Considerations for Estate Regeneration Proposals:
Warwick Road Estate

1 Introduction
This document identifies the Royal Borough’s Corporate consideration of the case for regenerating the Warwick Road Estate, as part of the Royal Borough’s Estates Regeneration Programme. This document should be read in conjunction with the Royal Borough’s overarching strategic considerations for Estate Regeneration proposals document.

This is a live document reflecting the information, analyses and decisions that are available at this time. Further work being undertaken by the Royal Borough seeks to discover whether there are any viable continued maintenance, infill, partial redevelopment, or full redevelopment options for the Warwick Road Estate that would deliver the Council’s objectives, whilst also meeting the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents. As this additional information becomes available, this document will be updated accordingly by the Royal Borough’s Housing and Property team.

This version of the document has also been prepared to support the potential allocation of the Warwick Road Estate within the Royal Borough’s Local Plan Partial Review. A version history is located on page 12 of this document.

The allocation of the site within the development plan would, if found to be “sound”, assist in delivering a flexible range of development options. Any allocation will not however determine the regeneration route to be chosen by the council in respect of the site. The contents of the development plan, and the views of the Planning Authorities (both strategic and local), will be material to any regeneration option choice. Ultimately the regeneration option chosen (if any) will be determined by the Council having regard to a wide range of considerations, including consultation responses.

2 Site Description
The potential boundary of the site, in relation to which options are being tested, comprises Royal Borough owned land. The following section forms a schedule of these landholdings and related considerations such as titles, uses and occupancy.
The Warwick Road estate is situated within the Abingdon Ward in the southern part of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The two adjoining sites comprise approximately 1.3ha in area. The sites are bounded by Warwick Road to the west, West Cromwell Road to the south, and are bisected by Pembroke Road.

2.1 Royal Borough land-holdings
The properties within the site boundary comprise of two registered freehold titles owned by the council under the following Registered Title numbers:

LN107388:

- This Title relates to the North and South sites bisected by Pembroke Road but excluding the workshop site located in the south east corner of the southern site (which is registered under separate Title, details below). The Title is registered in the name of the Royal Borough. The Title comprises 115 number of residential apartments plus 1 number KCTMO office, which are known as Chesterton Square and Broadwood Terrace, these are located on the upper levels of the building, and comprise 53 number Royal Borough tenants, and 61 number leasehold properties purchased under Right to Buy. The residential elements are managed by KCTMO. The Title includes the Royal Borough’s vehicle maintenance workshop, which is leased under a service agreement to SITA together with ancillary buildings including vehicle wash and storage buildings. This Title includes office facilities occupied by various Council operational services.

- Lease of Transformer Chamber at Pembroke Road Depot dated 20th February 1992 between the Royal Borough (1) and London Electricity plc. (2) for a term of 60 years from 1 April 1974 at the yearly rent of a peppercorn.

- Lease of part of the roof of Pembroke House, 37 Pembroke Road for the installation of telecommunications equipment dated 17th March 2016 between the Royal Borough (1) and EE Limited & Hutchinson 3G Limited (2) for a term of 15 years from 17 March 2016.

- Two leases dated 1 April 2005 between the Royal Borough (1) and SITA UK Limited (2) for a term of 16 years from 1 April 2005.

- An expired lease to NCP that occupy the car park on the north site.

- Warwick Pre-School who occupy the nursery building on the east corner of the northern site, a new occupational agreement is under negotiation.

- The property is subject to all the rights granted in the leases including rights of way, passage and running of water soil gas electricity and other services, support shelter and protection, entry and use of outdoor areas, entry phone, refuse chutes, dust containers or dustbins and other facilities or services, rights in respect of wireless or television aerials and other rights as are granted by those leases.

LN107499:

- This Title refers to the workshop site located in the south east corner of the southern site.

- The land is subject to the rights granted by a lease dated 20 February 1992 of a Transformer Chamber between the Royal Borough (1) and London Electricity plc. (2) for a term of 60 years from 1 April 1974 at the yearly rent of a peppercorn.
• Part of the land is also occupied under the SITA leases referred to above. This schedule of land holdings is not final or exhaustive, and is subject to change.

2.2 Non-Royal Borough land-holdings
There are no non-Royal Borough held land interests, other than those referred to within this report.

2.3 Land Title
A preliminary report on title has been completed in August 2016. This identifies all legal interest in the site and allows for an assessment of risk associated with redevelopment and/or disposal of land.

2.4 Land Uses
The site comprises residential, office, and sui generis depot uses.

2.5 Tenant / Leaseholder Status
Discussions are presently underway with the long leasehold residential owners. If a redevelopment option is progressed, it is intended that all Royal Borough tenants will be given the opportunity to relocate into a new home within the site.

2.6 Operational / Maintenance Considerations
In relation to the depot and office elements, the existing buildings are dated, and will have an increasing ongoing maintenance requirement. In addition, these fail to meet current operational/market criteria.
In relation to the residential elements, these will also require an ongoing maintenance/investment programme. It is intended these aspects will be examined as part of the Continued Maintenance Strategy.

3 Site-specific objectives
The following section sets out what the project is trying to achieve, what the objectives were at the start of the project, how these objectives have changed or have been refined over time, and where these changes were approved.

The 30 October 2014 Cabinet Paper (Item A11) sought Cabinets approval of the following:

“Based upon an analysis of the objectives set out by the Royal Borough for the Pembroke Road site, and a review of the alternative options which have been identified, the recommendation is that a decision is made to undertake further work on the full redevelopment option (Option 4).

It is recommended that the Council progresses the appointment of a consultant team to provide a more detailed scheme in order to enable further discussions with residents and the Planning Authority to be undertaken prior to submission of a planning application. Further details of the consultants required and proposed budget are set out in Part B of this report.”
On review of the report, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet approved recommendations above.

The 30 October 2014 Executive Decision Report (Item A11) also sets out the original objectives of the September 2013 Lambert Smith Hampton options appraisal work, presenting specific objectives for Warwick Road:

“The Objectives set at the outset of the options appraisal can be summarised as follows:

- “To increase the number of homes within the Borough.
- To improve the environment and the amenity in the area.
- To rehouse all Council tenants on site and provide resident leaseholders with the opportunity to acquire a replacement residence within the new development. This objective seeks to protect the existing resident community on the Pembroke Road site.
- To consider the options for provision of an improved council depot facility to serve current and future needs within the Borough.
- To ensure this publicly-owned land was being used efficiently and also to provide an improved long term income stream for the Council so as to protect frontline services.”

The July 2016 “Meet the Architect” event presented a refined set of objectives for the Warwick Road estate, aligned to the broader objectives of the Royal Borough’s aspirations for its estates:

- to increase the number of homes within the Borough
- to provide additional affordable housing, and make our housing stock as good as possible for current and future tenants
- to offer all existing Council tenants the opportunity to be re-housed on site and resident leaseholders with the opportunity to acquire a replacement residence if a redevelopment option is pursued
- to consider the options for provision of an improved, consolidated council depot facility to serve current and future needs within the Borough
- to build the conservation areas of the future.

4 Options Testing

The following section sets out how the options have been considered and refined over time, and how these decisions have been taken.

4.1 Optioneering Status

An initial options appraisal was undertaken by Lambert Smith Hampton in 2013/14, which considered a variety of options for the regeneration of the Warwick Road estate, including the potential for infill/refurbishment, partial redevelopment, and full redevelopment options. The 30 October 2014 Cabinet decision granted approval
for consultants to be appointed for further work to be undertaken to assess the
viable redevelopment options in more detail.

Shortly after this Cabinet decision, a local interest group submitted an application
to English Heritage to list Chesterton Square and Pembroke Terrace on the Grade
II schedule. Amongst other aspects, this application was based upon the
Chesterton Square building being constructed by Arup Associates, who were the
structural engineers for the Sydney Opera House. The application to English
Heritage to list the building was rejected, and a Certificate of Immunity from listing
was issued on 19 May 2015, valid for a period of five years.

Whilst the listing application was being considered by English Heritage, the Royal
Borough froze the optioneering and assessment work on the project. Following
English Heritage’s decision, in light of stakeholder interest and technical advice, the
Royal Borough considered that they should undertake further work on the full
spectrum of options, including Continued Maintenance, refurbishment / infill, and
partial redevelopment, in addition to the further exploration of the full
redevelopment option that was agreed at Cabinet in October 2014.

Following a procurement process, a team of consultants were appointed in 2015/16
to provide a range of services in order to evaluate the various options, as set out
below:

1. Continued Maintenance Strategy
2. Infill/refurbishment
3. Partial redevelopment
4. Full redevelopment

These options will be rigorously tested against the Council’s publicised objectives
and the preferred option and associated scheme will be presented for approval to a
Cabinet with a target date of Q2 2017.

4.1.1 Continued Maintenance Strategy

The ‘Continued Maintenance Strategy’ option assesses the merits and feasibility of
the Council carrying out no new development on the Warwick Road Estate. It
assesses the financial implications of this course of action by examining the
expenditure required to maintain the estate in its current condition as well as the
forecasted expenditure required to give the buildings a further 25-30 years of life.
The NPV of the estate is also established to determine if the current asset is
financially sustainable. Finally, the performance of this scenario against the
Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents, including the potential
disruption to residents, will also be assessed.

The Royal Borough have commissioned a review of the ongoing maintenance,
capital expenditure and facilities management programme for the residential,
office/commercial and depot elements within the existing buildings, which will also
take account of the longer term environmental and social impacts of retention as
opposed to partial or complete replacement.

An Asset Investment Study is being undertaken on behalf of the Royal Borough by
Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (KCTMO) to calculate
the NPV and to set out the forecast maintenance expenses in order to assess the continued maintenance approach assessing its financial impact.

In parallel with the evaluation of the continued maintenance strategy of the residential element, an assessment of the continued maintenance strategy will also be undertaken in relation to the existing Council depot and office facilities, and the existing nursery facility.

4.1.2 Infill/refurbishment

The infill/refurbishment option will assess the feasibility of developing additional residential units within the estate boundary, without demolishing any of the existing units. The infill/refurbishment option will also include an examination of the refurbishment of the existing office and workshop/depot facilities together with the nursery.

The consultants will review the work undertaken previously as part of the Lambert Smith Hampton Options Report, and will also consider what other alternatives may be appropriate within the parameters specified:

- Refurbishment and re-letting of the existing depot on the south site for alternative uses such as retail, retention and refurbishment of existing south site office accommodation with residential accommodation above left in situ.
- Introduction of new infill residential accommodation on the southern part of the south site.
- North site (Broadwood Terrace) retention and refurbishment of existing depot, with conversion of the existing upper level garage floors to office or residential use.

Each infill option will be subjected to a high level review by CBRE, informed by specialist technical advice, to assess the extent to which the Royal Borough’s objectives and commitments to tenants and leaseholders can be met by each option. The options are also reviewed from a planning and financial perspective to assess the likelihood of obtaining consent and the prospects for delivery.

4.1.3 Partial redevelopment

The Partial Redevelopment Option examines the merits and feasibility of redeveloping a portion of the Warwick Road Estate but keeping some of the existing buildings as they are. In this particular case, additional housing units could be provided above existing residential apartments and within the existing north site parking garage areas. Alternative residential/commercial uses on the ground level of the existing south site building will also be considered. The financial implications of this option will be assessed as well as how effective the proposed development is at achieving the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents.

Options to be explored would consider the partial demolition and redevelopment of Chesterton Square (Southern Site). This may include:

- Introduction of additional residential floors above existing structure.
- Removal of existing landscaped podium (Chesterton Square) and depot to provide improved natural daylight/sunlight to new residential units within existing office/depot accommodation
- Introduction of offices at ground floor (in place of existing depot) level to preserve employment uses below new lower level ‘garden ‘square’ in centre.
- Partial Redevelopment of Broadwood Terrace (Northern Site)
- Retention of existing depot facilities.
- Potential for introduction of additional residential floors above existing Broadwood Terrace structure and/or within existing upper level car park structure.

The Partial Redevelopment Option will be ranked against the Council’s objectives using a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) system.

4.1.4 **Full redevelopment**

The Full Redevelopment Options evaluates the merits and feasibility of redeveloping the entire Warwick Road Estate. This would potentially involve the phased demolition of all existing buildings, and development of a consolidated Council depot facility, new affordable and open market residential buildings, new office and retail facilities together with a nursery. This option would be based upon offering all existing Council tenants the opportunity to be re-housed on site, and resident leaseholders the opportunity to acquire a replacement residence. In this option, all 53 existing secure tenancy units will be re-provided in the new development. The financial implications of this option will be assessed in order to ensure the scheme is viable and the benefits to the council are maximised. The performance of proposed development against the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents will also be assessed. The option is likely to consider phased redevelopment of Broadwood Terrace (Northern Site) and Chesterton Square (Southern Site), with the following potential outcomes:

**North Site:**
- Re-provision of affordable residential units as well as additional affordable and open market units.
- Re-provision of consolidated operational depot facility, and ancilliary service provider offices,
- Potential for retail/commercial/residential use on Pembroke Road frontage, and introduction of retail/commercial frontage to part of Warwick Road to provide environmental enhancements, vitality, and employment opportunities.
- Retain and refurbish or re-provide existing nursery facility.
- Provide communal garden areas for use of residential homes.

**South site:**
- Open market and affordable residential units.
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- Relocate vehicle maintenance facilities off site and consolidate other depot
  /ancillary service office facilities to North site.
- Re-provide employment/office uses on Warwick Road frontage.
- Retail uses if viable along Warwick Road frontage.
- Retail/cafe uses exploring potential for outdoor seating areas/terraces
  should be introduced along Pembroke Road frontage.
- Aspiration for ‘garden square’.

The appointed consultancy team including architects and master planners will
review options for redevelopment of the entire site. The full Redevelopment Option
will be assessed based on these proposals.

The Full Redevelopment Option will then be ranked against the Council’s
objectives using a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) system.

4.1.5 Option Combinations

Through the initial options development process, it was acknowledged that the two
land parcels making up Warwick Road Estate could be treated differently.
Combinational options were devised, expanding on the original four approaches.
Nine combinational options were developed, shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option No.</th>
<th>Broadwood Terrace</th>
<th>Chesterton Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continued Maintenance</td>
<td>Continued Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Continued Maintenance</td>
<td>Refurbishment/infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refurbishment/infill</td>
<td>Refurbishment/infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>Refurbishment/infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>Partial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>Partial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partial Development</td>
<td>New Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>New Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>New Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appointed consultancy team are reviewing these nine options, considering
their performance against the borough’s stated objectives and wider project and
technical criteria.

4.2 Supporting Technical Assessments

A stock condition survey and structural assessment has been commissioned to
review the future maintenance requirement on the residential element of the WR
Estate against available resources and confirmed NPV. The report will address the existing and future maintenance costs for the housing, as well as the need to plan and prioritise where investment should be directed.

In order to assist in this prioritisation, the KCTMO asset management strategy produced an Asset Investment Framework. This starts from the objective that the Housing Revenue Account requires financial sustainable assets that contribute to the long term surplus of the Housing Revenue Account. In addition to this, assets should meet the strategic needs of the Royal Borough and meet agreed quality measures. Finally, development opportunities should be identified and exploited to enable future housing.

4.3 Housing Needs Assessment and optioneering:

The Housing Needs Survey will assess the needs of the current Royal Borough secure tenants. This information will confirm whether the current accommodation meets the needs of the tenants, and will also provide an indication of the accommodation that should be provided in any redevelopment proposed.

4.4 Consultations and Engagement undertaken

A series of preliminary consultation meetings and correspondence was undertaken in 2013 and 2014 with residents, owners and users of the buildings in the designated area. These events were used to engage with local stakeholders, to inform the previous Lambert Smith Hampton options appraisal work.

The previous consultation feedback has informed the refreshed options appraisal work, which was initially introduced to the public at the Meet the Architect Events, in July 2016. Since this initial introductory event, several additional public exhibitions have been held, through which the work of the project team has been shared, and attendees have been invited to provide their comments and thoughts on the emerging work:

- **25 October and 02 November**: Introduced the four option approaches (Continued Maintenance, Refurbishment/Infill, Partial Development, Full Redevelopment)
- **05 December and 12 December**: Introduced the nine combinational options, and RBKC’s draft methodology for assessing the options.

Furthermore, RBKC Officers and the project team have engaged with a number of specific interest groups on the projects, and the options development process, through one-to-one meetings and email/telephone correspondence; these groups include:

- Warwick Road Estate Residents Association (WRERA)
- Warwick Road Estate Leaseholders Association (WRELA)
- Edwardes Square Scarsdale & Abingdon Association (ESSA)

The principle of public consultation events, newsletters, web updates, email and postal notifications, as well as wider consultation with the local planning authority and other key stakeholders within the local community will continue. Regular events and public notifications will be scheduled in a communication plan. In
addition, a summary of consultation feedback and FAQs will appear on the Council’s website, alongside the materials from the public consultation events themselves.

Information from previous events and copies of newsletters sent to residents are also available on the Council’s website:

www.rbkc.gov.uk/newsroom/capital-projects/pembroke-road

4.5 Consideration of non-residential uses within optioneering

In relation to the existing Council depot facility, the re-provision of a consolidated facility would provide an improved environmental solution which would deliver long term benefits to both Borough residents as well as those living within the immediate vicinity.

The existing office accommodation is dated and would have an increasing maintenance cost to the Borough. New office facilities would create additional employment opportunities and attract business to locate on the site.

It is intended to consider retaining or re-providing the existing nursery facility on the site, as this provides a service to the local community.

5 Project delivery

This section considers how the project may be delivered.

5.1 Use of existing Council powers

Depending upon which option is selected, it may be necessary to obtain land owned by residents and others to enable the renewal of the estate. To do so, the Council will make all efforts to acquire this land by negotiation and private treaty, with mutual agreement from third party landowners to sell their property. The use of a compulsory purchase order (CPO) or permission from the Secretary of State for use of Section 10A of the Housing Act 1985, would be used only as a last resort.

5.2 Delivery and Funding Partnerships

Dependent upon the outcome of the options appraisal exercise, the Council may decide to procure a development/funding partner to deliver the selected project.

5.3 Decant Policies

Any rehousing will take place in line with the Council’s Decant Policies, which are currently under review and will be subject to further consultation.

6 Future project activities

This section sets out the project-related activities that are planned or due in the future.

6.1 Programme of work and broad timescales

As stated earlier in this report, the future options for Warwick Road Estate will be based upon the outcome of the investigation of the four options and feedback received through public consultation. A report will then be presented to the Royal Borough’s Cabinet with a target date of Spring 2017 who will make a decision on
the option that best meets the council’s objectives. The details of the will be
due to be publicly available on the Royal Borough’s website.

Current key milestones have been set out below, and an indicative programme has been developed.

- Options appraisal: Early 2017
- Internal evaluation: Q1 2017
- Cabinet Decision: Spring 2017

6.2 Governance structures and milestones

Following the development of the options study, which will be undertaken by the appointed Project Team, a report will be submitted to Cabinet which will include consideration by Housing and Property Scrutiny.

6.3 Future stakeholder engagement

A series of consultation events have already taken place to engage with the residents, local community/businesses, and key stakeholders. A communications plan is now being produced to ensure stakeholder engagement throughout the next stages of the process.

7 Appendices
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1.  **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 In accordance with the Council’s objectives to provide additional homes, reduce operational costs, increase revenues and maximise the efficient use of its publicly-owned assets within the Borough, the Council commissioned an options appraisal in September 2013. The purpose of this appraisal was to assess the future potential of the depots and Council offices located at Pembroke Road, including the Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square residential properties located above those sites.

1.2 The options appraisal was finalised in July 2014 and indicates that all the high-level options could be financially viable with the exception of Option 3 (partial demolition and redevelopment). Following a review of the appraisal in July 2014, approval was obtained to proceed with the consultation process with residents and neighbours to inform them of the findings and to seek their comments and feedback before Cabinet would decide on which option to pursue.

1.3 Consultation has now taken place with existing tenants, resident and non-resident leaseholders, and residents of properties in the adjoining area. Their
comments and feedback are summarised within Section 3 of this report, and a more detailed schedule is included as Appendices 1 and 2, to assist Cabinet in making an informed decision. An analysis of the financial viability of the various options is included in confidential part B of this report.

1.4 The conclusions within this report recommend that Option 4 – the full redevelopment option – is progressed and therefore seeks approval for funding to appoint a consultant team to work up a detailed scheme for discussion with the Planning Authority and residents prior to submission of a planning application. Approval is also requested for an increase in the existing budget for the acquisition of those leaseholder’s interests who wish to sell their property, with full compensation being offered prior to CPO powers being approved.

1.5 It should be noted that the recommendation before Cabinet is not a final decision that full redevelopment will happen, but is just a recommendation that the various redevelopment options should now be evaluated in more detail to provide a scheme suitable for further discussions with residents prior to submission of a planning application. Based on such detailed work and additional consultations, a further report would be submitted to Cabinet seeking a final decision on a specific redevelopment proposal prior to submission of a planning application.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Pembroke Road properties comprise two sites to the north and south of Pembroke Road with frontages to Warwick and Pembroke Roads, accommodating Council street cleansing and waste depots, with residential accommodation and office facilities above.

2.2 In September 2013 the Council appointed Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) as property consultants to undertake an options appraisal of the sites. LSH appointed a sub consultant team comprising SOM architects, Daniel Watney planning consultants, Carter Jonas property consultants and GIA Rights of Light consultants to advise on the options appraisal.

2.3 The Objectives set at the outset of the options appraisal can be summarised as follows:

- To increase the number of homes within the Borough.
- To improve the environment and the amenity in the area.
- To rehouse all Council tenants on site and provide resident leaseholders with the opportunity to acquire a replacement residence within the new development. This objective seeks to protect the existing resident community on the Pembroke Road site.
- To consider the options for provision of an improved council depot facility to serve current and future needs within the Borough.
• To ensure this publicly-owned land was being used efficiently and also to provide an improved long term income stream for the Council so as to protect frontline services.

2.4 LSH were asked to review the following four options:

1. Refurbishment and re-letting of the existing light industrial/depot accommodation and office space, leaving all existing residential in situ.

2. Refurbishment and re-letting of the existing light industrial/depot accommodation and office space, leaving all existing residential accommodation in situ, and exploring the potential for the introduction of new residential accommodation on the footprint of the south site.

3. Partial demolition and redevelopment of either the north or south site;

4. Full redevelopment across both sites.

2.5 An analysis of the four options is included in section 4 of this report.

3 COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Residents are aware that the Council has undertaken the options appraisal and have been regularly consulted throughout.

3.2 Notwithstanding this, residents are understandably very concerned by the possibility that the sites may be redeveloped with the resultant loss of their existing homes, and have expressed their desire to be advised of the outcome of the options appraisal as soon as a decision is made.

3.3 A consultation plan was produced by the Council’s Communications Department which has dealt with the period of time leading up to this Cabinet decision. A further Consultation plan will be required to address resident consultation moving forward after a decision on which option to pursue is made. Residents and other key stakeholders will then have a number of opportunities to express their views again through consultations that would take place in the context of the design process and a planning application.

3.4 The consultant’s report on the Options Appraisal has been made available to residents of the estate (excluding sensitive or confidential financial information) on the Council’s Pembroke Road page of the RBKC website.

3.5 In accordance with the original plan, a number of consultations with residents of Chesterton Square and Broadwood Terrace have now been undertaken via a series of newsletters and meetings. Existing residents and owners in the general area surrounding the site have also been informed of the proposals and initial consultations have taken place on 20th and 27th June 2013, and on 22nd July, 16th and 25th September, and 9th October 2014. A summary schedule of the key comments and concerns raised by residents and neighbours in writing or at the public meetings are included in Appendix 1 of the Report. A full compilation of all letters and feedback forms received from
residents, including those in adjoining areas, is included in Appendix 2 of this report.

3.6 The Council’s Decant Policy sets out the overarching approach to Secure Tenants and Leaseholders in terms of the offer that would apply to tenants, resident and non resident leaseholders, information has been made available which provides details as follows:

- Secure Tenants would be entitled to A Home Loss Payment, currently of £4,900. In addition they would be entitled to a Disturbance Payment to cover the reasonable costs of moving home. It is anticipated that the development will allow all Secure Tenants who wish to remain on the site to do so, with some taking temporary accommodation and then returning to a new unit within the scheme following redevelopment.
- Resident leaseholders would also be entitled to Home Loss payment of 10% of the market value of their property to a maximum of £49,000. They would also be entitled to a Disturbance Payments to cover the reasonable cost of moving, including the cost of selling their existing property and buying a new one. The Council would also provide the offer of temporary accommodation, and the ability to acquire ownership of a comparable size unit, with the Council providing a ‘top up’ of retained equity to bridge any differential in market value between the existing and new unit at no cost to resident leaseholders. The proposed offer to resident leaseholders has been based on high level viability assessments produced for the redevelopment option 4.
- Non resident leaseholders would be entitled to a Home Loss payment of 7.5% of the market value of their home and a Disturbance Payment but would receive the capital value of their residence without the option of returning to the new development.

3.7 A summary of the main comments and concerns following the consultations held to date is set out below;

General comments – Secure Tenants and leaseholders

- Residents feel that the existing design of the Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square residences provides a secure and safe environment with excellent landscaped/garden areas and natural light. Any new development should seek to provide communal but private landscaped areas to the north and south sites.
- Residents of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square value the diverse but friendly community that currently exists – a secure environment with good neighbours that is ideal for both young families and older residents enjoying retirement. Any new development should seek to preserve the strong sense of community that currently exists.
- A number of residents and neighbours have raised concerns about the existing depot in terms of the smells that are noticeable at times. Many
neighbours of the site would prefer the depot to be relocated elsewhere. If the depot is rehoused on site, the traffic movements to and from any new depot, as well as ensuring that the design of any new facility provides an acceptable environmental solution, were important to residents and neighbours.

- Residents value the size and quality of the existing accommodation and are concerned that replacement units should meet those same standards.

- Residents are concerned about the loss of their existing homes, timing of relocation, the nature of temporary accommodation, and the potential for years of uncertainty before any proposals are decided upon.

- A number of existing leaseholders expressed concerns about level of service charges in any new development being ‘affordable’.

- Residents who are currently allocated parking spaces are concerned about retaining a parking space in any new scheme.

- A number of comments were received about concerns relating to the massing, height and density of new buildings.

- A number of residents were concerned that Option 4 looked to reprovide all affordable housing on the north site and were worried that this would fail to deliver as mixed a community as currently exists.

- A number of residents mentioned the potential heritage value of the existing buildings believing them to be important examples of a particular style of municipal architecture.

- Both residents and neighbours expressed concern about potential traffic impact of any redevelopment that would increase densities. Warwick Road and Pembroke Road are already very busy, and so if redevelopment does happen then road improvements will be needed.

- Concerns were expressed by both tenants and leaseholders regarding short term lets, in relation to the respect and attitude of short term tenants housed in these units.

- Some residents and neighbours expressed concern that there is a general lack of community facilities and amenities in this part of the borough, and so if redevelopment does happen, it should be used as an opportunity to provide some such facilities.

- The issue of Safety and security being maintained during the construction period whilst new units are being delivered, minimising noise and disruption, is important to tenants and leaseholders.
Non Resident Leaseholders Comments

- A number of non resident leaseholders feel aggrieved that they are being treated differently from resident leaseholders by not being offered the chance to buy back in to any redevelopment on a shared-equity basis. This is felt particularly by those who have lived in the property in the past and intend to return.

- Some non-resident leaseholders have also expressed doubts that their properties are being valued fairly and that the values have already been “blighted” by the Council’s options appraisal.

Resident Leaseholders Comments

- The ability to buy in to a redeveloped scheme with an Equity share arrangement is important and is an option many will wish to pursue.

- Some leaseholders would prefer any replacement unit to be in a separate part of the scheme from ‘affordable’ units.

- A number of resident leaseholders are concerned about the level of service charges in any new development.

- The size and location of a replacement unit in the new scheme is an important consideration to resident leaseholders.

- Some resident leaseholders have raised queries about how any temporary move while redevelopment takes place will be handled, and are concerned that they have some choice but are not faced with extra costs.

Secure Tenant comments

- There are a number of long term tenants who are now elderly (including two who are over 100) so consideration of individual needs is essential.

- Some tenants are worried about the prospect of losing their current homes and sense of community and do not want redevelopment to take place.

- Tenants want clarity on where and how they would be rehoused on a temporary basis and also what any new unit would offer. There are concerns about being rehoused outside the Borough.

4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL RESULTS

4.1 The LSH Report is based on a high level assessment of the various options, and an analysis has been undertaken to establish how each option would deliver the stated objectives.

4.2 The alternatives presented should not be viewed as definitive, and if a redevelopment option was chosen, the optimum mix and type of uses would
be established through the feasibility, design, consultation and planning processes.

4.3 The assessment of the options is set out below:

**OPTION 1: REFURBISHMENT AND RE-LETTING OF EXISTING COUNCIL DEPOT AND OFFICES (RESIDENTIAL UNTOUCHED)**

4.4 In Option 1 the depot and office accommodation on the south site is refurbished and then re-let at market rents. The existing residential accommodation above is untouched. The existing nursery is refurbished and the depot accommodation on the north site is rationalised and continues as a depot.

4.5 The appraisal demonstrates that Option 1 is financially viable, provides an increased income to the Council, and minimises disruption to residents of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square. However in terms of meeting objectives it fails to deliver new homes or a new and improved depot facility, and provides significantly less income than other viable options.

**OPTION 2: REFURBISHMENT AND RELETTING OF EXISTING COUNCIL DEPOT AND OFFICES - POTENTIAL FOR NEW ACCOMMODATION ON SOUTH SITE (RESIDENTIAL UNTOUCHED)**

4.6 In Option 2 the depot and office accommodation on the south site is refurbished, re-modelled and relet as in Option 1, and the sheds at ground level are replaced with 16 mews houses. The refurbished and re-modelled accommodation is re-let at market rents. The existing residential accommodation above is untouched.

4.7 As in Option 1, the depot accommodation on the north site is rationalised and continues as a depot, with the existing nursery refurbished.

4.8 Option 2 is also financially viable but meets very few of the objectives. Whilst it provides a small quantum of additional housing, this is significantly less than other options deliver. It meets the objective of improving income but this is also less than alternative options, and the objective of a new and improved depot facility is not met.

4.9 The ability to provide more residential units on the footprint of the south site under Option 2, over and above the 16 mews houses indicated, is constrained by massing and rights of light issues.

**OPTION 3: PARTIAL DEMOLITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EITHER THE NORTH OR SOUTH SITE**

4.10 Following investigation it became clear at an early stage that the partial demolition of either the north or south site is not a viable option.

4.11 Demolition of the office/depot accommodation which is located below Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square would significantly impact on the structure and integrity of the buildings. Partial demolition would be a
complicated and expensive exercise, and it would likely be necessary to decant residents from these areas whilst work was undertaken. Moreover, to provide any new residential accommodation below Broadwood or Chesterton would require the lowering and loss of their communal gardens. Therefore, this option would not minimise the disruption to existing residents.

4.12 The ability to provide an increase in residential accommodation would also be very limited due to overhanging design of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square, which would limit the daylight and sunlight any new flats could enjoy. The areas within the existing structure which could provide additional accommodation would be restricted and the constraints would produce homes that would not meet the housing and planning standards required.

4.13 While some partial redevelopment could be technically be possible, it is considered very unlikely to be commercially viable as the costs would be prohibitive while the uplift in values would be uncertain and limited.

4.14 Fundamentally however the concerns regarding the deliverability of this option in terms of structural constraints, the risks involved and the requirement to decant residents, are felt to outweigh the benefits that this option would deliver. Option 3 is not believed to be feasible within reasonable financial constraints, and taking into account the other matters referred to above, the decision was taken not to explore partial demolition option 3 further.

**OPTION 4: FULL REDEVELOPMENT**

4.15 The formal pre-application meetings held with the LPA informed the height, massing and land uses included in the redevelopment options considered below.

4.16 The redevelopment options have further been informed by a market assessment of the uses proposed and a high level Rights of Light study.

4.17 Four alternative redevelopment options have been tested to establish the viability of redevelopment; all propose complete demolition of both sites on a phased basis.

4.18 The aim of producing four options was to test how the inclusion or exclusion of the various land uses impacts on the level of housing provision and the viability and potential benefits provided by each scheme in terms of meeting RBKC objectives.

4.19 All of the first three redevelopment options (Options 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 respectively) propose the same scenario on the north site:

- The existing buildings are demolished, with only the current nursery (346 sq.m) remaining as is;
- The depot operations are consolidated on to a new and improved facility on the north site at basement and ground level (7,100 sq.m);
102 affordable housing units are provided above the new depot on the north site (as against the 24 units within Broadwood Terrace at present).

4.20 The final redevelopment option (Option 4.4) assumes that the depot operations move off site entirely. This option also retains the existing nursery and introduces 102 new affordable units on the north site above new retail accommodation (1,791sq.m) at basement and ground floor levels in place of the new depot.

4.21 All four redevelopment options assume the south site is demolished in its entirety, and that the ‘base case accommodation’ to be re-provided on the south site comprises retail (1,279 sqm), office (1,884 sqm) and 126 new market housing units.

4.22 The redevelopment options for the south site then differ as follows:

- The inclusion of a 100 bed hotel OR a Private Rented Sector (PRS) residential scheme of 48 units (34 market and 14 affordable);
- The inclusion of 16 mews houses OR an independent school.

4.23 All of the options have assumed the inclusion of 30% affordable housing on the increase in residential floor space above 800 sq.m. The Council’s stated policy is to provide 50% affordable housing but viability of other private sector schemes in the Borough shows that the current average is 15-18%, so a percentage of 30% has been used as a benchmark in these options.

5 THE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS TESTED ARE OUTLINED IN DETAIL BELOW:

OPTION 4.1 – RESIDENTIAL AND HOTEL SCHEME

5.1 This option provides a 100 bed hotel and 16 mews houses on the south site in addition to the accommodation detailed above.

5.2 Although this option is viable, and meets a number of the objectives, providing a hotel on the site is not a preference at this time by comparison with other options.

OPTION 4.2 – RESIDENTIAL AND PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR SCHEME

5.3 In addition to the accommodation outlined above, this option replaces the 100 bed hotel with a 48 unit Private Rented Sector (PRS) scheme (34 market and 14 affordable units):

5.4 This option is viable and provides the highest number of additional residential units of the schemes tested. It would also meet the objectives of improving income stream, amenity in the area, and the provision of a new depot on site.
OPTION 4.3 – RESIDENTIAL, PRS AND PRIVATE SCHOOL SCHEME

5.5 This option is as per Option 4.2 above, but replaces the 16 mews houses with an independent school:

5.6 This option is also viable whilst producing a higher income stream than other options by virtue of the inclusion of the school, but delivering a slightly lower number of residential units than Option 4.2.

OPTION 4.4 – RESIDENTIAL SCHEME WITH NO RETAINED DEPOT

5.7 This option is as per Option 4.2, but does not retain a depot facility on the north site, and instead replaces it with retail floor space.

5.8 This option is viable, and provides the maximum number of residential units possible in addition to the highest income stream. However, the outcome of the bi-borough depot review indicates that the Council needs to retain a single-borough depot facility and this option would require the depot to be relocated elsewhere.

6 THE RESULTS OF THE OPTIONS APPRAISAL

6.1 Having analysed the various options in light of the objectives set, the conclusion is that all options are viable with the exception of Option 3.

6.2 Options 1 and 2 provide minimal disruption to the existing residents but fail to meet a number of key objectives stated, in particular the delivery of additional housing units, improvement of amenity in the area, delivery of a new improved depot facility, or significantly increased income to offset the reduction in central government funding.

6.3 Option 3 did not meet the majority of objectives, and equally importantly was not felt to be deliverable due to issues associated with the risks and high level of costs associated with the required construction work to the existing structure which would have a significant effect upon existing residents. In addition the increase in residential accommodation that could be provided is less than other options in Option 4, and the new accommodation would be of an unacceptable quality due to the constraints of the existing structure to be retained.

6.4 Option 4.4 is viable and delivers a number of the stated objectives, but would not provide the required replacement Depot facility that the borough needs.

6.5 Options 4.2 and 4.3 best meet the objectives that have been set for this site: between them they maximise the number of additional housing units, including doubling the amount of affordable housing on the site; they maximise the income for the Council so as to protect frontline services; they provide a new improved depot that would be cleaner and less of a nuisance for residents and neighbours; they provide the opportunity for new high-quality business space and community facilities; and they provide the opportunity to improve the built environment and public realm in this part of the borough.
6.6 It is acknowledged that Options 4.2 or 4.3 would cause more disruption to the existing residents of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square than either Option 1 or Option 2. However, it is considered that through careful design and ongoing consultation and engagement with residents it should be possible to address and satisfactorily resolve most of the issues and concerns that have so far been raised about full redevelopment.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Based upon an analysis of the objectives set out by RBKC for the Pembroke Road site, and a review of the alternative options which have been identified, the recommendation is that a decision is made to undertake further work on the full redevelopment option (Option 4).

7.2 It is recommended that the Council progresses the appointment of a consultant team to provide a more detailed scheme in order to enable further discussions with residents and the Planning Authority to be undertaken prior to submission of a planning application. Further details of the consultants required and proposed budget are set out in Part B of this report.

7.3 It is also recommended that further consultation is undertaken with residents as part of the design and planning process for which a budget is also requested.

7.4 It is also recommended that the existing budget for acquisition of resident leaseholders units who want to sell now by private treaty on a market value basis is increased in accordance with the budget set out in Part B of this report. Once a cabinet decision has been made, and so long as a full redevelopment option is being pursued, it is proposed that the Council’s offer to purchase leaseholders’ properties would include an additional payment which reflects the amounts that the leaseholder would be entitled to under CPO provisions, prior to any CPO process being instigated and approved.

8 REASONS FOR DECISION

8.1 To meet the objective of maximising the delivery of additional housing within the Borough.

8.2 To utilise fully and efficiently this under-used public asset and to generate new revenue in order to sustain provision of frontline Council services.

8.3 To improve the environment and amenity of the local area around the site.

8.4 To pursue the provision of a new improved Council depot to serve the current and future requirements of residents within the Borough.

9 CONSULTATION

9.1 The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration has been consulted and his comments have been incorporated in the Report.
9.2 In relation to consultation with residents:

Newsletters were issued on: March 2013, June 2013 (Q and A Booklet) February and August 2014.

Public meetings were held on: 20th and 20th June 2013, 22nd July, 16th and 25th September 2014, and 9th October 2014.

10 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no equality implications arising from this report.

11 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

11.1 There are no procurement implications arising from this report.

12 PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no planning implications arising from this report.

13 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 The Director of Law advises that there are no legal implications from this report (Legal comments provided by David Walker, Principal Solicitor (Property) david.walker@rbkc.gov.uk 0207-361-2211.

14 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

14.1 Group Finance Manager, Corporate Services, has been consulted and comments:

The Report requests the release of £1.5m for the next stage of this project – obtaining planning approval and further resident consultation – and £7m for the purchase of the leaseholder interests (Right to Buy flats). This is in addition to the £3m agreed as part of the 2013-14 capital programme. The Council – ahead of decisions on final options – will fund the investment from its own cash resources (internal borrowing) on the assumption that the project will generate capital receipts and income streams in the future. If the project does not progress, this additional cost of £8.5m can be currently funded from the Council’s resources.

14.2 The Housing Finance Manager, Housing Services, has been consulted and comments:

Housing Services have been consulted and the resultant comments have been included within the Report.

Michael Clark
Director for Corporate Property and Customer Service
Nicholas Holgate
Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance

Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)
Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

Contact officer

Martin Mortimer
Senior Development Surveyor
Corporate Property
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
martin.mortimer.rbkc.gov.uk
020 7361 3521
### Key concerns and points raised by residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. General Comments from Leaseholders and Secure Tenants</th>
<th>How the Council proposes to address these concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Existing design of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square provides a secure and safe environment with excellent landscaped/garden areas and natural light. Any new development should provide communal but private landscape/garden areas to the north and south sites.</td>
<td>The design approach for any new development will aim to deliver a safe and secure environment with some private communal landscaped areas for residents to enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Residents currently have a diverse but friendly community with a secure environment ideal for young families and older residents enjoying retirement, with good neighbours.</td>
<td>It is proposed that if a redevelopment option is progressed, then all existing tenants and resident leaseholders would be given the opportunity to return to any new development thereby maintaining the existing community. Appropriate security for the development as a whole, and facilities for children will be considered as part of the design process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. A number of residents have raised concerns regarding the existing depot:  
  • The smell generated at times  
  • Should the depot be located on the site or not. Many residents felt the depot should be relocated elsewhere.  
  • Highway considerations and traffic management need to be looked at to minimise effect of vehicles serving existing or new depot upon residents. |  
  • The Council will look for ways to address the current issues regarding smells.  
  • The provision of a new depot either on site or elsewhere will be considered as part of the next stage in the process. A number of the current redevelopment options provide for a new depot on the site, which could be located at basement and ground levels and current design techniques should minimise any effect on neighbours.  
  • The traffic management point will be considered by Highway engineers as part of the design process. |
<p>| 4. Residents value the size and quality of their existing accommodation and are concerned that any replacement units should meet those same standards. |  |
| 5. Residents are understandably concerned about the loss of their homes, timing of relocation, uncertainty and the nature and location of temporary accommodation. Also being updated about the process and timescales is important. | As covered in earlier points, all tenants and resident leaseholders will be able to return to a new home on the site if full redevelopment goes ahead. In terms of temporary accommodation, it is intended that this will be provided on the site where possible by means of phasing, if not on site then it should be provided in the Borough with a minimum number of moves. Discussions will also be held with resident leaseholders wishing to return to the site rather than sell regarding potential arrangements for |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Parking spaces. Residents who are currently allocated parking spaces are concerned about retaining a space in any new scheme</td>
<td>The design brief for any new development will take on board this request and residents will be consulted during the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> The existing development is relatively low density and a number of residents are concerned about heights and massing of any new buildings.</td>
<td>Any proposals for the scale and massing of new buildings would be informed though further discussions with the Planning Department and members of the consultant team. The overall envelope of any new buildings would also be restricted by neighbouring properties rights to light, and this is also a matter that will be addressed through consultation during the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> A number of residents were concerned that the Redevelopment Option 4 looked to re-provide all affordable housing on the north site, and were worried that this would fail to deliver as mixed a community as currently exists.</td>
<td>The high level options produced to date show virtually all the affordable homes located on the north site. There are a number of reasons for this including the need to minimise moves and disruption to existing residents but this point can be reconsidered during the design and planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> A number of residents mentioned the potential heritage value of the existing buildings, believing them to be important examples of a particular style of municipal architecture.</td>
<td>In response to these concerns, the Council has already appointed heritage consultants to review this issue. This is a matter that would need to be will be considered and consulted on as part of design and planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Both residents and neighbours expressed concerns about the potential traffic impact of any redevelopment that would increase densities. Warwick Road and Pembroke Road are already very busy.</td>
<td>As part of any planning process, this important point will be considered and it is likely that road improvements will be required if a redevelopment of the Pembroke Road site is undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Some residents expressed the view that there is a general lack of community facilities and amenities in this part of the borough. If redevelopment does happen then it should be used as an opportunity to provide some new facilities.</td>
<td>This will be considered in the context of existing and proposed provision in the general area as part of the design and planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> A number of existing leaseholders expressed concerns about the level of service charges in any new development being ‘affordable’.</td>
<td>The lower levels of cost associated with the maintenance and management of new buildings as opposed to older ones should provide long term benefits to leaseholders. However this point is noted and will be considered in the context of the design process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Secure Tenants and leaseholders are concerned about the responsibility for future maintenance and management of the development if redevelopment took place.</td>
<td>The future maintenance and management of any new development will need careful consideration and any options would need to be consulted on with residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Residents are concerned about short term lets on units acquired by the Council in terms of the social issues of short term tenants housed in these units. These concerns are noted. At present there are obviously only a small number of these units and if the redevelopment option is progressed the intention would be to use units becoming vacant as temporary accommodation for existing residents as well as any short term lets.

15. Residents are concerned about health and safety aspects as well as disruption which they feel would be inevitable if Option 4 is chosen. In addition to consultation taking place with residents during the planning process and any redevelopment taking place, the aim would be to cause the minimum disruption possible as well as providing liaison with residents to monitor construction activities.

**B. Non resident leaseholders comments**

1. A number of non resident leaseholders feel aggrieved that they are being treated differently from resident leaseholders by not being offered the opportunity to buy back in to any redevelopment on a shared equity basis. This is felt particularly by those who have lived in the property in the past and intend to return. Consideration will be given to the representations made. However non resident leaseholders are effectively business owners generating income from an investment, which is why they are treated differently under CPO provisions. Notwithstanding that point, all non resident leaseholders will have sufficient time to become resident before any redevelopment takes place so they could also benefit from the offer to resident leaseholders if they so choose.

2. Some non resident leaseholders have also expressed doubts that their properties are being valued fairly and that the values have already been ‘blighted’ by the Council’s options appraisal. In relation to any basis of valuation, the Council intend that non resident leaseholders should receive a fair market value for their property together with appropriate compensation. Any valuations would provide for any effect of the current proposals to be ignored.

**C. Resident leaseholder comments**

1. The ability to buy in to a redeveloped scheme with an equity share arrangement is important and is an option many will wish to pursue. Discussions will take place with all resident leaseholders during the planning process to progress this proposal.

2. Some resident leaseholders would prefer any replacement unit to be in a separate part of the scheme apart from ‘affordable’ units. The comment is noted and the tenure mix and location would be determined during the planning process. At present, the high level options for redevelopment show all of the affordable units located on the north site, whereas the private units available for resident leaseholders to buy back would be located on the south site.

3. Some resident leaseholders have raised queries about how any temporary move while redevelopment takes place will be handled, and are concerned that they are provided with some choice, but not liable for any additional costs as a result. Discussions will be held with individual resident leaseholders regarding their requirements once the nature of any redevelopment proposals are progressed and a programme for this is established.
of the temporary move.

### D. Secure Tenant Comments

1. **There are a number of long term tenants who are now elderly (including two over 100) and there are concerns about both the loss of their home, temporary accommodation and replacement home.**
   
   The Council’s Housing team would visit residents and discuss any special needs for those who are elderly or vulnerable, to ensure that appropriate measures are put in place in terms of minimising the effect of disruption and temporary accommodation.

2. **Some Secure Tenants are worried about losing their current homes and sense of community and do not want redevelopment to take place.**
   
   All existing Secure Tenants will be given the opportunity to return to a new home in any redevelopment if this option is pursued, and consultation will be maintained to inform tenants about the current position and programme.

### E. Comments from residents within the adjacent areas

1. **The ESSR residents group are opposed to redevelopment and prefer an option that retains the existing building. They would also favour relocation of the depot elsewhere.**
   
   These comments will be addressed as part of any planning process.

2. **One neighbour has expressed the view that the current buildings are obsolete and should be replaced through redevelopment, also that the depot should be relocated off site.**
   
   The issue of the future of the existing depot is addressed elsewhere in these comments.

3. **Chatsworth Court Residents Association welcome the improvements provided by the introduction of new housing, retail and green spaces for residents and would also like to see the depot relocated. They would like to see the inclusion of an appropriate amount of public car parking within any new scheme which they feel would benefit local residents. They have concerns about traffic on Pembroke Road particularly bearing in mind the effect of the new developments along Warwick Road.**
   
   These comments will be taken on board in the design and planning of any new scheme, subject to viability.

4. **A number of letters were received from neighbours who expressed the view that the existing depot should be relocated.**
   
   The options for the existing depot are being considered as part of the overall analysis for the future of the Pembroke Road site.
Feedback from residents following Consultation meetings

1. **Compilation of Comments received from leaseholders**

**WHAT MY FAMILY & I MOST VALUE ABOUT OUR HOME:**

We live in Broadwood Terrace, in a 3 bedroom house, on two floors, one of a small row of terraced houses (nos. 17-24).

1. **The house itself:**

   **Light:** we are blessed with lots of natural light - having a double aspect, and generous sized windows on either side of our 2 storey home.
   On the Warwick Gdns side, (facing east), we receive the morning sunlight.
   On the Warwick Rd side, (facing west), we are flooded with light from midday on.
   Our west facing living room and master bedroom effectively have walls of glass, which create a wonderful sense of space.
   The downstairs living room and upstairs master bedroom have balconies that extend along the width of the house.

   **Vista:** from our top floor, we have lovely, unimpeded views across the London skyline.
   Facing east, we are above the roof line of the houses on Warwick Gdns, and can see many of the London skyline features, such as the MI6 building opposite Tate Britain, the Shard, the BT Tower, London Eye, etc.

   Facing west, we have some lovely plain trees in front of our windows, and through the foliage, we look directly over and above the old Homebase car park with unimpeded far reaching views over the Overground train line, as far as Charring Cross Hospital and beyond.

   **Internal Space:**
   The internal space is well designed and rooms are generously sized. The sense of space is accentuated by the large windows and unimpeded views.
   Over the last 9 years, we have made many improvements and personalised this space and made it our home. This is the home that we welcomed our son into and which has strengthened our emotional attachment to it.

   **Our own front door:**
   that opens onto lovely, communal gardens, exclusively for the use of residents

2. **The immediate vicinity:**

   **Gardens:**
   these are lovely, clean and tranquil, and provide a safe and secure environment for our son to play in. We feel very safe here and this is very important to us.

   **Good neighbours and community spirit:**
   The relatively small number of properties in Broadwood Terrace (24) means that we now know many of our neighbours by name and we really value the simple, friendly
gestures and sense of community that we share with our neighbours. I'm very lucky that one of our neighbours is a very close friend of mine whom I have known since I was a child. There is greater turnover of private tenants, some (not all) of whom are less inclined to chat and keep themselves to themselves but for the most part, our neighbours are long term leaseholders and council tenants. It is quite usual for one neighbour to take in a parcel for another absent neighbour or for one neighbour to borrow something from, or lend something to, another neighbour.

We really enjoy the multi-cultural mix of friendly neighbours and the fact that most people stop to chat, and look out for our son.

**Safe environment:**
During all our time in Broadwood Terrace, we have never been the victim of any crime of any description. It is an unusually quiet, safe and friendly place to live.

**Privacy:**
Not having anyone living above or below us, or anyone overlooking us, our home feels very private.

In my previous flat, I lived on the ground floor and shared a main entrance door and hallway with 12 other residents. Over the years, I suffered a lot of noise disturbance from other residents, either from the communal areas, or adjacent flats, above and below me, especially those above me. Moreover, I periodically suffered water damage from the flats above.

I would never wish to be in that situation again and I would never willingly choose to have someone living above or below me again.

**Low density:**
I think one of the reasons that everyone gets on so well with everyone else on our terrace is that there is sufficient space for everyone and a general sense of spaciousness, both internal and external. Ultimately, this is a reflection on the design lay-out and the fact that the "build" is relatively low density, and feels more like a quiet back street terrace, than a high rise building.

3. Surrounding area and amenities:

We are in a wonderful position in a wonderful borough with all that this central London location has to offer.

Having the large Tesco nearby is very convenient for food shopping as is the Waitrose on High St Ken. and the many other shops and facilities there, including a cinema and post office. I have banked at the HSBC branch in High St Ken for more than 25 years, ever since returning from University. And I rarely feel the need to go beyond the high street to meet my needs.

For us, the greatest asset of the area are the lovely parks nearby which our son visits daily, either Holland Park or Kensington Gdns. I myself, grew up and spent large swathes of my childhood in these same parks. And I am very happy that my son is able to do the same.
The one thing that is sorely lacking in the close vicinity is a good public swimming pool and sports centre, but I understand, this is being remedied. Which will be a great boost.

These are just some of the things that my family and I value most about our home and where we live and given the choice we would like to remain here. The thought of living in an apartment sandwiched between other apartments, albeit worth more money, grieves us and gives us no comfort whatsoever.

And some of the things that we fear we may lose if full redevelopment of the estate is the option chosen by the Council Cabinet on October 30th.

It is for this reason, that our preferred Option would be Option 2.

This seems a fair compromise whereby RBKC are able to maximise their potential income from the site, with the modernisation of its office spaces and the development of 16 new mews houses to the south of the Chesterton Square site to replace the depot there, (which I don't think anyone will shed tears for), but at the same time, not cause the inevitable massive disruption to both the residents of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square and the many more years of uncertainty and anxiety facing all of these.

On top of the year and a half already of worry and anxiety felt by many.

I hope that you will all take this feedback on board.

Finally, a more general point about the process: I appreciate that there is still a lot for the Council to work out, depending on which Option is adopted, etc. However, for us living with this every day, it would be very helpful to have some more details of how the process over the coming several years is likely to unfold?

The steps that will need to be taken.

And the relevant time-frames for all of these?

I know that many people were left feeling frustrated after the first meeting in July to leave the meeting still unclear as to the time-frames before us.

It would be good if over the next couple of meetings in September, some idea of the steps ahead of us and time-frames could be fleshed out so that all residents are clearer as to what they are likely to face, and allow them to make informed decisions and plan accordingly.
2. Compilation of comments received from leaseholders

I would like to make a few points about the proposed regeneration/consultation of the Pembroke Road Estate site. I would also like to thank you for the well run focus groups and attention to resident's needs while we have been attending. I do however have some concerns regarding the consultation documents.

As you are aware, the site was built in the mid-seventies. Some original residents are still living there and it has become like a village community, where residents try to assist and help one another. It is spacious and residents can sit outside in spring, summer and autumn and socialise with neighbours. It has an excellent social mix of many nationalities and age groups, tenants and leaseholders.

The gardens are particularly unique, with a beautiful mix of trees and plants, which are beneficial and therapeutic for mental and physical health. Plant life is particularly important in such a polluted area. It is also a remarkably safe area, not having had any burglaries for 20 years or so, in central London.

Residents are able to watch their children outside or from inside their flats and also identify any anti-social behaviour. It is very quiet as the buildings themselves insulate the square and terrace from the noise of surrounding traffic. I understand that David Cameron’s most senior planner advised Mikes Gibson is working to the development of Garden Cities, which should be ideal planning for the future. The Pembroke Road Estate is a very special garden village, probably the first such design, built above office blocks in London and initiated many times I believe. The complex above Tesco is just one example.

As you are aware the Pembroke Road site is a Heritage site. A substantial section is included in the ‘Survey of London’, ‘Pevsner’s Architectural Guide’ and other historic documents. The value of the property in the consultation documents seems to be entirely limited to the financial return and does not include any community, historic or aesthetic values or considerations.

From the social/community standpoint, it appears that the new plans provide no more affordable homes than the site already contains. The plans are very unclear as to who would administer the new complex, rent, lease or own them. Under new government plans there would be less funding for homeless clients, so more affordable housing would seem to be an urgent option. I am also very concerned that Chesterton Square, an excellent site, would be demolished under Option 4 to provide private housing for which I see no urgent need. According to a number of authorities, it is often unoccupied in Kensington and not conductive to community building and adhesion. I see no pressing need for yet another hotel in Kensington and parking for 90 cars will just increase pollution levels.

There has been no inclusion in the consultation documents of proposed planning and development of either health, education, social and community or sporting facilities. These facilities have all been sadly lacking in the centre of the Borough. They are mostly concentrated in the South i.e. – New Horizons Hortensia and sports and swimming facilities, or else in the North of the Borough in Wornington vicinity.
I would like to say that the offer of deferred equity to leaseholders, should they wish to buy into the new build is much appreciated. Even so I do feel that a definitive choice of options by the Cabinet at the end of October is very premature.

The information we have received consists only of massing diagrams and no developed design proposals. There are far too many loose ends and unknowns. It would seem like picking an option blindfolded and having no real idea of the outcome.

I find the whole consultation/regeneration project raises many concerns. I also consider it difficult to comprehend why the Cabinet could choose option 4, which would destroy the kind of housing, gardens, environment and community which are set out by the Government as the ideal that Kensington and Chelsea should aspire to.

I do hope you will give these points your very careful consideration.

Kind regards.

Comments from leaseholders

Dear Sirs,
We are the leaseholders in Broadwood Terrace.
We lived in the flat for a number of years before we moved out as we required space for our family. We rely on the income from the flat to live off now.

The flat does hold sentimental value for us as we had our first child there and we are hoping in the future to move back there one day.

We are incredibly upset at the treatment of non resident leaseholders. I can understand if we were developers or a management company who owned the property but we are not. We care deeply about the property and the community there and we would like to have a chance to stay there.

I don’t understand how resident leaseholders can be preventing from renting their flats out in the future once the development has taken place.

We do feel discriminated against and I wonder if there is anyone we can talk to about our situation. Will the flats be treated on a case by case basis at all? That to me would be a lot more fair.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Best wishes
Comments from leaseholders

This is who I am. I arrived from British Guiana 19.4.62 and then one week later I started to work. I never claimed any unemployment benefit or any social security benefit; I always find work to support myself and family and I am still to this day working in a supermarket to pay my bills. I will be 75 years old in September.

I lived in this Borough for over 50 years, I bought this flat so I can live my old age in peace, conservative fund letter arrived I send whatever I can afford.

I was the first to move in to the estate in February 1976 and I loved it then and I still love living here now so I do not want to move out. No one lives above me and I get on well with my neighbours. When I come through the double security doors our landscape garden is very welcoming. I come in my flat close the door I feel safe because I know no one can break in to rob or assault me. I go out on the balcony and the view is great over the Pembroke Road. I was about to extend my lease before pulling down of this building started last year. I still have 96 years left on my lease. Our service charge is just affordable, as someone already asked for a Cap on service charge.

I am not crazy over money, I could have sold this Flat and buy a big house and still have some money in the bank. BUT NO I love living here in London and this borough.

Earlier this year someone was offering to buy this flat for £725,000 and so a couple of years time it will be £1million. 5, 6 years time it could be £1.5 million for this flat so I can put it towards my new flat you will give me over the Pembroke Road.

When you find me somewhere to live while the new flats are being built I would like all my safety requirements to be met please. Thank you.

Comments from leaseholders

We are leaseholders.

1. We welcome the option of buying an equity share outright, no additional mortgage is attractive.
2. We want to stay in Chesterton Square. Our flat was the show flat and my wife was the first family in. They chose the south west corner and would wish to stay overlooking the same view as we have three children in local schools.
3. We like the option to rent out and have rental income in the future if our circumstances change.
4. We have three children in a three bed flat the option to get a four bed would be excellent news.
5. Car parking is an issue in 1000 new properties going up – we would want the option to have parking.
6. I understand Chesterton Square leaseholders would be given the option of a new private accommodation in Chesterton Square and this is welcomed.
7. I was confused where the tenants from Chesterton Square would be relocated – would this be on the northern Broadwood site?
8. The social issues we have had over the years – litter, smoking, peeing in the lifts and stains have never been associated with leaseholders – my preference is to live somewhere with fewer tenants and more leaseholders or private residents because this affects the value of the property as an investment. If we were to invest in a block consisting of 100% social housing then the value would deteriorate relative to a block where residents have an investment.

9. The Council valuations are approx 10-15% below the lowest estate agents e.g. property valued £850k - £1m we are led to believe would be valued at £100k by the Council valuer – a difference of nearly 50% (42.8%).

10. Our preference is Option 4, 4 bed unit in southern site facing Warwick Road or Terraced House (4.4)/

11. I think the depot should be removed.

12. The social housing on the Homebase site will be located opposite the social housing at Broadwood – is this a good idea?

Comments from leaseholders

If we are to return to the building, will it have the same security and access to gardens that we have now? The garden would be the number one factor for me moving back.

What would be the increase in service charges?

How would we find alternative accommodation whilst waiting to move?

Comments from leaseholders

1. Prefer option buying an equity share in a new property.
2. The valuation of the new property will be important to us as Council blocks devalue relative to Private Accommodation.
3. We have 1050 sq ft with three children – we would prefer a four bedroom to a three bedroom.
4. We like the idea of being able to rent out and split the rental income.
5. We want to stay in Chesteron Square. We do NOT want to move to northern (Broadwood) site.
6. The Depot smells
7. Less Council tenants and more leaseholders is preferable for an investment as Council blocks have more social issues and suffer a bigger discount in market value.
8. Parking is an issue – can I have a parking space?
9. Your valuation of our leasehold property is approx 10% beneath the lowest estate agent’s market price and this is 30% below the highest valuation.
10. We spent £40k doing up this flat! So we intended to stay.
11. Our preference is option 4, 4 bed unit, at least 1050 sq ft, car parking, ability to rent out, more leaseholders, less Council tenants.
12. Our flat is 1050 sq ft and slightly larger than other three bed units.
3. **Comments received from tenants**

Dear Sirs

I am the daughter of the above lady, who is aged nearly 90 and has been a tenant in Chesterton Square since they were built. Additionally she has been a tenant with Kensington and Chelsea for approaching 70 years!

My mother is understandably worried and upset at a time when she should be enjoying a happy retirement - she now does not know what the future holds for her home, her future, her life, this clearly is something totally unacceptable.

I attended the meeting for tenants on the 25th September 2014 to voice concerns on behalf of my mother. Even though all options were explained at the meeting, I considered and felt you were 'just going through the motions', a decision has already been made.

This was confirmed for me when I asked Councillor Feilding-Mellen whether Kensington and Chelsea had purchased properties back from Leaseholders and was told yes, (two properties purchased and one going through). These properties have now been given to homeless people who are not secured tenants and can be moved as and when. You may think the 'tenants' are stupid or Plebs but we are not, this clearly indicates that option 4 with demolition of homes taking place is going to take place.

I wish to make it clear that as well as my mother there are several other tenants in their nineties who face this immense worry too, just so the council may reap the fruits financially of selling out on the community.

As more and more Leaseholders 'give in' and sell up, my mother faces the prospect of no longer being surrounded and helped by a caring long standing community but now surrounded by homeless people being temporarily rehoused who are strangers. Some of these people will not have the same regard for the environment, they will have no community spirit, more crime, the ghetto will arrive like other estates and frankly my mother will be unsafe.

I hold Kensington and Chelsea responsible for this. What are you going to do about it and how will you ensure my mother’s safety? I am pointing this out to you now and I expect to hear guarantees? My mother has human rights and has not asked for any of this to happen. Think of that when you have your meetings, and just see £ signs, try and think of people and individuals!

If flats are becoming empty then leave them empty until a full rebuild is complete?

I await to hear and wish my points to be discussed and await your proposals and guarantees for my mother.

Yours Faithfully
Dear Councillors,

My family and I have been living in Warwick Gardens for two years now. When we bought the house we knew there was a depot backing on to our garden but we never imagined the smell would be as bad as it is. We basically cannot sit outside and I am too embarrassed to invite guests.

I have two questions:

-I was told by RBKC that the trucks are cleaned and hosed down. The smell has progressively deteriorated. Are they not doing this anymore and is there something you can do to ensure they do disinfect the place to mitigate the smell?

-More importantly, I understand that there are plans for this depot to be repurposed or torn down at some point. (it seems like expensive real estate for a dump truck parking). Could you elaborate on these plans and what can I/we do to move this forward faster?

We are a young family who of course needed to compromise when buying our house so this was one of the compromises. We have refurbished the house, painted the exterior and are encouraging our neighbours do as well. Little by little the street is cleaning up. However as long as this depot remains, it will be a neighbourhood of bedsits and rundown buildings. I am sure this is something that we would all like changed.

Please let me know your thoughts and I would really appreciate any help you can provide.

Many thanks in advance.

Comments from wider residents

1. The only credible and financially viable option is complete redevelopment – option 4.4.
2. The depot is a health and safety and environmental issue – it must be relocated.
3. Traffic must be reduced on Pembroke Road.
4. The existing buildings are of poor quality in terms of design and refurbishment will be far too costly and provide no real financial return – it will probably be totally unviable.
5. Full redevelopment will provide good use of the land and a good financial return and affordable housing for the borough.
Comments from wider residents

Hello

I could not attend the meeting on 22nd July as at work but would be grateful to have a printed copy of the summary of the proposals for the site and we will try to attend the 9 October meeting as we live in Warwick Gardens. Whereas we welcome innovative and sensitive developments in our area, our main concerns are:

- poor quality design architecture creeping into the area, mainly uniform bland glass and concrete structures of no architectural merit
- Lack of green areas (gardens etc.) leaving a very hard environment
- Lack of amenities, e.g. restaurants and cinemas for local residents
- Resident Parking issues and maybe even traffic issues
- loss of light and privacy if high rise buildings are erected
- loss of a sense of village like atmosphere in some of the smaller streets with low level houses if replaced with uniform band higher structures.

We have not received any printed information of the proposals despite living in the immediate area.

We look forward to your reply.

Thank you

Comments from wider residents

I am again bringing up the subject of the Broadwood Terrace waste depot. All of last week and especially over the weekend the smell was over-powering and we were not able to sit outside. We might as well have bought a house overlooking a landfill site. You mentioned asking the company to disinfect the trucks and keep the area clean. Has this been done? Please let me know what more you can do as I have not had the courage to host a bbq in case the smell is too bad that evening. It's a shame that having re-done the house and garden, we can't really make use of it.

I look forward to your thoughts.

Cllr Fielding-Mellen, good evening. I am cc'ing you in as my husband attended on Wed the Pembroke Road tenants and leaseholders meeting. I was very unsettled to find out that there is a strong possibility of the depot remaining in place? What can I do as a resident to voice my extreme concern over this possible outcome. I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks in advance to both of you.
Comments from wider residents

Thank you for keeping us informed. As residents of one of the houses backing out of Broadwood Terrace/the Waste Depot site we have two major priorities.

1. The waste depot needs to be moved. The smell is intolerable, something I have been regularly pointing out by email to Kathy Map and Cllr Borwick. A waste depot in the middle of an increasingly residential area does not make financial sense and most importantly is unhygienic.
2. In considering any alternatives for redevelopment, we would require assurance that we maintain the same light that we currently enjoy – i.e. the overarching structure should remain of the same size.

I urge you to give full consideration to the above points. We have invested money and time in refurbishing our house as have our neighbours. Keeping the status quo will just mean that this area of Warwick Rd/Gardens remains one of the dilapidated houses and bedsits – something that I believe no one wants.

With thanks in advance for your attention.

Comments from wider residents (Chatsworth Court Residents Association)

We are grateful to be included in updates for any development options affecting Pembroke Road.

Broadly we welcome improvement for housing, retail and green spaces for residents.

Many of us would like to see the refuse dept removed if this can be included.

Also, the addition of public amenities such as shops, landscaping, park, green areas too.

We feel that the inclusion of some public parking facility (NCP) would be an advantage.

There are concerns for traffic on an already busy road, especially with other large developments along Warwick Road.

Local parking is already very limited.

Thank you for inviting local residents.

Yours faithfully.
Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet held in Committee Room 1, Kensington Town Hall, London W8 7NX at 6.30pm on 30 October 2014

PRESENT

Cabinet Members
Councillor Nicholas Paget-Brown (Leader of the Council), Chairman
Councillor Rock Feilding-Mellen (Deputy Leader, Housing, Property and Regeneration)
Councillor Tim Ahern (Environment, Environmental Services and Leisure)
Councillor Elizabeth Campbell (Family and Children’s Services)
Councillor Timothy Coleridge (Planning Policy, Transport and Arts)
Councillor Gerard Hargreaves ((Voluntary Organisations and Resident Engagement)
Councillor Warwick Lightfoot (Finance and Strategy)
Councillor Mary Weale (Adult Social Care and Public Health)

Other Members in attendance
Councillor Borwick (Abingdon ward)
Councillor Healy (Dalgarno ward)
Councillor Mason (Chairman of Cabinet and Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Pascall (Lead Member)

PART A (PUBLIC) MINUTES

A1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gardner and Will; and from Councillor Barbara Campbell (Lead Member).

A2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
Councillor Elizabeth Campbell declared an interest in agenda item A7 – Establishment of a Bi-Borough Alternative Provision Hub School, on the grounds that she is Vice Chairman of the Tri-Borough Alternative Provision (TBAP) Trust.

A3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2014
The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
A4. MEDIUM TERM PLANNING – BUDGET AND SERVICE PROSPECTS - KD04374

This report set out the Council’s overall budget and Council Tax plans with detailed service proposals for 2015-16. The Council’s financial plans include the option to freeze Council Tax for the sixth year running.

Councillor Lightfoot reported that net savings identified so far put the Council ahead of the savings required at this stage, but that three years additional savings will be required. Scrutiny Committees will be consulted on detailed service budget reports before they come to Cabinet for approval in February 2015.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed to the proposed revenue budget reductions set out in appendix 1 of the report which, subject to comments from Scrutiny Committees, will be brought back for confirmation or amendment by Cabinet in February 2015.

Reasons for the decision

The Council is legally required to set a balanced budget and Council Tax each financial year and this report forms part of the context to final decisions relating to this.

Action by: TCEDF

A5. BUDGET MONITORING 2014-15 QUARTER 2 OVERVIEW - KD04373

Councillor Lightfoot was pleased to report that the budget was proceeding towards another underspend for this year and this was achieved while the Council was continuing to maintain services, make cash savings and adjustments on services.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed to

(i) note the financial position as set out for the whole authority in paragraph 5 and annex I and for the individual services in appendices 1 – 10;

Corporate Services

(ii) approve the drawdown of £72,000 from the Repairs and Renewals reserve to fund laptop encryption (see appendix 9, paragraph 1.4); and

Whole Authority

(iii) note the forecast outturn position as set out (which is a combination of under and overspends within the service areas).

Reasons for the decision

Services report quarterly on the budgeted versus forecast actual financial
position to Cabinet. Though mainly for information, the report may also set out requests for in-year budget and funding changes.

Action by: TCEDF

A6. CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ACT: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - KD04343

This report outlined the principles of the initial eligibility guidelines for young people with special educational needs. The guidelines have been developed and used as a working document following the implementation of the Children and Families Act, which came into effect from September 2014. The paper recommends that Cabinet approves the initial eligibility guidelines to be formally implemented for the academic year 2014-15 and then reviewed with parents and other stakeholders throughout the first year of operation.

In introducing the report, Councillor Campbell welcomed the eligibility guidelines as they would target those in most need. She also welcomed the fact that they had been extended to cover young people between the ages of 16 and 25. However given the increase in age range, there may be some financial pressures as a result, but officers hoped to contain these within the High Needs block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the initial eligibility guidelines for formal implementation for the academic year 2014-15.

Reasons for the decision

The Children and Families Act requires education, health and social care services to work more closely together and undertake a combined assessment process for young people with complex needs. This assessment process will result in a combined Education, Health and Care plan that will, in effect, replace current ‘Statements’ of special educational need.

Action by: TBDS

A7. ESTABLISHMENT OF A BI-BOROUGH ALTERNATIVE PROVISION HUB SCHOOL - KD04280

This report summarised the current alternative provision for children not in mainstream education in Kensington and Chelsea and also in Hammersmith and Fulham, and made proposals for its development in order to raise standards of delivery and improve pupil outcomes.

Councillor Campbell declared an interest in the report as the Vice Chairman of the Tri-Borough Alternative Provision (TBAP) Trust.

In introducing the report, officers outlined how the economies of scale that would follow the establishment of the Bi-Borough Hub School would release revenue. Members further noted that the Council’s contribution would be capped at £6.2 million, with LBHF leading on the construction and bearing
the risk. The cost of the decant to the Latimer Centre would be included within the revised project costs.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed that

(i) the principle of a Bi-borough Hub School is adopted;
(ii) the recommended site option is the Bridge Academy site in Hammersmith and Fulham (option 2 in section 6.2);
(iii) the site currently occupied by Action on Disability (formerly HAFAD) adjacent to the Bridge Academy is included within the Bi-Borough Hub School site;
(iv) 3BM, through its existing contract with LBHF, is commissioned to produce a more detailed, costed programme for the works, developing the design for the new Bi-Borough Hub School sufficiently to give sufficient cost certainty, establishing the decant implications and checking existing proposals against the planning brief prepared for the site under BSF. This would be undertaken at risk by LBHF subject to a limit of £20,000;
(v) Consultation begins at the appropriate time with key stakeholders;

Subject to

(vi) Agreement by Cabinet in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea to make a capital contribution capped at £6.2 million to fund the additional facilities required for its resident pupils; and
(vii) Any additional capital costs for the scheme being met by the Education Funding Agency, following a bid from the TBAP Trust for AP Academies Capital.

Reasons for the decision

Cabinet approval is requested because:

- The scheme is of a high value;
- It requires substantial capital funding to create the Bi-Borough Hub School on a single site. It requires the physical relocation of all alternative provision principally supporting RBKC students at the Latimer Alternative Provision Academy currently located within RBKC to LBHF;
- It requires The Bridge Academy in LBHF to deliver education to Latimer students on its site, and the building to be remodelled accordingly; and
- Failure to approve may result in the TBAP Trust seeking a 125 year lease of both existing sites, as is their right of law as set out in the Academies Act, thus removing the ability of either Council to deal effectively and efficiently with property assets where they retain the
freehold or sue them to invest in improved alternative provision for the benefit of vulnerable pupils.

**Action by: TBDS**

### A8. APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE EARL’S COURT REDEVELOPMENT - KD04328

This report sought approval for the Local Employment and Business Strategic Plan (LEBS) for the Earl’s Court redevelopment. The plan has been developed and submitted by the owner (EC Properties Limited, a subsidiary of Capital and Counties PLC) as a requirement of the planning agreement. The report also sought approval for the arrangements to support the implementation of the LEBS through the representation on the Earl’s Court partnership Board and approval of LEBS Delivery Plans.

Officers outlined the five elements of the planning agreement – which included the £8 million contribution from the developer and high level strategy (the LEBS) on how this would be spent; delivery plan and feasibility study; and establishment of the partnership board. The feasibility study and delivery plan are currently in preparation, and the partnership board was being set up. The LEBS was now ready for Cabinet approval, subject to some minor and drafting changes. Members expressed some reservations about the pre-employment support to be offered and officers confirmed that they were looking to ensure that there would be local beneficiaries of the scheme through the delivery plan.

RESOLVED - Cabinet agreed to

(i) Formally approve the Local Employment and Business Strategic Plan (attached to the report as appendix A), subject to minor and drafting changes;

(ii) Agree the nomination of the Director of Strategy and Local Services as the Council’s representative on the Earl’s Court Partnership Board; and

(iii) Agree that the approval of delivery plans and the approval of the Construction Skills Centre Feasibility Study are delegated to the Director of Strategy and Local Studies in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

**Reasons for the decision**

The LEBS provides the strategic plan for the employment, skills and business growth measures linked to the Earl’s Court redevelopment.

**Action by: DSLS**

### A9. AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL’S REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF THE WESTWAY TRUST

The Board of the Westway Trust (formerly the Westway Development Trust) has approached the Council to seek agreement to change its Articles
of Association in such a way as to reduce the number of nominations that the Council would make to the Trust’s Board from seven to three.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed to the proposed changes to the Trust’s articles.

Reasons for the decision

The Cabinet’s agreement is needed before the Trust seeks formal approval to change its Articles at the forthcoming Annual General Meeting.

Action by: DSLS

A10. BARLBY PRIMARY SCHOOL SITE REDEVELOPMENT - KD04278

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to proceed with undertaking a Master plan to the stage of concept design and viability appraisal for the Barlby School site redevelopment.

In introducing the report, Councillor Fielding-Mellen outlined the proposal to develop this popular high-performing school. There was no definitive plan on how this would be achieved at present – the decision at this stage was to appoint the design team and for officers to come back to Cabinet before seeking consent.

Officers reported on the need for more local provision and on opening a special school in the borough.

Councillor Healy updated the meeting on comments made by local residents about the proposed redevelopment, citing the need for more social housing and for public consultation on the Council’s plans.

Councillor Campbell commended officers for the work carried out to date, and looked forward to the redevelopment of the site that would produce a new school, new SEN provision and rejuvenated estate.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) Approval to proceed with undertaking a Master plan. A full list is detailed in the exempt minutes;

(ii) To grant delegated authority to the Cabinet Members for Education and Libraries, and Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint

- Master planner (including School Design Team)
- Client Side Team;
- Commission all required surveys and investigations

(iii) To consult with residents and the community with regards to the expanding Barlby Primary School and the regeneration of elements of the adjoining housing estates.
Reasons for the decision

The fees requested will enable officers to seek outline planning consent, across all sites, pending Cabinet approval to proceed with a preferred option. Cabinet is therefore asked to approve this first stage of advice – this will help to establish what aspirations and opportunities for these sites are actually viable, prior to submission of the planning application.

Action by: DCPCS/DH/DSC

A11. PEMBROKE ROAD W8 – OPTIONS APPRAISAL- KD04366

Following the review of the options appraisal to assess the future potential of the depots and Council offices located at Pembroke Road, and consultation with residents and neighbours on the findings, this report and the exempt appendix proposes the recommended option and the appointment of a consultant team to work up the detailed scheme.

Councillor Feilding-Mellen introduced the report which was the culmination of a long process looking at the future potential of the depots and Council offices located at Pembroke Road, including the Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square residential properties located above those sites. He stressed that Cabinet was not seeking a final decision at this meeting, but would be making a decision to focus on one option that would best meet the Council’s objectives. He was of the view that the full redevelopment option meets more of the Council’s objectives more fully – socially, economically, environmentally and financially - and would outperform the others in –

- Providing double the number of affordable homes;
- Providing new community facilities as well as protecting the existing mixed community on the site;
- Providing more high quality business space;
- Improving connectivity and the streetscape;
- Delivering a new modern depot; and
- Producing up to four times more new income for the Council, which would contribute towards protecting vital new front line services

Options 1 and 2 would cause less disruption to the residents of Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square, however they would not deliver any new affordable housing or any community facilities, there wouldn't be a new and modern depot and any new income generated would be a fraction of what option 4 could produce. Pursuing option 3 would be commercially unviable and would be difficult to meet planning and regulatory requirements. The main advantage of options 1 and 2 would be missing from option 3 as the residents would have to be decanted.

Officers have consulted over the last fifteen months and have taken on board and responded to many of the comments made. Leaseholders have
been offered the shared-equity buy-back option as a direct response to comments made during the consultation. The Council would continue to engage with residents and address their concerns. The design team would be asked to design a scheme with features addressing size, light and aspect, including private communal gardens and replacement properties with similar configuration as at present, if viable. Cllr Feilding-Mellen acknowledged that the length of the process was daunting but the Council was committed to being as open and transparent as possible.

Annie Redmile then addressed the meeting. She was of the view that option 2 allowed a full compromise and offered something for everyone. There were a number of local specialists among the residents who believed that more could be done creatively with the space. They have applied to English Heritage and should they come back with a listing, the Council would have to revert to option 2. Further development of option 2, and even option 3 should be pursued. She spoke about the mixed community on the estate who felt safe and secure, including a number of elderly residents. She added that Anthony Walker was of the view that the options report was not strong enough to take a decision.

Mr Nourisson addressed the meeting. He spoke about the uncertainty that he and his family was going through as a result of the proposals and the distressing effect that this was having. He felt that less thought has been given to leaseholders on the estate, with the offer of shared equity made belatedly and with no information on what this would entail. He was also concerned that a number of residents would not be able to move back and the community would not survive.

Members discussed the likelihood of the residents moving back into comparable space to that which they currently occupy. This was feasible for the leaseholders using shared equity, although more complicated for the tenants. Councillor Feilding-Mellen outlined how the community could be kept largely together by developing the north side first with some households temporarily located elsewhere, followed by the south side. He added that he was happy to consult with the amenity societies.

Members acknowledged that the depot was not fit for purpose and the Council has a duty to maximise the use of the land. Option 4 would provide a mix of accommodation with 100 new affordable homes and 120 – 170 private for sale flats. None of the other options would provide the same amount of affordable housing units.

The Chairman concluded the discussion by stating that this decision would not preclude the Council from holding further discussions with residents and involving them in the planning. The Council would proceed to explore option 4 rather than the other options – once a viable plan has been worked up, it would be submitted to Cabinet for discussion. He hoped that the Council would continue with meaningful discussion with residents.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed that
(i) Based on an analysis of the objectives set out by the Council for the Pembroke Road site, and a review of the alternative options which have been identified, to undertake further work on the full redevelopment option (option 4);

(ii) The Council progresses the appointment of a consultant team to provide a more detailed scheme in order to enable further discussions with residents and the Planning Authority to be undertaken prior to submission of a planning application. Further details of the consultants required and proposed budget are set out in the exempt appendix;

(iii) Further consultation is undertaken with residents as part of the design and planning process for which a budget is also requested;

(iv) The existing budget for acquisition of resident leaseholders units who want to sell now by private treaty on a market value basis is increased in accordance with the budget set out in the exempt appendix. Once a Cabinet decision has been made, and so long as a full redevelopment option is being pursued, the Council's offer to purchase leaseholders’ properties would include an additional payment which reflects the amounts that the leaseholder would be entitled to under CPO provisions, prior to any CPO process being instigated and approved.

Reasons for the decision

- To meet the objective of maximising the delivery of additional housing within the borough;
- To utilise fully and efficiently this under-used public asset and to generate new revenue in order to sustain provision of frontline Council services;
- To improve the environment and amenity of the local area around the site; and
- To pursue the provision of a new improved Council depot to serve the current and future requirements of residents within the Borough.

Action by: DCPCS

A12. BETTER CARE FUND PLAN REVISED SUBMISSION – KD04385

This paper reports on the requirement on each health and Wellbeing Board to resubmit the Better Care Fund Plan, which was previously agreed in March 2014 and submitted to the Department of Health in April.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed the Better Care Fund Plan revised submission and to proceed with the implementation of the plan, including the development of the Community Independence Service (CIS).
Reasons for the decision

In July 2014 the Department of Health/DCLG wrote to Health and Wellbeing Boards requiring a resubmission of the Better Care Fund plan to strengthen the plans and provide greater confidence that the integration of out of hospital services would be delivered to reduce pressure on hospital care.

Action by: EDASCH

A13. STRIP OUT OF THE WESTWAY INFORMATION CENTRE FOR RE-LETTING - KD04336

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to the Council moving the pipeline budget for the strip out of the Westway Information Centre to the main capital plan.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed the release of £350,000 from reserves to fund the project as proposed.

Reasons for the decision

A decision for the Council to undertake the strip out works will allow the Council to benefit from an income stream earlier than the alternative option, as a shorter rent free period with be sought and/or granted. The Council will also retain control of works in this sensitive location, minimising disruption.

Action by: DCPCS

A14. NEW LETTING OF PART LOWER GROUND FLOOR AT HOLMEFIELD HOUSE, HAZELWOOD CRESCENT, W10 - KD04377

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to terms for the commercial letting of part of the lower ground floor of the derelict garage at Holmefield House.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the letting of the part of the lower ground floor at Holmefield House, Hazelwood Crescent under the terms listed in the exempt appendix.

Reasons for the decision

The new letting would fulfil the Council’s aim in reducing voids in the property portfolio and significantly increase income for the Housing Revenue Account. The terms of the letting would not affect the Council’s wider long term regeneration aspirations for the area. The asset is held in the Housing Revenue Account. This proposal represents a consideration equal to market value and best consideration reasonably obtainable.

Action by: DCPCS
A15. 65 GOLBORNE ROAD, W10 – LEASE RENEWAL – KD04342

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval for the grant of a new 20 year lease to the existing tenant on the terms contained in the exempt appendix.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the full Heads of Terms detailed in the exempt appendix.

Reasons for the decision

This is a commercial decision relating to the renewal of the expired term. The recommendation is in line with the Council’s objectives to maximise revenue from the investment portfolio, whilst preventing voids and marketing costs. The proposal represents the best consideration reasonably obtainable.

Action by: DCPCS

A16. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC


Cabinet resolved that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following specific items of business on the grounds that they may involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act, as amended:

B1. EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2014

Public summary of the decision:

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

B2. BARLBY PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT AND WIDER ESTATE REGENRINATION

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A10 above.

B3. PEMBROKE ROAD, W8 – OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A11 above.

B4. STRIP OUT OF THE WESTWAY INFORMATION CENTRE FOR RE-LETTING

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A13 above.
B5.  NEW LETTING OF PART OF THE LOWER GROUND FLOOR AT HOLMEFIELD HOUSE, HAZELWOOD CRESCENT, W10

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A14 above.

B6.  65 GOLBORNE ROAD, W10 – LEASE RENEWAL

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A15 above.

The meeting ended at 8.35 pm

Chairman
Our March newsletter set out an update and indicative timeline for examining the potential options for the Warwick Road Estate, depot facilities and Pembroke Road Council offices on the corner of Pembroke Road and Warwick Road. It also outlined the process for appointing specialist consultants and architects.

We would now like to invite you to an informal evening of discussions. Council officers responsible for the project, our specialist consultants CBRE and architects from the practice selected to produce more detailed proposals will be present and would like to obtain your comments before any design work commences.

Please join us for a coffee and chat to share your thoughts and ask any questions.

Further events will be arranged between now and the end of the year to advise you of progress and enable you to have input on the emerging proposals.

This event is open to tenants or leaseholders at Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square, and the surrounding community.

If you cannot attend, you will be able to give comments in a form on our website which will be online for four weeks from 5 July.

---

**WHEN**

**TUESDAY 5 JULY**

**6.30PM TO 8.30PM**

**WHERE**

**ST PHILIPS CHURCH EARLS COURT ROAD W8 6QH**

If you have mobility issues, please contact us so we can arrange transport to the venue.

**GET IN TOUCH**

We would be grateful if you could confirm your attendance via email to PembrokeRoadEnquiries@rbkc.gov.uk

We intend to keep local residents and businesses informed and involved. There will be regular newsletters advising you of progress and e-updates sent out to those who have signed up for this via the form which can be found under ‘Contact Us’ on the Pembroke Road section of the Royal Borough website – www.rbkc.gov.uk/pembrokeroad
Our overarching objectives when considering options for Warwick Road Estate are:

- to increase the number of homes within the Borough
- to provide additional affordable housing, and make our housing stock as good as possible for current and future tenants
- to offer all existing Council tenants the opportunity to be re-housed on site and resident leaseholders with the opportunity to acquire a replacement residence if a redevelopment option is pursued
- to consider the options for provision of an improved, consolidated council depot facility to serve current and future needs within the Borough
- to build the conservation areas of the future.

The Council will only decide to go ahead with any of the options, including redevelopment of Warwick Road Estate, when it is confident that this will:

- deliver on its objectives
- meet all its commitments to tenants and leaseholders
- be financially viable at no extra cost to council tax payers.
Developing more and better affordable housing

- There is an intensive and growing need for more housing throughout London and in the Royal Borough.

- The Royal Borough currently has approximately 1,800 families and single people in temporary accommodation to whom we owe a housing duty.

- Considering redevelopment options at the lower density estates we own is the most efficient way to deliver the affordable housing the Council needs.

We will reprovide all the existing social rented floorspace and continue to let the new properties at social rents.

We also aim to create additional affordable housing available for rent. This additional housing will typically be set at Intermediate Rent levels for those households on low-to-middle incomes, to help preserve the borough’s mixed communities.
Conservation areas of the future

We will develop new neighbourhoods, not new estates, by creating:

- streets and squares that are connected to and integrated with the surrounding areas
- buildings and public spaces that will be attractive, desirable and admired for many years to come
- buildings that are recognisably local in their character and appearance, emulating the best aspects of our traditional streets
- a mix of residential, business, community and cultural uses that will contribute to local life.
Our commitments

Tenants, leaseholders and freeholders directly affected by any redevelopment of the Warwick Road Estate sites can be assured we will:

- be sensitive to the concerns of the existing community and the desire to remain near friends and family
- provide at least the same amount of social rented floor space as currently
- give all existing Secure Tenants the right to return to a home in the same area, in a property on the same terms and conditions and rent level, or to move to an alternative home if they choose to
- phase moving so that the majority of people only need to move home once
- offer an attractive package to allow tenants to move at no cost
- repurchase properties at full market value from any leaseholders who wish to sell their homes but fear they are unable to do so because of the Council's proposals
- not pursue a redevelopment option unless it is viable to make a Shared Equity Offer to resident leaseholders who wish to buy a home in the new development.
THE CLEARINGS
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Client: McGrove
Program: Residential
Size: 32,000m² / 348,000ft²
76 Residences

In South Kensington a low-rise development of 76 new homes known as the Clearings will replace the former Peter Jones Repository. A new street pattern that improves connections to the surrounding neighbourhoods will revitalize a tired and underused long block. Three independent but related buildings integrate new street wall frontages with public gardens. The use of brick echoes the Victorian surroundings with generously proportioned windows and vertical emphasis.
PRINCES GARDENS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Client: Imperial College
Program: Residential
Size: 32,000m² / 344,000ft²
277 Residences

Imperial College invited KPF to participate in a competition to analyse how the college’s residential needs could be addressed. KPF’s approach was to create a master plan that restored the original scale and coherence of the square. The solution demonstrated that more rooms of a higher standard could be provided in a building whose architecture and massing would heal the important public space for one of the most important restoration projects of a historic London Square since World War II.
21 Davies Street takes the traditional-style mansion block, a staple of the London housing market since late Victorian times, and gives it a new twist. The scheme for this mixed-use residential-led building involved the replacement of a 1960s structure that did not fit within the urban fabric of Mayfair. KPF’s design responds to the surrounding context through its geometry and materials. The design reflects a close study of the strongly articulated forms of older residential blocks in the area.
Kings Court is a new mixed use precinct to the northwest of the Covent Garden Piazza comprised of an assemblage of contemporary and historic buildings around a new courtyard. 55 apartments occupying six different buildings, three of which are listed. KPF’s scope of work includes the design of residential interiors: contemporary in Floral Street with a palette that complements the architecture and period restorations in the King Street terraces.
In a world in which we are ever more conscious about taking the most sustainable approach possible in all walks of life, our decisions about buildings – their design, construction and management – are moving into sharper relief. For this reason, the benefits that can be realised from adaptive re-use of buildings, as opposed to demolition and replacement with new build, are rising up the agenda too; transforming existing structures and spaces for 21st century use. At KPF sustainable re-use - transformation - of buildings has been part of our approach for over 30 years with projects across Europe, the US and Asia.
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A. RBKC Vision Statement
B. 2014 Option Appraisal Report
C. Initial Planning Comments and Pre App Notes Policy CH4
   “Estate Renewal” sets out the Royal Borough’s Borough-wide
   Planning Policy for Estate Renewal
1. Background

1.1 The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC), the client and land-owner of the proposed project sites, has appointed CBRE to provide consultancy advice in relation to development proposals for a high-quality, residential-led, mixed-use project within the borough, known as the ‘Warwick Road Estate’ located on two adjacent sites on Warwick Road and Pembroke Road.

1.2 As part of the next stage of the process CBRE wish to appoint an architect/masterplanner to act as a sub-consultant to them to produce indicative development proposals (RIBA Stage 0: Strategic Definition, and Stage 1: Preparation and Brief) which can form the basis of consultations with residents, a viability assessment, and a recommendation to the client as to a scheme that could be taken forward.

1.3 The client is proposing to undertake this feasibility/options appraisal exercise to decide if it should progress a further detailed redevelopment process to work towards submission of a planning application for both sites. If at the conclusion of RIBA Stage 1 the client determines that there are no options which are viable and/or do not contribute sufficiently to RBKC’s redevelopment aspirations (see below), then it will not progress any further with these proposals. The client’s key redevelopment objectives for this project are:

a. Increasing the amount of affordable housing on site;

b. Delivering new private housing for sale;

c. To create new elements of retail, office and commercial uses;

d. Delivering RBKC’s aspirations for ‘conservation areas of the future’;

e. Delivering a new environmentally friendly depot facility that is compliant with Best Practice.

1.4 RBKC regards its role in these sites as one of ‘long term steward’ seeking to emulate the great ‘private estates’ who in the past succeeded in creating an enduring quality of design and architecture that is still appreciated today.

The RBKC’s objective is to create developments that are distinctively recognisable as Kensington and Chelsea in character, so they should either match their historic surroundings or represent an excellent contemporary rendering of these.

The Pembroke Road properties are important and prominent sites within this area of the Borough and this therefore provides the opportunity to deliver a high quality scheme that will meet both the aspirations of the community as well as providing a significant long term income stream to contribute to the provision of RBKC’s front line services.

1.5 The RBKC has already commenced initial consultation with residents groups to inform them about emerging proposals and has made the commitment to improve the quality of the environment and housing stock and increase the number of affordable homes.

In addition the commitment has been made:

a. That existing RBKC secure tenants will be given the opportunity of moving back in to new homes on the site, or very near to the existing property if they prefer.

b. Resident leaseholders will also be offered the ability to return to a home on the site in a new development and measures are under discussion to address any
differential in value between existing and new homes by provision of an ‘equity share’ arrangement provided by the Council.

c. Existing leaseholders who may wish to consider a sale of their property to the Council would be entitled to receive compensation now on the basis that would be applicable under relevant statutory Compulsory Purchase provisions, although the Warwick Road Estate is not subject to CPO provisions at present.

1.6 RBKC’s overarching vision is: ‘to re integrate estates into the wider neighbourhood community of streets and squares in order to provide good traditional homes in the conservation areas of the future.’ (Please see Appendix A for RBKC’s Vision statement)

The aspiration is to deliver:

a. Quality homes: provide best possible homes for existing and future tenants;

b. Quality neighbourhoods: design beautiful new places to form better-connected, better-designed, street-based neighbourhoods to be conservation areas of the future, while reflecting and integrating with local context;

c. Additional homes: provide the additional homes of all tenures that the borough needs;

d. Affordable homes: providing new affordable homes for those on ordinary incomes, who are currently not catered for by the market or social housing;

e. Regeneration in order to:

- Improve chances of better social outcomes for residents
- Increase level of economic activity via provision of right type of business space in mixed-use neighbourhoods.
- Increase level of social integration in borough.
- Delivering energy efficient buildings.

1.7 In order to achieve the Council’s objective of delivering projects of excellent urban design quality worthy of the best of the borough, it has set in place procedures of internal and external review, (for example by its own advisers CBRE Planning and Create Streets) against its Vision document (see appendix A). In addition, project presentation to an Architecture Appraisal Panel (AAP) and other such fora, who can carefully consider the design approach, and ensure that projects moving forward from RIBA Stage 0-1 represent exemplar design.

1.8 An initial Options Appraisal exercise was completed by Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of RBKC in July 2014 to determine the potential for the two adjoining sites (defined as the study area) in order to meet the objectives set at that time by the Council. The conclusion was that a comprehensive redevelopment would maximise on the delivery of those objectives: the options prepared provided affordable, market rental and private sales residential homes; a rationalised modern depot facility to provide an improved service for the Borough (on the north site); potential re-provision of the current nursery; office facilities and a mixture of other uses including the potential for retail/showroom, PRS and/or a private school to create an rental income stream for the site. Preferred Options 4.2 and 4.3 are included in appendix B of this document for information purposes.
2. Site Context

2.1 The study area comprises two separate sites to the north and south of Pembroke Road, W8, referred to as Broadwood Terrace (north) and Chesterton Square (south). The freehold of both sites is held by the Council which are subject to a number of residential leasehold interests and commercial tenancies.

2.2 The study area measures circa 1.3 ha (c.13,000sqm) and is bounded by Warwick Road to the west, West Cromwell Road to the south, and Pembroke Gardens to the north and is bisected by Pembroke Road, with a high level pedestrian footbridge linking the two sites. The study area abuts a conservation area.

2.3 The main buildings are both of a modern style designed in the late 1960’s and incorporate mixed-use activity within the buildings. An application was lodged by interest groups in 2014 to list the buildings but this was not accepted by Historic England; the buildings currently have a Certificate of Immunity for five years as of 2nd July 2015.

2.4 The Broadwood Terrace site (c.4,200sqm) is located to the north of Pembroke Road. (Note: Areas to be confirmed via measured survey):
   a. c.9,500 sqm NIA of Sui Generis local authority depot accommodation including vehicle storage, equipment storage and circulation space arranged over basement to first floor levels; and,
   b. 24No. Class C3 ‘dwelling house’ units comprising c.1,595 sqm NIA of residential floor space.
   c. The depot can be accessed via Pembroke Road or Warwick Road (restricted TfL Red Route) with vehicle movements facilitated by a spiral ramp leading from the basement level to a number of levels of roof-top parking.
   d. The building presents part 5/part 6 storeys to Warwick Road with three levels of blank depot façade and three levels of residential.

2.5 The Chesterton Square site (c.8,970 sqm) is located to the south of Pembroke Road. (Note: Areas to be confirmed via measured survey):
   a. c.2,400 sqm NIA Class B1 local authority office accommodation. There is a requirement to re-provide new office accommodation within the new proposals:
   b. c.7,110 sqm NIA of Sui Generis local authority depot including vehicle storage, workshop and staff training / staff mess space;
   c. 92No. Class C3 dwellings comprising c.6,600 sqm NIA of residential floor space, surrounding a central communal open space/garden area;
   d. ‘The Barn’ – a single storey local authority storage facility; and,
   e. An open service yard and parking spaces for staff/visitors.
   f. This part of the site accommodates four principal buildings, the largest of which comprises 6/7 storeys, presenting three levels of depot / office façade to Warwick Road with three levels of residential accommodation a number of which include external terraces (ie. private balconies).

2.6 There are a total of 116 existing residential units across both sites comprising 54 secure tenants, three service tenancies (KTMO), one TMO office and 59
leaseholders. A number of the residential leasehold units have already been reacquired by the Council.

2.7 Preliminary discussions with RBKC as local planning authority would suggest that any redevelopment of the sites would be height sensitive. An indicative sizing and massing study that addresses heights, rights-to-light, and overall development massing will be issued to the consultants as part of this study – but should not be relied upon and these may need to be undertaken again, in light of emerging proposals.
3. Planning Context and Early Discussions

3.1 All options proposed will need to have regard to the Council’s adopted Development Plan for the site which currently comprises the following documents:
   a. The published 2015 London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London);
   b. The RBKC Consolidated Local Plan (2015); and,
   c. Those extant policies contained in the adopted 2002 RBKC Unitary Development Plan.

3.2 The study area sits adjacent to a conservation area which will need to be addressed in the design proposals coming forward.

3.3 Regard should also be had to other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), emerging London Plan and RBKC planning policies and Mayoral and RBKC supplementary planning documents and guidance.

3.4 Regard should also be had to other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), emerging London Plan and RBKC planning policies and Mayoral and RBKC supplementary planning documents and guidance.

3.5 A planning appraisal has been prepared by CBRE and provides an overview of the planning position. A copy of this will be provided to the shortlisted of appointed architects. CBRE are also appointed to lead planning discussions with RBKC as LPA.

3.6 RBKC intends to continue consultation with the existing residents across both blocks at Warwick Road/Pembroke Road as part of an ongoing commitment to community engagement. The residents’ key criteria will be elicited and as far as is possible integrated into the Architect’s brief. The presumption will be for regular Residents/Architect consultation events to obtain resident input on the emerging proposals.

3.7 The options should take note of early discussions (see Pre-Application notes provided in appendix C) held with RBKC as LPA, namely:

3.8 The principle of locating all affordable housing on the Broadwood Terrace site may be acceptable, subject to prior agreement with the LPA, on the basis that this would facilitate phasing of the development, earlier delivery and would be less disruptive to the existing residents of the affordable units.

3.9 Local Authority Depot – The current depot facility (vehicle storage, service, office, mess facility, etc.) accounts for the majority of total floor space across both sites (c.9,500 sqm NIA at Broadway Terrace and c.7,113 sqm NIA at Chesterton Square). It is proposed that these facilities could all be consolidated into a reduced facility. This is not a use protected in the Local Plan, but any change in the size, function or location of the depot will need to be considered in relation to its traffic and amenity impacts. The Council will need to be satisfied that the proposed facility is fit for purpose and represents best practice. For the purposes of the feasibility study, it should be assumed that the depot facility is to be relocated into the basement and ground floor level of an new building; c.7,100 -10,000 sqm NIA facility on the north (Broadwood Terrace site), with the potential for taking advantage of the existing
basement area. This assumes that some of the current activity/facilities related to
the depot will be relocated off-site.

3.10 This requirement will be the subject of a specialist report procured through CBRE
(which will provide initial indicative information to assist the architects preparing the
feasibility study) and the areas stated may be increased once the requirements are
established in more detail (see Section 7.2 for architect’s scope of service
requirements). An innovative approach to this key element is required.

3.11 Commercial Office – The existing B1 commercial office accommodation
(c.2,435 sqm NIA) is protected under current planning policy. A reduction in
quantum may be considered if it could be demonstrated that the quality,
offer, layout or specification was tailored towards addressing an identified need
for employment space in this part of Kensington and Chelsea (for example,
catering for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)). The earlier Option
Appraisal (Appendix B) included 2,174 sqm NIA of office accommodation on the
Warwick Road frontage to the south site, above retail/commercial accommodation.

3.12 Retail – Previous Option Appraisals (Appendix B) show 1,279sqm NIA of retail uses
at ground floor and the LPA may support the introduction of a number of small-scale
retail units of less than 400sqm each as part of a mixed-use scheme. Uses at
ground floor frontages, to Warwick Road and Pembroke Road should be non-
residential. A mixture of ground floor uses including showroom and café may also
be appropriate to provide vitality to the frontages and facilities for local residents.

3.13 Educational/College Use – There would be no planning policy conflict with
locating a school/college on the site and a number of the earlier Option Appraisals
(Appendix B) for the site to make provision for a 4,800sqm NIA facility on the South
site. However, accommodating a school pick up and drop off will be challenging at
this location and the LPA would require full details of how this will be achieved.
Matters of residential amenity would also need to be considered given the proximity
to residential properties, as well as the incorporation of external play spaces. The
potential for incorporating an element of Educational use, for college or adult
education, possibly on the Warwick Road frontage, should be explored as part of the
design.

3.14 Social and Community Facilities – The LPA would support the introduction of
social and community facilities onto the site, including education, health and
community uses, if the proposal can be shown to predominantly serve, or provide
significant benefits to, Borough residents. Re-provision of the existing nursery
(346sqm) could fall in to this category.

3.15 Built Form – The LPA would be in favour of a series of individual buildings rather
than one extensive building; (see appendix C); generally to fit within the massing
arrangement in the Options Appraisal (appendix B). Detailed comments are
provided in the pre-application advice from the LPA (see appendix C) and CBRE will
also be able to provide further guidance.
4. Procurement Programme

The following procurement programme will be used to select an architectural practice for this project:

**PQQ / Architect Selection (Long-list to Short-list)**

a. Architects brief (PQQ) issued to long-list of architects: 22\textsuperscript{nd} February.
b. Architect’s initial confirmation of interest and intention to return PQQ: 26\textsuperscript{th} February
c. RBKC & CBRE visits to architects studios: 10\textsuperscript{th} March – 15\textsuperscript{th} March
d. PQQ responses returned from long-list of architects: 16\textsuperscript{th} March
e. Short-list of architects confirmed: 22\textsuperscript{nd} March

**RIBA Stage 0 (Design Competition) / Preferred Architect Selection**

f. Short-list of architects instructed to undertake RIBA Stage 0: 4\textsuperscript{th} April
g. RIBA Stage 0 (Design Competition): 4\textsuperscript{th} April – 23\textsuperscript{rd} May
h. Architect Presentations to RBKC & CBRE: 24\textsuperscript{th} – 27\textsuperscript{th} May
i. Preferred Architect notified: 17\textsuperscript{th} June

**RIBA Stage 1: June 2016 – December 2016**

j. Architect ‘Meet and Greet’ session with resident groups and key 3\textsuperscript{rd} party stakeholders: 27\textsuperscript{th} June – 8\textsuperscript{th} July
k. Consultation Workshop Sessions (Dates & Themes TBC): 30\textsuperscript{th} August – 28\textsuperscript{th} October
l. Submission of RIBA Stage 1 to RBKC: 2\textsuperscript{nd} December

**RIBA Stage 2 - 3 (Concept Design and Developed Design): January 2017 – March 2018**

m. RIBA Stage 2-3 (Concept Design and Developed Design): January 2017 – March 2018
n. Target Planning Submission Date (TBC): Q1 2018
To be returned to CBRE by Close of Business 9th March. Contact details below.

5. Qualitative Response - Skills and Experience (80%)

The responses to the following questions will be weighted as follows:

Q1. Please provide an outline of the approach and methodology you will use to deliver the brief and identify how you will resolve a key requirement of resident stakeholders to retain green space through good design and demonstrate how any new build will have attractive communal garden / green spaces together with potential for balconies for as many units as possible: 40% (1000 words max)

Q2. Please outline what you believe are the most critical challenges that need to be addressed in this project: 10% (500 words max)

Q3. Please demonstrate previous experience and provide high quality, relevant examples of similar projects which have been delivered: 10% (500 words max)

Q4. Please provide details of your Project Team, including their function, with relevant skills and experience to deliver the brief: 10% (500 words max)

Q5. Please demonstrate your experience of public engagement and working with consultation groups and keeping contact and communication with such groups. Please also provide a summary of your proposed approach to working with local authorities, residential house builders and Registered Housing Providers: 10% (500 words max)

Proposed Scoring Matrix: The above qualitative questions will be scored using the following scoring matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>No response or response completely fails to address all of the Council’s requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Very limited or vague response which fails to address key areas or meet key Council requirements, or the response received contains a large number of weaknesses or omissions in a majority of aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>The response addresses a number of key Council requirements but is unsatisfactory in a number of material respects. The proposal contains some material weaknesses or omissions which give the Council some serious concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>The response addresses a number of key Council requirements but is unsatisfactory in a number of material respects. The proposal contains some material weaknesses or omissions which give the Council some areas for concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The response generally meets the key Council requirements but with some aspects which give the Council concern because either they are incomplete or contain minimal material weaknesses or omissions, or differ from the Council’s requirement necessary to meet the criteria in at least one aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DEFINITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>The response addresses a majority of key Council requirements and is generally satisfactory but does not demonstrate any clear strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>The response is generally good in all material respects but does contain some minor weaknesses or omissions. The proposal does, however, contain a clear strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The response is of a good quality in all respects with good concepts and approaches, but contains a few minor weaknesses or omissions with a clear strength in a key area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>High quality response with clear, coherent and high quality proposals that present a fully workable response with clear strengths in key areas, and any minor weaknesses or omissions which may be present in the response may be acceptable as offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Very high quality, considered response with outstanding features in a majority of areas. A very strong response overall with no material weaknesses or omissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Exemplar response in all material respects. The response also demonstrates significant strengths and has no weaknesses or omissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All bidders are required to score a minimum of 3 marks for each of the qualitative questions to be considered further.

5.2 **Costing/Fee proposals Response**
Weighted at: 20%.

5.3 The proposal should provide a breakdown of the cost to deliver the services beyond RIBA Stage 1, exclusive of VAT but inclusive of all project expenses anticipated.

5.4 The proposal should submit grades and day rates for the proposed project team.

**Studio Visit**

5.5 As part of the evaluation, CBRE, and RBKC as observers, will visit the architectural practice to gain a first-hand understanding of how they would undertake and deliver this project. The visit will be arranged separately and will take place prior to the return of the PQQ, by close of business, 9th March.
6. Scope of Service – RIBA Stage 0

The short-listed architectural practices that successfully progress beyond the PQQ stage will be invited to undertake a feasibility study (RIBA Stages 0-1a). The Scope of service for this phase is as follows:

6.1 The selected architect will provide a high-level design, preferably on a block plan basis for appraisal and assessment by CBRE to determine whether they meet the RBKC’s objectives for a scheme which provides a mixed-use development as set out above, provides new additional affordable housing, and delivers a financially viable (feasible) regeneration project. The architect may provide sub-variations within their feasibility design proposals.

6.2 Deliverables should be:

a. One illustrated masterplan;
b. Three indicative freehand sketches or 3D illustrations
c. Three CGIs
d. One physical model;
e. Design approach statement to study area having regard to daylight/sunlight issues;
f. Indicative Area Schedules (GIA, GEA, NIA) to inform a financial viability appraisal.
g. A minimum Indication of architectural design principles to be considered in relation to elevational treatment (via the use of ‘mood boards’ and examples of previously completed, comparable or exemplary schemes)
h. Land use schedule (quantum of existing and new build provided) per land use type; set out individually for the north and the south site; and,
i. Indicative phasing strategy (to allow for the decant of the existing residents and Depot relocation).
j. A creative proposal for re-providing depot accommodation of up to 10,000sqm on the northern part on the site, Broadway Terrace.

6.3 The deliverables should be included within a report of no more than 50 pages including any appendices. The physical model should be presented at interview.

6.4 All options produced must be planning compliant.

6.5 The driver for all options is optimising on the delivery of RBKC’s two primary objectives of providing additional affordable housing on the site and creating new developments worthy of being the “conservation areas of the future” (see RBKC Vision statement at Appendix A).

6.6 CBRE will compile high-level highways advice, including estimated depot vehicle movements, for the purposes of the feasibility study.

6.7 The architect may be required to attend a clarification meeting with RKBC and CBRE in addition to the final presentation.
6.8 Deliverable: The architect will compile and present their option study in the form of a report to inform the client on next steps, including taking the project forward into the Planning Phase.

Viability Assessment (CBRE)

6.9 As part of RIBA Stage 0, the architect will be required to liaise with CBRE, who will prepare a high-level viability assessment to address delivery programme, commercial aspects, phasing and decant issues, and estimated ‘development surpluses’ generated to demonstrate the comparable viability of the option, to ensure that the option tabled is viable.

6.10 Deliverable: CBRE will compile the report to inform the client on next steps, including taking the project forward to the conclusion of RIBA Stage 1.
7. Appointment

7.1 CBRE sub-consultancy agreements will be put in place with the shortlisted practices to cover the relevant services provided. Each practice will be required to submit their PI cover, liability insurance and company registration details as part of the tender submission.

7.2 The selected architectural practice will be required to satisfy all relevant Anti-Money Laundering checks and RBKC and CBRE legal compliance procedures.
APPENDICES
A – RBKC Vision Statement
RBKC Neighbourhood & community integration vision: building good traditional homes to be the conservation areas of the future

I. Vision of our programme

We wish to reintegrate estates into the wider neighbourhood community of streets and squares in order to provide good traditional homes in the conservation areas of the future.

II. Aims of our programme: to build good traditional homes to be the conservation areas of the future

1. Quality homes: provide best possible homes for existing & future tenants
2. Quality neighbourhoods: design beautiful new places to form better-connected, better-designed, street-based neighbourhoods to be conservation areas of the future, while reflecting and integrating with local context
3. Additional homes: provide the additional homes of all tenures that the borough needs
4. Affordable homes: providing new affordable homes for those on ordinary incomes, who are currently not catered for by market or social housing
5. Regeneration: use development to tackle some of the causes of social deprivation on our most deprived neighbourhoods:
   – Improving chances of better social outcomes for residents
   – Increasing level of economic activity via provision of right type of business space in mixed-use neighbourhoods
   – Increasing level of social integration in borough
6. Financial: increasing net present value of and income from borough’s housing assets

III. Our urban design philosophy and brief

We wish to reintegrate estates into the wider neighbourhood community of streets and squares in order to provide good traditional homes in the conservation areas of the future. We are building for the long term. We do not wish to repeat the errors of 50 years ago. We do not anticipate that our developments will be pulled down in 50 years as too many of their predecessors need to be. We anticipate that our reintegrated neighbourhoods will be largely street-based with open space normally taking the form of squares and communal gardens. They should very strongly reflect the local character and sense of place in terms of design, height and massing in order to reintegrate with surrounding neighbourhoods. But we must also ensure financial viability.

1. Density: density for a site should be driven by what is appropriate for the site rather than by overly-rigorous imposition of central targets. That said, our starting position is that most developments will be in the 200-250 units / hectare range (i.e. at the higher end of the borough average) and that they should not typically be above the top of that range.
2. Unit size split: at present our primary need is for additional 2 bedroom units however we are very aware that the needs of the borough will evolve in ways that are impossible to predict in the decades and centuries to come. Therefore the key thing is that new homes and buildings should be adaptable over the years to different uses. This is how great places are able to evolve over time.
3. Ratio of houses to flats: we don’t wish to set over-arching guidelines for a ratio of houses to flats as we regard this as site-specific. While many aspire to live in a house we note that the borough is in many ways defined by street-based apartments in mansion blocks. Flats should be in smaller blocks rather than large blocks.
4. **Height restrictions:** we would not normally anticipate developments averaging above 5-6 storeys except where it is not antithetical to a very strong sense of place and/or where it is the only way to make the scheme viable. Developments should have a clear ‘language of height’ with heights on streets reflecting the importance of the street or square on which they are based. We would expect any buildings at the upper end of our likely height range to be particularly carefully designed so as to be in no way overly-imposing (no sheer glass monoliths please) and to ensure that they are visibly and firmly rooted in our borough’s history.

5. **Design:** in order to ensure that we are reintegrating neighbourhoods and reinforcing a very strong sense of place we would normally anticipate that new developments should be either a match for the historic surroundings or an excellent contemporary rendering of the historic neighbourhood. Non-traditional materials such as concrete will probably only be appropriate in very specific situations. Whilst we absolutely do not rule out excellent contemporary design, we categorically do rule out developments that ‘could be anywhere.’ We wish to build streets and neighbourhoods that are clearly, visibly and firmly rooted in the history of our borough. We anticipate working with architects and designers who both understand this approach and are instinctively sympathetic to it.

6. **Space & internal & external standards:** whilst all legal requirements on highways, open space and internal standards and access should be met we do not wish to impose standards in such a way as to make it hard for new developments to match the essential character of the borough or to reduce the adaptability of homes for the future.

7. **On-street-parking:** we anticipate that new streets in developments will have on-street parking but don’t rule out under-ground parking as well, where it is economically viable. Existing residents will have parking permits. Residents of additional units may not in all circumstances.

8. **Volumes of open space:** we are comfortable with the amount of open space being reduced in the neighbourhood reintegration programme as long as remaining open space is better used and situated.

9. **Nature of open space:** open space should not just be overlooked and of high quality but, essentially, must be true to the character of the borough. We see communal gardens and squares as a critical part of this character for much of the borough. Developments should normally focus on providing open space in this form rather than though balconies or other less locally-appropriate formats.

10. **Nature of streets:** we see well connected streets and a network of squares, crescents and communal gardens as being the likely defining character of new developments. These streets should have variety within a pattern as is appropriate for this borough.

11. **Connectivity:** we wish for developments to be reintegrated into the wider neighbourhood and it is axiomatic to achieve this that new streets should be provably well-connected in order to break down social-barriers and maximise the opportunity for mixed-use developments with persistently successful retail over many years.
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Our multi disciplinary team consisting of LSH, SOM Architects, Daniel Watney Planning, and Carter Jonas property consultants, has undertaken a full review of the development options of the Pembroke Road depot site, north and south. These sites are known as Broadwood Terrace (north site) and Chesterton Square (to the south).

The aim of the project was to consider and explore the potential for redevelopment and/or refurbishment of the existing accommodation, in order to allow the Council to make an informed decision as to its future. Our team has undertaken a number of due diligence work streams, including a review of planning policy and meetings with the Local Planning Authority, a review of legal and title issues, a review of the property market, a review of the design and structural refurbishment and/or redevelopment options.

These work streams have been woven together to establish a realistic assessment of the sites’ potential in the form an Options Appraisal. A summary of the work streams undertaken together with our findings is provided below.

Description of the options studied

Within the Options Appraisal the following four scenarios have been tested at a relatively high level in relation to the likely costs and values of the proposed development.

Refurbishment Options

**Option 1**: Refurbishment and re-letting of the existing depot and office accommodation with residential accommodation, left in situ.

In this scenario the north site comprises all of the Council’s operational depot facilities at ground and first floor, providing 8,560sqm of space. The existing 24 residential dwellings and the nursery (346sqm) are retained. The nursery benefits from a programme of light refurbishment works.

On the south site both the existing depot and office facilities are lightly refurbished and let at market rents. The existing 92 residential dwellings are retained.

**Option 2**: “Partial redevelopment of the vacated depot and office space with residential accommodation left in situ. Potential for the introduction of new accommodation on the southern site.”

In this scenario the north site comprises all of the Council’s operational depot facilities at ground and first floor, providing 8,560sqm of space. The existing 24 residential dwellings and the nursery (346sqm) are retained. The nursery benefits from a programme of light refurbishment works.

On the south site, both the depot and office accommodation have been vacated, a mezzanine level is inserted and the area is lightly refurbished and let at market rents. The existing 92 residential dwellings are retained. All other structures are assumed to have been demolished and replaced by 16 family houses.

Partial demolition option

**Option 3**: Partial demolition and redevelopment of either the north or south site.

Partial demolition of the main blocks on either the north or south sites is, in our opinion, not a viable option. Partial demolition of either site is virtually impossible to achieve without decanting residents from the residential accommodation, particularly given the shared access arrangements and crude stacking of the uses. Demolition of the commercial accommodation would significantly impact on the structure and integrity of the buildings, therefore putting occupiers of the residential accommodation at an unacceptable risk and rendering the proposal to “partially demolish” the main structure undeivable.

Options for refurbishment of the commercial areas have instead been considered, together with retaining the main structures as part of Options 1 and 2.

Redevelopment options

**Option 4** – Full redevelopment across both sites

- **Option 4.1**: On the north site at basement and ground floor, purpose built depot accommodation of 7,100sqm, then 102 affordable residential dwellings and a nursery of 346sqm.

On the south site a hotel and private residential scheme comprising basement car parking of 90 spaces and at ground floor 1,279sqm of retail, providing 142 private residential dwellings split as 126 apartments and 16 townhouses, a 100 bedroom hotel, and office accommodation of 1,884sqm.

- **Option 4.2**: On the north site, purpose built depot (7,100sqm), affordable housing (102 units), nursery (346sqm).

- **Option 4.3**: On the north site, purpose built depot (7,100sqm), affordable housing (102 units), nursery (346sqm).

On the south site, a Private Rented Sector, residential and private school scheme comprising basement car parking of 90 spaces, and 1,279sqm of retail at ground floor. This provides residential apartments (126 units), Private Rented Sector Units (34 units), affordable housing (14 units), office accommodation of 1,884sqm and a 3,600sqm private school.

- **Option 4.4**: This option assumes that there is no retained depot facility. Instead the north site is redeveloped to provide retail at ground floor, affordable housing (102 units), and a nursery (346sqm).

On the south site, the redeveloped scheme comprises basement car parking of 90 spaces, private residential apartments (126 units), Private Rented Sector Units (34 units), affordable housing (14 units), retail (1,279sqm), town houses (16 units), office (1,884sqm).

Conclusions

A broad range of redevelopment options have been considered to meet Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s aspirations and project objectives. It is clear that the two sites that comprise the Pembroke Road depot facility and residential community can be redeveloped. This more detailed study concludes that:

- **Options 1 & 2**: Refurbishment and reletting of existing accommodation is viable, but cannot deliver a vast increase in residential space.

- **Option 3**: Partial redevelopment of the site is not viable and attracts too many ancillary risks to warrant further investigation.

- **Options 4.1-4.4**: Wholesale redevelopment of the site is viable against all criteria that formed the basis of this study.
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The site is located in west London, in the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC); it lies south of Kensington High Street and north of Cromwell Road.

The development site is divided into two distinct blocks - Broadwood Terrace (north) and Chesterton Square (south). Both Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square currently accommodate C3 dwelling-house units, sui-generis local authority depot facilities, B1 local authority offices and a small privately operated D1 nursery.

The site is primarily surrounded by residential accommodation in the form of mansion blocks and townhouses, and some limited commercial properties. The west side of Warwick Road is also partly occupied by large scale retail units, Homebase and Tesco.
Existing Conditions - Broadwood Terrace

The Broadwood Terrace site currently comprises the following:

- 9,500 sqm of Sui Generis Local Authority depot accommodation including vehicle storage, equipment storage and circulation space arranged over basement to first floor levels;
- 24 no. class C3 ‘dwelling house’ units, of which 13 no. leasehold (private) and 11 no. tenant (affordable), comprising in total 1,595 sqm of residential floor space. All residential accommodation is accessed via a bridge from Chesteron Square;
- 346 sqm childcare nursery;
- Existing vehicle parking;
- And externally:
  - 3 levels of blank depot facade;
  - Amenity space at third floor;
  - Complete absence of active frontages along pedestrian level.
The Chesterton Square site currently comprises the following:

- 2,435 sqm occupied as Class B1 Local Authority Office accommodation;
- 7,113 sqm Sui Generis Local Authority depot including vehicle storage, workshop and staff training/staff mess space;
- 92 Class C3 ‘dwelling house’ units, of which 45 no. leasehold (private) and 47 no. tenant (affordable), comprising 6,600 sqm residential floor space, alongside central communal open space;
- Third floor amenity space;
- 3 levels of blank depot facade
- Lack of engagement with street level
SITE CONSTRAINTS + OPPORTUNITIES
Building Heights

INDICATIVE BUILDING HEIGHTS

Warwick Road
Pembroke Road
West Cromwell Road

Existing Building
Project Site

25-30m
20-25m
15-20m
35-40m
20m
23m
10-15m
30-35m
10.5m
27.5m
30.8m
The consultant team have sought to identify risks and opportunities in reference to the private legal rights (rights to light) and the planning considerations (daylight/sunlight). Typically this requires a highly detailed approach including the effective creation of a three dimensional computer model of the site and surrounding context from a measured survey.

As an interim study a computer model of the site has been produced based on review of high resolution aerial photography. The resultant model provides an indicative illustration of the development potential for the site respecting daylight requirements for adjoining properties and avoiding Rights of Light injury.

It is important to note that whilst these envelopes are indicating a massing form, a breach does not necessarily trigger a risk as further study of any proposal would likely include setbacks from the boundary in certain locations leading to offsetting the impacts.

The findings of this study have informed the development of massing for the studies.
Option 1 - Refurbishment and reletting of the existing depot and office accommodation

- Existing residential untouched.
- Depot facilities rationalised on north site

Broadwood Terrace

The north site is retained in its entirety.

Chesterton Square

All existing facilities are retained and options sought for internal optimisation and refurbishment.

In this scenario the north site comprises a depot at ground and first floor, providing 8,560sqm of space. The existing 24 residential dwellings and the nursery (346sqm) are not touched and retained exactly as is.

On the south site both the depot and office facilities are lightly refurbished and let at market rents. The existing 92 residential dwellings are untouched and are retained exactly as is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot (incl. B1)</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>92,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>8,906</td>
<td>95,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>7,113</td>
<td>76,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>26,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>9,566</td>
<td>102,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NIA (Net Internal Area)
Option 2 - Partial redevelopment, refurbishment and reletting of the existing office and depot accommodation, potential for the introduction of new accommodation on the footprint on the southern site

- Existing residential untouched.
- Depot facilities rationalised on north site

Broadwood Terrace

The north site is retained in its entirety.

Chesterton Square

The main building is retained and options sought for internal optimisation and refurbishment. The existing vehicle maintenance depot at the heart of this building is refurbished with a mezzanine inserted for additional area to let.

To the south of the site a row of terraced houses is provided, each of approximately 1,750 sq ft GEA. Sales or rental values may be compromised as a result of proximity to the retained existing building and additional light industrial accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROADWOOD TERRACE AREAS</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot (incl. B1)</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>92,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>8,906</td>
<td>95,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHESTERTON SQUARE AREAS</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>58,341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>26,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Houses</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>27,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>10,465</td>
<td>112,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Residential Units</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All existing dwellings retained in their current condition and remain untouched

* Based on 76% of efficiency and 97% for townhouses
Option 3 - Partial demolition and redevelopment of either the north or south site

Planning requirements demand the retention of some office use on site and also favour mixed use incorporating retail or other facilities. With the redevelopment of Chesterton Square and retention of Broadwood Terrace or the redevelopment of Broadwood Terrace and retention of Chesterton Square studies showed that the overall project was not viable for the following reasons:

Partial demolition of either site is virtually impossible to achieve without decanting residents from the residential accommodation, particularly given the shared access arrangements and crude stacking of the uses.

Demolition of, say, the commercial accommodation would significantly impact on the structure and integrity of the buildings, putting occupiers of the residential accommodation above at an unacceptable risk and rendering the proposal to “partially demolish” the main structure undeliverable.

In addition, the value enhancement of replacing the depot or commercial accommodation with more residential accommodation or other uses, is in our opinion so constrained by the existing structure and the built environment at the lower levels (so overly oppressive as a pedestrian environment) that it would not be attractive as a proposition to developers or investors. The design and therefore the end value of any replacement accommodation will be compromised too much.

Partial demolition of the main blocks on either the north or south sites is therefore in our opinion not a viable option. Options for refurbishment of the commercial areas have instead been considered, together with retaining the main structures as part of Options 1 and 2.

Once these issues became clear the option was not studied further.
Option 4 - Full redevelopment - Formation

- Stitching together Pembroke Road & Warwick Road.
- Improving sitewide accessibility and connecting sites to promote permeability.
- Enhancing engagement and activity at ground level.
- Ground level connection eliminates the need for a footbridge linking Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square.

- Sculpting new green spaces, and creating a central space of landscaped gardens for residents.
- Creation of a distinct public realm, characteristic of the desirable garden square typology of the borough.
- Increased opportunity for active frontages of retail and restaurants.
- Creation of a formal language of blocks, characteristic of the architectural language of Warwick Road and RBKC.

- Responding to the local area by stepping masses in relation to the built environment.
- Strategic massing sensitive to consented heights.
- Improved massing strategy in line with daylight/sunlight, and rights of light envelopes.
- Opportunity for parking/ancillary space in Basement level to Chesterton Square.

- Enhancing the architectural quality of the massing by adopting a ‘Pinwheel’ concept.
- A ‘Pinwheel’ enables further compliance with daylight and sunlight envelopes and consented heights, increasing solar permeability.
- Creation of green roof terraces
**Broadwood Terrace**

The existing building is demolished completely. The nursery to the east of the site is retained. New build development provides all depot facilities at basement and ground level. Affordable housing is provided across five upper floors with an expanded amenity terrace spreading across the entire roof area of the rebuilt depot.

**Chesterton Square**

A pinwheel mass, with repeating geometric forms around an open courtyard is developed to provide retail at ground level facing Warwick Road with office accommodation above and a mid-sized hotel over this. The remainder of the pinwheel is utilised as private market apartments. A shared courtyard is provided.

To the south of the site a row of terraced houses is provided, each of approximately 160 sm (1,750 sq ft) GEA.

A single level basement is provided below the main buildings and courtyard and providing plant area, refuse storage, 90 car parking spaces and cycle parking.

---

**BROADWOOD TERRACE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>76424.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Residential</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>96402</td>
<td>73266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>176551</strong></td>
<td><strong>134179</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Affordable Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHESTERTON SQUARE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depot</strong></td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>76424.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Residential</strong></td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>96402</td>
<td>73266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>176551</strong></td>
<td><strong>134179</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 76% of efficiency and 97% for townhouses
**Option 4.2 - Full redevelopment across both sites - Private Rented Sector scheme**

**Broadwood Terrace**

The existing building is demolished completely. The nursery to the east of the site is retained. New build development provides, at basement and ground level all depot facilities. Affordable housing is provided across five upper floors with an expanded amenity terrace spreading across the entire roof area of the rebuilt depot.

**Chesterton Square**

The pinwheel mass is developed to provide retail at ground level facing Warwick Road with office space above and private rented residential accommodation over this (split to provide (NIA) 23,621 sf private and 10,123 sf affordable accommodation with average apartment sizes of 695 sf). The remainder of the pin wheel is utilised as private market apartments. A shared courtyard is provided.

To the south of the site a row of terraced houses is provided, each of approximately 160 sm (1,750 sq ft) GEA.

A single level basement is provided below the main buildings and courtyard and providing plant area, refuse storage, 90 car parking spaces and cycle parking.

---

**BROADWOOD TERRACE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>76,424.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Residential</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>96,402</td>
<td>73,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross External Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Affordable</td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHESTERTON SQUARE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>13,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>20,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Residential</td>
<td>17,783</td>
<td>191,345</td>
<td>151,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS and associated affordable</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>44,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross External Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,864</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS units - mix to be confirmed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Based on 76% of efficiency and 97% for townhouses
**BROADWOOD TERRACE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>76,424.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Residential</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>96,402</td>
<td>73,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,551</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,179</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Affordable Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHESTERTON SQUARE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>13,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Residential</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>20,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>44,401.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>38,750.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,079</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>213,343</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented Sector Units</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broadwood Terrace**

The existing building is demolished completely. The nursery to the east of the site is retained. New build development provides, at basement and ground level all depot facilities. Affordable housing is provided across five upper floors with an expanded amenity terrace spreading across the entire roof area of the rebuilt depot.

**Chesterton Square**

The pinwheel mass is developed to provide retail at ground level facing Warwick Road with office space above and private rented residential accommodation over this (split to provide (NIA) 23,621 sq ft private and 10,123 sq ft affordable accommodation with average apartment sizes of 695 sq ft). The remainder of the pin wheel is utilised as private market apartments. A shared courtyard is provided.

To the south of the site a two to three storey private education facility is provided with open play space at the east and west.

A single level basement is provided below the main buildings and courtyard and providing plant area, refuse storage, 90 car parking spaces and cycle parking.
Option 4.4 Full redevelopment across both sites - No depot retained

Broadwood Terrace

The existing building is demolished completely. The nursery to the east of the site is retained. New build development provides retail at basement and ground level. Affordable housing is provided across five upper floors with open amenity space and retail delivery areas arranged across the residual open space. Options for additional density in this option, by building at the rear of the block, were discarded on the grounds of loss of amenity space.

Chesterton Square

The pinwheel mass is developed to provide retail at ground level facing Warwick Road with office space above and private rented residential accommodation over this (split to provide (NIA) 23,621 sf private and 10,123 sf affordable accommodation with average apartment sizes of 695 sf)). The remainder of the pinwheel is utilised for private market apartments. A shared courtyard is provided.

To the south of the site a row of terraced houses is provided, each of approximately 1,750 sq ft GEA.

A single level basement is provided below the main buildings and courtyard and providing plant area, refuse storage, 90 car parking spaces and cycle parking.

---

**BROADWOOD TERRACE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>19,271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Residential</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>96,402</td>
<td>73,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,714</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Affordable Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHESTERTON SQUARE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>GEA (sqm)</th>
<th>GEA (sqf)</th>
<th>NIA (sqf)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>13,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>20,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Residential</td>
<td>17,783</td>
<td>191,345</td>
<td>151,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS and associated affordable</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>44,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross External Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>205,097</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS units - mix to be confirmed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Residential units</strong></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 76% of efficiency and 97% for townhouses
C – Initial Planning Comments and Pre App Notes
Policy CH4 “Estate Renewal” Sets out the Royal Borough’s Borough-Wide Planning Policy for Estate Renewal
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Meeting Comments.

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Flight</td>
<td>Strategic Developments Team Leader (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Roberts</td>
<td>Senior Planning Officer (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Torpey</td>
<td>Senior Development Surveyor (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richards</td>
<td>Associate Planner Daniel Watney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Shaw</td>
<td>Lambert Smith Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeeun Song-Dusoir</td>
<td>SOM architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Jackson</td>
<td>SOM architects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project: Pembroke Road Depot  
Date: 14/10/2013

Meeting: Inception Meeting

Relevant Documents: None provided

1.0 Introductions

- JR explained that the project team (TSH, Daniel Watney and SOM architects) have been instructed to prepare development options for RBKC Corporate Property with a view to them being presented to RBKC property board by the end of December 2013. The intention of the pre-application discussions with RBKC Planning is to advise on the principles which will inform the development of the options.

2.0 Estate Regeneration

- A strong case will need to be made for redevelopment, if that is the option progressed. Please refer to Core Strategy policy CH4 for the policy position. Further to this, a separate case must be made to justify the range of options that were considered prior to concluding on the option for estate regeneration. This must be done prior to preparation and submission of a planning application. The Council’s housing team should be consulted as part of this process.

3.0 Land Uses
• TS explained that the existing buildings comprise 1600m$^2$ of sui generis floorspace (including depot and nursery space), 116 residential units (includes 58 social rented), and 2400m$^2$ B1 office floorspace

• TS explained that the depot would be reduced in size based on what the service needs to retain on the site. This is not a use which is protected in the Core Strategy, but any change in the size, function or location of the depot will need to be considered in relation to its traffic and amenity impacts. The Council will want to be satisfied that the proposed facility is fit for purpose and this will need to form part of any future application

• The existing 2,400m$^2$ office floorspace is protected by Core Strategy policy CF5 and must be re-provided within any redevelopment scheme. It was confirmed that a proportion of this could be provided as SME units

• TS confirmed that their feasibility brief requires as a minimum the re-provision of the existing residential units (including re-provision of all 58 social rented units)

• JR explained that the feasibility work was to be based on the 40% affordable housing draft housing policy requirement. This is incorrect. The current and applicable policy position is set out in Core Strategy policy CH2, that is that 50% of residential floorspace in excess of 800m2 must be provided as affordable housing

• The housing mix must meet the Borough’s specific housing need. Paragraph 35.3.10 of the Core Strategy identifies the shortfall across market, affordable rent and intermediate housing. Any future proposal will need to meet this need. Any application will need to detail existing tenures on site

• A hotel may be acceptable in land use policy terms, subject to satisfying the Council that there would be no undue traffic or amenity impacts. There is some concern at this stage about how this can be successfully incorporated without unacceptably pushing the building envelope

• Student accommodation would be resisted. It is not a suitable location for this tenure.

• Extra care may be acceptable subject to demonstration of Borough need. This will not be accepted as an alternative to the re-provision of the existing social rental units

• Ground floor retail uses are a concern at this location. This would not be a destination premises and would be better if they were designed
4.0 Urban Design

- No details provided at this time, however it was confirmed at our meeting that feasibility work would investigate creating meaningful connections through the north and southern sites and would introduce active frontages. This is a principle we support.
- Uses at ground floor should be non-residential. Residential at street level would not be compatible with Warwick Road in amenity terms.

5.0 Other Matters

- JR confirmed that the proposals would be referable to the Mayor
- JR confirmed that the proposals would be EIa development

6.0 Next Steps

- SR to produce draft PPA and circulate for comment and agreement
- SR to offer dates for meeting in November and December (w/c 11th and 16th respectively)
- JR to circulate all presentation material and agenda 5 days prior to next meeting (see draft PPA)
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Meeting Comments.

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Flight</td>
<td>Strategic Developments Team Leader (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Roberts</td>
<td>Senior Planning Officer (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Butler</td>
<td>Senior Design Officer (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Burrage</td>
<td>Transport Planning Manager (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Torpey</td>
<td>Senior Development Surveyor (RBKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richards</td>
<td>Associate Planner Daniel Watney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Jackson and Peter Jackson</td>
<td>SOM architects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Road Depot</td>
<td>15/11/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting:
Meeting to primarily discuss scale and massing

Relevant Documents:
• Daniel Watney letter dated 12th November 2013
• SOM Pembroke Road Depot Site Planning Presentation dated 15th November 2013

1.0 Chesterton Square

• Demolition of the existing buildings as part of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme that complies with the development plan is acceptable in principle

• Principle of 133 market residential units (circa 13,885m²) is acceptable, subject to the proposed residential units meeting the internal and external accommodation standards set out in the Core Strategy and Mayor’s Housing SPG

• The principle of locating all affordable housing (includes existing and new units) to the Broadwood Terrace site is likely to be acceptable, on the basis that this would facilitate phasing of the development, earlier delivery and would be less disruptive to the existing residents of the affordable units. We would require further details of the proposed accommodation and delivery. This should be included as part of the case for regeneration which will need to be prepared and submitted in advance of the planning application(s) for redevelopment

• Provision of the market residential units in three blocks is acceptable. However, I would raise caution with residential development along
Warwick Road which is a red route. Issues of noise and air quality will need to be considered at the early design stage. The hotel might be better placed on Warwick Road as per option 2

- The pre-application scheme shows a reduced office floor area (approximately 279m²). Part of the re-provided space would be small and medium sized offices which, though the amount is not defined, would be reasonable in principle within the context of a comprehensive scheme. It would be helpful to see plans of the existing office accommodation. If it covers the whole floor plate I would expect parts to be poorly lit. This would help us understand what type of improvements to our office stock we would be getting. However, the Core Strategy position is to retain all office floor area and as such this departure will need to be justified.

- New retail floor space would be acceptable in principle. I note from the pre-app pack that this would be provided as small flexible A1, A2 and A3 units. Given the location and proximity to the Pembroke Neighbourhood Centre small scale commercial units would be most appropriate. Careful consideration would need to be given to the extent of Class A3 in the flexible use as this may give rise to other implications in terms of residential amenity. We would also expect the building to be design to adequately accommodate these any of these uses without significant modification.

- Principle of a hotel is acceptable. I note your propose two locations for this at this stage. The key issue here will be the servicing/traffic implications and what the amenity impact of this would be

- There would be no land use planning policy conflict with locating a school on the site. However, accommodating school pick up and drop off will be challenging at this location and we will require full details of how this will be achieved. Matters of residential amenity will also need to be addressed given the proximity to residential properties. We would also question how the school and its associated external spaces can be successfully integrated into the development in townscape terms. To reduce the impact on surrounding neighbours it may be preferable to move the school from the residential buildings towards Warwick Road. This would also allow a more coherent design for the open space area at the rear of the Chesterton Square perimeter block

- Principle of two levels of basement is acceptable. I can confirm that the emerging Core Strategy policy CL7 (Basements policy) will not limit the depth of basements for “large comprehensively planned sites”. Construction and traffic management will be a key issue.

- We support the perimeter block site layout, and we welcome the level of permeability through the site, although the open space at the rear of the block appears unresolved and it is not clear who would use this space
and whether it would be public or private

- We have some concern that the proposed public realm will be unsuccessful and could be compromised by proposed school and hotel pick up drop off points. We will need details of how this will work

- The scale is unresolved. The proposed Pembroke Road block would have a shoulder height of 8 storeys with a 9th level set back. The buildings opposite are 3 storeys with commercial at ground and residential above. This element of the proposed building is too high for its context and would provide a poor relationship with the existing three storey buildings on the opposite side of road. Furthermore, this proposed relationship would result in the loss of sun/daylight and increased sense of enclosure to these buildings. Therefore, the proposed massing should not exceed the existing building envelope to the main Pembroke Road frontage

- The block opposite Huntsmore House is 6 storeys and from the plans would not appear to be any closer to Huntsmore House. This scale is similar to the existing building and the separation distances are sufficient to ensure amenity levels would be preserved

- The southern residential block is 4 storeys, it is not clear why this is so low given the distances from neighbouring buildings. However we do not object to this

- The Warwick Road block would be 8 storeys at its shoulder with two further storeys set back. Warwick Road is undergoing substantial change and some sites which have planning consent have yet to be developed. These sites (west side of Warwick Road) without exception, see 6 storey buildings fronting Warwick Road, with a 7th storey set back in some cases. All larger buildings are set back behind these lower buildings. The reason for this arrangement of scale was to prevent Warwick Road becoming a canyon. We have significant concerns about a full 8 storey building on the back edge of the pavement, particularly because it would not be read in isolation but alongside Broadwood Terrace in axial views. The shoulder height of this block should be reduced to 7 storeys, but we can discuss an additional floor being set back

- The pavement along this stretch of Warwick Road is also quite narrow and inadequate for a retail frontage. It would be appropriate to step the development back further into the site to allow for a more generous pavement width to accommodate increased activity associated with shop frontages

- The school block would be 3 storeys. It would be on the boundary and in close proximity of neighbouring buildings to the south and east. You explained that the building is within the envelope of the existing
workshop building, but we do not have drawings to confirm this. Please provide these at the next meeting

- We would not encourage reprovision of the NCP car park

- Car parking should accord with the draft Transport and Streets SPD which is currently out to consultation – see below link [https://planningconsult.rbkc.gov.uk/consult.ti/tranportandsteetspd/viewCompoundDoc?docid=4246324&sessionid=&voteid=](https://planningconsult.rbkc.gov.uk/consult.ti/tranportandsteetspd/viewCompoundDoc?docid=4246324&sessionid=&voteid=)

- There is a house between the eastern end of the existing workshop building and Warwick Mansions, Cromwell Crescent. This butts up against the workshop. The proposed plans do not show this building, what is the intention for it?

### 2.0 Broadwood Terrace

- Principle of refurbishment and demolition options are acceptable

- Replacement of nursery floorspace is acceptable

- Reprovision of Council depot, if required, is acceptable. It is noted that this area might reduce following a review. This is acceptable subject to it meeting the service requirements

- The preference in highway terms would be for vehicle access and egress to and from the depot to be from separate points. However, there are urban design benefits to a single access and egress point and as such a shared access and egress point from Warwick Road would be acceptable in principle

- Principle of providing of 121 residential units is acceptable, subject to the proposed residential units meeting the internal and external accommodation standards set out in the Core Strategy and Mayor’s Housing SPG

- Principle of reproviding all 58 existing affordable units and any additional affordable units on this site is acceptable to facilitate phasing and earlier delivery of the affordable units. This would need to form part of the case for regeneration of the sites and would be secured by a s106 legal agreement

- We will apply the policy requirements set out in Core Strategy policy CH2, i.e. that 50% of residential floorspace above 800sqm is provided as affordable housing. The 30% presumption set out in your pre-app letter does not comply with policy CH2. Any scheme providing less than 50% affordable housing will need to be supported by a viability assessment to demonstrate the maximum reasonable amount is being
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The correct affordable housing split set out in policy CH2 is a minimum of 85% social rent/15% intermediate tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We are concerned by the height and typology of this building. The building would represent the longest unbroken frontage along this part of Warwick Road and at a full 7 storeys it would have a significant visual impact. The site is also adjacent to 3 storey buildings to the north and a four storey building to the south. The 3 storey Victorian buildings to the north sit within the Edwardes Square, Scarsdale and Abingdon Conservation Area, the boundary of which also runs directly to the rear of the site. It is unclear how will any transition in height be successfully achieved, and what building typology will this building be. In light of this the building should not exceed 6 storeys, with the 6th storey being set back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is not clear from the plans how high the building will be at the rear of the site, adjacent to the Warwick Gardens properties. Any increase in height closer to the boundary is likely to have an adverse impact. We will need sections through this area to demonstrate how this issue will be tackled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principle of additional basement levels is acceptable. Construction and traffic management will be a key issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Car parking should accord with the draft Transport and Streets SPD which is currently out to consultation – see below link <a href="https://planningconsult.rbkc.gov.uk/consult.ti/tranportandsteetspd/viewCompoundDoc?docid=4246324&amp;sessionid=&amp;voteid=">https://planningconsult.rbkc.gov.uk/consult.ti/tranportandsteetspd/viewCompoundDoc?docid=4246324&amp;sesssionid=&amp;voteid=</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You have asked for our view on the possibility of including 110 Warwick Road and 84 Pembroke Road in the redevelopment. 110 Warwick Road is of no architectural merit and as such I raise no objection to including this building. 84 Pembroke Road is not listed or situated within a conservation area, but is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset due to its positive contribution to the local architecture of the area forming part of the original Victorian street layout. The building is an attractive Victorian pub (built 1852) that was formally known as the Kensington Arms and is positioned on a prominent corner site where Pembroke Road meets Warwick Road. The building is considered worthy of retention and thought should be given to incorporating it into any future scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 **Next Steps**

- Next meeting 16th December 2013. Please could you provide an agenda of items for discussion
- GLA pre-app discussions – Does your client wish to engage with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLA at this stage given that the proposals would be referable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Further pre-app discussions following this initial feasibility stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chesterton Square

- We support the perimeter block site layout. The public route to the east and south of the main block makes sense in terms of vehicular and pedestrian access and is welcome. However, there is some uncertainty with respect to the proposed northeast/southwest link through the main block. Points for further consideration on this include:

1. Does the link offer a meaningful connection, i.e. does it lead anywhere that connects with other routes and would it be recognisable to the public as a public route
2. What is the ownership of the ‘public realm’ inside the main block. If it is private space then a public route will not work. If it is public space then would it be recognisable as such and would people want/be encouraged to stop and use the space
3. The link would reduce footfall past the proposed Warwick Road retail units. This seems counterintuitive

- We still have some concern that the proposed public realm to the south of the main block would be unsuccessful due to the position of the school. It could also be compromised by the proposed school and hotel pick-up drop/off-points and retail delivery area. We will need details of how this will work
- The principle of a 2/3 storey residential block in place of the proposed school would be acceptable and would strengthen the public realm to the south of the main block.

- The stepped massing of the main block is more successful, with it reading as a series of interconnecting blocks of differing heights. The scale along Warwick Road is now more comfortable, with the building broken into 6, 7 and 8 storey elements. Locating the 6 and 7 storey elements opposite the 8/10 storey Fenelon Place building would help to ease any canyon effect, though how the building is articulated will be crucial. The 6 storey element on the corner of Warwick Road and Pembroke Road is similar in height to the existing building and is acceptable. The 7 storey element would increase the height of the existing building by one floor and is acceptable in principle.

- The 8 storey element on Warwick Road, which would be a full 2 storeys higher than the existing building (5.9m higher according to SOM sections), would be particularly exposed in views from the south due to the smaller terrace adjacent to the site. This element would be 18m wide with a 28m long Warwick Road frontage (approximately). This height is not uncommon in the immediate area, with the Fenelon Place building rising to 8 storeys on Warwick Road (with a further 2 floors set back), however this building is less exposed and sandwiched between larger buildings. Warwick Road is approximately 19m wide at this point and the 8 storey block would be opposite the 5 storey Tesco building. This would not be an uncomfortable scale. In views from the West Cromwell Road/Warwick Road junction the existing building already has a significant presence, and has a monolithic presence as it over sails the lower scale buildings to the south. While the 8 storey element would increase the height on the Warwick Road side of the block, the proposals would offer substantial townscape improvements as a result of the rearranged massing of the south elevation of the main block. If the massing and architecture of the 8 storey element is carefully considered then it would be an acceptable scale for this part of the site.

- The proposed Pembroke Road frontage now also comprises a range of heights, from 5 to 8 storeys. The 5 and 6 storey elements are acceptable heights given the scale of the existing building, width of the street and immediate context.

- The Pembroke Road 8 storey element would be two storeys higher than the existing building (2.4m higher according to SOM sections) and would be approximately 4m forward of the Huntsmore House frontage. Huntsmore House is primarily 6 storeys in height, with the top floor expressed as a setback attic storey (though it rises to 7 storeys next to the depot). The buildings opposite are 3 storeys. As a result of its proposed height and building line relative to the neighbouring buildings the 8 storey element would be highly prominent within the townscape. It would be out of scale with all other buildings in Pembroke Road and would therefore be unacceptable. The SOM sections show that the...
seventh storey would be marginally lower than the existing building, though it would project further forward at the upper levels due to the existing set backs on the residential floors. If the massing and architecture is carefully considered then this marginal increase is scale to 7 storeys at this point may be acceptable. This should be confirmed with a townscape views analysis.

- The block opposite Huntsmore House is now proposed to be a mix of 6, 7 and 8 storeys. The 8 storey element is unacceptable in townscape terms (for reasons set out above), but would also be likely to adversely affect the living conditions of the facing units at Huntsmore House. The 6 and 7 storey elements are not dissimilar to the height of the existing building and from the plans would not appear to be any closer to Huntsmore House. The separation distances look sufficient to ensure the amenity levels at Huntsmore House would be preserved.

- The pavement along this stretch of Warwick Road is also quite narrow and seems inadequate for a retail frontage. At our meeting SOM indicated that they would explore this but were confident that the footway was of sufficient width to accommodate the type and scale of retail units likely to be proposed. More detail on this is needed.

- The school block would be 3 storeys. It would be on the boundary and in close proximity of neighbouring buildings to the south and east. SOM confirmed at our meeting that the building is within the envelope of the existing workshop building, but we have not been provided with drawings to confirm this.

2.0 Broadwood Terrace

- The height has been revised and is now a full 6 storeys as suggested in my last advice note. This is acceptable. However, from the information provided it is not clear what the abutment with the three storey buildings to the north and south would look like (the northern buildings lie within the Edwards Square/Scarsdale & Abingdon Conservation Area). Three to six storeys would be an abrupt change, particularly given how exposed the flanks of the proposal would be in views from the north and south. It was suggested by SOM that they were exploring the option of setting the sixth floor in from the north and south edges of the building to ease this transition in height. This would be welcome and I would invite further details for discussion. The proposal would have the longest frontage along this part of Warwick Road. At this early design stage it is not clear how this building will be articulated, but the architecture will need to be of a high quality to successfully assimilate it into the townscape. I would invite further details for discussion.

- The SOM sections suggest that the rear part of the building would be lower than the existing building. This is welcome. However, the proposals would comprise a terraced communal private garden to the
rear of the site, stepping down towards Warwick Gardens. This site would accommodate all the affordable housing units and while the communal private garden is a welcome amenity benefit, we would raise some caution with respect to management of this area. From the plans it would seem that the garden would adjoin the Warwick Gardens properties and we will need details to explain how the garden will be designed and managed to prevent any conflict with Warwick Gardens in terms of overlooking and general noise and disturbance.

3.0 Other Matters

John Richards has also asked that I provide comments on the following matters.

- **Relocation of nursery to Warwick Road frontage Broadwood Terrace** – This is unlikely to be acceptable given the large number of car borne trips generated by nurseries and parents dropping off their children tend to dwell for longer than other educational uses. Stopping is not permitted on Warwick Road between 7am and 7pm and the parking outside the site is very well used. This would afford limited drop off opportunities. Pick up and drop off on Pembroke Road might be appropriate but this would depend on the number of nursery places proposed, the management arrangements the nursery could put in place and the availability of kerb side space following the redevelopment. Such a proposal would be need to be carefully scrutinised given that Pembroke Road accommodates three bus routes. Notwithstanding the above, there is too much uncertainty in relation to how the external space would be accommodated on the site and where this would be in relation to the residential properties. The possible impact of noise from the external playspace on the residential properties will need to be carefully considered.

- **The principle of on-site school drop-off/pick-up with access/egress via the existing Pembroke Road access** – The principle of a two-way access from Pembroke Road to the southern site is acceptable. However, the access would have no way through to Warwick Road and would have limited turning space for vehicles. Therefore it is very poorly suited to an access for a school where demand is highly peaked. This could lead to congestion and an unsafe environment for pupils outside the school during peak hours. If the amount of space for vehicles was increased to accommodate demand this could compromise the quality of the public realm, which is already a concern as outlined above. Although we have no details of internal layouts and entrance points for the residential units at this time I would also raise the point of possible conflict with users of this access and the residential units (particularly entrance points) in the main block facing this access.

More generally the arrangement should not encourage car trips but should be able to accommodate those trips that are likely to remain after the introduction of a travel demand management measures as part...
of Travel Plan. There is no opportunity for pick-ups and drop-offs on Warwick Road and very limited opportunity on Pembroke Road. More detailed information on the school roll and the arrangement of the access road are needed before any detailed comments can be provided.

- **The principle of circa 16 2/3 storey Class C3 residential townhouses in place of the proposed private school** – I have commented on this above. However, I would add that in highway terms this option is far less problematic and more acceptable than the school option

- **The principle of circa 85% of affordable units being intermediate tenure** – There should be no net loss of existing social rented provision in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CH4. This amounts to the reprovision of the existing 58 social rented units. I would have no objection in principle to any *additional* affordable provision comprising of circa 85% intermediate tenure, though it isn’t clear what intermediate products would be proposed. However, a case supported by a viability appraisal will need to be made to demonstrate that the proposed level of intermediate tenure is required to subsidise delivery of the social rented units

### 4.0 Next Steps

- GLA pre-app discussions – Does your client wish to engage with the GLA at this stage given that the proposals would be referable
- Would you like to have further pre-app discussions following this initial feasibility stage
WARWICK ROAD ESTATE

Review of options to achieve Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s regeneration objectives

September 2016
Introduction

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) has embarked on an ambitious regeneration programme across the Borough. As part of this programme, they have considered a number of potential regeneration options for the Warwick Road Estate and concluded that further work should be undertaken to understand the Continued Maintenance Strategy, Infill/Refurbishment, Partial Redevelopment and Full Redevelopment options in more detail.

This process will also seek to discover whether there are any viable redevelopment options that would deliver the Council’s objectives, whilst also meeting the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents. The Royal Borough is now taking forward further investigative work to understand the “Continued Maintenance Strategy,” Infill/Refurbishment, Partial Redevelopment and Full Redevelopment options.

To support RBKC in the preparation of these options, they wish to appoint an architect and design team to develop the options mentioned above for the Warwick Road Estate.

In parallel with the consideration of the options specified above that form the subject of the architect’s brief, RBKC will separately instruct investigative work to evaluate the effect of the Continued Maintenance Strategy in terms of meeting the Council’s stated objectives.

This document represents Council’s current aspirations for further evaluation of the options for the Warwick Road Estate in order to meet its objectives, as the options review has progressed since the earlier Brief was issued in February 2016.

Once this evaluation process has been progressed, any proposals will need to be approved by Cabinet and will receive appropriate legal advice.
Housing Regeneration Principles

RBKC has embarked on an ambitious housing regeneration programme. The overarching vision for this regeneration programme is to reintegrate estates into the wider neighbourhood network of streets and squares. The wish is to provide high-quality homes which will become ‘the conservation areas of the future.’

RBKC aim to deliver:

a. Quality homes: provide best possible homes for existing & future tenants;

b. Quality neighbourhoods: design beautiful new places to form better-connected, better-designed, street-based neighbourhoods to be conservation areas of the future, while reflecting and integrating with local context;

c. Additional homes: provide the additional homes of all tenures that the borough needs;

d. Affordable homes: providing new affordable homes, including for those on ordinary incomes, who are currently not catered for by the market or social housing;

e. Regeneration: use development to tackle some of the causes of social deprivation in our most deprived neighbourhoods:
   i. Improving chances of better social outcomes for residents.
   ii. Increasing level of economic activity via provision of right type of business space in mixed-use neighbourhoods.
   iii. Increasing level of social integration in borough.

f. Financial: increasing net present value of and income from borough’s housing assets.

As part of reaching these objectives, RBKC is exploring a range of options as set out in the Introduction for the Warwick Road Estate that may include full redevelopment.
The study area comprises two separate sites to the north and south of Pembroke Road, W8, referred to as Broadwood Terrace (north) and Chesterton Square (south). The freehold of both sites is held by the Council which are subject to a number of residential tenancies and leasehold interests, in addition to commercial tenancies.

The study area measures circa 1.3 ha [c.13,000 sq m] and is bounded by Warwick Road to the west, West Cromwell Road to the south, and Pembroke Gardens to the north and is bisected by Pembroke Road, with a high level pedestrian footbridge linking the two sites. The study area abuts a conservation area. (Please refer to site boundary plans included in Appendix A.

There are a total of 116 existing residential units across both sites comprising secure tenants, a number of service tenancies (KTMO), one TMO office and a number of leaseholders. A number of the residential leasehold units have already been re-acquired by the Council.

**Broadwood Terrace (Northern Site)**

i. The Broadwood Terrace site (c.4,200 sq m) is located to the north of Pembroke Road. (Note: Areas to be confirmed via measured survey):

ii. c.9,500 sq m NIA of *Sui Generis* local authority depot accommodation including vehicle storage, equipment storage and circulation space arranged over basement to first floor levels; and,

iii. 24No. Class C3 ‘dwelling house’ units comprising c.1,595 sq m NIA of residential floor space.

iv. The depot can be accessed via Pembroke Road or Warwick Road (restricted TfL Red Route) with vehicle movements facilitated by a spiral ramp leading from the basement level to a number of levels of parking above.

v. The building presents part 5/part 6 storeys to Warwick Road with three levels of blank depot façade and three levels of residential.

**Chesterton Square (Southern Site)**

vi. The Chesterton Square site (c.8,970 sq m) is located to the south of Pembroke Road. (Note: Areas to be confirmed via measured survey):

vii. c.2,400 sq m NIA Class B1 local authority office accommodation. There is a requirement to re-provide new office accommodation within any new proposals:

viii. c.7,110 sq m NIA of *Sui Generis* local authority depot including vehicle storage, workshop and staff training / staff mess space;

ix. 92No. Class C3 dwellings comprising c.6,600 sq m NIA of residential floor space, surrounding a central communal open space/garden area;

x. A modern freestanding office building known as the Annex.

xi. ‘The Barn’ – a single storey local authority storage facility, and adjoining vehicle wash and ancillary facilities.

xii. An open service yard and parking spaces for staff/visitors.
xiii. This part of the site accommodates four principal buildings, the largest of which comprises 6/7 storeys, presenting three levels of depot / office façade to Warwick Road with three levels of residential accommodation a number of which include external terraces (i.e. private balconies).
Options Study

The following options have been commissioned by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea to review and evaluate the alternatives available for the Warwick Road Estate and demonstrate how the Borough’s Objectives and Vision can be achieved.

1. Continued Maintenance Strategy
RBKC will commission a review of the ongoing maintenance, capital expenditure and facilities management programme for the residential, office/commercial and depot elements within the existing buildings, which will also take account of the longer term environmental and social benefits and effects of retention as against partial or complete replacement.

2. Infill / Refurbishment
The architects will review the work undertaken previously as part of the Lambert Smith Hampton Options Report, and will also consider what other alternatives may be appropriate within the parameters specified,

- Refurbishment and re-letting of the existing depot on the south site for alternative uses such as retail, retention and refurbishment of existing south site office accommodation with residential accommodation above left in situ.
- Introduction of new infill residential accommodation on the southern part of the south site.
- North site (Broadwood Terrace) retention and refurbishment of existing depot, with conversion of the existing upper level garage floors to office or residential use.

3. Partial Redevelopment
Partial Demolition and Redevelopment of Chesterton Square (Southern Site). This may include:

- Introduction of additional residential floors above existing structure.
- Removal of existing landscaped podium (Chesterton Square) and depot to provide improved natural daylight/sunlight to new residential units within existing office/depot accommodation
- Introduction of offices at ground floor (in place of existing depot) level to preserve employment uses below new lower level ‘garden ‘square’ in centre.

Partial Redevelopment of Broadwood Terrace (Northern Site)

- Retention of existing depot facilities.
- Potential for introduction of additional residential floors above existing Broadwood Terrace structure and/or within existing upper level car park structure.
4. Full Redevelopment

- Phased Redevelopment of Broadwood Terrace (Northern Site) and Chesterton Square (Southern Site). The clarification below is a supplement to the original brief following refinement of the design criteria:

North Site

- Re-provision of consolidated depot facility, informed by specialist advice and plans prepared by depot consultant with input from RBKC service provider.

- Preferred depot vehicular access/egress on to Warwick Road subject to highway approvals.

- Self-contained ancillary depot and service provider offices of circa 700m2 with frontage to Warwick Road.

- Potential for retail/commercial/residential use on ‘infill’ to Pembroke Road frontage on existing access point, and introduction of retail/commercial frontage to part of Warwick Road.

- Potential for main residential entrance from Pembroke Road to be explored.

- Retain and refurbish or re-provide existing nursery facility.

- Re-provision of affordable residential units as well as additional affordable and open market units.

- Provide communal garden areas for use of residential homes.

South Site:

- Relocate vehicle maintenance facilities off site and consolidate other depot/ancillary service office facilities to North site.

- Re-provide employment/office uses (circa 2,435m2 ) on Warwick Road frontage, exploring potential for flexibility for subdivision for smaller office users of circa 500m each in terms of core arrangements.

- Introduction of school/educational uses should not currently be pursued within design proposals, with possible exception of lower ground/ground on Warwick Road frontage.

- Retail uses if viable along Warwick Road frontage.

- Retail/cafe uses exploring potential for outdoor seating areas/terraces should be introduced along Pembroke Road frontage.

- Parking provision to be accommodated by underground car park supplemented by selective surface parking.

- Aspiration for ‘garden square’.

- Open market and affordable residential units.
The expected key programme milestones leading up to the conclusion of RIBA Stage 1+ are outlined below. The Architect is in the process of reviewing and validating these programme dates and the period proposed for the development of RIBA Stage 1+.

### Key Programme Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet and Greet Session 1</td>
<td>5 July, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet and Greet Session 2</td>
<td>28 July, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence RIBA Stage 1 +</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target interim resident consultation events (3) dates tbc</td>
<td>October 2016 (once sufficient information available), December 2016, Early 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of DRAFT RIBA Stage 1 + Report</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission RIBA Stage 1 + Report</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultants to be appointed

If required the following consultants may be appointed to support the option study:

- Mechanical, Electrical and Public Health
- Fire Safety Consultant
- Landscape Architect
- Structural Engineer
- Daylight/Sunlight and Right to Light Consultant
- Party Wall Surveyor
- Building Control/Approved Inspector
- Logistics / Construction Advisor
- Sustainability/BREEAM Consultant
- Highways and Transportation
- Access Consultant
- Townscape and Heritage Consultant
- Depot consultant

Specialist advice from consultants including building surveyors and property managers will be instructed separately by RBKC to provide advice in relation to the Continued Maintenance Strategy option.
Site Boundary Plan
RBKC Freehold Land Ownership