

2. Constructing a deck over the tube line should be a strategic decision for the Council, not just a way to increase the size of the site. The developer says that sometime in the future, if the Copthorne Tara Hotel is ever redeveloped, the deck would be helpful in providing a pedestrian link across the railway. But such a deck is a major undertaking with important implications for the wider community. The railway line here divides this part of Kensington, with no way across it from Kensington High Street to Lexham Gardens. The station itself has only one entrance and would benefit from access in other directions. So if a deck is to be built, it should be considered in a thorough appraisal of how best to improve access to the station and provide new ways to connect the areas on either side of the track. In other words, it calls for a strategic look at the needs of the neighbourhood, not as a device by the developers to increase their building area. Otherwise there's a risk that it might limit or even prevent any future development round the tube line and the station.

3. A larger site means a bigger development, which results in even greater disruption to the neighbourhood. Residents of the Royal Borough are used to putting up with the inconveniences of construction. It is the price we occasionally have to pay for the advantages of living in Kensington. But why should we in this quiet corner of the Borough have to put up with 4 years of unreasonable disturbance because of – there's no other word for it – the greed of the developer?

All the spoil from excavating the vast basement and demolishing the existing buildings, all the material for the construction of the deck and the 5 new blocks will have to be brought in and out through the site's only vehicle entrance. This is the narrow opening in South End, which the Heythrop SPD describes as '*not wide enough to accommodate a significant increase in traffic or large lorries*'. To reach the site, construction traffic will have to use an unprecedentedly long route past a school, a college, a school canteen and a pub. The residential roads of this quiet corner of Kensington could hardly be less suitable for such traffic. Throughout the day children from the two local schools use the proposed route, as they walk to and from the park and their canteen. One of the roads was recently designated a Cycling Quietway. The west end of St Albans Grove, part of the proposed route, is even sign-posted 'Unsuitable for HGVs'.

Yet, according to the application there will be over 24,000 heavy vehicle journeys down these roads. (That's an estimate, so it's likely to be many more). At the peak of construction, in the first three months of 2021, there will be a lorry every 5½ minutes trundling through our community.

RBKC has an air quality policy: *to continue to assess planning developments for their impact on air quality and ensure adequate mitigation and low emission strategies are developed*. (Not surprisingly as mortality from air pollutants is 48% higher in the Borough than the UK average). How will 24,000 extra HGV journeys impact the air quality of a neighbourhood whose roads currently have very few HGVs?

The air pollution, the noise, the potential damage to property, the risk to safety and the disruption to the peaceful enjoyment of our everyday lives over so long a period scarcely bears thinking about – all because of an unnecessarily large development.

Again, it is hard to see how a massive project like this with the unreasonable disturbance it will cause will preserve '*the tranquil and picturesque nature of the site*'.

4. The developers claim their proposal fulfils the requirement of 'social and community use' because of the extra care provided. In their words '*The extra care facility would meet a specific identified need in the RBKC by providing fit-for-purpose accommodation for older people who are in need of care.*'

But how many older people in the Borough will be able to afford these flats?