</p> <p>Agreed - an update on the Cremorne site has been included within the new context section in the chapter. Air</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>18.3.13 needs we think to acknowledge that to tackle the core issue of overloaded/polluted streets (which present major health risks) the Air Quality Action Plan needs to be strengthened with additional traffic reduction initiatives - see CRALV's email of 6/11/15 to Guy Denington 18.3.13 needs to recognize that the waste management facility at Cremorne Wharf has been decommissioned, that Thames Tideway Tunnel Ltd is about to start major construction work there to be followed by Thames Water's proposed Counters Creek Storm Relief Sewer project, and that it will be at least five years before the Wharf can return to its GLA status as a protected wharf for river freight operations which PLA intend to pursue. This will leave no scope for reversion to borough waste management operations now consolidated at Smugglers Wharf in Battersea.</p> <p>18.3.14 needs to refer to the recently built Heatherly Fine Arts School which replaces the one demolished to make way for the Academy and which should also be shown on the map and also refer explicitly to Chelsea Design Quarter as an adjunct to the well established Design Centre in Chelsea Harbour itself, London's centre for Interior Design.</p> <p>We consider the reference to the Employment Zone should be strengthened to emphasize that this valuable business cluster should whenever possible be expanded and reinforced by providing more space for independant businesses more small business units and more managed workspace; this is particularly necessary on employment generation grounds in view of the fact that Chelsea Riverside Ward is the third most densely populated ward in RBKC but, unlike other wards in Chelsea, its Workplace Population does not increase to a much higher level during the working week; it remains no higher than its usual resident population, only two thirds of which are economically active. See also CRALV's comments on the Enterprise Core Strategy Review in Nov/Dec.2014 .</p> <p>18.4.5 already says "there is a need for the area to settle after the implementation of these projects take place" - it will be at least another FIVE years before the Power Station site is completed (and over 1,000 residents added to the population of Lots Village ) and longer before the intensive infrastructure works at Cremorne Wharf are finished. There is therefore no case at all for further residential development to be planned in this neighbourhood apart from the low rise redevelopment of the Pound site as extra care housing for the elderly which we would very much favour and indeed eagerly await.</p> <p>The map on page 110 (from the 2010 Local Plan) suggested there were "potential development sites" in the lower part of Lots Road running up to the King's Road. As this area is almost entirely given over to Employment Uses, and is so coloured on the map as part of the Lots Road Employment Zone, there can in our opinion be no case for any more residential development or so-called "mixed use" development when there are such compelling reasons (as recorded in commenting on 18.3.14 above) for reinforcing employment space needed by Chelsea Design Quarter.</p> <p>The creation of new homes in the Employment Zone is contrary to the Council's Local Plan; because this is already the most densely populated ward in Chelsea before the coming of 420 new homes on the LRPS site any further residential development should be located in less densely populated wards with more infra-structure capacity to accommodate additional homes.</p>	<p>pollution is a borough (and London) wide issue and best addressed through the borough wide Policy CE5.</p> <p>Agreed and put into the new text.</p> <p>Agreed – we have strengthened the role of the employment zone in the vision as a centre for innovation particularly on art architecture, antiques and interior design.</p> <p>Noted. This site is allocated in the plan.</p> <p>Noted – the Council feels that this parade of retail units are of poor quality and that King's Road shopping centre would benefit from redevelopment. Any retail or office floorspace would be protected.</p> <p>The Council's emerging approach to employment zones is to protect existing employment floorspace and ensure that development brings an uplift in office floorspace. Some residential may be acceptable under these circumstances. Residential uses will be very much subordinate to employment uses within</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		designated employment areas.
South Kensington & Queen's Gate Residents Association (Caryl Harris)	<p>Green Spaces Some time ago the Science Museum put forward plans to convert the small green section on the corners of Museum Lane and Exhibition Road, to site yet another café/kiosk which all the residents associations strongly opposed. Fortunately after local pressure was exerted the Museum withdrew the application. The Council's protection of this and indeed all green spaces for the public use is of paramount importance. We are delighted that good use of the NHM lower lawn areas and Wild Life Garden is now seen as invaluable space for the Natural History Museum visitors and residents alike, and can be seen in their new renovation plans for the museum. Obviously some institutions are taking notice of the residents concerns about loss of garden squares and green areas.</p> <p>South Kensington Station - link to Brompton Cross Turning to the area around South Kensington Tube Station we have already expressed our views concerning the overcrowding, not assisted by the revised traffic flow around the station. Nor do we feel that Pelham Street requires any more retail on the southern side of this beautiful, classic London Street and nor indeed a pedestrianisation. This narrow street needs to be a single one-way street in a southerly direction to Brompton Cross. There is ample room especially for buses, in Sidney Place to accommodate traffic heading north as the contra flow to this simple plan – suggested many times to the Town Hall.</p> <p>The Station is now progressing well in its redevelopment, despite several over ambitious and ugly suggestions to this historic destination. And we are encouraged by the consultation currently underway with TfL to develop a station design that is both appropriate, step-free and sympathetically designed, maintaining and adding to the historic values of this iconic site. We are fortunate to have some very well informed other local residents association chairmen, like Sophie Andrea who has enormous experience in preserving and enhancing listed buildings. We would also include the Museum link/tunnel within this development, as this too is under full consideration and discussion.</p> <p>In conclusion, we consider that revisions to the Plan should include a greater emphasis on the protection of local residential amenities and the historic beauty of this area. And although we appreciate the need to cater for the 40 million visitors that arrive at South Kensington Station, it should not be to the detriment of those that live and work around this beautiful heritage area.</p>	<p>Striking a balance between the needs of residents and visitors in South Kensington is a key aspect of the place vision.</p> <p>Agree – this has been brought forward in the draft policy.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	<p>The main points from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having a chapter devoted to the Kensington High Street is absolutely essential, because it brings together and provides a bridge between the high-level vision and priorities of the Local Plan and the policies for the main subject areas. It essential in order that local people can understand the implications of the Local Plan for their community.</li> <li>• The chapter needs to have place-specific policies included in the policy box, not just mentioned in the reasoned justification</li> <li>• Not just a shopping centre, but a town centre and focus for the Community: The existing chapter presented the High Street almost entirely as a shopping destination competing with other high-order centres rather than as a town centre containing not only shops, but major offices, leisure and tourism facilities, but, just as import as all of these, it was focus for the whole community because of public and community services, such as the town hall, library, post office, pharmacies, banks and local employment opportunities. The vision needs revising to reflect this.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council's approach is to have an overarching policy which ensures that development meets the visions, priorities and principles set out in the places chapters. This approach reduces the repetition in the current plan between the vision and the CP place policies whilst providing a policy hook to ensure development management colleagues</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The chapter should give clear policy guidance on the future of key facilities, such as the post office - the post office moved from a Royal Mail building next the Odeon and new premises leased for 10/15 years from 2012 – the High Street will need to keep a post office. We should be planning now for the replacement of this key social and community use.</li> <li>• There is insufficient wayfinding material and interpretation material – signs, plaques and literature – to inform visitors and residents about the range of attractions and activities in the High Street</li> <li>• Step-free access to High Street Underground is a very high priority</li> <li>• Clearing the clutter – a further round of reducing the number of telephone kiosks, including those attached to advertisement panels, and removal of the derelict Infopoint.</li> <li>• Cycling – although strongly supportive of cycling, we would be opposed to a Mayoral Cycle Superhighway and any further Mayoral Cycle Stations in the High Street – if this were proposed.</li> <li>• Strong concern about impact of allowing change of use, especially: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- changes of shops to coffee shops, cafes and restaurants that might happen as a result of Design Museum</li> <li>- changes of shops to estate agents, such as in Kensington Church Street</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Council should consider removing these freedoms to change use using Article 4 Directions to stop excessive concentrations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to review secondary frontages to see whether some could be reclassified as primary frontages – in the west to include Waitrose and shops on north side west of Holland Green and in the east between 1 and 35 Kensington High Street</li> <li>• More attention needs to be given to enhancing the spaces in and around the High Street including in front of the Odeon, the Design Museum, the former Vestry Hall (now Bank Melli), the spaces off Kensington Church Walk, in front of St Mary Abbots and within the future Lancer Square scheme</li> <li>• Need for places for people to sit and enjoy just being in the High Street. More benches are needed on the north side of the High Street between Kensington Church Street and Holland Park, perhaps a couple for each block. This would greatly improve the High Street as a place where older people can stop and rest.</li> <li>• Better management of the street, especially east of Kensington Court Passage to get rid of A-frames and other footway obstructions and tackle unauthorised shopfronts and secure compliance with disabled access.</li> <li>• Greater promotion of the High Street and its history</li> </ul>	<p>are able to use the contents of the vision as a framework to negotiate with developers.</p> <p>The vision for High Street Kensington has been altered to reflect its role as a cultural destination and well as a centre serving residents' needs.</p> <p>Improved wayfinding and reducing clutter are priorities within the chapter.</p> <p>Cycling – noted this is TfL and GLA initiative.</p> <p>Change of use – the policy protecting the retail uses within designated centre remains in Policy CF3. Consideration of article 4 directions is a separate process outside of the LPPR.</p> <p>Frontages – this has been taken forward as part of the LPPR.</p> <p>Many of these areas have been highlighted as priorities within the place. The delivery section raises the prospect of neighbourhood CIL as a funding source.</p> <p>This is picked up within the principle of reducing street clutter.</p> <p>Agree - Promoting KHS is dealt with in delivery section of the chapter.</p> <p>Heythrop – the Council has produced an SPD for the site to guide development. Tertiary education would be acceptable at the site in policy terms but the</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining Heythrop College as a tertiary education use plus student accommodation</li> </ul>	<p>eventual use will depend to some degree on the intentions of the eventual owner of the site.</p>
Judith Blakeman	<p>Latimer</p> <p>The name "Latimer" is misleading. Many residents think it relates to the Latimer Road area north of the Westway elevated motorway, whereas it refers to the area south of the Westway, to the west of Ladbroke Grove. The second choice of name for this area at the time of the Core Strategy consultation was "Bramley" and this more accurately represents the area in question. Consideration should therefore be given to changing the name of this "Place" to Bramley for the avoidance of confusion.</p> <p>(Similarly, the underground station has been mis-named since the developments of the 1960s and 1970s and in an ideal world should now be called Bramley Road Station.)</p>	<p>The term Latimer is used to describe the area both north and south of the Westway, Latimer Road tube station and the Latimer Road / Freston Road Employment Zone. This area was called 'Latimer' in the existing Local Plan and in other supporting documents. A change now would add additional confusion rather than reduce it.</p>
The Chelsea Society (Michael Stephen)	<p>CLP CHAPTER 18 - Lots Road/World's End</p> <p>Lots Road/World's End is treated as the triangle bounded by the ECOWS, the River Thames and the inter borough boundary. This serves to isolate it from the remainder of Chelsea Riverside and thus constrain coherent and constructive debate about the integration and relationship of this "place" to the other parts of Chelsea Riverside, in particular the adjacent zone of the Thames Chelsea Bank.</p> <p>Progress over the five years since 2010 has been disappointingly slow, and this should be reflected in the Review because : -</p> <p>Ten years ago the Secretary of State overruled the Planning Inspector and gave planning permission for the strategic Lots Road Power Station site in Chelsea but the developers have yet to get beyond the demolition phase in redeveloping. So no Section 106 money has become available and no matching funds from RBKC to help overcome the impact of blight (created by a derelict, roofless power station) by improving the neighbourhood.</p> <p>A community centre within the Power Station has yet to materialize to replace that lost when Ashburnham School was demolished to make way for the Chelsea Academy, and the Academy itself has not become a local facility for the community as a whole.</p> <p>No progress has yet been made in completing the Thames Path from Cremorne Gardens through to Chelsea Creek.</p> <p>No moves have been made to improve accessibility by perhaps installing pedestrian lights at the zebra crossings between the World's End Estate and Lots Village, or by installing a suggested crossing half way down Edith Grove. The Council's aim of "returning the one way-way system to two-way working" has not been realized although we do not know the terms in which RBKC may have pursued this with TfL, nor the grounds on which TfL may have declined to pursue or at least investigate this positive proposal; we have received no feedback and no local consultation process has taken place despite the high volume of heavy polluting traffic and long tail backs particularly at weekends. This aim should be re-emphasized in the updated text as a key priority.</p>	<p>The issues within Lots Road / Worlds End are sufficiently different from King's Road to merit a separate chapter. The principles and priorities for the Lots Road / World's End focus on the need to better integrate the area with other parts of Chelsea Riverside.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>We are of course pleased that much of Lots Village has become a Conservation Area and believe we can build on this. In particular the VISION for this area should now be strengthened to :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• foster recognition of the Thames as a major amenity, and aim to make the waterfront more available for all to enjoy</li> <li>• revitalise and not just protect, Cremorne Gardens and Westfield Park as essential public recreational space in this densely populated Ward, and manage the increased demands now made on them</li> <li>• create a new Green Way following the track of the Kensington Canal up from the Pound site to Stanley Bridge and beyond ,following the commitment in 18.3.5 to give consideration to "the creation of new open space"</li> <li>• replace the giant advertising hoardings with Green Walls at the junction of Lots Road with Cheyne Walk to benefit air quality and make the entrance to Lots Villlage once home to extensive market gardens and now in need of more tree planting</li> <li>• reinforce Chelsea Design Quarter as a major cultural and employment asset within Lots Road Employment Zone</li> </ul> <p>The text on pages 109,111 and 112 of the Consolidated Local Plan 2015 needs some specific updating as follows : -</p> <p>18.1.2 needs the words " on the A3220 one-way system and the A308 " added after the words "The high volume of traffic"</p> <p>18.3.2 needs to be updated to explain the Conservation Area has now been established</p> <p>18.3.6 needs to say that Cremorne Gardens and Westfield Park have been awarded Green Flag status; the Cremorne Riverside Centre has been built on part of the Gardens ; and in January 2015 English Heritage declined to designate the Gardens as fit to be added to the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>18.3.7 needs to recognize the Council's valuable support for better local shopping facilities, as reflected in an excellent range of practical/functional retail outlets along the south side of King's Road West between Beaufort Street and the modernised Co-op on the corner of Edith Grove.</p> <p>18.3.9 needs to acknowledge that Chelsea Academy has yet to become "an important local facility" for the local community as a whole.</p> <p>18.3.11 needs to explain that bus routes in the neighbourhood have been very much improved and the West London Line has achieved increased capacity through longer trains and increasing frequencies. References to a Chelsea-Hackney line potential interchange with the West London Line should be deleted as the Council has written to TfL to rule out the earlier option of a station in West Chelsea on Crossrail 2.( Also delete reference at 18.4.4).</p> <p>18.3.13 needs we think to acknowledge that to tackle the core issue of overloaded/polluted streets (which present major health risks) the Air Quality Action Plan needs to be strengthened with additional traffic reduction initiatives.</p> <p>18.3.13 needs to recognize that the waste management facility at Cremorne Wharf has been decommissioned, that Thames Tideway Tunnel Ltd</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This is represented on the map for Lots Road.</p> <p>This is dependent upon the owner of the advertising hoarding agreeing to take it down and thus is difficult to deliver.</p> <p>Agreed – this has been done in the new vision text.</p> <p>This is shown on the new map.</p> <p>Much of the text has been amended to streamline the chapter and make it more accessible and legible.</p> <p>This is a point brought out in the King's Road place chapter and its made more generally in the foster vitality chapter and CF policies.</p> <p>Agreed – if a Crossrail 2 station is delivered it will be delivered within the</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>is about to start major construction work there to be followed by Thames Water's proposed Counters Creek Storm Relief Sewer project, and that it will be at least five years before the Wharf can return to its GLA status as a protected wharf for river freight operations which PLA intend to pursue. This will leave no scope for reversion to borough waste management operations now consolidated at Smugglers Wharf in Battersea.</p> <p>18.3.14 needs to refer to the recently built Heatherly Fine Arts School which replaces the one demolished to make way for the Academy and which should also be shown on the map and also refer explicitly to Chelsea Design Quarter as an adjunct to the well established Design Centre in Chelsea Harbour itself, London's centre for Interior Design. We consider the reference to the Employment Zone should be strengthened to emphasize that this valuable business cluster should whenever possible be expanded and reinforced by providing more space for independent businesses more small business units and more managed workspace; this is particularly necessary on employment generation grounds in view of the fact that Chelsea Riverside Ward is the third most densely populated ward in RBKC but, unlike other wards in Chelsea, its Workplace Population does not increase to a much higher level during the working week; it remains no higher than its usual resident population, only two thirds of which are economically active.</p> <p>18.4.5 already says "there is a need for the area to settle after the implementation of these projects take place" - it will be at least another FIVE years before the Power Station site is completed (and over 1,000 residents added to the population of Lots Village ) and longer before the intensive infrastructure works at Cremorne Wharf are finished. There is therefore no case at all for further residential development to be planned in this neighbourhood apart from the low rise redevelopment of the Pound site as extra care housing for the elderly which we would very much favour and indeed eagerly await.</p> <p>The map on page 110 (from the 2010 Local Plan) suggested there were "potential development sites" in the lower part of Lots Road running up to the King's Road. As this area is almost entirely given over to Employment Uses, and is so coloured on the map as part of the Lots Road Employment Zone, there can in our opinion be no case for any more residential development or so-called "mixed use" development when there are such compelling reasons (as recorded in commenting on 18.3.14 above) for reinforcing employment space needed by Chelsea Design Quarter.</p> <p>The creation of new homes in the Employment Zone is contrary to the Council's Local Plan; because this is already the most densely populated ward in Chelsea before the coming of 420 new homes on the LRPS site any further residential development should be located in less densely populated wards with more infra-structure capacity to accommodate additional homes.</p>	<p>King's Road place. References within the Lots Road/ World's End Place have been deleted.</p> <p>Agreed - an update on the Cremorne site has been included within the new context chapter. Air pollution is a borough (and London) wide issue and best addressed through the borough wide Policy CE5.</p> <p>Agreed and put into the new text.</p> <p>Agreed – we have strengthened the role of the employment zone in the vision as a centre for innovation particularly on art architecture, antiques and interior design.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – the Council feels that this parade of retail units are of poor quality and that King's Road shopping centre would benefit from redevelopment. Any retail or office floorspace would be protected.</p> <p>The Council's emerging approach to employment zones is to protect existing employment floorspace and ensure that development brings an uplift in office floorspace. Some residential may be acceptable under these circumstances. Residential uses will be very much subordinate to employment uses within</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		designated employment areas.
Penny Laughton	<p>16.4.7 – Vision</p> <p>Value judgment: 2: the preservation of the C20 architectural heritage of Notting Hill Gate should not be excluded.</p> <p>Environment: 4: given the changes proposed, the council should include air pollution as a feature to be monitored.</p> <p>Food store: 5: does Notting Hill Gate need a new food store?</p>	This chapter has been amalgamated with Portobello Road and the text has been re-written.
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>I am against the Crossrail 2 station in Kensal.</p> <p>I am also against the Borough-wide exemption from permitted development rights for change of use from office to residential. Shame on you. This is a blatant attempt by the council to continue to starve the borough of much needed residential in favour of developments that generate more lucrative business rates for the council.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council must balance the demand for residential uses with the need to ensure the borough remains a location for employment. Our housing trajectory shows we can meet housing targets within the borough on identified sites without hollowing out the Royal Borough's employment base.</p>
Onslow Neighbourhood Association (Eva Skinner)	As long as they are reviewed frequently in cooperation with the Local Resident Associations, say every 2 years.	Agreed that reviewing is essential. The time scale will depend on the pace of changing circumstances and the resources available.
Sonia Richardson	Yes, comments re Chapters 15 and 18 already recorded	Noted.
Roy Burns	Yes. South Kensington, and in particular the linkage of this Place with Brompton Cross via Pelham Street. There are good grounds for developing the commercial activity along Pelham Street, and this could be achieved by pedestrianizing the street. See below for additional details.	Noted.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	We must work within the framework set out in legislation. Where possible we will take measures to address this issue.
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)	<p>The South Kensington Place chapter 12 needs to be updated to reflect both projected changes and needs in the area during the plan period, including consideration of the V&amp;A's future operational needs.</p> <p>The updated South Kensington chapter needs to cross reference to policy CF11 - the South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area - which in</p>	<p>Noted – it has been updated.</p> <p>The Strategic Cultural Area is shown on</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>association with a review of the Cultural Placemaking document of 2012 could evolve to become a separate "Supplementary planning document" as part of the Plan review.</p> <p>Updated Place Policy needs to encourage visits to the Cultural Quarter by enhancing public transport access and also pedestrian linkages between the South Kensington District Centre to the Cultural Quarter.</p> <p>Updated Policy also needs to be flexible so that the V&amp;A can make full use of the grade 1 listed building for its own operational needs and expediently install temporary exhibitions both within and outside the building, including Exhibition Road.</p> <p>References should be made to the importance of the installation of public art within the Cultural Quarter and the need for an integrated planning policy approach with Westminster City Council in the delivery of the Cultural Quarter.</p>	<p>the map. The opportunities for cultural placemaking have been identified in this plan so a Supplementary Planning Document is unnecessary.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Individual developments will be assessed on their merit taking into account the policies within the LPPR and other material considerations.</p> <p>This is a principle within the place.</p>
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	<p>In South Kensington, the Exhibition Road public realm scheme has greatly improved the experience for users and the setting for our world-class cultural institutions. There remain some issues to be resolved. Specifically, the balance between pedestrians and vehicles needs to be reviewed. The speed and volume of traffic on Exhibition Road still causes concern for safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Particular issues are: pedestrians not waiting for traffic signals – particularly at junction with Thurloe Place, but also at the junction with Cromwell Road; drivers not stopping at roundabout at Prince Consort Road (Westminster); difficulty for pedestrians crossing from Princes Gardens to Imperial College; pedestrians (including children) stepping out into Exhibition Road unaware that vehicles may be approaching - particularly between Cromwell Road-Prince Consort Road</p> <p>South Kensington Station remains in urgent need of improvement. It is a disgrace that this station, the gateway to some of the UK's most visited cultural institutions, does not have step-free access, is so over-crowded; and that the user experience in the station is so poor, particularly compared to the quality of the public realm and public offer within South Kensington. It is good to see plans for much-needed congestion relief now moving forward. It is essential that plans for step-free access from train to street are brought forward without delay. Improvements to the pedestrian tunnel are essential and should be integral to plans for station improvement.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed- the Council is working with TfL to bring forward improvements at the station.</p>
Jo Poole	<p>Latimer must become a model of preservation of community and restraint when it comes to updating the area in due course.</p> <p>All "places" should be regenerated for all-age communities, including step-free access to transport, nursery and primary schools and using existing buildings as far as possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
Natural History Museum (Kevin Rellis)	<p>South Kensington.</p> <p>The South Kensington Places chapter is currently very outdated in respect of the Natural History Museum (NHM) and does not reflect the current developments of the NHM or the Grounds Transformation Programme.</p> <p>The chapter refers to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the NHM which was adopted in 2012. As discussed in previously with</p>	<p>Agreed- it has now been updated.</p> <p>The new draft does not refer to this</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>RBKC, the SPD was prepared in response to discussions about temporary uses within the grounds and the disruption to local residents. The policies within the SPD relate to the long term management of temporary events within the east grounds and establish guidelines for these uses. The SPD was prepared prior to the development of the Grounds Transformation Programme and does not take into account the proposals which will alter the way the grounds are used. These proposals will therefore make large parts of the document no longer relevant.</p> <p>We suggest that the Places chapter removes reference to the SPD.</p> <p>Ground Transformation Programme:</p> <p>The local plan is at the early stages of consultation with the current draft considering potential Issues and Options. Draft policies will not be published until Summer 2016 with adoption not due until 2017.</p> <p>Whilst the application for the Grounds Transformation Programme has not yet been submitted, it is at an advanced stage of design and has been the subject of detailed consultation with RBKC and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>The South Kensington Places chapter should therefore reflect these proposals which will be developed over the course of the plan development, and the subject of a detailed planning application.</p> <p>In particular, Figure 3.8 should be redrawn to reflect the Grounds Transformation Programme and in particular, the potential to enhance the public realm on the junction of Exhibition Road and Cromwell Road.</p> <p>Exhibition Road:</p> <p>When the South Kensington Chapter was originally drafted, the Exhibition Road project was not complete.</p> <p>The plan should recognise that the project is now completed and identify the opportunities which these improvements can bring to the area. In particular, there is significant opportunity for the institutions along Exhibition Road to support the civic nature of the space, improving access and enhancing the public realm.</p> <p>This is being realised at the V&amp;A and the NHM are considering short and long term proposals which will link into Exhibition Road through the Grounds Transformation Programme and in the future the Museum's new Earth and Planetary Science Centre. In addition, future opportunities may exist for the relandscaping of the Museum Lane area.</p>	<p>document.</p> <p>This is acknowledged in the text.</p> <p>This has been done.</p> <p>The opportunity to relandscape Museum Lane is noted in the text.</p>
Turley (Ian Fergusson)	<p>Please see comment above. On the Portobello Road 'Place' it was clear from the discussion group held that there was strong support for the Council supporting the provision of improved connections for pedestrians between Portobello Road, Westbourne Grove, All Saints Road and Golborne Road and Ladbrooke Grove. This will significantly benefit residents, workers and visitors alike.</p>	<p>Agreed - this is shown on the map.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Christie's South Kensington (Francesca Filippini Pinto)	In South Kensington, the Exhibition Road public realm scheme has greatly improved the experience for users and the setting for our world-class cultural institutions. There remain some issues to be resolved. Specifically, the balance between pedestrians and vehicles needs to be reviewed. South Kensington Station remains in urgent need of improvement. It is a disgrace that this station, the gateway to some of the UK's most visited cultural institutions, does not have step-free access, is so over-crowded; and that the station experience is so poor compared to the quality of the public realm and public offer within South Kensington. It is good to see plans for much-needed congestion relief now moving forward. It is essential that plans for step-free access from train to street are brought forward without delay. Improvements to the pedestrian tunnel are essential and should be integral to plans for station improvement.	Noted.
Christian Durie	See answers to questions at the very beginning. Keep Rents & Rates reasonable for our local King's Road/World's End shops. They are currently a community asset. Protect our green spaces. Protect Social Housing. Don't build higher than the average Chelsea houses. Control parking on the King's Road to allow better public transport flow and help improve air quality.	Rent/rates are set by private landlords and the government. They are no issues that can be tackled by the local plan. Agreed- this is done through Protection of social housing is written into estate regeneration policy. The council's tall building SPD shows very little scope for tall buildings in Chelsea. Parking is an issue to raise with TfL and our highways department
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	A printed copy for the document is always available in the public libraries for reference during consultation periods.
The Institute of Cancer Research (Steven Surridge)	Please see email / written response on behalf of the Institute of Cancer Research. (9 February 2016) - in Section 4 Question 4	Noted.
Princes Gate Mews Residents' Association (Jane Whewell)	LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW: SOUTH KENSINGTON  I was very sorry not to be able to attend the meeting last week at the Science Museum to discuss the partial review of the Local Plan due to a clashing meeting at Westminster Council.  I am however keen to respond to the consultation as the text on South Kensington causes me and my fellow residents a number of concerns. In particular, the text and questions in relation to South Kensington have inherent assumptions which do not in fact reflect the facts and do not recognise – nor assess the impact of - the profound transformation that has already taken place in South Kensington over the last 3 years. The text assumes more cafes/restaurants are needed without making any assessment of the impact of the huge number of new café/restaurants	The amended place text makes no reference to the need for more cafes/restaurants.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>which have sprung up in the last 3 years, nor does it take account of the large number of new/expanded café restaurants which are already under construction.</p> <p>First, we would wish to oppose the Council's suggestion that the Council might "relax its percentage based policies in parts of the South Kensington District Centre to reflect its role in serving those visiting Exhibition Road and the Museums"</p> <p>This question has inherent bias (in favour of visitors and the Museums) and fundamentally misunderstands the importance and the role of South Kensington – which serves local residents as a key district hub. South Kensington is a profoundly residential area The emphasis in the question on visitors is inaccurate (statistics show only 50% of users of the station are visiting local institutions/Exhibition Rd) and misplaced and damaging to residential amenity. In our view the balance between the needs of visitors and the needs of residents (who elect local Councillors and pay Council taxes) in the current policy is already seriously tilted unfairly and unjustifiably against the needs of residents and residential amenity.</p> <p>As highlighted above, Para 6.5.21 also does not recognise – far less assess - the impact of the profound transformation in the area the previous policy has delivered in the last 3 years which has seen shop after shop convert to cafe/restaurant. The 'practicalities' and needs of Museums and visitors are already more than met – and indeed more cafes are on the way with the Museums building new / expanding cafes inside their buildings (the V&amp;A, Natural History Museum and Science Museums). There is already a glut of places to eat, drink and buy a souvenir and the Council policy has facilitated this change despite local resident concerns. What is needed is retail A1 use shops where local residents and workers (and probably visitors too) can buy fresh ingredients/a newspaper/a pint of milk/visit a bank.</p> <p>We disagree with the suggestion that "The Council could relax its percentage based policies in parts of the centre to reflect its greater 'service' role and reinforce the role of the remaining centre as serving the needs of the local populous. Do you agree?".</p> <p>The needs of local residents cannot be filled by Old Brompton Road, Bute Street and the western end of Harrington Road (which are not local to those in eg. Thurloe Square, Thurloe Street, Exhibition Road etc. ). It should also be noted that Old Brompton Road, Bute Street and the western end of Harrington Road have also seen shop after shop convert to café/restaurant so there is only limited A1 left.</p> <p>Place Policy Needs to assess and take account the Negative impacts of Café/Restaurants on the Area</p> <p>A key aspect of the area which the text also fails to take into account is the 'cost' (in a broad sense) of the changes to date and the changes now proposed. The increase in the number of cafes and restaurants in this area has resulted in a significant increase in the area in litter, vermin, noise, late night street drinking, vagrancy and street dirt. All this has a very significant cost - which is borne by residents and tax payers. The Council has been paying we believe some £30,000.00 a year in increased street cleansing costs in Exhibition Road alone to clean up after the litter and grease and dirt left on the street by café/restaurants, the police have been using ASBOs against street drinkers (and have cited the increased numbers of cafes/bars as the cause of increased vagrancy and street drinking) and the Council have had to increase litter collections in the area and regularly call out the enforcement team to enforce the licensing and street furniture rules. All this costs the Council – and thus Council tax payers - money. Residents have had to suffer the noise and disruption all this causes – not to mention the vermin and litter. The place strategy needs to take these 'costs' into account – and assess their impacts – before considering increasing these costs by increasing the number of café/restaurants.</p>	<p>The service retail area has been reduced in size to reflect the concerns of residents and the nature of services in the centre.</p> <p>South Kensington serves a dual function in serving the needs of residents but also being at the centre of a cultural destination that attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors a year. The vision need to balances these two functions.</p> <p>The Council's policy to protect retail uses within designated town centres remains in place and that remains the policy starting point for any change of use applications.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>Over-Crowding</p> <p>The Place policy also fails to take into account the sheer scale of overcrowding already in the area - something which increasing the number of café/restaurants will make far worse.</p> <p>South Kensington is already dangerously overcrowded– with the tunnel having to be closed regularly due to overcrowding and people walking into the road in Exhibition Road due to lack of space on the pavement. The idea of allowing more café/restaurants (with their queues of people waiting for their table/coffee/takeaway and inevitable applications for external tables and chairs) in what is already a packed and busy thoroughfare is frankly worrying. Encouraging café/restaurants in the narrow listed station arcade (the main entrance and exit for the millions of station users – and all station users when the tunnel is closed) and in the street directly north of the Station Entrance is seriously misplaced. This area needs to be kept clear to allow station users safe exit and egress.</p> <p>We also note that the south side of the block to the north of the station is broadly currently in office use. We would oppose the loss of still more small offices in the Borough – which this change in policy would facilitate.</p> <p>The text also does not take into consideration how deliveries would be made to these new areas – the combination of delivery lorries and pedestrians is a dangerous one – particularly in narrow streets that are already overcrowded.</p> <p>Street Markets – for all the reasons listed above we would also oppose the encouragement of street stall and street markets in the area in and around South Kensington (apart from in Bute Street) – and indeed ask that the place policy text in relation to markets be amended to take account of over-crowding issues in this place to discourage markets in this area.</p> <p>Finally, we note that the proposed changes and their specific locations would appear significantly to benefit only a small number of specific landowners – to the detriment of other commercial landowners in the immediate area. Such a proposed change is anti-competitive and detrimental to public policy. It would also see a significant transfer of benefit from the public to the private sector with the public sector (and residents) bearing all the costs and gaining no benefit. This is not appropriate.</p> <p>Northern Section of Exhibition Road (north of Cromwell Road) in the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</p> <p>We would ask that map/s be amended to take account of and indicate the large number of local residents – some 130-140 households) who live in Princes Gate Mews and in Exhibition Road (opposite the Science Museum) in the Royal Borough. The ‘obliteration’ of residential uses from Council maps of this area has been a persistent source of difficulty for local residents as even Councillors - let alone local institutions and planners - assume there are no residents in the area as a result. The map currently designates the location of our homes as solely a cultural area – it is not. It is very much in dual use!</p> <p>Prioritisation of the provision of Class A1 retail and other town centre uses on suitable sites in order to meet an identified need</p>	<p>The service retail area has been reduced in size to reflect the concerns of residents and the nature of services in the centre.</p> <p>Agree- the council's Policies are very robust in seeking the protection fo this use.</p> <p>There are no references to street markets in the text.</p> <p>The service retail area has been reduced in size to reflect the concerns of residents and the nature of services in the centre. The decision to look at this issue was taken for spatial planning reasons regardless of ownership.</p> <p>Agree - the Maps have been amended to show building blocks. The cultural area is a specific planning designation that must be retained.</p> <p>The only site that is being allocated within the South Kensington area is the former Iranian site at Harrington Road.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>We would oppose the Council's suggested process for seeking to " 'allocate' these sites for new retail development, whether stand alone or as part of a wider mixed use proposal. 'Allocation' rather than 'identification' would include a degree of compulsion – were the site to come forward for development in the future." The suggestion that "a Council should only allocate land for a town centre use when it is satisfied that the proposed use is viable, and indeed that there are no suitable sites within a designated centre." rules out open, genuine prior local consultation on land use and thus gives far too much control to the Council and to developers and an insufficient role to residents who could be profoundly impacted by such proposals.</p> <p>Conclusion The Local Plan Policy CF3 states "The Council will secure the success and vitality of our town centres by protecting, enhancing and promoting a diverse range of shops and by ensuring that these uses will be supported, but not dominated by, a range of complementary town centre uses".</p> <p>Para 6.5.16 states " The Council takes the view that the strength of its centres lies in the diversity of uses taking place within them. This includes a critical mass of shops to encourage shoppers into a centre; supporting social and community uses; banks and building societies to serve the wider needs of those visiting the centre; and supporting a range of restaurants, cafes, pubs and bars encouraging visitors to linger and to help provide activity in the evening. To this end Policy CF3 of the Local Plan sets out what types of use will be appropriate in different parts of a centre. In essence 80% of units within the primary shopping frontages of the higher order centres should remain in shop uses, this dropping to 66% in the secondary areas."</p> <p>The Council has given no justification (other than an inaccurate statement of the usage of South Kensington by and needs of visitors) for dis-applying this policy at South Kensington – and has made no assessment of the significant costs to the area, residents and Council of the current policy's impacts. We ask that the Local Plan Policy CF3 as drafted be applied in full at South Kensington and that the Place Policy be amended to reflect that there is no longer a need to "encourage cafes and restaurants" – as they are already dominant almost to the exclusion of other uses.</p>	<p>The service retail area has been reduced in size to reflect the concerns of residents and the nature of services in the centre.</p>
<p>Kensal Road and Director of Bella Freud Limited (Bella Freud)</p>	<p>As a long term resident of Kensal Road and Director of Bella Freud Limited, a fashion business based in the area, I would like to provide some comments having considered the plans for the Kensal Gas Works.</p> <p>I believe it is crucial to maintain the creative spirit of the area with studios and office space for small upcoming creative companies. We risk stripping Kensal of its personality if we do not ensure creative space is available at affordable and attractive rates. There are so many new proposals flooding into the area (for example the pre application at the White Knight Laundry for something so out of character to this neighbourhood) which involve turning original spaces into large, corporate looking buildings. This seems really sad and easy to avoid with some good design and respect for the heritage of the area.</p> <p>The development should be generous to local people of all backgrounds. Health clinics, sports centres and lidos. This has to benefit the community and should include the area around the canal.</p> <p>Social housing is essential to maintain the diverse mix of people as is traditional in Kensal. Not just 'affordable' housing.</p>	<p>Agreed – we have robust policies to protect employment uses. This is also reflected in the amended vision for Kensal.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	The beauty of this area is that rich and poor people live closely together and there is a community spirit because of this.	
Earl's Court Society (Malcolm Spalding)	<p>10.1.1 Delete third sentence. Insert at end of fourth sentence after "brand" "which now requires a renaissance"</p> <p>10.1.7 delete first two sentences</p> <p>10.1.8 Insert at end new sentence. "It has the capacity to be further developed as a public amenity green space. There is also potential for roofing over the West London Line from West Brompton to Stamford Bridge in order to create a green corridor walkway"</p> <p>10.2 CV10 (p72) replace "Exhibition Centre" with "Earl's Court site"</p> <p>Insert "nationally" as shown "for mixed uses with a nationally/internationally significant convention, exhibition, or cultural use"</p> <p>Insert at the end a new sentence "Much of the above could be achieved through a Business Improvement District (BID) including active Town Centre Management of both the existing and new environments".</p> <p>10.3.5 add at end "and extending the overground platform lengths to reinstate mainline train services to Gatwick Airport."</p> <p>10.3.6 amend "St Cuthbert's Church (Grade 1)"</p> <p>10.3.8 delete "within the existing Earl's Court or Olympia complexes. If it is located in the same ownership as Earl's Court Exhibition Centre then ...."</p> <p>Continue from "A significant cultural facility that is at least a national destination should be provided....."</p> <p>10.3.9 delete "following the Olympics"</p> <p>10.3.10 delete " and a post office"</p> <p>10.3.12 amend "2,000" to "7,000"</p> <p>10.3.1.3 add at end new sentence "This could be achieved by means of an Earl's Court BID and active town centre management".</p> <p>10.4.2 Amend "500" to "1,000"</p> <p>After "10,000m2 of office floorspace" add "plus at least 1,400 m2 of consolidated cultural space"</p> <p>Amend "1,500" to "6,000" Amend "2,000" to "7,000" Delete final sentence.</p> <p>10.4.4 amend "will be" to "has been"</p> <p>10.4.5 Q4 insert at end "which is at least a national destination ?"</p> <p>INSERT NEW POINT 10.4.11 at end</p> <p>"The Placemaking Chapters of the Consolidated Local Plan form the basis of Neighbourhood Plans"</p> <p>Change Chapter title to "Earl's Court Opportunity Area site"</p> <p>26.2.1 Amend "2,000" to "7,000" Amend "7,000" to "12,000" or "17,000" pse check Amend "500" to "1,000"</p> <p>26.2.3 After "It is expected that this will be located within the most public transport accessible part of the Opportunity Area" add "in the form of at least 1,400m2 of consolidated venue infrastructure"</p> <p>POLICY CA7</p> <p>(a) Amend "500" to "1,000" delete "conducted in the preparation of the SPD" insert "in the Joint SPD"</p> <p>(d) after "important" insert "national and international" to read "as an important national and international cultural destination"</p> <p>(o) Insert at end "Restore direct mainline train services to Gatwick Airport"</p> <p>(p) Insert after "cycle links " "and bus lanes"</p> <p>Insert at end "Investigate roofing over the District tube lines at the Warwick Road entrance to the station to create open green space, or covered</p>	The text for Earl's Court has been amended dramatically to improve legibility to reduce repetition. Many of the recommendations here are factual updates, which have been taken forward in the draft policies. We look welcome to your comments on the next iteration of the plan.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>retail space, to create safe footway linkage to Earl's Court Road"</p> <p>26.3.1 delete "There is also a risk that the SPD is not adopted.....and a planning application"</p> <p>26.3.3 Update needed</p> <p>26.3.4 delete 2009 &amp; text delete 2009-11 &amp; text delete 2012 &amp; text</p> <p>26.4.5 Amend "Current Uses" to "Previous Uses"</p> <p>26.4.7 Update needed</p> <p>Change Chapter title to "Earl's Court Opportunity Area site"</p> <p>26.2.1 Amend "2,000" to "7,000" Amend "7,000" to "12,000" or "17,000" pse check Amend "500" to "1,000"</p> <p>26.2.3 After "It is expected that this will be located within the most public transport accessible part of the Opportunity Area" add "in the form of at least 1,400m2 of consolidated venue infrastructure"</p> <p>POLICY CA7</p> <p>(a) Amend "500" to "1,000" delete "conducted in the preparation of the SPD" insert "in the Joint SPD"</p> <p>(d) after "important" insert "national and international" to read "as an important national and international cultural destination"</p> <p>(o) Insert at end "Restore direct mainline train services to Gatwick Airport"</p> <p>(p) Insert after "cycle links " "and bus lanes"</p> <p>Insert at end "Investigate roofing over the District tube lines at the Warwick Road entrance to the station to create open green space, or covered retail space, to create safe footway linkage to Earl's Court Road"</p> <p>26.3.1 delete "There is also a risk that the SPD is not adopted.....and a planning application"</p> <p>26.3.3 Update needed</p> <p>26.3.4 delete 2009 &amp; text delete 2009-11 &amp; text delete 2012 &amp; text</p> <p>26.4.5 Amend "Current Uses" to "Previous Uses"</p> <p>26.4.7 Update needed</p>	
Earl's Court Partnership Ltd (ECPL)	Comment on Earl's Court required.	
Judith Blakeman	<p>Latimer</p> <p>The community of the Latimer "Place" is united in its concern about the Council's current study on land and properties in Council ownership and the wider area and the strong likelihood of further estate regeneration in this area. The current study does not appear to have included consideration of the refurbishment potential of many of the buildings within this study area. This concern is compounded by uncertainty as no one knows precisely which estates are included within the Latimer boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is concern about the potential loss of the green open space that is desperately needed, given the very poor local air quality. The need for further greening within this "Place" does not appear within this Local Plan review and it should be there.</p> <p>Westway</p> <p>At the moment there is no clarity about which authority or organisation will take responsibility for the day-to-day management of the new pedestrian and cycle subway beneath the West London railway line from the Imperial West Innovation Hub to North Kensington. This would be</p>	<p>The Housing Department have commissioned consultants to look at this issue. Four options have been considered in relation to Estate Renewal including refurbishment. The 'Strategy for Regeneration' is an evidence base document, which will be publicly available on the next round of consultation.</p> <p>A principle of the Latimer places it to 'Provide good quality, safe and useable</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>the ideal location for the Westway Circus station on the West London railway line and then the matter of upkeep would automatically be resolved.</p> <p>We support the Westway Trust's ambition to create a larger and more vibrant sports hub at the Westway roundabout, preferably one which includes an equestrian offer. This is set out in the Westway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Core Strategy contains a plan for the "hanging gardens" of Westway. A green wall has recently been built beside the Westway Trust's sports pitches and there is much scope for further greening initiatives in the area. New York's High Line exemplifies a possible way to develop the unused motorway spur.</p> <p>Portobello/Notting Hill</p> <p>This contains an error in paragraph 3.3.21. The Museum of Brands, Packaging and Advertising has recently relocated to larger premises in Lancaster Road off Ladbroke Grove, within the Latimer "Place", not the Portobello/Notting Hill "Place".</p>	<p>open space'. Reference has been made to Westway Circus Station.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Cllr E Dent Coad	<p>KENSAL</p> <p>We have major concerns about the Gasworks site that can be summarised in two areas:</p> <p>1, if we succeed in our bid for a Crossrail station, the likelihood is that the S106 contribution will be attributed to building the skip-stop station and there will be no social or affordable housing whatever. The benefits of such a station to local people, given that it will not be in use throughout the day, will be limited. So what will be the local benefit?</p> <p>2, if we do not succeed in our bid for a Crossrail station, how will we improve transport infrastructure? There is no Plan B to join the Gasworks site to Old Oak Common and it seems the only possibility will be a proposal to have a link road to the south of the railway joined by a proposed bridge – which, given the restrictions and width of the tracks would be expensive if at all possible. There are huge problems to overcome here and there are no good solutions on the table.</p> <p>We should delete the proposed pedestrian bridge over the canal through Kensal Cemetery. Given that the Cemetery will not allow access when it is closed, there will be no viable commuter link and we should be realistic and not pretend this is achievable.</p> <p>There should be a 'destination' offer at the Gasworks, whether this is a public park on the canal and/or some kind of sporting facility. Without this, and affordable shops such as Lidl (which we are regularly asked for), the danger is that the Gasworks becomes a new Chelsea Harbour which is a ghost town.</p> <p>The Kensal Employment Zone has suffered from developments offering retail and office space of the wrong kind that is not desirable by local businesses. The Canalot student hostel units are empty, we must understand local need and cater for that rather than building units with plate glass frontages suitable only for luxury goods constantly on display. Some businesses are small, messy and not aesthetic and we must cater for them as well.</p> <p>Once again we would like to emphasise that evidenced local need should be our starting point and not an 'add-on' that developers can easily</p>	<p>The Kensal DIF study demonstrates that a Crossrail Station would increase viability of the site and the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered. The station would be in use throughout the day it would have 4-6 trains an hour which is sufficient for people not to have to plan which train they will catch. The benefit to the local community would be in terms of widening employment and education opportunities.</p> <p>The Kensal Transport study sets out how the transport infrastructure can be improved.</p> <p>The pedestrian link would provide considerable benefits during daylight hours.</p> <p>The supermarket will be re-provided (slightly larger) and there will be a new neighbourhood centre as well as new</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>'subtract' from their equations. If not we will continue to have luxury developments standing beside abject poverty, which is unacceptable and bad planning.</p> <p>GOLBORNE/TRELICK</p> <p>We would like to repeat the comments made earlier about the Inspector's recommendation in relation to health inequalities. The current scheme under way for the Edenham site has managed to avoid the health clinic that has been evidenced as essential to improve local health.</p> <p>As far as we can see the only 'benefit' for local residents as currently proposed is a potentially better view from local buildings – if indeed it is better. The proportion of social rented homes – at 'affordable' rent – is minuscule in relation to local need. This is a major missed opportunity and frankly it seems obscene for the Council to be monetising a site such as this where health deprivation is actually worsening. There is work here for the Council and they must accept their responsibilities and create a proposal that will directly benefit the housing problems, health and work possibilities for this deprived community.</p> <p>The proposed bridge over Grand Union Canal should be deleted from this chapter as there is nowhere for such a bridge to land on the north side.</p>	<p>public spaces on the site.</p> <p>The Council is working with the NHS West London Clinical Commissioning Group to understand better the health facilities needed in the area.</p> <p>The Council will deliver affordable housing on this site in line with our housing policies subject to viability considerations.</p> <p>This is not a specific action within the place.</p>

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

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	<p>Let Portobello evolve away from the "antiques" which are really mostly garage sale tat. The Council should stop trying to preserve dinosaurs, and allow the Portobello area to thrive and evolve as a new type of place with its own new personality and attraction.</p> <p>And stop the nonsense each year of the "Carnival" , which is dangerous, drug -infested; crime ridden; etc.</p> <p>It is no longer a quaint celebration by locals- it has become a massively attended street party that should be relocated to the Olympic park. As a local resident, it is nothing but a source of increased rubbish, noise, pollution; blocked streets; blocked parking; congestion etc. Few if any local residents attend- it draws the far and dirty into our area by the multitudes who wreak havoc that needs to be cleaned up by the locals for days thereafter.</p> <p>Have the guts to stop this nonsense!</p>	<p>The market remains one of the most visited attractions within the borough supporting jobs and bringing economic benefits. It is right the Council's policies reflect that.</p> <p>The carnival does not fall within the control of the planning department and the LPPR.</p>
J Wilson	<p>I make the following suggestions which I hope will be taken up in whole or in part. My comments relate to the area I know best – South West Chelsea (the Lots road area in particular) which is less commercially viable than some of the other areas in the borough such as Sloane Square, Kensington or Knightsbridge. I feel the policies may need to be different for the different areas to reflect the very different attributes and needs of the community.</p> <p>In the Lots Road area, we need the following:</p>	<p>We have policies to protect parks and it is a priority within the Lots</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies to prevent the loss of parks and open spaces for development e.g. Thames Water taking over Cremorne Gardens for The Thames Tideway Tunnel and counters creek project. Cremorne Gardens has been leased previously for construction use</li> <li>• Protection from the excessive concentration of infrastructure projects in the Lots Road area in particular e.g. Counters Creek Sewer, the Thames tideway tunnel national grid Gas works.</li> <li>• A policy preventing developers in other areas within the borough “dumping” so much of the affordable housing associated with their schemes within our area.</li> <li>• Policies to restrict extended working / 24 hour a day and weekend construction working only in emergencies and only for short periods of time, never for more than a few weeks and once only.</li>   <li>• Streetscape improvements e.g. Removal all of the illuminated and non illuminated advertising hoardings that blight our area, proper, attractive hoardings around building sites</li>   <li>• Consider designating the area an environmental zone, or similar e.g. lowering the speed of traffic passing through the area to 20 MPH thus improving safety and encouraging cycling and walking, reducing the number of lorries in the area (and not just during school hours – plenty of residents, including many children, are out and about in the area outside these hours!), junction redesign, improving the pavements (wider, cleaner, and better condition) to make them more pedestrian friendly and appealing. Additionally the pedestrian crossings across Cremorne and Ashburnham Roads need to be improved, made more pedestrian friendly and be made safer.</li>   <li>• Policies to encourage retail that actually meets the needs of the local community e.g. a supermarket (other than the Co-Op or the Tesco at the petrol station so we have proper choice), coffee shops, restaurants newsagents and estate agents rather than more antique shops, betting shops and dry cleaners!</li>   <li>• Policy to prevent developers leaving vacant sites in a deliberately derelict state to the detriment of the local area or, where the construction cannot start, require the developer to fully hoard the site in a visually attractive way to reduce the eyesore that derelict sites bring. The policy ideally needs to be implemented straight away or within a year not just left with little or no action as in the case of the lots road power station which has been roof less, derelict shell condition and semi demolished for year after year</li>   <li>• A policy ideally prohibiting but at the very least limiting the amount of time our roads are completely closed off whilst work is done. The current work by National Grid in Kings Road is a prime example of why this policy is necessary. The extra traffic jams and the inconvenience caused to the local residents is considerable and will continue for another eight months. Then they will return again in a few years time or less to close restrict Cheyne walk west bound or east bound. These works should be located elsewhere to avoid concentrating them all in one area</li>   <li>• I strongly agree with the policy to remove the safeguarding clause around Cremorne Wharf. It would be very welcome and I highly encourage the council to be vigorously campaigning for this</li> </ul>	<p>Road / World's End place chapter.</p> <p>The location of these scheme are considered on their own merits.</p> <p>This is an issue that must be tackled within the housing policies within the plan rather than the place policies.</p> <p>The Council has strict agreements with developers regarding construction to protect residential amenity.</p> <p>This is difficult to deliver if the advertisements have been consented.</p> <p>This is an issue to raise with transport for London who have control of strategic road network.</p> <p>The Planning system is unable to control the type of shops that come forward but can only protect the use (i.e. retail)</p> <p>Once a developer begins construction on a site they are deemed to have 'implemented their permission' and the Council has no powers to prevent a very slow build out time.</p> <p>These issues are dealt with by</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>• I strongly agree with the councils policy to locate crossrail 2 chelsea station near the town hall</p> <p>Slightly further afield, the issue of a safe pedestrian crossing over Beaufort Street / Drayton Gardens needs to be addressed. Heading north from Battersea Bridge, there is not one designated pedestrian crossing place over the whole length of the street right up to Old Brompton Road. There are several sets of traffic lights but due to traffic turning left or right at these junctions, none provides a specific safe crossing time. A pedestrian crossing across Chelsea Embankment at Battersea Bridge similar to the one at Albert Bridge is, also, very much needed.</p>	<p>transport experts during the course of an application.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is outside of the geographic scope of any of the designated places.</p>
Sonia Richardson	North -South interconnectedness must be addressed. Why should it take me over an hour to travel from home (Lots Road) to North Kensington by public transport which I do on a frequent basis?	The Imperial Wharf Overground station has gone some way in to addressing transport deficiency travelling north. The strategic bus network is controlled by TfL rather than the Council.
John Eagle	<p>The Local Plan is so large a document that it is completely unreasonable to expect individual residents to wade through all of it to try to find the parts which affect them, and on which they would like to comment.</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the whole consultation process is deeply flawed</p>	See comments above on this point.
Kerry Davis-Head	The individual questions are difficult to answer online without a printed copy of the whole document	Printed copied are available in the public libraries during the consultation.
Sotir Ted	<p>Sarah Palmer of Edwardes Square forwarded to me the neighbourhood planning document chapter 11 --Kensington High Street. I read the chapter and am supportive of the initiatives and the long term planning to enhance the viability of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>The report on page 7, item 11.1.7 notes the great success of the 'Significantly improved pedestrian environment following streetscape improvement'. Everyone who lives in the neighbourhood or visits the area would agree on the success of this feature.</p> <p>As more development increases to the west of the Odeon movie theatre project, and in particularly 375 Kensington development and school</p>	This has been included as a priority within the Kensington High Street place.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>initiative, there in another strip of street that would greatly benefit from extending the streetscape further west. The space to target on KHS is between west side of Edwardes Square (Road) and to Warwick Gardens. It is a stretch of road approximately 200 meters long.</p> <p>This area would be well served by a better streetscape and some trees planned in the middle. The benefits would include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To keep traffic to same pace down the whole length of KHS.</li> <li>2. To continue to provide turn lanes for east bound traffic turning into: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Saint Mary's Abbot's Place</li> <li>b. Edwardes Square (road, west side)</li> <li>c. Earls Terrance</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. To help extent the business/shopping district further to the west</li> <li>4. To help encourage more pedestrian traffic to these area and better support the increased flow</li> <li>5. To better connect 375 Kensington development and the new school to KHS</li> <li>6. To improve the general look and feel of the KHS. This section of road looks out of context with the rest of KHS to the east.</li> </ol>	
Penny Laughton	<p>CHAPTER 7 – PORTOBELLO/NOTTING HILL</p> <p>7.1.4 Multiple retailers: 18% is a very high percentage compared with 10 years ago suggesting the direction of travel which should leave no room for complacency.</p> <p>7.2 Vision: it is strange that RBKC state that the mix of shops in Portobello road, including the antiques arcades, should remain whilst admitting to having little power to control the landlords (see 7.3.10 &amp; 11).</p> <p>7.3.5 &amp; 6 Marketing: as part of their support, RBKC should actively engage in the marketing of all aspects of the market, including the antiques aspect as this is potentially the most vulnerable; 'a sustainable long-term future' includes access for independent retailers and thus costs to them.</p> <p>7.3.8 Street lighting: RBKC should 'move with the times' (7.3.6) adopting and elegant and modern system, rather than an 'olde worlde', sub-Victorian option (and see Chapter 6).</p> <p>7.3.13, 14, 15 Protection of antiques centres: I support the council's initiatives to better protect the antiques centres 100% as well promoting smaller, more affordable, units, all while resisting unit amalgamation.</p> <p>7.3.17 Shop fronts: control of shop fronts is vital, but the council failed catastrophically in the case of Jamie Oliver on Notting Hill Gate; multiples should not be given grants; clear guidelines should be produced and implemented if they have not already done so.</p> <p>7.3.23 Environment: mention of air pollution monitoring and amelioration should be included.</p> <p>CHAPTER 6 – GOLBORNE/TRELLICK</p>	<p>The vision for Portobello / Notting Hill Gate has been amended.</p> <p>This is a statement of fact in relation to changes of use within the same use class.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Facia signage and shop front alterations requiring planning permission will be assessed on their merit taking into account the Council's policies on protecting the character and heritage assets.</p> <p>Air quality is a borough wide issue and best addressed in a general</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>6.3.7 This paragraph is too long, covering too many topics.</p> <p>Street lighting: RBKC should adopting and elegant and modern system, taking a leaf out of Erno Goldfinger's book, rather than an 'olde worlde', sub-Victorian option; take care when considering the nature of the speciality market. In adopting 'New heritage style streetlights' for Golborne Road RBKC is mistaken.</p> <p>Artwall: give over to London street art to encourage a younger demographic (employ a specialist curator or gallery – not a council committee! - to manage a changing display; every 6 months white wash the wall for the art to be renewed so that people re-visit)</p>	<p>policy. See policy CE5.</p> <p>The Council have sought to reduce the information</p> <p>This is an issues that could be taken up with public art panel.</p>
Savills (Aimee Squires)	<p>Places – Earl's Court</p> <p>The site is situated within the Earl's Court Place which generally comprises the area between Kensington High Street to the north, Lillie Road to the south, Earl's Court Road to the east and the west London train line to the west.</p> <p>Policy CV10 (Vision for Earl's Court in 2028) sets out the overall vision for the Earl's Court area. This policy states –</p> <p>The western edge of the borough will be reintegrated with the Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre so that the centre is able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban village' environment which local residents can enjoy.</p> <p>Crucial to this is reducing the impact of the one-way system on residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport users, preferably by returning the one-way system to two-way working or other significant environmental improvements. The function of the centre will be reinforced by improved links to the Exhibition Centre, which should be developed for mixed uses with a significant convention, exhibition or cultural use. Earl's Court site will therefore retain its important London-wide role as a distinctive cultural brand, but also transformed into a new vibrant urban quarter. New residential-led mixed use development along Warwick Road will further reinforce this urban quarter, which will include new open space and a new school. The area will continue to offer a wide range of residential accommodation and will include community infrastructure to support local life. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements to Cromwell Road, Warwick Road and Earl's Court Road will transform the environment, making it more pleasant for pedestrians and residents, marking the arrival of the A4 in Central London.</p> <p>The following paragraphs specifically mention 100 West Cromwell Road – Paragraph 10.3.10 – Community facilities will be provided as part of the developments on the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, at 100 West Cromwell Road and the Warwick Road sites, including a new primary school at the northern end of Warwick Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.12 – Earl's Court must retain the diversity of housing tenure, which it currently enjoys. Residential development in Earl's Court must deliver a mix of housing to reflect local and borough-wide need. There are significant new housing projects at 100 West Cromwell Road alongside Tesco, and further north in Warwick Road. Guidelines have been prepared for the Warwick Road sites.</p>	

Name	Comment	Council's Response
	<p>The following paragraphs address the area surrounding the subject site –</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.3 – Pedestrian movement across West Cromwell Road will be improved, particularly at the junction with Warwick Road, as well as improvements to the pedestrian environment on Warwick Road north of West Cromwell Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.14 – The sites located in Warwick Road will have an important role in providing public open space, an improved streetscape and community facilities.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3.15 – There are also plans to transform the environment in West Cromwell Road, introducing avenues of trees, and bringing significant improvements to the pedestrian environment in Warwick Road.</p> <p>Policy CP10 states – The Council will ensure an attractive ‘urban village’ environment in Earl’s Court by supporting improvements to the public realm, pedestrian environment and open space. The Council will resist development proposals which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and compromise delivery of the vision.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.4.2 addresses the quantum of development within the Earl’s Court area and identifies two strategic site allocations including the Warwick Road site. This paragraph states that – The Warwick Road sites are allocated for 1,600 homes overall. Within the Royal Borough, therefore, the Earl’s Court is expected to deliver a minimum 2,100 homes during the lifetime of this plan.</p> <p>As part of the Local Plan Partial Review, the Council has provided an update on the progress that has been made in bringing forward the strategic aims for Earl’s Court. Paragraph 3.3.28 of the Local Plan Partial Review Document states –A Supplementary Planning Document was produced for redevelopment of the Opportunity Area including the part of the site in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. Redevelopment has received planning permission and is underway. Some of the Warwick Road sites have been built out.</p>	
Earl’s Court Partnership Ltd (ECPL)	<p>Para 3.3.28</p> <p>Suggest text changes to the paragraph, noting that the SPD was prepared in collaboration with LBHF, GLA and TfL. Note that it was adopted.</p> <p>Need to significantly expand the final sentence to provide additional context to what has taken place on the site to date, i.e. what works have commenced under permissions granted.</p>	Noted.
Exhibition Road Cultural Group (Emily Candler)	South Kensington place policy needs updating to reflect work completed and forthcoming proposals.	This has been done.