

Local Plan Partial Review Issues and Options Consultation Summary



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.

22 responses. Key issues raised:

- Overwhelming support for the retention of place chapters
- Place chapters seen as the best way to outline the distinctiveness of the Royal Borough's neighbourhoods and set out a broad outline of how to respond to those differences and individual strengths and challenges.

Question 2

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

11 responses. Key issues:

- Some scepticism over how effective the place Chapters have been in delivering on the visions expressed in the Core Strategy.
- Residents felt that closer liaison between Council Officer's and Residents' Associations could be one measure address this issue.

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?

17 responses. Key issues raised:

- Majority support including from the GLA and TfL for the inclusion of site allocations within the appropriate place chapters.
- Amalgamation would improve legibility of the Local Plan by reducing repetition.
- Combining the chapters would allow the sites to be properly considered within the wider context of the place in which they are located.
- A minority against amalgamation felt that a separate sites chapter would allow each site to be dealt with in greater detail or felt an SPD was a better way to deal with sites.

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?

12 responses. Key issues raised:

- Place chapter could be clearer about what the development goals are of a particular place and how that might be delivered.
- Could be achieved by greater cross referencing with other relevant policies within the Plan; including the sites within the place chapters could also help.
- Recognition of the balance between being specific about objectives and visions within a given place and ensuring we are not overly restrictive in our approach to the point where alternative beneficial changes are precluded.

Question 5

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

8 responses. Key issues raised:

- Identification of possible improvements to the public realm
- Protection of lower value uses
- Identity of places
- Residential amenity
- The role of landowners and improving access for all ages and physical abilities
- The opportunities to intervene and address these issues will depend to some extent on the circumstances in each individual place and on the level of influence the planning authority can have given the powers available to it. Such issues are therefore best addressed on a place by place basis, taking into account these constraints.

Question 6

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

14 responses. Key issues raised:

- Some support for development management policies relating to specific places being included in the place sections.
- Should only be pursued where the circumstances of specific places required a more nuanced or alternative approach to that pursued in the rest of the Borough.
- Need to ensure that the policy is easily picked up by developers reading the plan.
- Better cross referencing between the place chapters and specific spatial policies outlined in the general development management policy section would help improve the legibility of the plan.
- Suggestion to include the policy in both the general development management policy section and the place chapters to ensure that the nuanced spatial difference is not missed though this risks repetition
- Policies working at smaller geographical scopes than the borough level could best be

achieved through neighbourhood plans or summarised in conservation area appraisals.

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?

3 responses. Key issues raised:

- Policy should be formulated to ensure flexibility, and to avoid a prescriptive approach to plan-making
- Should include details and specific details on how a defined key part of the Borough can be regenerated

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

3 responses. Key issues raised:

- Place chapters could be used as a vehicle for more tailored 'place-based' or neighbourhood level policies on a range of issues depending on local need.
- 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.

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

19 responses. Key issues raised:

- Brompton Cross could be removed or amalgamated with South Kensington; it doesn't constitute a 'place' in its own right.
- Thought needs to be given to the boundaries of the current Latimer and Westway places
- Case for treating the Kensal Gasworks site as a place in its own right, focused on its relationship with the future Old Oak area, and for 'Kensal Town/Meanwhile Gardens' to be merged with a Golborne/Trellick 'place'.
- Questions about the retention of Westway as a 'Place' in its own right given its linear nature; some comments suggested linking the different character areas along the stretch of the Westway with other place chapters where they are an integrated part of local areas, eg Latimer, Portobello.
- Separation of Lots Road from Worlds End. Lots Village, now a conservation area, could be considered a place in its own right.
- Amalgamation of Worlds End with Kings Road.
- King's Road/Sloane Square should remain a 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.
- Rethink Earl's Court place, and reduce its size 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 as there will be no new activity or development and will not have any real sense of identity as it will be an area of little interest or connection with the wider area.

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.

9 responses. Key issues raised:

- Neighbourhood areas for which neighbourhood plans have been adopted should be recognised as Places, with a summary of the key policies in the neighbourhood plan. On that basis, St Quintin neighbourhood should be recognised by a short 'place' chapter
- The whole of Chelsea Riverside from the LBHF boundary to the WCC boundary should be designated as a Place in its own right in order to bring appropriate focus to fostering and protecting its unique heritage and amenity qualities.
- Chelsea Medical Quarter as a world-class medical facility embracing the Royal Brompton, Royal Marsden and institute for Cancer Research needs planning, coordination and official recognition

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

3 responses. Key issues raised:

- The Kensington Society cite the need for more place-specific policy in the place chapters, not just the reasoned justification/text.

- 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.
- Need to experiment in terms of what would best relate policy to delivery.

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?

72 written responses. Key issues raised:

Kensal

- It should be made clear that the regeneration of the Gasworks should not be tied to the delivery of a Crossrail station to avoid any uncertainty for landowners and developers
- If we do not succeed in our bid for a Crossrail station, how will we improve transport infrastructure?
- Should be a 'destination' offer at the Gasworks
- Kensal Employment Zone has suffered from developments offering retail and office space of the wrong kind that is not desirable by local businesses.

Golborne / Trellick

- Vision of Golborne needs to maintain a community focus and take into account the specific needs of the local people
- Lots of the community centres and spaces and play areas are being 'planned out'
- Regeneration to the area isn't really benefitting the people who live in the area (i.e. designer handbag shops and Deli's). The shops do not appear to be creating jobs for local people.
- Still a very eclectic place, but is beginning to move towards being more of a cafe society
- Need to protect the Venture centre – provides a key community hub to this area.

Portobello / Notting Hill

- This chapter should only cover Portobello and the side shopping streets but should not include Westbourne Grove
- Need to strike a balance between the needs of the local community and Portobello market as a tourist destination
- Need to keep its sense of identity in the face of the economic pressures that have arisen as a result of its success
- Ladbroke Grove, especially around the station, should be a gateway into Thorpe Close.
- Looking only at the needs of tourists will not make the area self-sustaining. Need to look at residents' needs, the local dimension and why people live there.
- Air pollution needs to be tackled at a local level

Westway

- The Westway shouldn't be looked at as being completely independently from Portobello.
- The Westway feels unsafe and something needs to be done to remedy this.
- Public space under the Westway is of a good quality but still located under a motorway

and therefore will never be an attractive place for people to play or linger.

- Support new business and shops under the Westway.

Latimer

- The name 'Latimer' is misleading. Many residents think it relates to the Latimer Road area north of the Westway elevated motorway, rather than the area south of the Westway, to the west of Ladbroke Grove.
- If the estates are to be partially or wholly redeveloped, they must be explicitly referenced
- Reinventing traditional street patterns will be ignoring the current long-standing street patterns of Lancaster West Estate
- A new neighbourhood shopping centre is needed in the local area.
- More clarity required on terms such as "better functioning of these residential areas," and "perception of community safety"
- More community use developments that will become business opportunities and generate income for local communities and by local communities.
- Community would like full involvement in this process, wishing to positively contribute to regeneration of the area
- Support for the role of the employment zone as a necessary aspect of local life and economy.
- Improve the connections westwards to Westfield shopping centre. The under pass serving the Imperial is not that useful for residents of Latimer.

Earl's Court

- What is the future of Earl's Court as a place now that it has lost its anchor? Comments focused on the need for a new role and purpose, and called for some thinking about the identity of the place and aspirations for the area in the future.
- Earl's Court chapter needs to be 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.
- 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:
 - Feasible economic activity
 - Quality of life for residents and visitors
 - Maintenance of heritage links
 - Acceptance of life style revolution

Kensington High Street

- There should be a relaxation of the retail policy to allow cafes and restaurants in the town centre frontages to create more of a neighbourhood feel
- Lack of civic places in the high street. There are opportunities for small scale interventions along the high street
- Better cycle provision. Make it safer along the high street. Improve the east/west link through Hyde Park onto the high street.
- Support the division of large retail units into smaller ones.
- Support pop up restaurants/shops/market
- Numerous cultural institutions (Kensington palace, opera, design museum) but they are

very disconnected. Could improve signage and way finding.

- Core frontage should be extended or reviewed.

South Kensington

- 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.
- Residents of Thurloe Street have the perception of being “under siege” from increasing commercialisation. It remains an oasis – but need to strive to maintain the balance
- Resist pressure of late night uses.
- Concern that commercial uses spread to the west towards Knightsbridge. In particular spread of A4 uses in Brompton Road.
- Long term viability of the area requires a mix of housing types. Buy-to-let seen as a problem and encourages a transient population with no connection to the local area
- Concerns about the tables and chairs at the southern end of Exhibition Road.
- Residential development rather than retail use more appropriate for Pelham Street

King’s Road / Sloane Square

- Residents value access to shops/amenities which mean they don’t have to travel further/drive. Focus should be on shops for locals rather than to attract more visitors.
- KR is already vibrant, busy and lively – should avoid it being ‘Knightsbridged’.
- Pollution levels on KR are a concern and there is heavy construction traffic. Also consider potential environmental impact of loss of local amenities if more residents have to drive.
- Should acknowledge the impact of the future redevelopment of Stamford Bridge, and to a lesser extent Earls Court.
- Maintain the charm and character including original shop facades.
- Retain small retail units where possible to appeal to a wide range of retailers including independents and start-ups.
- Protect existing health facilities on the Kings Road
- Protect low-rise nature of the area and uniformity of height of properties.
- Concern about loss of Thamesbrook and housing for older people in Chelsea.

Notting Hill Gate

- Comments relating to Notting Hill Gate focused on the need to reduce traffic and vehicle dominance raising issues of air quality and how to improve this.
- Vaguely worded and dangerous value judgements e.g. poor quality of NHG modern buildings
- Concerns raised included; changing the offer- are we sure it will deliver the impact that we want? Can Notting Hill sustain being made into a shopping district – are we sure it will survive?
- Notting Hill Gate has to be a visual gateway to the other areas
- It is important to ensure that vision reflects what local people actually want as this will be used to define what developers propose for the future
- Everything is being hit by the opening of Westfield. Notting Hill Gate has to differentiate itself in terms of its mood/atmosphere/clientele, as people have both Portobello and Westfield and so the area has to have its own atmosphere without competing with the others.

Lots Road/World's End

- More floorspace for employment and creative uses is needed.
- Reinforce the creative and cultural hub in the Chelsea Harbour area. This should also be referred to in the art chapter in the Local Plan rather than leave art for the Kensington High Street place.
- More focus on environmental issues including green walls and roofs, and the health implications of their provision.
- Improve the green way alongside the railway. There should be more accessibility and openness, maybe the creation of a green corridor along the railway to improve air quality.
- Impact of advertising hoardings
- Impact of one-way system and use of roads for long-distance trips
- Should reference riverside walk and the creek and make more use of the river
- Should be a greater emphasis on delivery.
- The Council should push for a Crossrail 2 station in this area and the chapter should reference the impact of a future station whether here or on King's Road.