

Planning and Place

Kensington Town Hall, Hornton Street, LONDON, W8 7NX

Director of Planning and Place

Graham Stallwood



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

Mr Lambshead
JLL
30 Warwick Street

Date: 28/02/2019
My Ref: PRE/AR/19 /00535/L3FU

Please ask for: **Ms. R. Marshall, Planning Officer**
Service Standard: 28/02/2019

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Dear Mr Lambshead

Address: 19 Mallord Street, LONDON, SW3 6AP
Proposal: Proposed secondary school (d1 use) for children age 11-18
floorspace: 2,850m²

Attached is my Level 3FU advice on your proposal. The levels of advice we provide are explained on our website at: <http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/advice>

If you would like further advice to develop your proposal, you can request follow up pre application advice as detailed on our website.

Yours sincerely

Rebecca Marshall

Rebecca Marshall
Planning Officer

Email: Planning@rbkc.gov.uk
Web: www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

19 Mallord Street, LONDON, SW3 6AP
Advice report for Proposed secondary school (d1 use) for children age
11-18
floorspace: 2,850m²

Our reference: /AR/19/00535

Date: 27/02/2019

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 In summary, and following our meeting on the 14th February and site visit on 25th February 2019, I advise:
- i. There is still concern over the capacity of the existing building to properly accommodate a 3FE school with 6th form and provide a building of high functional quality;
 - ii. There is concern over the visual impacts of the proposed new services, including lift and stair housings;
 - iii. There is concern over the impact of the proposed use on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers due to possible sound escape and odours;
 - iv. There is concern there would be overlooking of neighbouring properties to the rear from the proposed roof terrace;
 - v. There is concern that additional vehicle movements on Mallord Street would be prejudicial to the efficient operation of the highway. The information provided is currently not sufficient to address these concerns.
- 1.2 For these reasons I would not support the proposal if an application were made. Whilst the advice is given in good faith, it is based on the information provided and the assessment of the proposals has not been subject to public consultation. It does not bind the Council to a particular decision and is made without prejudice to any formal determination which may be given in the event of an application being submitted.
- 1.3 The advice in this report is provided at Level 3 as described in our customer guide, which can be viewed at: www.rbkc.gov.uk/advice. Should you require further advice I would welcome the opportunity to be of further assistance. The guide also explains how we can provide this to you. If you refer to our advice in public consultation events or marketing please ensure that you accurately reflect the full extent of the advice provided.
- 1.4 Should you decide to make an application following this advice then the easiest way to do so is electronically by registering on the Planning Portal at:

<https://www.planningportal.co.uk/applications>

- 1.5 Any application will need to be accompanied by appropriate information before it will be registered and considered. If any information requirements are missing, we cannot consider your application until it is provided. Section 6 summarises the information necessary to register an application for this proposal and if you are in any doubt please view the requirements on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/checklist before you submit the application.
- 1.6 Once an application is registered, should substantial amendments be required in order to address concerns, these will not generally be accepted as part of the application but you will be offered the opportunity to withdraw the application and resubmit it in an amended form.

2.0 Relevant planning history

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

3.0 Main relevant strategies and policies

The Development Plan

- 3.1 The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

	Consolidated Local Plan	London Plan
Conservation Area	CL3, CL11	
General townscape	CL1, CL2, CP15, CV15	7.4, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13
Living conditions	CL5	
Social and Community uses	CK1	3.18, 3.19
Environmental	CE7, CE6	

These documents can be found at:

- Consolidated Local Plan:
<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan>
- London Plan:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan>

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

- 3.2 Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) adopted by the Council relevant to the proposal are:
- Transport and Streets
 - Noise

- Planning Obligations

More information on these documents can be found at:

<http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningandconservation/planningpolicy/supplementaryplanning.aspx>

Other Local Strategies or Publications

3.3 Other local strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

•	Chelsea Park/Carlyle Conservation Area Appraisal - view at: https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/heritage-and-conservation/conservation-area-appraisals
---	--

4.0 Explanation

4.1 The below comments should be read in conjunction with comments previously made on AR/18/03325.

Design considerations

4.2 As stated previously, officers strongly welcome the proposals to retain and re-use the building, maintaining its positive contribution to the townscape. In principal, the proposed use of the building as an education facility is a good fit, making good use of the extensive floorplates, generous ceiling heights and large window openings. It similarly responds well to the civic quality of the host architecture.

4.3 The concerns arise however from the capacity of the building and proposed intensity of use. It remains questioned whether the building can sustain a 3FE secondary school with 6th form, albeit for the independent sector and confirmed reduced class sizes (20 pupils per class). It should be demonstrated how the building meets the standards for the proposed school role of 420 pupils (including SEN) as set out in the DEFS guidelines for mainstream school (BB 103, June 2014).

4.4 It is also important that the scheme architects verify that there is sufficient provision of ancillary services (e.g., toilets, showers, changing rooms), for those with disabilities (pupils, staff and visitors) and emergency egress; albeit these are more matters for building regulations. It may be that the building is more suited to 2FE and/or years 7-11 (pupils aged 11-16 years) and that an alternative site is found for the proposed 6th form.

4.5 Looking at the revised layout, the adaptation of the service passageway as the pupil entrance to the school is sensible. The western end of the building is sited closer to the street corner, with good access to the King's Road for those arriving on foot; and has the ability to draw in pupils from the public footway into a 'controlled' zone, where staff can maintain security.

4.6 The 'open' design of the entranceway is welcome, with inward opening doors, minimal framing and extensive glazing, preserving the appearance of the carriageway entrance. The framing should be inset rearward of the archway's rusticated brickwork, preserving its form and sense of depth.

- 4.7 It is important that no roller-shutters become incorporated that would spoil the appearance and read as target hardening. Early thought should be given to security and if required, the glazed entrance set further back and the existing gates retained. The floorscape should continue to read as paving, using a high quality natural stone and typical unit size, preferably as setts responding to the servicing character (e.g., granite or York stone).
- 4.8 The entrance sequence, however, runs counter to the building's architectural legibility and potential flexibility, as the existing main entrance is proposed to be relegated to an emergency egress. Note the suggestion to retain the existing main entrance as a secondary entrance for staff and pupils out-of-hours, which is welcome to an extent, though it is unclear from the submission how this would operate.
- 4.9 Reference has also been made to its possible use as a separate entrance for 6th form students, though no details are provided. It should also be confirmed whether the entrance could function for the local community, where access is provided to the basement facilities out-of-hours. However, thought should be given to upgrading the entrance and foyer area to make for a welcoming space.
- 4.10 The revised layout requires all pupils to pass through the reception area, which has been relocated to sit partly within the passageway, which is welcome in providing informal security. The new position of the school office is similarly welcome in providing some oversight of the entranceway and street, which should be retained and not replaced by storage facilities, maintaining good informal surveillance. Any further oversight (including within the passageway) would be welcome where/ if levels permit.
- 4.11 The location of classrooms at ground floor level animating the street façade along its full length is welcomed. The concomitant relocation of the SEN onto the 3rd floor rear elevation is sensible, given the need for special care and sensitivity, though the extent of the SEN facility remains a concern (see above).
- 4.12 At basement level, the revised layout is welcomed, providing a single, larger hall with dual aspect that can be readily subdivided to provide smaller studio spaces. The provision of the library resource area at this level is also welcomed, though question whether an additional or replacement entrance should be provided off the circulation core to allow access when the hall is in use, but also some additional daylight penetration. There is concern that there are no changing facilities or technical area/ backstage allocated at basement level that would support the full use of the hall and studios.
- 4.13 At first floor level and above the layout seems sensibly arranged, albeit the toilet provision seems limited. It is notable that there are no-longer any dedicated art rooms, though they may form part of the DT classrooms: this should be confirmed. Ventilation and services for the DT rooms and adjacent science labs should be identified and incorporated seamlessly within the building envelope.
- 4.14 It is understood that all windows are to be replaced, allowing their upgrade for thermal performance. The windows will be fixed shut and possibly obscured glazed at lower levels to safeguard residents' amenity. It is unclear at this stage whether fixing shut and obscured glazing is proposed for the rear façade only or extended to include the street façade: preferably the former and limited wherever possible, as the treatments

impacts upon the animation and appearance and of the facades, as well as the opportunity for natural ventilation.

- 4.15 The upgrading of the windows is not problematic, where the new windows are Crittal-style, multi-paned and painted in a consistent colour (black or white). The approach of inserting louvres within the upper section of windows works reasonably well with the fenestration, maintaining the multi-paned appearance, though it requires the frames to be painted black to reduce their visual intrusion.
- 4.16 The windows, however, do appear rather heavy-lidded. Whilst the consistent treatment is acknowledged, thought should be given to whether an alternative approach could be taken for the three feature windows with stone surrounds on the street facade, where the impact of the louvres and black finish is most impactful.
- 4.17 On the rear elevation the reinstatement of the original openings and upgrading of the windows are welcome, including the retention of the servicing openings. The inclusion of the Juliette balconies as 'decorative' elements is questioned, given that the openings are fixed shut. It is welcome that the servicing openings on the rear elevation are being retained, maintaining its industrial/warehouse character, though this approach should be extended to include the retention of the platforms and restraining bars.
- 4.18 Moreover, the new fenestration should continue to read as doors, albeit fixed shut and with metal infills for the lower door panels. The top-lights could include the louvres. The other large openings at rear raised ground floor level could be retained, though the Juliette balcony should be removed as it is considered unnecessary.
- 4.19 Regarding the rooftop outdoor space, it is unlikely that the current roof structure will support the additional facilities and therefore will require strengthening and rebuilding. If this is the case, its like-for-like re-provision is encouraged, maintaining the appearance of the host architecture, though the opportunity should be taken to remove any high level clutter (handrails).
- 4.20 There is also the opportunity to sink the roof garden partially within the roof form, given the generous ceiling heights within the mansard. This would help to reduce the visual impact of the proposed plant equipment, overruns and terrace.
- 4.21 The proposal to remove the external metal fire escape staircase and to take the staircore inbound within the building envelope is welcome in removing the external clutter. However, its proposed extension to provide access to the new roof garden level has resulted in high level bulk that disrupts the roof form and appearance. Its treatment in matching brickwork and glazing works in close views from the rear courtyard.
- 4.22 However, the orientation of the building and more modest building heights along this stretch of the King's Road result in the upward extension of the new service core (stair and lift) becoming visible above the consistent neighbouring roofline, reading as unattractive high-level bulk. The treatment in brickwork (albeit matching) and glazing serves to highlight the bulk. The glazing in particular is likely to catch the eye in bright sunlight or when internally illuminated, drawing attention to the high-level bulk, appearing discordant on the roofline.
- 4.23 The CGIs submitted confirm the roof extension is visible from Paultons Square

(east), where it detracts from the appearance of the host building and townscape in general. Similarly, the new plant and pergola are visually intrusive. Further CGIs are requested demonstrating its townscape impacts from within and around the garden square, and to the east and west along the King's Road.

- 4.24 Thought should be given to minimising the scale and appearance of the proposed roof extension, preparing options for further assessment. The options could include taking the core further inbound within the building footprint; removing or reducing the 'glazed' top to its minimum, reading similar to the roof lantern; recladding the structures in alternative materials (e.g., matching tiles or dark metalwork); or deleting the service core to roof level in this location and extending the existing core on the buildings north flank to provide access. It is notable that the existing brick core is in non-matching brickwork. Its rebuilding in a more sympathetic material finish is encouraged.
- 4.25 That perimeter planting is incorporated to provide a green boundary treatment and limit the wider visual impact of the rooftop use is welcome. However, the new roof plant and new pergola remain distinctly visible within the views from Paultons Square, adding rooftop clutter and impacting upon the roof form.
- 4.26 The new glass perimeter railing is not shown, though both the railing and the school children are likely to be visible in places on the skyline, intruding on the roof profile. The position, height and footprint of the plant should be reviewed to minimise its visual impact, as should the height and design of the pergola. The perimeter railing should be set back slightly further and/or the mansard roof slope marginally extended to help form the perimeter railing or partially obscure the roof garden, though the roof form itself should not become top-heavy.
- 4.27 As stated previously, if the roof space is to be used as play/ unsupervised breakout space, thought should be given to the provision of a rooftop mesh and/or creation of a MUGA, though the impact of the additional equipment must be carefully considered. Where the adjoining amenity and townscape impacts are of concern, thought could be given to sinking the outdoor space within mansard structure itself, though this has floorspace implications.

Conclusion

- 4.28 The amendments to the proposed school office and pupil entrance are welcome, providing a secure gate line and good informal surveillance that works sufficiently well with the host architecture, albeit the more legible entrance remains underused. The alterations to the entrances and fenestration are generally supported, though more could be done to support the richly detailed window openings at the front and industrial character at the rear.
- 4.29 The submission has confirmed the visual impacts of the proposed new services (including lift and stair housings) and equipment at roof level. The services and equipment present high-level bulk and clutter that impact upon the roof profile, harming both the host architecture and wider townscape, including views into and out of local conservation areas. Options should be explored to resolve the visual impacts or minimise the extent of harm, with any remaining harm possibly off-set by planning benefits.
- 4.30 However, the capacity of the existing building to properly accommodate a 3FE school

with 6th form and provide a building of high functional quality remains an outstanding concern and further information is requested. At this stage an objection is therefore maintained on design grounds.

Impact on neighbouring living conditions

- 4.31 There are concerns over the impact that this proposed use would have on neighbouring residents on King's Road and Mallord Street. These impacts include sound escape from the proposed school building to the neighbouring residents from the rear reverberant courtyard area, use of the classrooms and common parts across the party wall to the neighbouring flat, the use of the roof, noise from children arriving and departing the premises and the proposed building services plant to be installed in the basement.
- 4.32 There is a commercial kitchen to be installed within the school basement level, there will be noise escape and potential odours which will need to be addressed. All these factors need to be considered within an acoustic and odour control report, to outline how they can be controlled and what measures would be required to protect the amenity of residents.
- 4.33 The information submitted does not outline the hours of use of the building and the early morning / late evening use that may impact significantly on residents. There will be impacts from the arrival and departure of children and teachers to and from the school and noise from extra vehicles in the street in a predominantly residential area.
- 4.34 There is also concern about potential overlooking of properties on King's Road from the proposed outdoor roof space. A number of residential properties on King's Road have roof terraces which would be overlooked.

Transport considerations

Draft Transport Assessment

- 4.35 The use of travel survey data from The Hampshire School (THS) is considered to be acceptable, but additional data would be preferable to ensure that the forecasts made are as robust as possible. Use of data from the London Travel Demand Survey is also acceptable, but officers are not clear on how the applicant has used that data to draw the conclusion that there is on average a 50% reduction in pupils travelling to school by car between primary and secondary schools. This needs further explanation.
- 4.36 Notwithstanding the above, the principle of reducing the forecast car mode share from THS travel data is acceptable, but until further explanation is provided applying the 50% reduction indicated by the London Travel Demand Survey is not agreed. It is also the case that using a London wide average is not necessarily considered to be an accurate representation of school travel in RBKC. For instance, at THS 34% of pupils are recorded as travelling to school by car, but on average across RBKC the average figure for primary/preparatory schools is only 23% and whilst there is a material decrease in car use for secondary school pupils in the borough, down to 15%, this is only a 35% decrease.

- 4.37 The below tables set out average mode share from 2016-17 travel survey data taken from the 29 primary and five secondary schools across the borough, both state and independent, that had School Travel Plans in place at that time.

Fig.1 - Primary School Travel Data

Walking (inc scooter, buggy)	Car	Bus (inc school buses)
4,447 (55%)	1,843 (23%)	939 (12%)
Cycling	Underground	Overground
293 (4%)	425 (5%)	74 (1%)

Fig.2 - Secondary School Travel Data

Walking (inc scooter, buggy)	Car	Bus (inc school buses)
504 (34%)	225 (15%)	493 (33%)
Cycling	Underground	Overground
28 (2%)	111 (8%)	113 (8%)

- 4.38 Applying a 50% reduction in car mode, compared to THS data, the applicant forecasts that 17% of pupils, which equates to 73 pupils, would travel by car. Applying instead the 35% figure indicated by RBKC specific data, however, would mean 22% or 92 pupils travelling by car.
- 4.39 The THS, however, also records that the same number of pupils that travel by car, 34% or 141, also travel by school minibus. The applicant is proposing a limited minibus service of five minibuses for the new school, which at sixteen seats per bus would allow, as a maximum, 80 pupils (19%) to travel to school by that mode. *(The matter of how these five minibuses would be managed and stored when not in use, is also a point that needs further detail. Out of hours and overnight storage on surrounding local streets would not be acceptable)* The applicant recognises that there would be a shortfall in provision, compared to THS, so proposes to reallocate this unmet demand, 15% or 63 pupils, entirely to public transport. This approach is not agreed, with a proportion of minibus trips certain to be displaced to car trips.
- 4.40 As it stands, the forecast mode share set out in Table 5.7 of the draft TA is not agreed, with the car mode share considered to be a significant underestimate.
- 4.41 The use of parking occupancy data as the sole means to assess what the impact of the additional vehicle movements would be on traffic flow and highway conditions, is not supported. Officers' primary concern is not that there would be inadequate spare capacity to accommodate these additional vehicles, should they all wish to park at the kerbside for a period of time, but rather that the additional vehicle movements on Mallord Street would be prejudicial to the efficient operation of the highway, contrary to policy CT1(b).
- 4.42 The parking survey data submitted by the applicant is useful to confirm officers' view that parking occupancy on Mallord Street is already very high, with two and four spaces available in the AM and PM peak periods, but the extent of the area surveyed is well beyond that which is likely to be used by parents dropping off or picking up

their children. In reality it would likely only be Mallord Street itself and the closest sections of The Vale and Old Church Street, respectively, that would be used for this purpose.

- 4.43 Officers do not consider that the information provided demonstrates, or would demonstrate were it submitted in support of a full planning application, that the proposed school could operate in this location without giving rise to an unacceptable impact on the safe and efficient operation of the highway, contrary to policy CT1(b).

Draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

- 4.44 The proposed scheme does not propose any subterranean works and therefore policy CL7, which requires details on the proposed construction methodology to be submitted in support of the planning application, does not apply. The scale of physical works required to convert the building from its current use in to a school, however, would be significant and the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would certainly be secured by condition should planning permission ultimately be granted.
- 4.45 The applicant has submitted a draft CTMP, which has been prepared using the RBKC pro-forma. Given the early stage of the scheme, few details are known and no substantive information is provided on how the works would be undertaken. The various drawing numbers listed have not been submitted and it is not possible for officers to make any judgement on whether or not the proposed methodology, as far as it goes, would likely to acceptable or not.

Draft School Travel Plan

- 4.46 School Travel Plans (STP) are now produced, submitted and managed by means of the STARS website. At this stage, before a school exists, it is not possible to use the STARS website to create a draft STP document and therefore the submission of a paper based version is the best approach.
- 4.47 The proposed measures set out in the draft STP are largely as would be expected for a school in Inner London. They do not, however, overcome officers' concerns that a school of this size is not appropriate for this location.
- 4.48 It is also noted that The Hampshire School (THS), operated by the same applicant and located in close proximity to this site has not had a STP in place since 2014.

Draft Delivery and Servicing Management Plan

- 4.49 The submitted document is considered to provide a good basis for future versions. The proposed measures, especially the booking of deliveries outside of the drop-off and pick-up periods, are considered to be appropriate. This is however caveated by the fact that none of the supporting figures have been submitted at this stage.

Use and Management of Minibuses

- 4.50 Very limited information has been submitted in relation to how the school would utilise minibuses, both for conveying pupils to and from school at the start and end of the day, but also how they would be used throughout the day.
- 4.51 The absence of substantive on-site sports facilities and the lack of suitable facilities within a suitable walking distance of the site, likely make this inevitable. Details are requested on which off-site facilities would be used, how frequently they would be used and by how many pupils at a time. Details are required on where mini-buses would be stored when not in use throughout the day and overnight and at weekends.

Flooding and drainage

- 4.52 A Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy Statement (SuDSS) has been submitted for review and includes information on flood risk, SuDS and sewers.

Flood Risk

- 4.53 The site lies in a Flood Risk Zone 1 (low flood risk from the river) and it is outside a Critical Drainage Area so a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is not required with the planning application.
- 4.54 However, the Council's policy CL7n requires all basement development to be protected from sewer flooding through the installation of a suitable pumped device. The location of the suitable pump device to prevent sewer flooding should be shown in the proposed plans.

Sustainable Drainage Systems

- 4.55 Policy CE2e of the Consolidated Local Plan 2015 aims to reduce the amount and speed of surface water run-off in all development. The aim is to provide an overall betterment. Following the ministerial statement, all applications relating to major development should ensure that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. SuDS should provide attenuation for all rainfall events.
- 4.56 The 'SuDS options for Drainage Strategy' report proposes "to match existing flows for the 1 in 30 year, 15 minute event by offsetting the increase in foul flows resulting from the buildings change of use". This principle does not meet our current policy or the London Plan. The main problem in the Borough comes from surface water run-off entering a close-to-capacity combined sewer so maintaining the existing flows into the sewer will not be policy compliant. A thorough analysis of the discharge rate for all events up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change should be included in the Drainage Strategy and a substantial reduction of surface water run-off should be provided for all rainfall events.
- 4.57 The report explains that SuDS such as rainwater harvesting, green/sedum roofs, planters at roof level and permeable paving at ground level will be explored. It considers rainwater harvesting of limited merits to reduce surface water run-off. An attenuation tank at basement level is dismissed as "this introduces a significant flood risk to the building". I do not consider that an attenuation tank at basement level is the most sustainable option but I do not understand how it would introduce significant

flood risk to the building if properly implemented, managed and maintained.

4.58 Dual attenuation/rainwater harvesting tanks could be potentially implemented under the permeable paving at ground level. This could harvest water to be used in the basement to flush toilets. Blue/green roofs could also be combined at roof level to harvest water for re-use in the building. All these options should be thoroughly addressed at application stage.

4.59 The Drainage Strategy should include the following:

- An analysis of the discharge rate for all events up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change.
- An analysis of the SuDS which could be implemented on site taking into consideration the London Plan drainage hierarchy. SuDS should provide a substantial reduction of surface water run-off for all rainfall events. If SuDS are dismissed due to structural reasons, this should be supported by a statement from a qualified engineer.
- Information about the proposed sustainable drainage systems, their location, attenuation capacity, specification, structural integrity, construction, operation, and maintenance.
- Profile sections of the SuDS (for green roofs/blue roofs and permeable paving).
- Species for green roofs.
- Expected foul flows as a result of the change of use.
- Drainage drawings to understand how the whole drainage system will operate.

Other Material Considerations

Were the development permitted and built the landowner may be liable to pay the Mayor of London's and the Borough's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to contribute towards infrastructure. This figure is dependent on comprehensive floorspace information being submitted for the Council to calculate an accurate CIL liability. CIL liability is not fully confirmed until planning permission is granted when a CIL Liability Notice is served, and then when development commences when a CIL Demand Notice is served. More information about CIL can be found at: www.rbkc.gov.uk/cil

5.0 Consultations I recommend you carry out

5.1 I encourage you to discuss your proposals with all neighbours with a boundary with your site, as we will advise them of any application, as well as any residents' association. You may be able to deal with any concerns they may have before making the application and therefore avoid objections being submitted by them. Information on residents' associations is available here: <https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/community-and-local-life/communityengagement/community-groups-and-campaigns/residents-associations-4>

6.0 Information to accompany your application

6.1 Should you wish to submit an application following this advice, the easiest way to apply is electronically by registering on the Planning Portal at: <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/applications> Any application will need to be accompanied by the following information before it will be registered and considered. If you submit your application on paper rather than electronically we will need two sets of all information.

- Application form listed below (available at <http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/forms>) with all sections completed, signed and dated:
 - Full planning permission application form
- The correct fee. You can calculate your fee by using the Planning Portal: <https://1app.planningportal.co.uk/FeeCalculator/StandAlone?region=1> Alternatively, please telephone PlanningLine for assistance on 020 7361 3012. If you would like to pay by credit or debit card tell us who to call to take payment. Please make all cheques payable to 'Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea' and write the site address clearly on the reverse.
- Location Plan - based upon up-to-date map and ideally at scale of 1:1250, with the site boundary identified in red, and a blue line drawn around any adjacent land owned by the applicant.
- Site Plan - clearly indicating north, at a scale of 1:200 or 1:500, showing footprints of all buildings existing on site in relation to site boundaries and neighbouring buildings.
- All relevant existing and proposed floorplans, elevations and sections to a scale of 1:50 or 1:100. All plans should include the paper size, scale and a scale bar.
- All relevant existing floorplans, elevations and sections to a scale of 1:50 or 1:100 indicating all parts of the building to be demolished. All plans should include the paper size, scale and a scale bar.
- Design and access statement
- Heritage statement
- Photographs of the site
- Acoustic and odour control report
- Planning statement
- Construction Traffic Management Plan
- Completed CIL Form
- Completed CIL Calculator
- Completed S106 obligations calculator
- Draft heads of terms
- Drainage Strategy
- Evidence as to how you comply with Policy CE2(e) which requires sustainable urban drainage (SUDS), or other measures, to reduce both the volume and speed of water run-off to the drainage system. You are encouraged to use the Council's SUDS tool at: <https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/flooding/sustainable-drainage-systems>.

Further information about our flooding policies and evidence reports can be seen here

<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/flooding/flooding-planning-policies>

- Delivery and Servicing Management Plan
- Travel Plan
- Contamination - detailed desk top study and preliminary risk assessment

6.2 If any of these requirements are missing, we cannot consider your application until it is provided. If you are in any doubt, please take time to view the requirements at our website at:

<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-applications/guidance-and-advice/how-make-application/how> before you submit the application.