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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been prepared by London Communications Agency, working to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (Kensington and Chelsea). The Royal Borough is the co-sponsor of the academy along with lead sponsor the Aldridge Foundation and lead for the leisure centre.

The SCI relates to the community consultation that has taken place on proposals for a new academy and the rebuilding of Kensington Leisure Centre in the North of the borough.

This SCI forms part of the planning application documents, submitted in May 2012, for the Kensington Aldridge Academy and new Leisure Centre and seeks to demonstrate that a thorough approach has been taken to consultation.

It also reflects the guidance set out by the Department for Education (DfE) which expects Academy promoters to engage widely with both local communities and other interested parties when developing proposals for Academy Schools, and the Localism Bill which has a requirement for applicants to consult local communities on development proposals prior to the submissions of major planning applications.

This SCI focuses predominantly on the pre-application consultation on the designs for the Academy and Leisure Centre between January 2012 and May 2012. However, there are also sections on both the specific academy consultation which took place between May and June 2011 and the consultation on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These were key to informing the consultation strategy for the academy and leisure centre for the period leading up the application submission.
SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In relation to this document, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea is referred to as Kensington and Chelsea throughout.

2. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) outlines Kensington and Chelsea’s commitment to local community consultation in advance of submitting a detailed planning application to the planning department of the Council to build a new academy catering for 900 11-16 year olds with a sixth-form provision for 240 students, an Autism Spectrum Condition Centre for 20 students and a new leisure centre to replace the existing facility. The SCI is submitted as part of the full planning application.

3. The core of this document relates to consultation on the design proposals that took place between January 2012 and May 2012.

4. The consultation strategy agreed by Kensington and Chelsea, in partnership with the Aldridge Foundation was based on building on the positive engagement that took place with local communities and stakeholders through the academy consultation in mid 2011 and on the Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document) between November 2010 and February 2011. These are set out in sections 4 and 5.

5. The focus was to continue to provide opportunities for local residents, businesses and prospective parents to understand, comment on and influence the development of the design proposals for the academy and leisure centre before the application was submitted (see section 3, Consultation Strategy). Our approach to facilitating this is detailed below.

- Met with self appointed representatives of the Lancaster West Estate in July 2011 and there agreed to establish the residents forum (page 27)
- An architects’ exhibition in September 2011 showcasing the initial design ideas to the community before the lead architect’s, Studio E, were appointed to the project (page 22)
- Community briefing session held over two days in January 2012 providing an update on the project and the emerging designs (page 22)
- A pre-application public exhibition held over two days in April which set out the design proposals for the academy and leisure centre (page 25)
- Regular engagement with leisure centre users on both the emerging designs and the operational changes (page 12)
- Monthly meetings of the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) residents’ forum which began in September 2011 (page 27)
- Provision of up to date information on the proposals on both the Kensington Aldridge Academy and leisure centre sections of Kensington and Chelsea’s website as well as the Kensington Aldridge Academy website maintained by the lead sponsor (page 28)
- Continuation of regular newsletters distributed across the area to update local people on the proposals (page 28)
- Regular media activity to help publicise the proposals and the consultation events (Appendix Y).

6. A community briefing was held in January 2012 following the Council’s Cabinet decision in December 2011.

7. The pre-application exhibition was held over two days in April 2012.

8. At both the January and April events the attendees were given the opportunity to register their views through comments cards (Appendices L1 and T3).

9. Of the 59 who responded, 7 expressly noted their support of the proposals as a whole. 6 commented on their general disapproval of the plans whilst the majority of comments noted
suggestions and/or concerns on the various aspects of the proposals as detailed in sections 7 and 8.

10. The leisure centre consultation centred around three key meetings with current users and the Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club. These meetings took place in November 2011 and March 2012. Further engagement meetings took place in February 2012 and May 2012 as detailed in section 6.

11. The Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) residents forum which was established in September 2011, met six times to discuss the detailed proposals for the academy and leisure centre.

12. A webpage on the Kensington and Chelsea site was established in mid 2010. This aimed to provide an accessible way for people to obtain information about the project, to view the designs as they developed and to respond to consultations. The Aldridge Foundation established a website specifically on the academy for prospective parents as well as the local community.

13. A detailed Frequently Asked Questions document was developed, published on the website and referred to throughout the consultation (Appendix Z).

14. Three newsletters were produced between August 2011 and the submission of the planning application in May 2012 - Summer, Autumn and Winter editions. These sought to inform a wide number of residents, businesses and stakeholders about the progress of the project and publicise events where they could see and comment on the plans.

15. A project email address (kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk) was set up and all emails were replied to by the programme manager or relevant project team member.

16. Members of the council were informed about the proposals throughout the project and several attended the events including the community briefing sessions and the public exhibition.

17. Media coverage during the consultation can be found in Appendix Y.

18. In terms of quantifying the results of this detailed consultation programme, the following provides a summary of responses (please note there has been no attempt to de-duplicate responses to different elements of the consultation):

19. In analysing the responses, there is clear evidence of support for both the academy and the leisure centre. However during the early stages of the consultation in particular there were some concerns over both elements. Whilst the sponsors recognise that not everyone will support the proposals, many of these concerns have now been addressed and a number of key changes were made to the design. These are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough money is being invested in this project</td>
<td>£40.2 million of funding was agreed by the Council’s Cabinet in December 2011 in addition to the £17.6 million provided by the Government for the academy. This shows a significant investment in a challenging economic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements should be made to the estate and Grenfell Tower</td>
<td>This was raised as a priority by residents following comments made at the KALC residents’ forum. The Cabinet has agreed to fund the TMO to deliver a range of improvements to Grenfell Tower at a cost of £6m, which will be subject to further detailed design and consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regular communication on the</td>
<td>We set up resident and leisure forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about public spaces</td>
<td>Significant improvements to the public realm are being proposed and overall, the development retains the same level of public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will our play areas and football pitches be lost?</td>
<td>Investment to improve an underused playing pitch has been made five minutes away at the Westway Sports Centre. The current play area will stay on site but be significantly enhanced along with other improvements to nearby green spaces. In addition there will be a multi-use games area as part of the academy which will be available for the community to use at agreed times. This has increased the capacity there in the knowledge that like for like pitches at Lancaster West would be lost as a result of the new development.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leisure centre changing facilities need improvement</td>
<td>There will be different changing areas in the new leisure centre including dedicated male and female swimming changing areas, family changing areas, two group changing areas and ‘Dry’ activities male / female change areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leisure centre’s facilities need to be better laid out</td>
<td>Customers of the proposed new leisure centre would only have to travel small distances to reach the facilities and changing areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are insufficient aids such as overhead tracking hoists for swimmers with disabilities and their carers</td>
<td>The swimming pools will have number of design features which will make them more accessible including hoists, shallow steps and a moveable floor in the training pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dry side hire of spaces is limited and more flexibility in the design and use of these spaces (e.g. for dance studios) is needed</td>
<td>All the dry side activity spaces are being designed with more than one use in mind. For example, the two squash courts can be easily converted into one room and could be used as a children’s play area or for parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the proposals as green as possible</td>
<td>We expect to achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method) “excellent” rating which would mean a significantly reduced carbon footprint and lower fuel bills. Green features will include bicycle docking stations, green roofs and solar panels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. The changes set out above demonstrate that Kensington and Chelsea carefully considered the responses gained during the consultation in developing the detailed designs for the academy.

21. There will be further consultation via the statutory consultation process on these proposals once an application is submitted.

22. If the planning application is approved, Kensington and Chelsea and the Aldridge Foundation will continue to engage regularly with local communities throughout the construction process. In addition, Kensington and Chelsea will engage further with leisure centres users on alternative provision once the leisure centre is being redeveloped.
SECTION 3: CONSULTATION STRATEGY

1. The aims of the consultation process were to engage widely and regularly with local communities and other interested parties throughout the period leading up the submission of the planning application.

2. This commitment reflects and incorporates the guidance from the DfE on consultation around the development of proposals for academies.

3. It also meets the guidance set out in the Localism Act (2011) which sets out a requirement for community engagement in advance of the submission of major planning applications.

4. The strategy also needed to reflect the engagement that had already taken place on the proposed Planning Brief (SPD) between November 2010 and February 2011 and on the Academy proposals in May and June 2011.

5. Bearing this in mind the focus of the overarching consultation strategy specifically sought to:
   - build on the previous consultations on the SPD during 2010/11 and the Kensington Aldridge Academy. These had established relationships with a wide range of stakeholders across the local area
   - outline the design for the Academy, layout and stages involved in developing a new school
   - outline the design for the new Leisure Centre and the changes and improvements for the existing centre
   - provide key stakeholders in the local and wider community with opportunities to input into the process before the detailed planning application was submitted.

6. In delivering this strategy Kensington and Chelsea, and the Aldridge Foundation, developed the following comprehensive approach:
   - A community 'drop in' event held over two days to introduce people to the emerging designs for the academy and leisure centre (January 2012)
   - A two day pre-application public exhibition of the designs (April 2012)
   - A continuing series of newsletters to provide regular updates on the project and its progress
   - Ongoing development and updates to both the websites – www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk
   - Regular meetings with the established residents forum to proactively engage with residents, while also maintaining a policy of attending any meeting reasonably requested by interested parties.

This was also underpinned by a rolling media programme to publicise consultation events and key stages in the programme.
1. In advance of the planning application for the new academy and leisure centre, Kensington and Chelsea prepared a planning brief to provide guidance for how the site should be developed.

2. The purpose of this was to guide future planning applications on how to address the key issues in developing the site, such as its layout and vehicular and pedestrian connections as well as examining ways of minimising the impact on existing residents.

3. The preparation of this brief followed work undertaken by architects John McAslan and Partners, who were commissioned by Kensington and Chelsea to prepare a feasibility study in May 2010 and come forward with options for the site that would integrate into the local area, link well with local transport, improve the current street pattern and allow for two high quality buildings and some housing.

4. A first stage of consultation with residents took place before a draft of the brief was prepared. This included a ‘snap and say’ consultation event on Saturday 20 November 2010, where 50 residents attended a series of walking tours, photographing the area as well as taking part in map-based exercises and answering a survey. This gave officers a better understanding of residents’ concerns, which were largely focussed on the loss of open space (known as Lancaster Green) for the building of a school. Officers also heard from local residents about what they wanted from their leisure centre.

5. A further consultation workshop was held in the evening of 2 December 2010, during which officers provided feedback from the 20 November 2010 session. Approximately 40 residents attended this workshop.

6. A further presentation of the same feedback material was given to the Estate Management Board of Lancaster West Estate on 6 December 2010.

7. A survey was also made available in the winter of 2010/2011. This was delivered to all residents living adjacent to the site, as well as being made available at consultation events and on-line. 119 responses were received.

8. A draft brief of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was then issued for public consultation for 6 weeks. Three events were held. The first was an afternoon drop-in held in the Estate Management Board Hall on 2nd February 2011. This event was attended by around 20 members of the public.

9. The second was held at the Lighthouse Centre on Lancaster Road on the evening of 9 February 2011. This event gave local residents and Leisure Centre users a chance to publicly ask questions about some of the decisions and assumptions made by the Council in the brief. Around 30 members of the public were in attendance.

10. A final event was held on 22 February 2011 at the Leisure Centre. Around 80 visitors attended this session which took the form of a drop-in. Among the many issues raised, those of most concern were the decision to favour a vehicular north-south connection as opposed to a purely pedestrian link and the loss of open space.

11. Following the end of this consultation, the SPD was finalised and presented to and agreed by the Council’s Cabinet on 9 May 2011. It was subsequently adopted on 16 May 2011 and is now adopted as a material consideration in determining planning applications.

1. As part of funding agreements for new academies, sponsors are required to undertake a formal consultation process with local communities and a wide range of stakeholders.

2. This enables local people and stakeholders to meet with the sponsors, read and hear about the ethos and vision of the Academy as well as make comments on the emerging proposals.

3. The Academy consultation took place between 16 May and 26 June 2011 and was led by the sponsors of the Academy, Kensington and Chelsea and the Aldridge Foundation.

4. The consultation included a wide range of events including a public meeting on 16 May at the St Clement James Centre. This was publicised in advance with approximately 22,800 leaflets, advertising the event, to the local catchment area. A press release was issued on 7 June and was reflected in the K&C Chronicle newspaper and website. The event was also referred to on the Aldridge Academy website and the academy and leisure centre pages of the Kensington and Chelsea website.

5. Approximately 150 people attended the public meeting including local residents, members of the Grenfell Action Group, prospective parents and people interested in education provision in the borough. Members of the council present were Cllr Elizabeth Campbell, Cllr Timothy Coleridge, Cllr Judith Blakeman and Cllr Todd Foreman.

6. The meeting enabled people to ask any questions about the academy and also the leisure centre. The sponsors therefore provided the following representatives so that any question could be answered:
   - Honor Wilson-Fletcher, CEO, Aldridge Foundation
   - Rebecca Matthews, Director of Schools, Kensington and Chelsea
   - Penelope Tollitt – Kensington and Chelsea, Planning
   - James Masini – Kensington and Chelsea, Planning
   - Geoff Burrage – Kensington and Chelsea, Transport
   - Yinka Odusina – Kensington and Chelsea, Housing
   - Ullash Karia – Kensington and Chelsea, Leisure
   - Steven Bell – Kensington and Chelsea, Property Services

7. A summary of this meeting is provided in Appendix A.

8. The sponsors subsequently held a community ‘drop in’ event on Tuesday 21 June 2011 from 5.30pm to 9pm at the Lighthouse West London, 111-117 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QT. This enabled people to come along and ask any questions of the sponsor group.

9. This event was attended by the following representatives from the group:
   - Sally Lawson-Ritchie, Director Aldridge Foundation
   - Honor Wilson-Fletcher, CEO Aldridge Foundation
   - Rebecca Matthews, Kensington and Chelsea, Director of Schools
   - Peter Bradbury, Kensington and Chelsea, Family and Children Services
   - Penelope Tollitt – Kensington and Chelsea, Planning (and representing housing and transport)
   - Ullash Karia – Kensington and Chelsea, Leisure

10. Councillors present were Elizabeth Campbell, Timothy Coleridge, Judith Blakeman and Todd Foreman.

11. In total 22 people made written comments on the plans.

12. Of these 77.3 per cent (i.e. 17) were in favour of the proposed academy. 18.2 per cent of respondents (i.e. 4) were opposed to the proposed academy. 4.5 per cent of respondents (i.e. 1) were undecided.
13. Respondents who were in favour of the Academy commented that it “would be an excellent addition to the community” and it “would greatly enhance the variety of what is on offer and become a tower of strength for the whole community”.

14. Respondents also acknowledged there is a need for school places in the borough and that the Academy would “improve the area, give it a heart and bring it into the 21st century”.

15. The respondents not in favour of the Academy expressed concern over the proposed site location and its close vicinity to a “deprived council estate”. One response questioned the disruption to the elderly and disabled residents, along with a sense of dissatisfaction about the initial consultation with the residents.

16. In addition to the public meeting, representatives of the sponsors also met with the following organisations, groups and individuals.

- 25/5/11 Cllrs Blakeman and Foreman
- 15/6/11 Head of Barlby Primary School
- 20/6/11 Grenfell Action Group
- 23/6/11 Y3 parents of St Clements and St James Primary
- 6/7/11 Westway Development Trust
- 6/7/11 Deputy Head of Middlerow Primary
- 11/7/11 Wesley Square Residents Association
- 12/7/11 Headteacher and staff at Thomas Jones Primary
- 19/7/11 Golborne Forum
- 1/9/11 Residents of Lancaster West Estate
- 22/9/11 Y4 parents of Middlerow Primary
- 22/9/11 Wesley Square Residents Association

17. A consultation document was produced following this process and is set out in Appendix B.

Further community involvement

18. Following the formal consultation process, the Aldridge Foundation has undertaken two further elements of community engagement on the education offer of the academy. These include:

- visits by Kensington and Chelsea and the Aldridge Foundation to local primary schools to meet with parents and staff
- the creation of a Sponsor Partnership Group, led by the Aldridge Foundation, which focuses solely on the academy and has allowed for the engagement with a number of local stakeholders from a range of education, community and resident groups. These including the following invited members:
  - Holland Park School
  - Sion Manning RC Girls School
  - St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College
  - Thomas Jones Primary School
  - Westway Development Trust
  - Clement James Centre
  - The Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea Centre
  - Notting Barn Ward Councillors
  - Avondale Park Primary School
  - Bevington Primary School
  - Colville Primary School
  - Barlby Primary School
  - Middlerow Primary School
  - Oxford Gardens Primary School
  - Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation
  - Golborne Forum
  - Lancaster Youth Centre
- Golborne Youth Centre
- The Rugby Portobello Trust
- Portobello Business Centre
- The Harrow Club W10
- K&C Cabinet Member for Education
- Local Residents
- Walmer School
- Director of Housing, RBKC
- Charterhouse
- Godolphin & Latymer
- LAMDA
- Royal Academy of Dance
- Kensington & Chelsea Social Council
SECTION 6: LEISURE CENTRE CONSULTATION

1. Kensington and Chelsea have consulted widely on the proposals for a new leisure centre between November 2011 to May 2012. Meetings have been held with current leisure centre users and clubs in addition to the pre application exhibition and community briefing sessions. Leisure centre operator, Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) has been involved in each event held.

2. A Public Realm Scrutiny Committee Working Group on Leisure Facilities, comprising Cllr Joanna Gardner, Cllr Barbara Campbell and Cllr Pat Mason, conducted consultation with a range of current users and non-users of the leisure centre, and their report included a list of suggestions for a new centre based on this consultation, which has been passed to the architects. The full report is available on the Council’s website. The committee met on the following dates:

- 20 October 2010
- 25 November 2010 - visit to Northolt Leisure Centre
- 9 December 2010
- 11 March 2011
- 11 and 13 April 2011 - interviews with user and non user groups of Kensington Leisure Centre
- 13 and 29 June 2011 - focus group sessions with young people
- 20 July 2011 – tour of Kensington Leisure Centre facilities (Cllr Gardner and Cllr Mason only)
- 2 August 2011 - discussion with residents’ group representatives

3. Following the appointment of the project architect’s in September 2011 there have been three key meetings held on the leisure centre proposals:

- Wednesday 2 November 2011 – Leisure centre user forum
- Thursday 22 March 2012 – Chelsea & Westminster Swimming Club
- Wednesday 28 March 2012 – Leisure centre user forum

4. There have also been further engagement meetings with groups such as Big Voice (February 2012), Al Manaar and a group of parents in May 2012. The proposals were also discussed regularly at the residents’ forum and Kensington and Chelsea gave a more detailed update at the resident forum held on 30 November.

First leisure centre user forum – 2 November 2011

1. The first leisure centre user forum was held on Wednesday 2 November 2011 from 6 - 8pm. The event was promoted to current leisure centre users and a letter and poster was also displayed in the leisure centre reception in advance of the forum (Appendix C1, C2).

2. Kensington and Chelsea leisure services officers, Kensington Leisure Centre staff (GLL) and both Studio E (lead architect) and LA Architects (leisure centre architects) were present with LA leading a presentation on emerging ideas on what the new leisure centre could include. A Q&A session was held after the presentation.

3. The materials used included a presentation by LA Architects on what could be included in the design of a new leisure centre and comment forms were also available for attendees to fill out.

Results of first leisure centre user forum

5. Approximately 60 people attended the first user forum on 2 November 2011.

6. Attendees were encouraged to fill out comment response forms to help develop the design of the new leisure centre (Appendix C3). Users were asked three main questions:
What do you think the most important considerations are for the design of the new leisure centre? (think about spaces around the building, the layout, the environmental impact of the building)
What are the most important facilities for the leisure centre to provide?
Are there any particular issues that the new leisure centre needs to address, to make sure it serves the local community effectively? (for example, services that the current leisure centre provides which you feel it is important to continue)

7. Recurring points of discussion which arose from the responses (measured on the number of people who mentioned a topic and not the number of comments on a topic):

- Preference of 33m Pool (10)
- Preference for the centre to be left as it is and stay open or refurbished (9)
- Easier accessibility to the centre (9)
- What will existing users / clubs do whilst the centre is closed? (7)
- 25m Pool benefits (6)
- Lavatories access / quality / changing rooms (6)
- Timescale (5)
- Expense of project and consequential affordability issues (4)
- Sauna / Steam room (3)
- A new gym (2)
- Sport Centre should be modernised or rebuilt (2)
- Bicycle parking facility (2)
- Larger facility for group classes (2)
- Outside Space (2)

8. Kensington and Chelsea noted the main points raised during the event which included a preference for a 33m pool instead of 25m, the option to refurbish the current facility rather than build a new centre and the length of time the centre would have to be closed during construction.

9. During the event Kensington and Chelsea responded accordingly and noted that a decision made by the Council’s Cabinet in December 2011 would confirm what option for the leisure centre would be taken forward.

10. A detailed Questions & Answers (FAQ) document was produced in response to points raised and all comments were fed back to LA Architects (Appendix D1).

11. A letter detailing the results of the comment responses received and a copy of the FAQs was sent to those who attended the meeting (Appendix D2)

Meeting with Chelsea & Westminster Swimming Club - 22 March 2012

1. Kensington and Chelsea and LA Architects met with the Chelsea & Westminster Swimming Club on Thursday 22 March 2012 to discuss the leisure centre proposals.

2. The main points discussed during the meeting included:

- Concern over the large distance between the main pool and the training pool, consider the implementation of a corridor between the two as opposed to going through the changing room
- A coach from the club requested that a camera is fitted for stroke analysis and development of swimmers. LA Architects seemed interested in the idea and agreed to look into it
- Arguments against the leisure pool proposed for the new centre. Reasons being that there is a suitable one in St. Marks Park, waste of space, applications can rust and break
• Changing rooms – complaints that there will be a large volume of traffic, both people changing and others passing through travelling from pool to pool

• The changing rooms will be bigger than the current in square meters

• Visibility of the changing rooms with people being able to see in but also, if large groups, teachers or parents for example being able to see everyone

• Many parents were in favour of a ‘changing room village’ and against individual changing rooms.

• Natural Light – Swimmers claimed to not want people to be able to watch them swim from the outside but want natural light. Possible solution of frosted windows

• Lane assist on the ceiling for swimmers, helping them stay in a straight line

3. Kensington and Chelsea was given positive feedback on the plans following the meeting and the Club also commented on the meeting in the eleventh issue of their newsletter (Appendix E).

Second leisure centre user forum – 28 March 2012

1. The second leisure centre user forum was held on Wednesday 28 March 2012. The event was promoted to leisure centre users and posters were displayed in the centre in advance (Appendix F). Those who attended noted a lack of communication on the progress of plans and short notice of when the forum would be taking place.

2. Kensington and Chelsea and GLL were present with GLL chairing the discussion on the current leisure centre operation and the proposals for a new leisure centre. Attendees were also updated on the pre-application exhibition.

Results of second leisure centre user forum

3. This section analyses the comments made during the second leisure centre forum on 28 March. 9 people attended and there was a mix of questions raised on the general operation of the current centre, membership fees and the proposals for the new centre. Attendees were encouraged to sign in to be kept up to date with the plans.

4. One of the key points discussed was the main pool size, with various attendees noting the petition raised by swimmers opposing the proposed 25m pool. Kensington and Chelsea responded noting the Council’s Cabinet decision made in December 2011 which agreed that a new leisure centre with a 25m pool was the preferred option.

5. Kensington and Chelsea noted an eight lane 25m pool would allow for teaching and training at all levels, fitness swimming, competitions and distance swimming at all standards that would meet Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) standards and it raised that the ASA would oppose any decision to remain with a 33m pool.

6. Questions and answers given during the discussion relevant to the proposals include:

• Have the staff been told when the leisure centre is going to close and what is going to happen to them once it is closed?
• When is the centre closing?
• There is a rumour that there isn’t enough funding for the new leisure centre, is this true?
• Will any of the facilities be available to use during the redevelopment?
• How long will the build take to complete?
• When do we get a chance to see the plan and talk about the finishes?
• How do we find out about things? I think there needs to be bigger advertising and a notice board specifically for clients.
• What guarantee will the council (GLL) give that clubs can still access the facilities as much as they do at the moment?
• Are sports development in a position to support / lobby for clubs?
• Can the gym equipment be put into another room or space?
• What provision are the council and or GLL going to put in place for swimmers to get to another pool?
• In the consultation about the new pool, it seems that you favour organisations, schools and minority groups. Do you think you could do better? Ordinary swimmers were not consulted.
• Why didn’t you send an e-mail to members to ask for their views?
• What is the length of the pool going to be?
• Is there anything that has changed because of customer input about the new leisure centre?
• I’ve heard that some of these 25m pools no longer have a gully. Will the new pool have a gully?
• The ASA have said that they would not insist that the side of the pool needs to be smooth so why does it have to be here?
• What will be the mechanism for clubs and schools to work with GLL to find facility time at their other centres?
• Once the contractors are in will we have a date for closure and opening?
• Could the plans for the new leisure centre be moved to the Town Hall after it is held at the Methodist church?
• What is the scope for a portable pool?

7. Kensington and Chelsea responded to questions raised as follows:

• Is there anything that has changed because of customer input about the new leisure centre?
  − There are many examples of this. We received feedback stating the current swimming pool changing rooms provide insufficient privacy and their mixed use is unpopular so we are proposing a range of changing areas, including male, female, family and group. All will be accessible for disabled people.
  − Centre users also stated there are insufficient aids such as overhead tracking hoists for users with disabilities and their carers and in response the new swimming pools will have number of design features which will make them more accessible including hoists, shallow steps and a moveable floor in the training pool.

• In response to questions raised regarding the next steps, rumours of lack of funding, closure and reopening dates and staff management:
  − The Cabinet committed to providing £24.7 million for a new leisure centre and £5.1 million for public realm improvements and other enabling works. Funding for the leisure centre is coming from the Council’s own capital reserves and is not dependent on grants.
  − A public exhibition showcasing the latest proposals will be held on 19 and 21 April. Following this event the aim is to submit plans on the 25 May 2012. We expect a decision will be made at the Planning Committee meeting on 6 September 2012. If the application is successful we would expect the leisure centre to close from January to April 2013. The rebuild will take approximately 18 – 20 months and the centre would reopen in the autumn of 2014. Chelsea Sports Centre will remain open during this time.
  − In March 2011 just prior to GLL taking over the leisure contract, they made a made a commitment that all existing staff would find employment at their other sites for the duration of closure.

• In response to questions on keeping centre users informed and how they can comment on the plans:
We have consulted on the plans widely over the last eighteen months. There have been a number of consultation events on the academy and leisure centre between November 2010 and September 2011. Following these events the first meeting of the Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) User forum took place on 2 November 2011 where only current users of the centre received an invitation.

Previously, consultation events held at the centre and other local buildings and were open to all interested people including local residents, current centre users and representatives of local groups. At all these meetings the future of the leisure centre was an agenda item and discussed.

There will be a public exhibition on 19 and 21 April. The aim of this exhibition is to update the local community and leisure centre users on the latest proposals for the academy and leisure centre. The exhibition will include the most up to date designs and a model. Members of the project team, including the architects, will be on hand to answer questions. The architects will also give a presentation on the designs. This will also be an opportunity for everyone to comment on the detailed designs and give their feedback on the proposals.

In response to questions regarding the future of swimming in the new centre including the length, inclusion of a gully and favouring organisations, schools and minority groups:

- From the very outset of the public consultation over the new leisure centre, we heard the views of several current users who enjoy the 33 metre pool length. We knew that reducing the length to 25 metres would not be welcomed by these users. We did not set aside their opinions lightly. However, we had to take account a number of other considerations when deciding the optimum length and breadth of the new pool. These included the following:

- We wanted the new leisure centre to meet the needs of everyone, including people and families who are not necessarily interested in distance swimming and who simply want to have fun in the water. We wanted therefore to build a leisure pool as well as a conventional swimming pool. We hoped by doing so to draw local people into the new leisure centre who might never have used it before.

- We knew the footprint of the new leisure centre was limited by the amount of land available; we had to have regard to the overall cost of the new centre as well. We were concerned that if we designed in a 33 metre swimming pool it could make it difficult to fit in, or afford, a decent sized leisure pool as well as a training pool.

- We wanted the pool to be wider than it is now, with two extra lanes, so the potential for conflict between different users could be reduced. Eight lanes would give us the capacity to offer much more opportunity for general and lanes swimming, as well as a wide variety of club pursuits, lessons and school sessions.

- We wanted a pool which meets Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA). The Amateur Swimming Association also wrote to us at some length, concluding that they would positively oppose any decision to remain with a 33.3 metre length.

- The Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC), which has 400 members, wrote to us making several compelling points in favour of a wider pool with a 25 metre length.

- The Council weighed up these competing considerations and concluded that an eight lane 25 metre pool with a leisure pool and a training pool would provide the optimum mix of water facilities in the new leisure centre. It would mean a pool that can provide for teaching at all levels, for fitness swimming, fitness training such as aqua aerobics, distance swimming at all standards and competitive.
− The proposed teaching pool would add further flexibility; we are currently investigating the provision of a 20m x 10m tank with a movable floor. This would provide excellent swim teaching space, allowing fewer lessons in the main pool and therefore a wider range of times in the main pool for fitness swimming and club use.

− Finally, there will be gullies at the side of the pool for swimmers to hold on to.

- In response to questions about using the facilities during construction and a temporary pool:
  - We have reviewed whether these suggestions could be incorporated when building the new centre however the current leisure centre is the result of three different build programmes and there is difficulty in finding adequate space within a ten minute walk of the existing facility to provide temporary facilities. Therefore, it is proposed that the whole of the centre will need to close entirely during construction.

- In response to questions about current users accessing alternative facilities:
  - Discussions are already under way with centre operator GLL on how they can assist current users. GLL operate in London with thirteen other local authorities including Westminster and Hammersmith and Fulham.
  - Three centres are approximately a mile away from Kensington Leisure Centre. These include Phoenix Fitness Centre and Janet Adegoke Swimming Pool which is 1 mile away to the east, Porchester Centre is 1.1 miles away to the north, and the Jubilee Sports Centre which is 1.2 miles away the north). Additionally the new Holland Park School facilities are only 0.7 miles to the south.
  - GLL has experience in handling leisure centre redevelopments and in keeping disruption to service users to a minimum. Chelsea Sports Centre will remain open during the rebuilding of the leisure centre. GLL will also be considering how to facilitate travel to proposed alternative centres.
  - We will also talk to our local schools and other local providers such the Westway Development Trust, particularly to see if they can accommodate clubs and sports hall users.
  - We want to continue to support our local voluntary sector and have thriving affiliated sports club scene. Therefore, we will work closely with clubs and the operator in order to programme their present level activities into the new facilities

Other engagement meetings

Meeting with Big Voice – 9 February 2012

1. Kensington and Chelsea met with Big Voice, a self advocacy project targeted at adults with a learning disability, on 9 February 2012 from 1.30 – 3.00pm at the Venture Centre to discuss the proposals.

2. Four of the seven members at the meeting attend sessions at the leisure centre and take part in activities such as multi-sports, boccia, badminton, strictly dance and swimming (training and main pool)

3. The following questions and answers were discussed at the meeting:

- Why were Learning Disabilities services not told about the consultation?
  - Learning Disabilities services were informed about the consultation at the Learning Disability health sub group. In future e-mails will be sent to all organisations through the CSPAN.
• Will there be another consultation?
  – Yes there will be. This will be communicated to Big Voice through Karen Ludford.

• Could the consultation be held during the day so that people can be supported by services to attend?
  – No time or date has been confirmed for the next consultation.

• Why don’t you build on another site?
  – This was looked into however there is not another suitable site in north Kensington.

• When do you plan to close the centre?
  – There is no date as of yet for when the centre will be closed for redevelopment. Plans will be submitted in August 2012.

• Where will people go to play sport when the building is closed?
  – There is no definite answer for this yet. This is all being considered and where possible sessions will be moved to alternative locations.

• Will there be a changing places toilet in the new building?
  – Yes.

• Will there be easy read signs in the new building?
  – Christopher Allen will bring this up at the next KALC meeting.

• Will the water in the pool be warmer?
  – The water temperature will be set according to Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity regulations.

• People with high support needs don’t want to have to change in the same space as parents and families. Will there be separate changing rooms for disabled users.
  – There will be a Changing Places toilet / changing area. There will not be a separate changing room for disabled users.

• Will there be a proper tracking hoist in the disabled changing area?
  – Yes.

• Will there be a proper pool side hoist?
  – Yes and it will be an up to date model.

• Will there be a ramp into the pool for people who have difficulty walking?
  – No.

• Does the new leisure centre have a lift?
  – Yes.

• Will there be public transport near the leisure centre?
  – There are currently no negotiations with TFL about this however this could be discussed in the future.

• Will free sessions for disabled users remain free?
  – Yes any existing sessions for disabled users which are currently free and are successfully relocated once the leisure centre closes for redevelopment will continue to be subsided by The Royal Borough.

Informal discussion with parents – 3 May 2012

1. On 3 May a Research and Information Officer within the Bi-Borough Environment, Leisure Resident Leisure Services (ELRS) team had informal discussions in the leisure centre café with
parents of children taking swimming lessons regarding the proposed pool layout and play area for
the new leisure centre.

2. The feedback given confirmed the proposed offering a leisure pool and soft play area will
appropriately service the current users. All comments were fed back to Kensington and Chelsea.

3. Comments noted include:

  • There should be temperature controls for showers and they should be visually clear and easy
to use so that children can also operate them.

  • Lockers should be as close to the changing rooms as possible, not in a public area.

  • Opinion was mixed on the layout of the pools - some noted having one child in the main pool
and one (or more) at the other side might be an issue, particularly if both swimming lessons for
each child finish at the same time. Those in favour of the layout thought it would be better to
have the pools separated to keep older children away from the younger groups, particularly
when they are being taught in the teaching pool.

  • A splash area is generally a good idea and the location next to the teaching pool is ideal as
parents could take their youngest child to the splash area whilst the older child has lessons.

  • A jungle / play area is expected in the new centre as the splash area has a much smaller
range of audience. Pricing of the play area will be important and a spectator/drinks area
nearby will be needed if not it will be difficult to use.

  • Important to provide fun pool activities for older children at weekends such as slides.

  • Family changing rooms are important and there needs to be enough of them. Facilities for
holding / putting down babies within the changing rooms would be very useful.

  • The current toilet doors are too heavy and need to be improved in the new centre.

  • The current pool spectator area gets too hot to sit in - can this be improved.

Meeting with Al Manaar – 17 May 2012

1. Kensington and Chelsea met with members of the Al Manaar group at the Muslim Cultural
Heritage Centre on the 17 May 2012.

2. The aim of the meeting was to discuss the proposals for the new leisure centre with female
members of Al Manaar including what they would like to see in the new centre.

3. The group raised the issue of women only swimming in the borough. They cannot use the current
leisure centre because it is open to viewing by the public. They would like to have access to a
swimming pool, sauna, steam room and gym.

4. The discussion highlighted the need to offer flexible sectioning off of the training pool for certain
groups of users.

5. Questions and answers discussed at the meeting are detailed as follows:

  • Could the members have swimming lessons and early swimming lessons?
    − The two pools have been designed to be separate and therefore, we will have more
      flexibility than at present to offer closed off swimming session at these times and offer
      lessons in the teaching pool.

  • Could they have an open day at the leisure centre allocated to them?
Leading up to the opening of the new centre, we can more fully discuss with the management of the centre how best to show round people the new facilities.

- Could there be more staff to support elderly in the gym?
  - The centre management will take this into consideration when the elderly are using the fitness suite.

- Will there be massage services for them?
  - There will be a spa in the new leisure centre and if the demand is there, then this would be offered.

- Will there be reasonable prices for the swimming pool?
  - There are currently concessionary leisure passes with discounts for the over 60s and this will continue when the new centre is open.

- Could they have female life guards while using the swimming pool?
  - Yes, there would be female lifeguards during the sessions when the teaching pool is closed off from public gaze for women only sessions.

Summary of key issues raised during leisure centre consultation

1. The two main reoccurring objections raised about the proposals for a new leisure centre during the consultation events have been the change in size of the main pool from a six lane 33m pool to an eight lane 25m pool and what temporary provision would be available to users once the centre closes.

2. A petition opposing the proposals for a 25m pool with 206 signatures was organised by a group of early morning swimmers and submitted to Kensington and Chelsea.

3. Kensington and Chelsea acknowledged the concerns raised by those who prefer a 33m pool and considered their arguments however concluded that a 25m pool with a leisure pool and a training pool would provide the optimum mix of water facilities in the new leisure centre.

4. Other considerations for the 25m pool are detailed below.

- Currently the pool is 6 lanes, which is partitioned off to allow for swimming clubs to use for sessions.
- A 25-metre, eight lane swimming pool would allow for teaching and training at all levels, fitness swimming, competitions and distance swimming at all standards
- The pool which would meet Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) standards.
- The Amateur Swimming Association wrote to Kensington and Chelsea at some length, concluding that they ‘would positively oppose any decision to remain with a 33.3 metre length (Appendix G)
- Kensington and Chelsea wanted the pool to be wider than it is now, with two extra lanes, so the potential for conflict between different users could be reduced.
- The Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC), which has 400 members, wrote to Kensington and Chelsea making several compelling points in favour of a wider pool with a 25 metre length (Appendix H).

5. The Kensington and Chelsea sent a detailed response letter to the petitioner detailing the considerations noted above (Appendix I).

6. Correspondence between Kensington and Chelsea, local Councillors and leisure centre users regarding the pool have been answered accordingly with the considerations noted above.
7. Kensington and Chelsea has also noted concerns raised by leisure centre users on the closure of
the centre during construction. Kensington and Chelsea understands the centre is well used and
centre users will want to continue accessing a facility whilst the centre is closed. Kensington and
Chelsea, alongside GLL, will be assisting current users with accessing alternative leisure centres
whilst the new facility in North Kensington is being built.

8. Details of alternative leisure centres, as well as how users can work with Kensington and Chelsea
and GLL on temporary provisions has been communicated at each consultation event and in the
pre-application exhibition brochure.
SECTION 7: COMMUNITY BRIEFING SESSIONS ON THE EMERGING DESIGNS

1. In September 2011 Studio E were appointed as the lead architects for the project after a design competition. Prior to this the six shortlisted firms had displayed their initial ideas on the designs at the EMB Hall at Grenfell Tower on 12 September. Members of the public were invited to attend and comment on the design ideas (Appendix J).

2. Following the architects’ exhibition, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet decided in December 2011 to take the proposals forward and commit £40.2 million of funding, in addition to the £17.6 million provided by the Government for the academy. A press release was issued announcing the Council’s Cabinet decision on 13 December (Appendix K). Kensington and Chelsea subsequently held community briefing sessions to discuss the next steps and showcase the emerging designs.

3. The two briefing sessions were held on the 26 and 28 January 2012 at the Kensington Leisure Centre on Walmer Road.

4. To ensure sessions could be easily attended by the local community the following time slots were chosen:
   - 4.00pm to 8.00pm, Thursday 26 January
   - 10.00am to 2.00pm, Saturday 28 January

5. To communicate the briefing sessions to local people, Kensington and Chelsea used a number of tools:
   - A5 leaflets were produced and sent to local residents two weeks before the sessions. The leaflets also included a detachable freepost comment card which residents could send back if they were unable to attend the event (Appendix L).
   - Posters were displayed around the Lancaster estate and in the Kensington leisure centre (Appendix L1).
   - A press release was published in the Kensington and Chelsea Chronicle on 20 January – a week before the exhibition (Appendix M and N).
   - A Winter edition of the project newsletter was sent out, promoting the exhibition to 10,000 people in the Norland and Notting Barns wards (Appendix O).
   - Copies of the newsletter were also sent to resident associations in Norland and Notting Barns wards and 100 copies each were sent to 15 headteachers in both wards so they could be displayed in the following local schools: Avondale Park, St Clement, St Francis, Thomas, Colville, Oxford Gardens, Sion Manning, St Charles, Bevington, Fox, Barlby, St Thomas, Middle Row, St Mary Roman Catholic, St Barnabas.
   - It was also made available in the customer service centre within town hall and in the Council’s staff magazine and updates were published on the weekly staff “e update”.
   - 1,000 newsletters were sent to North Kensington library.
   - The event was advertised on the academy and leisure centre pages of Kensington and Chelsea’s website and the Kensington Aldridge Academy website.
   - Ward Councillors were emailed about the exhibition, together with the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Housing and Property – of which the latter attended.
   - The event was also promoted during resident forum meetings.

6. The materials used in Kensington and Chelsea’s community briefing included mounted images and emerging site plans, one model and a comments card.

7. Two architect’s presentations led by Studio E were held in order for residents to hear about the designs in more detail. These presentations took place at 5pm and 7pm on 26 January and 11am and 1pm on the 28 January.

8. Council officers, the Aldridge Foundation and GLL were also present to answer questions.
Summary of results of community briefing

1. **88 people attended the drop-in sessions across the two days.** 51 people attended on Thursday 26 January and 37 on Saturday 28 January.

2. All who attended were encouraged to sign in and their details were added to the project distribution list in order to keep them up to date on the project.

3. **49 comment cards were filled out in total.** People were asked for general comments on the plans as the designs were still being developed. All comments detailed were logged and fed back to the architects and council officers (Appendix P).

A breakdown of the comments is detailed below.

Of the 49 cards submitted:

- 10 per cent (5 people) said they would like to see a temporary leisure facility set up whilst the current centre is closed
- 10 per cent (5 people) said they would like the new pool to be 33m or 50m
- 12 per cent (6 people) are concerned about the north – south link being opened to traffic
- 10 per cent (5 people) noted they were concerned about the disruption during construction

The comment cards included suggestions for the new leisure centre such as:

- single sex changing rooms
- quiet areas
- green roofs (for both buildings)
- an open air tennis court to be shared with the academy
- gymnastics gym
- wave pool

There was also a comment that improvements should be made to Grenfell Tower and the surrounding estate including double glazing of the flat windows, more parking spaces, community gardens and
protective measures to be put in place to mitigate disruption during construction and any issues that might arise from students of the Academy.

Other comment cards showed support for the plans, improvements to the public realm and approval of the designs so far.

Questions raised at both sessions included how green the buildings would be, whether there could be temporary leisure facilities and what sort of access around the site would be allowed during construction. There were also questions on noise levels, effect of new Imperial College campus nearby, shadowing (caused by the proposed buildings), alternative leisure centres during construction and whether the residential elements could be reduced.
1. In the run up to the submission of the detailed application, Kensington and Chelsea held a public exhibition to display the full designs.

2. The two-day public exhibition was held on the 19 and 21 April at the Notting Hill Methodist Church on Lancaster Road.

3. To ensure the exhibition could be attended easily by residents, leisure centre users and parents of potential students, the following time slots were chosen:
   - 4.30pm to 8.30pm, Thursday 19 April
   - 10.00am to 2.00pm, Saturday 21 April

4. To communicate the exhibition to local people, Kensington and Chelsea used a number of tools:
   - An A5 4-page leaflet was produced and sent to local residents and schools (Appendix Q1)
   - Posters were displayed around the Lancaster estate and in the Kensington leisure centre (Appendix Q2)
   - A press release was published in the *Kensington and Chelsea Chronicle* on 13 April – a week before the exhibition (Appendix R and S)
   - The event was advertised on the Academy and Leisure Centre pages of Kensington and Chelsea's website and the Kensington Aldridge Academy website
   - Ward Councillors were emailed about the exhibition, together with the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Housing and Property – both of whom attended. Cllr Judith Blakeman attended both days and Cllr Joanna Gardner attended on the Thursday.

5. The materials used in Kensington and Chelsea’s pre-application public exhibition included nine display banners, one model, a twelve-page A4 information booklet and a comments card.

6. The nine display boards contained the following information:
   - PANEL 1 – Welcome
   - PANEL 2 – Master plan of the entire site
   - PANEL 3 – Site context including a 3D overview of the development
   - PANEL 4 – Academy proposal including an image of the NE entrance
   - PANEL 5 – Academy floor plans
   - PANEL 6 – Leisure centre proposals including an image of the entrance and surrounding public realm
   - PANEL 7 – Ground floor site plan of the leisure centre and detail of each floor layout
   - PANEL 8 – Additional benefits of the proposals including the residential proposal and green features
   - PANEL 9 – Next steps

(See the banners in Appendix T1).

7. In addition a 12-page A4 exhibition brochure (Appendix T2) was given out. The brochure provided a comprehensive summary of the proposals, outlining the designs and showing the site plans. It included information on the temporary provision whilst the current leisure is closed, environmental features of the development and addresses the question of possible improvements to Grenfell Tower. The brochure also provided details on safety features, transport plans, the residential proposal and timetable for redevelopment as well as the project team and how to comment on the plans.

8. There was an architect’s presentation on each day of the exhibition. This was led by Studio E, and supported by LA Architects (leisure centre architects) and Churchman Landscape Architects.
9. Kensington and Chelsea also provided a comments card for those who wanted to comment on the proposals. Visitors were encouraged to complete the form at the exhibition, post or email comments back to Kensington and Chelsea (Appendix T3). Results of these comments are analysed below.

8.1 Summary of results of pre-application exhibition

1. This section analyses the comments to Kensington and Chelsea on, or after the 19/21 April.

2. Visitors were invited (but not required) to sign in and give their address details so that any new contacts could be reached with future correspondence.

3. A total of 84 people attended the public exhibition with 48 present on Thursday, 19 April and 36 people on Saturday 21 April.

4. The level of comments cards received is considered low, as only 11 comment cards were received by Kensington and Chelsea. 5 attendees filled out comment cards during the exhibition and a further 6 were received in the weeks following the event. A log of the comment cards received can be found in Appendix U.

5. The following section analyses these comments.

- Liked the designs and in favour of the plans – 2
- Impressive designs but wrong site – 1
- Concerned about loss of resident parking - 1
- Concerned about construction traffic affecting their homes – 1
- Suggest closure of North / South link for certain hours – 1
- Suggestions for the leisure centre – 1
- Community evening classes in the academy - 1
- Liked residential proposal but would like 3+ bedroom flats – 1
- Design of the swimming facilities, changing rooms – 2
- Temporary gym and vouchers – 1

Comments from the consultation

The quotes below are excerpts of comments made in the cards provided during the exhibition.

“I am totally in favour of the plans and development…I look forward to seeing this new provision…”

“Concerned about construction traffic…Suggest North/South through road is closed from 6am to 10am so no rat run to Holland Park Ave.”

“Looked at the designs, very impressing BUT I still believe that the proposed site, around Lancaster West Estate, is not suitable. The area is too small.”

“Is it possible to provide a temporary gym?”

“Enough resident parking spaces…losing substantial amount?”

“I do hope evening classes will be here [academy] which will encourage everyone to feel included not just parents or teenagers…”

“The plans for the Academy and Leisure Centre look splendid.”

6. Following the public exhibition a further update report was submitted to the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee on 10 May 2012 which demonstrates the changes made to the leisure centre designs following the initial report from the working group, and subsequent feedback.
SECTION 9: THE RESIDENTS’ FORUM

1. In July 2011 Kensington and Chelsea met with self appointed representatives of the Lancaster West Estate to establish a KALC residents’ forum and an exhibition on the designs.

2. Following this, the KALC residents’ forum was formed so that residents could be involved in the development of the proposals and be kept up to date on the designs. The forum also gave residents an opportunity to discuss their concerns and ask questions directly to Kensington and Chelsea, the architects and Councillors.

3. The forum was chaired by Cllr Timothy Coleridge, in his role as part of the project team and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property. Cllr Judith Blakeman regularly attended the meetings, in her capacity as a Councillor and a resident.

4. The forum met six times, from September 2011 to April 2012. The group met once a month, from 6.30 – 8.30pm in the EMB Hall of Grenfell Tower on the Lancaster West Estate.

5. Details on forum attendees and comments raised in the meetings can be viewed in the minutes (Appendix V).

6. Some of the key points discussed during the forums include:
   - Improvements to Grenfell Tower and the Lancaster Estate
   - Public realm, including the play areas, and how it would be used by residents of the estate
   - Disruption caused by construction
   - Height of the buildings
   - Noise from the academy
   - Feeling of lack of consultation
   - North / South link
   - Parking

7. A site walkabout was held on 16 December 2011 with the architects in response to resident forum members who wanted to walk through the site to better understand the context of the development from ground level. Seven residents, including Cllr Blakeman attended the walkabout.

8. A community use plan was produced by the Aldridge Foundation to detail how certain facilities within the academy could be used by the local community. The plan was submitted to the resident forum which fed back comments (Appendix W).
SECTION 10: WEBSITES

1. Kensington and Chelsea’s webpage, hosted on the Council’s website, was set up in order to keep the local community and interested parties up to date with the latest information on the project.

2. The webpage can be found at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc

3. The page features the latest news on the project, FAQs, images, project newsletters and the exhibition materials.

4. The page has been promoted in all the consultation events and materials distributed including the newsletter, brochures and leaflets.

5. The Kensington Aldridge Academy website (www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk) was set up and maintained by the Aldridge Foundation in order to provide potential students and their parents, as well as the local community, with more information on the Aldridge Foundation and what the academy would propose.

6. The Kensington Aldridge website includes information on the proposed academy, the entrepreneurship and performing & creative arts specialisms, news on the project, the academy design, consultation and recruitment. It also includes contact details for the project team and FAQs.

7. The academy has a link to Kensington and Chelsea’s main webpage for the project.

SECTION 11: NEWSLETTERS

1. The project newsletters provided key information on the project and major milestones. The newsletters also served to promote the resident and leisure centre forums as well as the main consultation events.

2. Three newsletters have been published since Summer 2011 and a further Spring 2012 edition will be published in the coming weeks (Appendix X).

3. Each newsletter was distributed widely to 10,000 addresses in the Norland and Notting Barns wards with Grenfell Tower and the entire Lancaster West Estate also receiving the newsletters. Further details on the newsletter distribution are below.
   - 1,000 leaflets to North Kensington library
   - 1,000 leaflets to Kensington Leisure Centre

Approximately 100 leaflets were also sent to head teachers at the following primary schools:

- Avondale Park
- St Clement
- St Francis
- Thomas Jones
- Colville
- Oxford Gardens
- Sion Manning
- St Charles Bevington
- Fox
- Barlby St Thomas
- Middle Row
- St Mary’s Roman Catholic
- St Barnabas
Record of Kensington Aldridge Academy Public Meeting  
16 May 2011 - 6.30pm to 8.30pm at the St Clement James Centre

(NB: For brevity and to avoid unnecessary repetition, some questions, responses and contributions have been paraphrased)

1. In attendance

There were approximately 150 attendees made up of local residents, Grenfell Action Group members, prospective parents and people interested in education provision in the borough. Councillors present were Elizabeth Campbell, Timothy Coleridge, Judith Blakeman and Todd Foreman.

Panel members were:
- Honor Wilson-Fletcher, CEO Aldridge Foundation
- Rebecca Matthews, Director of Schools, RBKC
- Penelope Tollitt – RBKC, Planning
- James Masini – RBKC, Planning
- Geoff Burrage – RBKC, Transport
- Yinka Odusina – RBKC, Housing
- Ullash Karia – RBKC, Leisure
- Steven Bell – RBKC, Property Services

John Simpson was the independent chairperson

The meeting was organised by Tribal, the Project Management Company.

2. Introductions and presentations

John Simpson (chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced the panel members, outlined the consultation process and described how the meeting was to be conducted.

Rebecca Matthews (RBKC) gave a brief presentation, outlining the case for a secondary school in the area and highlighted the tradition of high quality education in the Royal Borough.

Honour Wilson-Fletcher (Aldridge Foundation), in her brief presentation, described the work of the Foundation and its sponsorship of its other academies and outlined the role of the Foundation in supporting the academy.

Following the presentations, members of the audience were invited to give their views on the proposal to establish the academy and to ask questions of the panel members.

3. Contributions, questions and answers

The contributions and questions that followed the presentations are grouped in the following categories:
i. **Role of Aldridge Foundation**

QUESTION: Is the Aldridge Foundation (AF) aware of the extent of deprivation in the area?

RESPONSE: The AF already works in areas with high deprivation and hopes to work with the local communities here to become more aware of the local area and its needs and strengths.

CONTRIBUTION: Rod Aldridge is Capita. Capita is involved in ICT projects and staff recruitment to schools. By sponsoring this academy, he is acting in his own self interest.

RESPONSE: Rod Aldridge is not connected to Capita. He founded Capita and his entrepreneurship made it a success and, indirectly, gave him the means to set up the Aldridge Foundation, a charity to support education. The DfE scrutinise all sponsors of academies and they would not approve the sponsorship if there was a conflict of interest.

QUESTION: We don’t know who the Aldridge Foundation are and why are they not putting their hands in their pockets to help fund this development?

RESPONSE: The Aldridge Foundation does not fund capital projects. The role of the Foundation is to drive the education vision of its Academies and to ensure that they improve. They will be involved with the Academy for its lifetime.

ii. **Need for Academy**

CONTRIBUTION: Contrary to the statement made in the presentation, many students do well in schools outside the borough.

RESPONSE: I fully accept that many such students do well, nonetheless, there are many advantages for students who attend a good local school.

QUESTION: The proposal is for 20 places in the Academy for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) – this seems very low for a school of this size?

RESPONSE: The plan is to create a centre of excellence for the provision of specialist support for children on the autistic spectrum continuum: this is in addition to pupils who have special educational needs and who would routinely attend the school. The specialist provision at the Academy would also support children in the local primary schools. This provision would go towards making up for the lack of any special schools in the borough.
iii. **Academy specialism**

**QUESTION:** What does entrepreneurship mean, why should parents be attracted to the Academy and how will it work for the community?

**RESPONSE:** Entrepreneurship is about the development of basic life skills, confidence building, taking risks, skilful communication, being determined, team work and not being frightened of failure. The difference between academies and Local authority schools is that sponsors bring extra resources and the freedom to innovate in order to attract the very best teachers.

iv. **Use of Academy by local community**

**CONTRIBUTION:** A plea for parents and the community to be fully involved and engaged from the beginning with the development of the Academy.

**RESPONSE:** Agreed – we fully endorse parental involvement fully and as early as possible.

v. **Costs**

**QUESTION:** Is it true that less than £20m is available for this academy compared with much higher amounts for Chelsea Academy and Holland Park?

**QUESTION:** What is the total cost of the Academy?

**RESPONSE:** The Department for Education (DfE) has agreed to provide £17.6m and we will need to look at that amount in the context of the development of the whole site.

**QUESTION:** How do the budgets of other AF academies compare?

**RESPONSE:** They all vary. The AF is not interested in accepting a sub-standard building.

**QUESTION:** What are the respective percentage contributions made by the DfE and RBKC for Chelsea Academy and Holland Park School?

**RESPONSE:** For Chelsea Academy, the lead sponsor, the London Diocesan Board for Schools (LDBS) committed £2m towards the capital costs (there is no longer a requirement from the DfE for a sponsor contribution to the capital costs). The remainder capital was provided by the DfE and RBKC. Because Holland Park is not an academy, all of the capital costs came from RBKC. Given the current national economic climate where most other local authorities have received no DfE funding at all or much reduced funding, RBKC is fortunate to be given this amount for this Academy. We are now looking at further opportunities to get the best deal for the site.

**RESPONSE:** Partnership for Schools (the body that manages the capital programme for schools on behalf of the Government’s Department for Education) is confident that £17.6m is adequate to build a good school given...
average conditions in an average urban area. At this stage RBKC officers cannot make decisions about any additional funding that may be necessary until more becomes known about conditions on the site.

RESPONSE: Cllr Campbell made a statement in answer to the questions about the adequacy of the funding to the effect that the borough were very pleased with the £17.6m contribution from the DfE, particularly given that school projects in other Local Authorities were receiving much more reduced or no funding; and that the borough had not yet concluded how much additional funding, if any, it would need to eventually contribute. She went on to confirm that the borough have now contributed an additional £1.5m towards the costs of producing detailed design proposals and investigations of the site conditions. This work would be completed by December 2011 at which point funding decisions would be finalised.

CONTRIBUTION: Compared to Chelsea Academy and Holland Park, the funding for this Academy is mere scraps from the rich man’s table and this community is not prepared to take that. The Grenfell Action Group has been treated with contempt by the borough, we have been undermined and decisions have been taken behind our backs.

QUESTION: How much is the AF putting towards the capital costs?
RESPONSE: The sponsor does not contribute towards the capital costs (that is no longer a requirement from the DfE). The AF provides professional support, expertise in raising additional revenue funding and will, as a charity, support the Academy and community in perpetuity.

CONTRIBUTION: There is no benefit for the community: the funding is going down; there is no extra space and no community space. There is a need to fund the development properly.

CONTRIBUTION: The borough should put more money towards the project. It has £171m reserves. When asked previously why the reserves were not used to protect services for people with disabilities, we were told that the reserves were needed for capital projects. This is a capital project. The borough cannot have it both ways.

vi. Site selection

QUESTION: Is it not the case that there is already a commitment to this site and that we should move on in the debate?
RESPONSE: Yes, there is a commitment to developing this site.

QUESTION: How does the area and outside space of this academy compare with other schools?
RESPONSE: Decisions about area and space have not yet been made but there is an expectation of outdoor space: the link with the Leisure Centre also provides opportunities for access by the Academy to that space.
CONTRIBUTION: Whilst I welcome the idea of a new school for north Kensington – there has been too much conflicting information with the latest news of the funding. We need a good school in the right place, rather than a poor school in the wrong place.

RESPONSE: The Council looked initially at five potential sites in the north of the borough (two more were added in response to suggestions). In arriving at a decision, the Council has to weigh up the different needs of the different communities in the area. Under this proposal, the car park would be closed, the pitches would be relocated to a nearby site and the open space would be retained but reduced in size.

CONTRIBUTION: In response to one local resident’s attempt to make a statement in support of the Academy proposal, another member of the audience interrupted forcibly with a statement about the poor choice of site and the waste of money on the proposal to date.

QUESTION: Why is there no mention made in the proposal about what green space is to be protected?
RESPONSE: There is mention made in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) of the protection of some green space on the site.

QUESTION: What are the benefits of the cross-road?
RESPONSE: There are a number of advantages – the damage to the street pattern would be repaired; the school needs to be connected to the surrounding area; a through-road is safer at night.

CONTRIBUTION: Compared to the existing service road, the cross-road would present problems for safety – access by fire-tenders would be affected, and the open road would be used by taxis, trucks, business traffic, etc., and an invitation to problems resulting in accidents.

vii. Consultation process

CONTRIBUTION: The consultation process to date has been seriously flawed. In July 2010 the Council failed to distribute the consultation leaflets, the proposal went to Cabinet and was approved with local people having no say. The Scrutiny Committee ignored the local (Planning Aid) response document. We want meaningful consultation. The community should have been consulted in the first place. Finally, there are a number of parents who don’t know about this meeting and one Estate received no leaflets about the meeting.

CONTRIBUTION: The consultation has given no choice to the community; people have moved out of the area because of the Academy plans.

(NB there was a question and answer about ‘stock letters’ that I did not understand)

RESPONSE: The core consultation strategy has been to engage directly with local community groups and organisations with the expectation that they
would, in turn, inform their residents and members. For the feasibility study last summer, 10,000 leaflets were distributed to all residents with a second, follow-up leaflet drop. In addition multiple leaflets were placed in the Leisure Centre and local schools. We accept that the consultation on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was more detailed and more successful than the earlier consultation. It should also be noted that the borough funded the Planning Aid response document in recognition that the local community needed professional support to respond to the proposal. The company responsible for distributing the leaflets for this meeting apologised for the non-delivery to half of the Lancaster West Estate – this was an oversight and future distributions during the consultation period would ensure that this would not happen again.
Main points arising from the Public Consultation

16 May 2011 – 26 June 2011
3. There were three means of submitting feedback:
   a. Via tear-off postal slip in Consultation Brochures and Leaflets
   b. Via the Academy’s website
   c. Via voicing of opinions at public events (listed below)

4. All the information contained within the consultation document was made available from the Academy’s website - [www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk](http://www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk)

5. A ‘Frequently asked questions’ document was posted on the Academy’s website.

6. 15 written responses were received during the consultation period.

7. 7 electronic responses were received during the consultation period.

8. A Public Meeting, to find out more about the Academy proposal, was held at the St Clements Centre on Sirdar Road on 16 May 2011. Approx. 150 people attended.

9. A ‘drop-in session’ was held on 21 June 2011 at the Lighthouse West London on Lancaster Road and was attended by approx. 50 people.

10. 77.3% of respondents (i.e. 17) were in favour of the proposed academy.

11. 18.2% of respondents (i.e. 4) were opposed to the proposed academy.

12. 4.5% of respondents (i.e. 1) were undecided.

13. Respondents who were in favour of the Academy commented that it “would be an excellent addition to the community” and it “would greatly enhance the variety of what is on offer and become a tower of strength for the whole community”. Respondents also acknowledged there was the need for school places in the borough and that the Academy would “improve the area, give it a heart and bring it into the 21st century”.

14. The respondents not in favour of the Academy expressed concern over the proposed site location and its close vicinity to a “deprived council estate”. One response questioned the disruption to the elderly and disabled residents, along with a sense of dissatisfaction about the initial consultation with the residents.
feasibility study. Their brief was to come up with options that would integrate into the local area, link well with local transport, improve the current street pattern and allow for two high quality buildings and some housing. A number of workshops were held in the local area to enable local people to influence that study.

In September 2010 there was a very well attended public meeting organised by local ward councillors. Over the winter, the Council’s planning department held a number of consultation events on the planning brief for the site – see below. The planning brief set out what the Academy and Leisure Centre development will have to deliver in order to be granted planning permission.

Before drafting the planning brief for the LDF, consultation with residents took place:

- A ‘snap and say’ consultation event took place on Saturday 20th November 2010, where 50 residents attended a series of walking tours, photographing the area as well as taking part in map-based exercises and answering a survey. This gave officers a better understanding of residents’ concerns, which were largely focussed on the loss of open space (known as Lancaster Green) for the building of a school. Officers also heard from local residents about what they wanted from their leisure centre.

- A further consultation workshop was held in the evening of 2nd December 2010, during which officers provided feedback from the 20th November 2010 session. Approximately 40 residents attended this workshop.

- A further presentation of the same feedback material to the Estate Management Board of the neighbouring Lancaster West Estate took place on 6th December 2010.

- A draft brief was then issued for public consultation for 6 weeks. Three events were held. The first was an afternoon drop-in held in the Estate Management Board Hall on 2nd February 2011. This event was attended by around 20 members of the public.

- The second was held at the Lighthouse Centre on Lancaster Road on the evening of 9th February 2011. This event gave local residents and Leisure Centre users a chance to publicly ask questions about some of the decisions and assumptions made by the Council in the brief. Around 30 members of the public were in attendance.

- A final event was held on 22nd February 2011 at the Leisure Centre. Around 80 visitors attended this session which took the form of a drop-in. Among the many issues raised, those of most concern were the decision to favour a vehicular north-south connection as opposed to a purely pedestrian link and the loss of open space.

- A survey was made available in the winter of 2010/2011. This was delivered to all residents living adjacent to the site, as well as being made available at consultation events and on-line. 119 responses were received. The results of this survey have been used to inform this document and the report and are available on the Council’s website.
The Academy would open in 2014 with one year 7 group of 180 students, and grow to a roll of 900 students in Years 7-11 and 240 in the sixth form by 2018.

The Academy would specialise in Entrepreneurship supported by a secondary specialism of Expressive arts. The Lead Sponsor would be the Aldridge Foundation with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) as Co-Sponsor, supported by a coalition of education partners.

The Academy would be a non-denominational inclusive Academy in North Kensington to provide wider choice, diversity and fair access to educational provision. Demand for places cannot be met within the present pattern of secondary school provision which currently results in over 50% of local students travelling outside RBKC for secondary education. Pupil projections indicate that by 2018 there will be a demand for about 140 additional secondary places.

The Academy would be built adjacent to a new leisure centre on the site of the existing North Kensington Leisure Centre. The area does not currently have a co-educational school and the leisure centre is nearing the end of its useful life. A new school and new sports centre would play a key role in the redevelopment and regeneration plans for the Latimer area. The new school would lie at the heart of the local community, providing places for young people within that community to meet local demand.

The consultation set out to assess public opinion in relation to the proposed development of an Academy. The consultation comprised a marketing campaign and quantitative research based upon:

- Distribution of over 4000 copies of the Consultation Document (which included a detachable questionnaire returnable by freepost) to:
  - Year 3 parents at 11 local primary schools;
  - Headteachers and governing bodies of 3 local secondary schools;
  - 8 resident associations;
  - 13 local faith groups;
  - 2 local Members of Parliament;
  - 12 local Councillors from St Charles Ward, Notting Barns Ward, Norland Ward and Golborne Ward;
  - 7 youth and voluntary organisations;
  - 6 local libraries;
  - Police.

- A Kensington Aldridge Academy Public Meeting was held on 16 May 2011, at the St Clements Centre, which included presentations from both Sponsors. The meeting was also attended by several Council Officers representing planning, housing, transport, capital assets and leisure. 4000 flyers were distributed to the immediate surrounding area
A ‘drop-in session’ was held on 21 June 2011, at the Lighthouse West London, to allow any interested party to meet with representatives of the Academy to have a direct conversation about the Academy’s plans, e.g. what facilities will be available; what students will be taught; what do the Sponsors (The Aldridge Foundation and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea) bring to the party; what does the specialism of entrepreneurship mean; how will the Academy integrate and work within the community as well as what SEN provisions there will be. 23,000 flyers were distributed to the whole priority/catchment area for the Academy. The flyer was also translated into Arabic, and there was an Arabic interpreter present during the ‘drop-in’ session.

The meeting was also attended by several Council Officers representing planning, housing, transport and leisure. Two RBKC Cabinet Members were also present.

A Press Notice was issued on 7 June 2011 and an article appeared in that week’s edition of the Kensington & Chelsea Chronicle advising of the plans for the new Academy, the consultation process and the date for the ‘drop-in session’.

Briefing meetings were held with:

- 2 local councillors of the Notting Barns ward
- Representatives from Grenfell Action Group, Lancaster West Estate Management Board, Lancaster West Resident’s Association and the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association.
- Head and Deputy Head of Barlby Primary School
- Head and Year 3 parents of St Clements and St James Primary School
- Chair of Governors of Thomas Jones Primary School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detachable Response Forms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Response Forms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Do you think the ethos of the new Academy would benefit the local community?

- Agree - 17
- Disagree - 4
- Undecided - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Resident of a neighbouring Borough
- Resident in immediate vicinity of the site
- Interested in benefitting from community use of the Academy's facilities
- Member of staff or governor of a local school/college
- Representative of the local business community
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent of a child who might attend the Academy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of a neighbouring Borough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident in immediate vicinity of the site</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in benefitting from community use of the Academy's facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of staff or governor of a local school/college</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of the local business community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52.9% of the respondents commented that the proposal was a positive proposal.

29.4% of the respondents stated that the Academy plans would improve the area and benefit the community.

58.8% of respondents agreed with the proposals for admissions.

29.4% of the respondents commented that the Academy is needed with one respondent saying “This would be a marvellous addition to other secondary schools in RBKC and very valuable to the children of families in North Kensington”.

Question 1: What are your views on the proposals for admissions?

1. Parent of a child who might attend the Academy

   Comments included:

   - Admissions seem fair, there is already a shortage of places in this area so it will ease the problem

2. Resident of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

   Comments included:

   - I think that the proposals for admissions are exceptional

3. Resident of a neighbouring Borough

   Comments included:

   - Everything that I read was amazing and made me want to find out more

4. Resident in immediate vicinity of the site

   Comments included:

   - School sounds great
6. Member of staff or governor of a local school/college

Comments included:

- *This would be a marvellous addition to other secondary schools in RBKC and very valuable to the children of families in North Kensington*

7. Representative of the local business community

Comments included:

- *None*

8. Other

- *Positive step forward in an area that would benefit from an Academy*
- Resident of a neighbouring Borough
- Resident in immediate vicinity of the site
- Interested in benefiting from community use of the Academy's facilities
- Member of staff or governor of a local school/college
- Representative of the local business community
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent of a child who might attend the Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of a neighbouring Borough</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident in immediate vicinity of the site</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in benefiting from community use of the Academy’s facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of staff or governor of a local school/college</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of the local business community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary table of main areas of concern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of people who commented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for admission policies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of green space</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Resident of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Comments included:
- *Fanciful words but would have been good to see previous examples of this in action first*

3. Resident of a neighbouring Borough

Comments included:
- *None*

4. Resident in immediate vicinity of the site

Comments included:
- *Badly thought out location. Disruption to elderly and disabled residents. No consultation initially with residents and Cavalier attitude*
- *You will be putting young children at risk of mixing with thugs in the making when coming and going from the school ground*

5. Interested in benefiting from community use of the Academy's facilities

Comments included:
- *None*

6. Member of staff or governor of a local school/college

Comments included:
- *None*

7. Representative of the local business community

Comments included:
- *None*

8. Other
   - *None*
Section 5 – Outcome of meetings with key stakeholders

1. Public Meeting on 16 May 2011

Attendance
There were approximately 150 attendees made up of local residents, Grenfell Action Group members, prospective parents and people interested in education provision in the borough. Councillors present were Elizabeth Campbell, Timothy Coleridge, Judith Blakeman, Robert Atkinson and Todd Foreman.

Presentations
Rebecca Matthews (RBKC) gave a brief presentation, outlining the case for a secondary school in the area and highlighted the tradition of high quality education in the Royal Borough.
Honour Wilson-Fletcher (Aldridge Foundation), in her brief presentation, described the work of the Foundation and its sponsorship of its other academies and outlined the role of the Foundation in supporting the academy.
Following the presentations, members of the audience were invited to give their views on the proposal to establish the academy and to ask questions of the panel members.

Contributions
The contributions and questions that followed the presentations are grouped in the following categories:

- Role of The Aldridge Foundation
- Need for Academy
- Academy specialism
- Use of Academy by local community
- Costs
- Site selection and amenities
- Consultation process
Representations

There was representation from both the Academy’s Sponsors as well as representatives from the Council able to respond to queries on planning, housing, transport and leisure.

3. Consultation with staff and parents of local primary schools (e.g. Barlby Primary)

The main issues arising were:

- 80% of their pupils go outside of the borough for their secondary education.
- It’s a challenge for the primary schools to transition their pupils to upto 12 secondary schools.

4. Consultation with local residents (i.e. Representatives from Grenfell Action Group, Lancaster West Estate Management Board, Lancaster West Resident’s Association and the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association)

- They were generally in favour of an Academy in the local area, but had the following concerns:
  - Locating a school of 1140 students on a constrained site will impact the life of local residents.
  - Although they are aware that the Council has rejected other sites, they dispute some of the reasons given.
  - Potential issues which the local residents will have to deal with after school hours.
  - Loss of parking space.
  - Dissatisfaction with the consultation process undertaken by the Council for the Local Development Framework.
  - They would appreciate some 'meaningful consultation', i.e. how will their concerns be addressed / mitigated.
  - Residents in the adjoining tower block have severe heating and ventilation issues and have to open their windows all the time which will then subject them to noise from the school.
appraised of progress - whether there is some or not.
3. This report on the outcome of the consultation process will be supplemented by several other processes and included in the Funding Agreement submission to the Department for Education, in July 2011, for final sign off.

4. This report will be circulated to key stakeholders and published on the Academy’s website.

5. Following the appointment of a design team, further meetings organised by the council will be held with stakeholders and local residents to discuss the design scheme.

6. Ongoing meetings and presentations will be planned with the local primary feeder schools and their respective parents.

7. A ‘Sponsor Partnership Group’ is being established, comprised of Heads of local feeder schools; prospective parents; local business people; local faith groups; representatives from the Sponsors; local ward councillors; local community leaders; local youth groups; local sports groups and other willing volunteers to challenge our approach, spread the word, attend public meetings, open evenings and potentially join the eventual Academy Governing Body.

8. As part of the planning permission process with the Council, the detailed design of the new buildings will be consulted upon, and just like any development in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea the plan will be available for review at a future Open Day.

For further information on and any enquiries about the Kensington Aldridge Academy please contact Matt Bates, Tribal Group by telephoning 07920 821779 or e-mailing info@kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk
1.) Letter/Email to individuals

Dear Customer/Club Representative,

The competition to design a new academy and leisure centre for North Kensington was won in late September by a team led by Studio E that includes sports and leisure specialists LA Architects, as well as building engineers Max Fordham and Curtin and Churchman landscape architects.

Studio E will now develop a series of design options for the academy and leisure centre. These will be reviewed by leisure centre users and other interested groups and presented to the Council's Cabinet in December, when a final decision will be taken as to whether or not the project can proceed.

Therefore, you are invited to attend a meeting dedicated to leisure centre users to hear your views on the current concept design for a new leisure centre.

This will take place at the Kensington Leisure Centre on Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} November starting at 6.30pm and finishing at 8.30pm.

This will be your opportunity to put questions to representatives of Studio E, the Borough’s Leisure Services Department and GLL, the centre’s operating company. We look forward to seeing you.
A New Leisure Centre.

The competition to design a new academy and leisure centre for North Kensington was won in late September by a team led by Studio E that includes sports and leisure specialists LA Architects.

A meeting dedicated to leisure centre users to hear your views on the current concept design for a new leisure centre will take place here on:

**Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} November 6.30pm- 8.30pm.**

This will be your opportunity to put questions to representatives of Studio E, the Borough’s Leisure Services Department and GLL the centre’s operating company. We look forward to seeing you.
Kensington Leisure Centre
User group– comment response form

Many thanks for your interest in developing the design of delivering a new leisure centre on the site of the Kensington Leisure Centre and playing pitches.

If you would like to be involved in future consultation on this project please give us your contact details:

Name: .......................................................... Surname: ..........................................................
Organisation (if applicable): ...........................................................
Address: ..........................................................................................
..........................................................................................
..........................................................................................
Post code: ..........................................................................
Email: ........................................................................... Tel: ..........................................................

At this early stage, we would like to know your thoughts on the following:

1) What do you think the most important considerations are for the design of the new leisure centre? (think about spaces around the building, the layout, the environmental impact of the building)

2) What are the most important facilities for the leisure centre to provide?

3) Are there any particular issues that the new leisure centre needs to address, to make sure it serves the local community effectively? (for example, services that the current leisure centre provides which you feel it is important to continue)
4) Do you wish to make any other comments?

To find out more, including our Frequently Asked Questions, please visit www.rbkc.go.uk
Background on the project

We know that our young people can do well when they get a place in a Royal Borough secondary school and have a good chance of going on to A-level study, college and university. But places in our schools are in short supply, especially in North Kensington, and the indications are, that unless something is done, that shortage will continue to grow.

At the same time, the Council is committed to improving the health of residents in North Kensington and wants to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay healthy. For these reasons the Council’s flagship ambitions for North Kensington are to build a new secondary school and a new leisure centre, more tailored to the needs of local residents.

Kensington Leisure Centre was built in the 1970s and its sprawling layout does not make the most efficient use of its site. It is expensive to run and it is hard to see it continuing to provide adequate sports and leisure facilities in its current form beyond 2025. We would like to see it replaced by a modern, energy efficient building that offers sports and leisure facilities that meet the needs of the community and which can be enjoyed by residents of all ages.

1. **How old is the leisure centre?**
   - The leisure centre was originally built in the mid-1970s as a swimming pool.
   - It was further developed in 1986 to include dry-side facilities including full size and smaller sports halls and squash courts. In 2001 Kensington Leisure Centre was reopened after a £3m redevelopment and upgrading which resulted in an improved swimming pool, sports hall, new café bar/reception and better facilities for disabled people.

2. **Wasn’t the leisure centre recently refurbished?**
   - The latest significant redevelopment took place more than a decade ago, in 2001. Since then no major improvement works have taken place and the facilities and the building itself have aged significantly.

3. **Why does the leisure centre have to be rebuilt?**
   - There is a strong case for replacing the building because of how the centre was originally built; as it does not currently make the best use of the space, nor is it an environmentally sustainable building.
   - The centre underwent a redevelopment in 2001 however since then no major refurbishment works have taken place and facilities are in need of renewal.
   - Additionally as part of an initial consultation exercise undertaken last year users of the centre have also told us they would prefer a new leisure centre for this part of the borough.

4. **Has the Council considered alternative sites for the leisure centre?**
   - The Council has considered other sites that might be suitable for the construction of a new leisure centre and found no other sites in North Kensington that are currently available for development and that could realistically be used to house a new leisure centre to the minimum specification.
   - Also we know that local people treasure having this facility there and we want to make sure that local communities can enjoy this for many years to come. Rebuilding it is the most effective way of ensuring that this is achieved.

5. **Will the same or additional facilities be included in the new leisure centre?**
   - The new leisure centre would be at least as big as the current facility and would contain a swimming pool.
   - The exact mix of other facilities will depend on the size and layout of the new leisure centre as well as demand from the local community.
• The Council and architects will work with users and the local community to establish exactly what facilities will be included in the new leisure centre.

**Rationale**

6. **What is wrong with the present premises?**
• The current centre was built in the 1970s and just isn’t tailored to the health needs and pastimes of local people. The internal layout is sprawling and as a result makes poor use of the space. The layout also makes the building hard to maintain and oversee and therefore expensive to run. We believe by rebuilding rather than refurbishing we will significantly reduce running costs.
• Environmentally speaking, the current centre is a poor building and a refurbishment is unlikely to successfully address this failing. A new building would certainly be low carbon, in fact we would expect it to achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method) “excellent” rating which would mean a significantly reduced carbon footprint and lower fuel bills.
• Architecturally the current centre has little or no merit. With award winning architects on board, we believe we can do better. We want to design new and much improved facilities that meet local needs and aspirations and which help people become healthier.
• But perhaps most importantly of all, the current centre is coming to the end of its useful life. Leisure centres built in the 70s typically have a lifespan of between 30 and 50 years. So the current centre’s time is up. As a result repair and maintenance costs are starting to mount. We think a really good refurbishment would only keep the centre in business for another decade or so and still leave fundamental shortcomings unaddressed.

**Cost**

7. **How much would it cost to put the current leisure centre right, compared with the cost of a rebuild?**
• The architects estimate that a full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14 million, and would last around ten years, versus around £20 million lasting 50 years for a new centre. We also need to take into account that the running costs for the original building are also set to get more expensive as the building ages, so by rebuilding it now we can save money in the long-term.
• Refurbishment on the scale of providing a like-for-like facility would still involve closing the leisure centre for up to a year. New builds therefore provide a more cost effective construction option. Finally, because we are intending to build a new academy at the same time, we may be able to achieve economies of scale on the cost of a new centre. That means there may never be a better time than now to try for a brand new, state-of-the-art centre for the people of North Kensington.

8. **Is the funding of the academy linked with the funding of leisure centre?**
• No, £17.6 million has already been provided by the DfE for the academy which clearly shows Government commitment to the school and is a significant investment in the challenging economic climate.
• During the Cabinet meeting in December it was agreed that an additional investment of £10.4 million would go towards the new academy from the Council.
• The Cabinet committed to providing £24.7 million for a new leisure centre and £5.1 million for public realm improvements and other enabling works. Funding for the leisure centre is coming from the Council’s own capital reserves and is not dependent on grants.
9. **Why didn’t the Council start with a consultation of users before formulating its first plan many years ago?**

- We have consulted on the plans widely over the last eighteen months. There have been a number of consultation events on the academy and leisure centre and these have happened on the following dates: 20.11.10, 2.2.11, 9.02.11, 22.02.11, 16.05.11, 21.06.11, 29.06.11, 19.07.11, 28.09.11. The meeting on the 2 November was the first Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) User Forum meeting where only current users of the centre received an invitation. Previously, consultation events held at the centre and other local buildings and were open to all interested people including local residents, current centre users and representatives of local groups. At all these meetings the future of the leisure centre was an agenda item and discussed.

- A consultation event is being held by GLL at the leisure centre on 28 March 2012 to update users on how the project has progressed following the January 2012 drop-in sessions on the designs.

- A Public Realm Scrutiny Committee Working Group on Leisure Facilities, comprising Cllr Joanna Gardner, Cllr Barbara Campbell and Cllr Pat Mason, conducted consultation with a range of current users and non-users of the leisure centre, and their report included a list of suggestions for a new centre based on this consultation, which has been passed to the architects. The full report is available on the RBKC website.

10. **What was decided at the December Cabinet?**

- After carefully considering a number of design and cost options, the Council’s Cabinet committed to funding both the new academy and brand new leisure centre.

- During the meeting the Cabinet reviewed a range of options for the development and agreed on one which includes an additional investment of £10.4 million towards the new academy from the Royal Borough. The Cabinet also committed to providing £24.7 million for a new leisure centre and £5.1 million for public realm improvements and other enabling works. This is on top of £17.6 million of funding already confirmed by the Government for the academy.

- The Council’s Cabinet carefully discussed the different options available for the leisure centre. The option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in region of £14 million, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. A brand new leisure centre should last much longer.

11. **If leisure users do not support the plans will you listen and change the development proposed?**

- We have many different users of the centre and quite often the use of the facilities conflict with each other and the operator tries to strike the right balance between competing demands. Decisions will be based on a range of opinions from leisure users, industry experts, architects and politicians. As well as consulting and satisfying existing users, we have an obligation to provide a facility that attracts new users, not just today but into the future. The present building whilst enjoyed and loved by sections of the community is neither attractive nor flexible enough to increase its usage. The architects chosen for the redesign will continue to talk to users and non-users as the facilities are designed.

12. **Have people with learning disabilities been consulted yet?**

- Yes. We have consulted with current and potential users of a new leisure centre. For example, one of the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee’s Working Group key recommendations is that the borough’s leisure facilities “meet the needs of people with restricted mobility and other disabilities, throughout the centre not just parts of it.” They spoke at length with user groups including those representing local disabled people and also disabled people. Also, the Kensington and Chelsea Community and Physical Activity Network (CSPAN) have a dedicated sub-group for disabled people and disability issues. Again the new leisure centre has been a key agenda item at its meetings. Local
organisations such as Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea have been invited to our  
public consultations events. We are proud to support local clubs such as Emperors  
Swimming Club, who teach swimming to disabled people regardless of age or disability  
and the work they do.

Pool

13. Why has the Council gone back on its previous assurances (e.g. about the length of  
the pool)?

- It was common practice between the 1950s and early 1970s to build 33 metre long  
swimming pools. These incorporated a 25 metre short course length and an additional 8  
metres deep end that could accommodate diving from boards either at 5 metres high or at  
the Olympic and World Championship height of 10 metres. However this type of design is  
now obsolete, and diving – where it is still practised – is now normally accommodated in  
special diving pits. New, modern pools are built either to 25 metres (short course) or 50  
metres (long course), which are the standard lengths used for school and club  
competitions. This is why most surviving 33 metre pools have had bulkheads built into  
them to create a 25 metre length.

- From the very outset of the public consultation over the new leisure centre, we heard the  
views of several current users who enjoy the 33 metre pool length. We knew that reducing  
the length to 25 metres would not be welcomed by these users. We did not set aside their  
options lightly. However, we had to take account a number of other considerations when  
deciding the optimum length and breadth of the new pool. These included the following:

  - we wanted the new leisure centre to meet the needs of everyone, including people  
    and families who are not necessarily interested in distance swimming and who  
    simply want to have fun in the water. We wanted therefore to build a leisure pool  
as well as a conventional swimming pool. We hoped by doing so to draw local  
people into the new leisure centre who might never have used it before. We also  
wanted to retain a training pool for non-swimmers, i.e. to have three pools in total.
  - we knew the footprint of the new leisure centre was limited by the amount of land  
    available; we had to have regard to the overall cost of the new centre as well. We  
were concerned that if we designed in a 33 metre swimming pool it could make it  
difficult to fit in, or afford, a decent sized leisure pool as well as a training pool.
  - we wanted the pool to be wider than it is now, with two extra lanes, so the potential  
    for conflict between different users could be reduced. Eight lanes would give us the  
capacity to offer much more opportunity for general and lanes swimming, as well  
as a wide variety of club pursuits, lessons and school sessions.
  - we wanted a pool which meets Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association  
    (ASA) standards. The Amateur Swimming Association also wrote to us at some  
length, concluding that they ‘would positively oppose any decision to remain with a  
33.3 metre length’.
  - the Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC), which has 400 members,  
wrote to us making several compelling points in favour of a wider pool with a 25  
metre length.

- The Council weighed up these competing considerations and concluded that an eight  
lane 25 metre pool with a leisure pool and a training pool would provide the optimum  
mix of water facilities in the new leisure centre. It would mean a pool that can provide  
for teaching at all levels, for fitness swimming, fitness training such as aqua aerobics,  
distance swimming at all standards and competitive.

- The proposed teaching pool would add further flexibility; we are currently investigating  
the provision of a 20m x 10m tank with a movable floor. This would provide excellent  
swim teaching space, allowing fewer lessons in the main pool and therefore a wider  
range of times in the main pool for fitness swimming and club use. At the very peak  
time of fitness swimming (e.g.: 7.30am – 8.30am), this pool could provide extra lane  
capacity with the weaker swimmers in the teaching pool at a constant depth of 1.2m  
freeing up more lane space in the main pool for stronger swimmers.
This decision had regard to the interests and preferences of those swimmers who had told us they preferred a 33 metre length, but the Council concluded on balance that other considerations should prevail.

14. What would adding a third pool provide that the current two pools cannot?
- With a sloping, shallow water level the leisure pool will be the ideal place for all the family to enjoy. In addition, it will help adults and their young children gain confidence in the water, before taking swimming lessons in the other pools. It would enable younger people to have fun and develop a sense of comfort and security in the water. This is currently not provided.

Academy

15. How much would current access to the facilities be curtailed by the school's use?
- The detailed provision of sports facilities will be looked at more closely when the plans for the academy are fully developed. As with all other schools, the academy would deliver a sports curriculum, either on-site or using nearby facilities as many other boroughs and inner London schools already do. For instance, students from Chelsea Academy routinely use off-site sports facilities, as do the pupils from the Cardinal Vaughan School. The academy would become another customer of the leisure centre but would not have any exclusive deals on the use of the new facilities.

16. Does a sports hall in the school mean the leisure centre will not have one, and can non-school users access the school's hall?
- The proposed new centre will have a 120 station gym and an eight-court sports hall. This would enable us to offer more flexible programming for casual use and for local clubs and organisations. The academy would have its own dedicated four badminton court-size sport hall which would be accessible to the community outside of curriculum time.

The Process

17. What consultation has taken place on the academy to date?
- The consultation on the ethos and vision for the academy is the latest of several processes that previously the Council, and now the academy sponsors, have undertaken for this significant project.

1. It started with consultation by the Council on the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework (LDF) during 2008 and 2009. This looked at opportunities for the wider Latimer area, for this specific site, as well as borough-wide planning policies such as those relating to open space.
2. The next stage was looking at the more detailed planning requirements for the academy and leisure centre site by preparing a Planning Brief. The Planning Brief – known also as a ‘Supplementary Planning Document’ (SPD) – takes the policies set out in the borough-wide planning policy document, called the Core Strategy, and provides more detail on the planning requirements for the development of the site. This was consulted on between January and May 2011 and adopted in May 2011.
3. The adoption of the SPD allowed the academy sponsors to consult with the local residents on the early vision and the ethos for the academy itself, and this consultation took place in the summer of 2011.

This will be followed by further consultations on the design of the proposed school and on separate plans for the leisure centre.

Following an architect’s exhibition held in September 2011, Studio E architects were chosen as the designers for the project. They are now developing designs and a residents’ forum and leisure group have been formed in order to ensure ideas from both groups are fed back to the architects. Now that a preferred option has been confirmed by the Council’s Cabinet the view is to submit a planning application for the site in May 2012.
18. What are the next steps?

- Further consultation with residents by the sponsors and the Council’s Leisure Department will continue to take place through 2012.
- Two drop-in sessions were held at the leisure centre on 26 and 28 January to share how the designs have progressed now that the Cabinet has chosen a preferred option.
- A public exhibition will be held on Thursday 19 April and Saturday 21 2012 at Notting Hill Methodist Church on the full designs for the academy and leisure centre. Further details on the event will be advertised on the Royal Borough’s website, the next project newsletter and in the local press in the coming weeks.
- We aim to submit the planning application in May 2012 for determination in the summer/autumn of 2012.
Dear

Thank you for coming to the user group meeting at Kensington Leisure Centre on 2 November. I know that we did not manage to answer everyone’s questions fully, and I am enclosing a question and answer list that I hope will answer points that were raised.

We have read through the feedback forms that were filled in. The comments we received were varied, and show the range of users that the centre has. The most common issues raised were as follows:

1. Preference for 33m pool (10 comments)
2. Preference for the centre to be left as it is an stay open or refurb (9 comments)
3. Easier accessibility to the centre (9)
4. What will existing users / clubs do whilst the centre is closed? (7)
5. Preference for 25m pool (6)
6. Quality and access of toilets and changing rooms (6)
7. Timescale (5)
8. Expense of project and making sure the new centre remains affordable (4)
9. Sauna / Steam room (3)
10. A new gym (2)
11. Sports Centre should be modernised or rebuilt (2)
12. Bicycle parking facility (2)
13. Larger facility for group classes (2)
14. Better outside space (2)

I understand that there was frustration at the lack of firm information about the future of the centre. The decision whether to go ahead with the project, and whether to refurbish or rebuild the leisure centre will be made at the Council’s Cabinet Meeting on 12 December. After this decision is made, we will be able to say with certainty what is going to happen to the centre, and I will contact you again after this meeting to let you know the outcome of it.

Thank you again for your participation in the meeting. If the decision is made to go ahead with a new or refurbished leisure centre, there will be opportunities to influence the mix and design of the new facilities, which I hope you will take part in. Our website will be updated regularly to let you know what is happening, and we may also contact you directly.

Yours sincerely

Ullash Karia
Letter from the Chairman

Dear CWSC Members:

Congratulations to all the CWSC swimmers, coaches and members on many recent achievements. Some of these include: the Club fielded its first ever relay team at the London Region Youth Championships (for swimmers at least 15 years old), as well as a record number of individual CWSC swimmers; the successes of three CWSC swimmers at the British Olympic Trials, held at the London Aquatics Centre in Olympic Park; and as word of the Club’s excellent coaching spreads, we had a record 120 swimmers turn out for new member assessments last month. (Unfortunately, most of these swimmers must go onto our waiting list, given the severe constraints we face on pool time.)

CWSC volunteers, lead by Sarah O’Connell (mother of Orla), Claire Keogh (mother of Phoebe), and Head Coach Bram Montgomery, have been hard at work exploring additional pool time to replace the sessions at Kensington Leisure Centre (KLC). Our current expectation is that KLC will be closed for two years beginning in early 2013. We are in discussions with various potential replacement pools and at this stage are optimistic we will be able to replace the KLC sessions. There will, of course, be some adjustments to schedule and locations. As partial consolation, a fantastic new pool is planned for KLC. Thank you to those who have made CWSC an active participant in the planning process for the new pool and leisure centre.

CWSC was recently award the ActiveWestminsterClubmark by Westminster Borough, giving us, for the first time, accredited status in Westminster. Sarah O’Connell’s tremendous efforts made this happen. Westminster and our other boroughs are looking to field strong teams for the upcoming London Youth and Mini Youth Games, and we encourage you to participate. You should have been contacted already by your home/school borough, but if not, please let Claire Keogh know at secretary@cwswimming.com.

This is the final edition of the newsletter for our Editor Celeste Shirvani (mother of Kamran and Leili), who is moving on to lead the effort for a first ever Parent Handbook for the Club. Thank you to Celeste and welcome to Mags Close (mother of Chloe and Charlie), who has kindly agreed to serve as Newsletter Editor. If you would like to help on the newsletter, Parent Handbook, social events or other Club work, please email office@cwswimming.com. Other than the Coaches, the Club is entirely staffed by volunteers.

Just in case you are not already in the Olympic spirit, please be sure and turn out to see and hear Misty Hyman, a Gold medalist from the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000. Misty will speak and coach at the regular CWSC training sessions on Thursday May 31st and Friday June 1st. Misty won the 200m butterfly at Sydney in one of the most thrilling swimming races ever. Misty is also a top student and attended Stanford University. A portion of the funds raised at last year’s CWSC Swim-a-Thon have been utilized for Misty’s appearance.

I wish everyone a great British Olympic Summer.

Philip Boeckman
CWSC Chair
Not to be Missed

CWSC Nominated for Pro-Active London Sports Awards

CWSC was one of three London sports clubs shortlisted for the Sports Club of the Year Award sponsored by the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation. This gala event, held in April at the Kia Oval, was attended by coaches Lianne Murphy and Chris Bennett, accompanied by Sarah O’Connell. Although we did not win the Award, this is wonderful recognition of CWSC’s commitment to giving our swimmers every opportunity to achieve at sport, through swimming. A very heartfelt thank you to Saba Hemmatabady from the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea who nominated CWSC for this important award.

LONDON YOUTH GAMES

Bram, Chris and members of the CWSC Committee worked together to send lists of potential swimmers to all of the CWSC partner boroughs. These include RBKC, Westminster and Hammersmith & Fulham. The borough for which a swimmer is eligible is based on the residential information we have on our records. Contact will be made with potential team members by these boroughs - although each has a slightly different process, so please do respond to the contact name on the letter as soon as you can if your swimmer(s) is interested in being considered.

If you have not received an email or letter from your borough and your child would like to be considered, please contact Claire Keogh (secretary@cwswimming.com) as soon as possible. Swimmers for the Mini Youth Games team (competition is on June 28th, which is a school day) must be in Years 5 or 6 and swim regularly with the Club, as ability is taken into consideration when selecting the teams. Youth Games swimmers (competition is on June 30th) should be in years 7-12 with dates of birth between 1/9/94 and 1/9/97. Swimmers for the main team will also be selected on the basis of ability as well as interest in competing.
**Recent Competitions**

Be sure to check the website [here](#) under the COMPETITIONS>RESULTS tab for all updated competition results. The ASA/Middlesex County websites also have information on full results for many competitions. Click [here for ASA website](#).

**Ealing Development Meet**
11th & 12th February

Although cold and snowy back in February, (as opposed to all our rain now), CWSC fielded 30 swimmers at this development meet at Ealing. As always, Ealing SC were great hosts and it showed by the performances of our swimmers. There were PBs in many events and for many swimmers. Congratulations to our four 9-year old swimmers who took to the pool that weekend! The future looks bright at CWSC.

**Middlesex County Championships**
Enfield
25th/26th Feb, 17th/18th March & 24th/25th March

Another record setting Middlesex County Championships came to a close at the end of March, and CWSC swimmers, parents, and coaches should be thrilled with the overall results. For the 3rd successive year, the club set new highs for total number of Medals (77) and Top 8 finishes (183). Most impressive was the fact that 17 different swimmers won at least one medal, compared to only 8 last year. Our swimmers also managed to once again re-write the Club records books, with 8 swimmers setting 36 new short course records. This brings the total of new records for the 2011-2012 season to an amazing 132!

**London Region Youth Championships**
Crystal Palace
5th & 6th May

CWSC continues to show remarkable progress at all levels. In May 2010 the newly formed club had only 4 swimmers qualified for this senior level meet; two years later we not only had 10 swimmers entered into the meet, but CWSC came away with 13 medals and further 9 swims finishing in the top 8 overall. Our swimmers managed to break 6 Long Course Club records and achieved 13 PBs which is a fantastic result for a competition at this stage in the season.

**British Gas Olympic Trials**
London Aquatics Centre
Olympic Park
3rd – 10th March

Three CWSC swimmers--Isabella Hindley, Charlotte Hogarth, and Jessica Harper-- met the difficult qualifying standards to compete at the 2012 Olympic Swimming Trials. Jessica Harper (17) competing in the Multi-Disability events, swam in the 50m and 100m Freestyle, as well as the 100m Butterfly. Jessica swam an especially strong 100m butterfly, finishing 9th overall. Isabella Hindley (15) swam in the 100m and 200m Backstroke, as well as the 50m and 100m Freestyle. Isabella went through to the semi-finals in both the 100m and 200m Backstroke events where her strong performance earned her a place on the GB Junior National team that will compete this summer at the European Championships in Belgium. Charlotte Hogarth (13) qualified for the 50 metre Freestyle as one of the youngest competitors. She scorched her heat, putting her first in her age group of 1998/99 qualifiers.

**Middlesex County Development Meet**
Enfield
15th, 21st & 22nd April

Congratulations to all CWSC swimmers who took part in the April 2012 County Development Meet. Despite an alarmingly and disappointingly high number of no-shows from our swimmers, those who did make it up to Enfield brought home numerous medals and Speeding Tickets (new county qualifying times), and most importantly dozens of PBs. Thank you to Chris, Lianne and Simeon who put in the time on poolside with all our swimmers.

**Link to**
Olympic Trials Full Report
Coach’s Corner: by Bram Montgomery

I’d like to start by saying a giant THANK YOU to our outgoing editor, Celeste Shirvani. She’s done an amazing job putting together a great newsletter for our members and we will miss her organization and enthusiasm. As one of her last requests as editor, Celeste asked me if I could write a Coach’s Corner on “why I coach”, so here goes!

The short answer is of course because I love it! It is such a rare thing in this world to truly love what you do for a living and I’ve been blessed to be able to honestly say “I love my job” since I began coaching full time 11 years ago. While I was studying for my Masters degree in Education, I was also coaching with both the local Age Group team and the university team in Providence. I found myself dreading leaving the pool while heading to my lectures and quickly came to realize that my passion was working with young people on poolside and not in the classroom. A year later I was able to secure a full-time coaching job in Boston working with elite age group swimmers as well as international level swimmers at Harvard and I have never looked back.

Although like all jobs there are elements of being a coach that I enjoy less than others, but ultimately the positives far outweigh the few negatives. Whether it’s watching our youngest swimmers master a racing dive for the first time; watching a 12 year old drop huge amounts of time to achieve his first Regional time; or seeing our top swimmers win medals at Nationals or get selected to represent GB, helping young people reach goals and accomplish things they never believed they could is hugely rewarding.

I feel one of my primary responsibilities as a coach it to help our swimmers learn about hard work, commitment, success and failure (in equal amounts), fairness, teamwork, and the tremendous sense of accomplishment anyone can achieve when you dedicate yourself to something fully. My goal is to not just help my athletes win accolades and swim fast, but to help them become positive, confident young people. They should be able to take the lessons they’ve learned in the pool and carry them with them their whole lives and hopefully achieve greatness in everything they do.

Training Schedule Updates

The Jubilee Holiday training schedule is on the website. Look for the summer training schedule on the website in early July. Our next newsletter will come out in September—so keep an eye on the website for the September back-to-school training and competition schedules.

Kit Update

Do you have Club kit? If so, don’t forget to wear it to training and competitions.

Don’t have Club kit? Check it out at this CLUB KIT LINK (www.mailsports.co.uk) or via the link on our website. There are hoodies, t-shirts, caps and back packs, plus lots of other great swimming items.

Wearing the kit is great because the items are specially designed to be suitable for the conditions poolside. Having the team in Club kit shows that we are CWSC: a great team with swimmers who not only swim great, but look great too! It says we are all proud to be a part of CWSC. And, of course, it makes it easy for parents to find swimmers poolside at Enfield, Northolt, Sheffield, Stratford and beyond!

Should you wish to order an item that is out of stock on the website, please direct your questions to mailsports or to secretary@cws Swimming.com.
We want to congratulate and encourage all our swimmers in the teaching squads, along with their coaches, for all their hard work. Try your luck at this puzzle. Coaches can give it a go as well!

If you are in the red, yellow, orange, or blue squads, send in your answers to newsletter@cwswimming.com.

A little CWSC surprise awaits those with the correct solutions. GOOD LUCK!

**WORDS TO FIND**

BACKSTROKE  JULIA
BLACK       KENSINGTON
BLUE        MIDDLESEX
BUTTERFLY   MOTHER
BRAM        ORANGE
CHELSEA     QUEEN
CHRIS       RED
            YELLOW

Thanks to Coach Julia for writing up this fabulous puzzle!

---

**LATYMER AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

The Club offers termly Associate Member places at Latymer on Tuesday and Thursday: 3.40-4.30pm for Beginners (Years 3-6, should be able to swim at least 25m of Front, Back and Breast) and from 4.30-5.30pm for Intermediates (Years 5-8, should be able to swim at least 50m of Front, Back, and Breast) at £70 per term for 1 session per week, £115 per term for 2 sessions per week. Interested? Contact headcoach@cwswimming.com with "Latymer After School" in the subject line.

---

**Squad News**

*In this newsletter, James and George Quillen interviewed Coach Anna Ochocinska. Many thanks for their time and energy to share this interview with us. Anna coaches both the Advanced Development and Black Hats at Queen Mother.*

*Please let us know if you would like to interview your coach. Send an email to newsletter@cwswimming.com.*

**This one is in Q&A format:**

- Where are you from? I am from Poland.
- How long have you been living in the UK? I have been living in the UK for over 10 years.
- Did you ever swim competitively? Yes, from when I was 6 or 7 until I was 15.
- What is your best event? My favourite stroke is breaststroke and my favourite event is IM.
- Why do you like coaching? I like helping to motivate young athletes to improve and achieve their goals.
- What is the secret to being a successful swimmer? The secret to being a successful swimmer is to set goals and to work with your team and coaches to achieve them.
- What is the best way to keep motivated? The best way to keep motivated is to work hard, enjoy your swimming and have fun.
Club Calendar

Entries for competitions are posted on the website - click on **COMPETITIONS>MEET ENTRIES**. Information on most competitions, including directions to the venues, can also be found on the [Middlesex County ASA website](http://www.middlesex-asa.org.uk).

### May 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12th</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSC Club Time Trials, Queen Mother Sports Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Metro Open Meet, Sheffield</td>
<td>Rotherham Metro Open Meet, Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet entries &amp; schedule on website</td>
<td>Meet entries &amp; schedule on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26th</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Open Meet, Crystal Palace</td>
<td>Beacon Open Meet, Crystal Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet entries &amp; schedule on website</td>
<td>Meet entries &amp; schedule on website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd &amp; 9th</th>
<th>3rd &amp; 10th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Region BAGCATS, Crystal Palace</td>
<td>London Region BAGCATS, Crystal Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet entry on website</td>
<td>Meet entry on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY, 28th June</strong></td>
<td><strong>SATURDAY, 30th June</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Mini Youth Games, Crystal Palace</td>
<td>London Youth Games, Crystal Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible swimmers notified/finals teams tbc by boroughs</td>
<td>Eligible swimmers notified/finals teams tbc by boroughs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### July 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st July</th>
<th>15th July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leatherhead Summer Open, Dorking, Surrey</td>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham Development Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet schedule &amp; qualifiers to be posted</td>
<td>Meet schedule &amp; qualifiers to be posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY, 5th July</strong></td>
<td><strong>FRIDAY, 6th July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSC End of Season Time Trials at KLC (8+)</td>
<td>CWSC End of Season Time Trials at QM (8+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details to be posted on website</td>
<td>Details to be posted on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIDAY 6th July to SUNDAY 8th July</strong></td>
<td><strong>FRIDAY 6th July to SUNDAY 8th July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmstadt International, Germany</td>
<td>Darmstadt International, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7th July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region Sprints, Crystal Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet schedule &amp; qualifiers to be posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14th July</strong></td>
<td><strong>TUESDAY 17th July to SATURDAY 21st July (15-19)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham Development Meet</td>
<td>ASA National Youth Championships, Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet schedule &amp; qualifiers to be posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUESDAY 17th July to SATURDAY 21st July (15-19)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASA National Youth Championships, Sheffield</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA National Age Group Championships, Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNDAY 22nd July to THURSDAY 26th July (11-14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASA National Age Group Championships, Sheffield</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Committee

Volunteer Spotlight

As a club supported by volunteers, CWSC thanks each parent for all that you do to support our swimmers. Particular thanks this quarter goes to:

Adele A’Brassard: Recognised as a “Local Hero” by RBK&C.
Ali Kidd (mother of Anna, Angus & James), Joanne Murray (mother of Reagen & Max), & Mark Rijkse (father of Caroline & Scarlett): For fantastic effort in organising the May Club Time Trials
Paolo Revelli (father of Carlo & Pietro): For attending “Equity in Coaching Seminar”
Mags Close (mother of Chloe & Charlie): For attending the “Team Manager Course” run by London Swimming and for agreeing to take on the role of Newsletter Editor.

THE WONDERFUL WORLD OF SWIMMING JUDGES! By Cristina Barbosa (Pedro’s mum and judge trainee)

Have you ever wondered, at poolside, who those ladies and gents wearing white outfits, doing bizarre gestures and even sometimes leaning over the pool edge as if some precious jewel is down there to be found, are? Well, let me introduce you to the world of swimming judges, to which I am aspiring to belong sometime in the future!

On a distant February evening 2012, 14 CWSC parents gathered at Pimlico Academy for what I expected to be the first of three pleasant training sessions to turn into a Judge Level 1. But the reality of becoming a swim judge is serious business. Pam and Andy, our beloved instructors, offered us almost 3 solid hours of condensed information on ASA laws and regulations, on the different roles a Level 1 Judge can assume and, my preferred, on how to record and calculate official manual times! And last, but not least, six pages of time calculations as homework!

On the eve of the second training session, there I was applying all my mental maths skills in order to come up with the official time of any individual or group race when different officials (in a ideal world, 3 timekeepers per lane) come up with different recorded times.

Then on the second evening, after checking the homework (with some surprisingly good results), a FINA video on DQs: the hundred and one situations that can get your precious son/daughter, or any swimmer for that matter, disqualified on freestyle, backstroke, breaststroke, butterfly, individual medley or medley relays, plus the proper way to blow the whistle on it! And I thought I understood swimming competition!

Now, is just a question of one more training session, at least ten mentoring training sessions and the final assessment. Bear with us; some will eventually get there! Thank you to CWSC for supporting us in the judging course, and we look forward to more of you joining us. White is definitely the “in” colour this season!

Kensington Leisure Centre Update

Thank you to the coaches and swimmers who met with the architects to review plans for the new Kensington Leisure Centre. People were really impressed by the thoughtful contributions. The plans themselves look great with a 8 lane 25m competition pool and a 20m teaching pool with a moveable floor. This means that the current Leisure Centre will close in early 2013 and it will be two years before the new pool opens. The Committee are working hard to find alternative pool time.

In the run up to the Olympics—there are lots of ways to win tickets to events and get all the aquatics news. Keep checking:

http://www.swimming.org/myswimming/tour

Welfare Officer Profile

Do you know about our CWSC Welfare Officer?
The Club Welfare Officer is available for all swimmers under 18 and makes the needs of these swimmers a priority. CWSC is lucky to have Jo Greengross (mother of Anderw) as our Welfare Officer. She is the first point of contact for staff and volunteers, young people and parents for any issue concerning child welfare, poor practice or potential/alleged abuse. If a swimmer, parent or carer has a concern about themselves or another swimmer, about how someone is being treated by others or something that is creating discomfort, your club welfare officer is there for you.

Your Club Welfare Officer is Jo Greengross (Wilson)
Jo has a professional background in Health Visiting & School Nursing.
Jo can be contacted on email: welfare@cwswimming.com

Jo is usually at Kensington Leisure Centre on Monday and Thursday evenings and at Chelsea Pool on Sunday evenings. Jo, as with all the volunteers on the CWSC committee, generally attends the club events so do look out for her and come over and say hi!

Next Newsletter: 3rd Quarter 2012
Please send in any items you would like included in the newsletter.
News from all of our squads is most welcome.

newsletter@cwswimming.com
GLL User Forum

We are always interested to hear your views about Kensington Leisure Centre.

A meeting dedicated to leisure centre users will take place here on:

**Wednesday 28th March 6.30pm - 8.00pm.**

Please email a question you would like answered with your name to Kensington.enquiries@gll.org (closing date for questions 26/3/12).

We look forward to seeing you.
Friday 18th November 2011

Our Ref: asa/facilities/dlfw

. Ullash A Karia B.A. (Hons)
  Head of Leisure
  Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
  The Stable Block
  Holland Park
  Ilchester Place
  London
  W8 6LU

Dear Mr Karia

SUBJECT: 25-metre x 8 lane swimming pool proposal

I refer to your recent email regarding the above swimming complex proposal.

It was common practice in the 1950 to early 1970’s to build 33.3-metre long swimming pools, which incorporated a 25-metre short course length and an additional 8.5-metres deep end that could accommodate diving from boards either to 5-metres or Olympic and World Championship height of 10-metres.

However developments since then have meant that such a configuration was no longer tenable or even desirable.

The need to reduce serious accidents from diving into shallow water introduced guidance that required a minimum water depth of 3.5-metres for diving pits and the recommendation that diving boards should have their own separate diving pool, which caused a great many diving boards in 33.3-metre pools where the deep end depth was less than the recommendation to be removed.

Without the diving boards it was very soon realised that the additional 8.5-metres of deep water was underutilised space and that more imaginative pool dimensions could better serve the public at large.

Research has shown that the optimum depths for main swimming pools range from 0.9-metres at the shallow end to 2-metres at the deep end and that even with this configuration at certain times of the day the deeper water is underutilised. However this water depth configuration is suitable for the widest range of pool uses and in fact the need for water deeper than 2-metres is only of benefit to diving from boards, water polo and synchronised swimming all of which although important to the Amateur Swimming Association are of marginal interest to general fitness and recreational swimmers.

Additionally the shallower depth has significant energy efficiencies and is not as wasteful of energy as the deep water 33.3-metre pools.

With regards to pool length there are two determinants as to pool length and they are short course (25-metre) and long course (50-metre) length pools. Without one of these lengths swimming clubs and competitions are severely restricted and remove the benefit of competition from clubs and schools. It is for this reason that the majority of surviving 33.3-metre pools have had bulkheads introduced at the 25-metre mark.
It is a considered view that there is little difference between fitness length swimming over the two distances and that the greater benefit to all of a 25-metre length configuration should take precedent. It is understandable that a loyal and devoted group of swimmers will be fond of the pool and the increased distance of each length of the swim but balanced against the greater usage the 25-metre configuration provides their desire should yield.

Apart from formally endorsing your council’s decision to build a new pool that meets FINA’s, Sport England’s and the Amateur Swimming Associations pool requirements I have to say that we would positively oppose any decision to remain with a 33.3-metre length.

The Amateur Swimming Association’s Facilities Team can support you with a range of services and advice particularly with business planning, programming, strategy reviews, risk assessments and Pool Safe Operating Procedures. They also provide a range of training services including Pool Water Treatment Certificate courses and Pool Supervisor Courses. If you are interested in any of these services please contact dennis.freeman-wright@swimming.org or tom.mukherjee-neale@swimming.org.

Yours sincerely

David Sparkes
Chief Executive Officer
Amateur Swimming Association
Amateur Swimming Association

25m by 8 lane pool - Advantages

Refurbishment

The ASA does not rule out refurbishment but such schemes have a number of pitfalls including unexpected problems which arise even when a comprehensive survey of the building has been undertaken prior to work commencing. Often these problems relate to defects in the structure, which are hidden, or to structural elements, which prevent the refurbishment being effective in relation to better use of the building and restrict access particularly in relation to disabled persons. Also in most cases, where substantial work is being carried out, the building will have to be closed.

Lastly refurbishment may only extend the life of the building for a limited period of time and may not be value for money.

Replacement

The present Dolphin Swimming Pools, Bromsgrove provides a 25m by 6 lane pool with spectator seating plus a learner pool. The ASA would recommend that any replacement should give an enhancement on this level of facilities providing better conditions for all users and anticipating the increase in use which comes with the opening of a new pool, the increased attendances which are likely to stem from the various Government initiatives relating to active lifestyles and health and lastly the projected increase in population in the West Midlands.

The advantages to be derived from an 8 lane pool relate to the increased capacity and the increased opportunities it provides for programming and the simultaneous mix of activities of activities and user groups which can increase throughput and help viability. This of course assumes that other factors such as the following are in place

- the correct design of the pool tank with perhaps the provision of a moveable floor
- the efficiency of the water treatment plant
- the adequacy of the changing areas
- suitably trained staff
- proactive management

Extra width

Based upon the guidance contained in "Managing Health and Safety in Swimming Pools" the additional width of the pool increases the maximum bather capacity for un-programmed sessions to 141 compared to 108 for a 6 lane pool.

Just as importantly the extra width gives greater scope for a number of different activities to take place simultaneously so for example

- lanes 1 to 3 could be in use for club swimming, lanes 4 to 8 public fitness swimming. Indeed this is a common type of arrangement and gives the opportunity for talented swimmers who require to swim twice daily including an early morning session, the opportunity for the evening session to be at a reasonable time,
- 6 lanes public un-programmed recreational swimming, two lanes for improvers,
- play session for children with inflatables in one half of the pool and session for older persons in the other half.
Moveable Floors and Bulkheads

Increased flexibility comes with the addition of moveable floors and the ultimate with the addition of a bulkhead which allows the pool to be split into sections and teaching and improver’s classes, lane swimming and deep water activities to take place simultaneously.

Readers are advised that the guidance or advice given in this information sheet is not inclusive and any decisions on swimming pool design should first be discussed with a member of the ASA’s Facilities Team. Contact details: facilities@swimming.org or telephone: 01509 618700.
AMATEUR SWIMMING ASSOCIATION

Pool Design Requirements 25m by 8 Lanes

This information sheet briefly outlines the design requirements for a 25m by 8 lane pool to be used for general community swimming and which is also capable of providing for swimming competitions (up to and including National Short Course) and training, synchronised swimming and water polo.

 Ideally a learner pool, which can be used for warm up and swim down (essential for National Short Course) and by persons and groups as well as for the teaching of swimming, should also be provided.

For 8 lane pools not providing for major competitions; water depths, seating etc will vary according to needs.

**Main Pool**

Length - 25m plus 0.03m minus 0.00m.

Width – Minimum 8 by 2m lanes with minimum 0.2m outside the first and last lanes (16.4m); preferred 8 by 2.5m lanes with 0.5m outside the first and last lanes (21m National Short Course).

Deck level construction with water overflowing the two sides and with raised ends 0.3m above the water level. Finger-grip detail to be provided at water level in the raised ends. The edging tile between the side walls of the tank and the pool surround, over which the water flows, should be of a contrasting colour to the pool tank walls and the pool surround and provide a finger grip for swimmers.

Slip resistant surfacing on pool end walls extending 0.8m below the water level.

Recessed steps in the side walls at each end of the pool.

Moveable floor to provide a deep water pool of 2m all over depth. (Should the pool be considered for Synchronised Swimming a 12m section of the pool will require a minimum depth of 3m). Where a moveable floor is not provided the minimum depth of water at the shallow end should be 1.2m if a learner pool is provided, with a depth of 2.0m at the opposite end. If a learner pool is not provided the minimum depth may be 0.9m but should not be less.

Lane markings of a dark contrasting colour (black is most commonly used) on the floor of the pool in the centre of each lane. The width of each lane line should be 0.2m plus or minus 0.05m and should end 2m from the end wall of the pool with a distinctive crossed line 0.80m long and of the same width as the lane line. Target lines should be placed on the end walls, in the centre of each lane of the same width as the lane lines. They should extend from the pool deck edge to the floor of the pool and should have a cross line 0.5m long placed 0.3m below the water surface, measured to the centre point of the crossed line.

Pool surrounds to be a minimum of 4m at the start end and 3m at the turning end and on both sides. The main pool surrounds plus the surrounds of the learner pool should be able to accommodate 250 competitors and officials and fixed (bench) or alternatively bleacher seating should be provided.

Gallery providing seating for a minimum of 250 spectators (National Short Course 500 plus) and 6 spaces for wheelchairs. The seating and wheel chair spaces should give a view of the whole area of the pool.
Water temperature – 27/28 degrees C

Lighting – 500 lux (in accordance with CIBSE Guidance) for competition and 300 lux for other activities. Up-lighting preferred to reduce reflection and glare on the water surface.

The provision of a pool side land conditioning room should be considered.

Equipment

8 lane swim timing system comprising timing computer, printer, start system with 8 speakers, 8 touch pads, wiring harness and 8 line alpha-numeric scoreboard. The timing computer and printer to be capable of linking to a results system and ideally to be housed in a separate suitably ventilated control room at the start/finish end of the pool at first floor level with direct access from the pool side. A storage trolley should be considered for the touch pads and it would be prudent to have an extra touchpad in case of damage.

8 by starting platforms (0.75m high) if water depth is 1.5m or more. If high level competitions are to be held consideration should be given to providing platforms fitted with an electro mechanical contact device which will provide a split second recording of the take off time.

In pools where such platforms are not necessary one such block may be provided for training purposes.

9 by anti-wave lane lines with the floats extending 5.0m from each end of the pool being red. Additionally there is a need at 15 metres from each end of the pool for the floats to be of a distinctive colour from the surrounding floats.

The colour of the lane ropes should be as follows:

- 2 green ropes for lanes 1 and 8
- 4 blue ropes for lanes 2, 3, 6 and 7
- 3 yellow ropes for lanes 4 and 5

False start rope to be suspended across the pool not less than 1.2m above the water level from fixed standards placed 15m in front of the starting end. The rope should be secured to the standards by a quick release mechanism and should effectively cover all lanes when activated.

2 by backstroke turn indicators which should take the form of flagged ropes suspended across the pool at a minimum height of 1.8m above the water surface from fixed standards placed 5m from each end wall of the pool.

Water polo pitch goal and side lines (including goals 0.75m in depth providing a 23.5m pitch between goal lines) with the side lines suitably coloured to outline the goal line and half way – white, 2m from the goal line red and 5m from the goal line yellow.

Water Polo timing equipment, including possession clocks, linked into the 8 line scoreboard. (appropriate software package added to timing computer)

If Synchronised Swimming is to take place judging equipment and an underwater sound system.

2 by Large sweep hand timing clocks

White boards at both ends of the pool

Real time clock
Public address system.

Portable hoist, for use by swimmers with disabilities, with fixings in both the main pool and the learner pool.

Drinking Water fountain

**Learner Pool**

4 lane (8m) x 17m (20m preferred for a National Short Course swim down pool).

Deck level construction.

Recessed steps at each corner in the side walls.

Moveable floor to provide a variable depth of water down to 1.8m.

Pool surrounds ideally a minimum of 2m in width in order to allow adequate circulation space at points of access from changing areas and for wheelchair users. On sides of the pool where there is less movement of bathers a narrower width of 1.5m may be considered.

Ideally it should be possible for the learner pool to be separated both visually and acoustically from the main pool to allow for use by people or organisations or activities which require quiet or privacy e.g. teaching of swimming, persons with disabilities and ethnic groups. The separation should be such that the pool hall area can be opened out to become contiguous with the main pool area at other times.

Water temperature 29/30 degrees C.

Lighting – 300 lux

Spectator accommodation for up to 30 persons and including a space for a wheelchair adjacent to the pool hall area.

Group, individual cubicles and disability changing areas with direct access to the learner pool which can be separated off from the main changing area if required.

**Equipment**

Swimming and teaching aids

Play equipment

Portable stairs or ramp to assist access to and egress from the pool for people with walking difficulties

Drinking water fountain

Real time clock

**General**

The above are the main requirements to meet the detailed needs of the ASA but in addition the design should ensure
a high standard of water treatment with medium rate (24m/h) sand, pressure, air scoured filters, with the continuous dosing of a coagulant, good water circulation within the pools, appropriate turnover periods and chlorine supplemented by ozone or ultra violet for disinfection is recommended. Good practice would dictate that each pool should have its own separate water treatment plant. However, there may be operational advantages if the main and teaching pools are linked.

a good standard of ventilation with heat recovery, but no re-circulation of exhaust air, providing an air temperature of plus or minus 1 degree C of the water temperature and a relative humidity of 50 to 70% in the pool hall areas and temperature of around 24 degrees C in the changing and shower and toilet areas,

there is no glare or specular reflection in the pools from either natural or artificial light sources and no solar gain unless this is compensated for in the design and used as an energy conservation measure,

if water polo is to be played, that the design is such as to prevent damage to the building fabric including glazing, plant, controls and equipment from the ball

village and group changing areas have circulation routes which encourage the use of toilets and showers prior to entry into the pool areas adjacent to shallow water,

the use of appropriate finishes; including slip resistant surfaces in wet areas which comply with the requirements as appropriate of groups A, B and C EN 13451-1 in all directions,

adequate storage areas - this may mean also providing areas for Clubs which use the pool to store equipment e.g. swimming training aids, polo balls, sub aqua equipment etc,

provision of a First Aid room which will also be suitable for Dope Testing,

pool safety equipment in accordance with a risk assessment, including reaching poles and throwing ropes, spine board, push button alarms and consideration should be given to computer aided pool surveillance equipment to supplement but not replace pool lifeguards,

provision of a meeting room,

provision of notice boards for clubs,

adequate safe parking for cars and coaches together with drop-off and loading points close to the front of the building,

the building incorporates the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and is in accordance with the Code of Practice BS8300: Design of Buildings and their Approaches to Meet the Needs of Disabled People and the Sports Council publication “Access For Disabled People” which can be downloaded from the Sport England website,

Indeed these should be part of a design providing a facility which is

intended to meet the swimming needs of the whole community,

constructed to a high standard of materials, plant and equipment which meet appropriate manufacturing and operating standards,

sustainable, being responsive to environmental issues in terms of the use of energy and non- sustainable resources and the control of pollution,
• cost efficient to allow the facility to be managed with sustainable operating costs.

Readers are advised that the guidance or advice given in this information sheet is not inclusive and any decisions on swimming pool design should first be discussed with a member of the ASA's Facilities Team. Contact details: facilities@swimming.org or telephone: 01509 618700.
From: [member@fergalh.fsnet.co.uk]
Sent: 25 November 2011 09:07
To: Karia, Ullash: TELS-WasteLeis
Cc: Allen, Christopher: TELS-WasteLeis
Subject: FW: Fwd: leisure centre meeting 2nd Nov.

Importance: High

Hi Ullash,

CWSC have received a couple of approaches from the 33m lobby.

Our line has been:

1. 25m is the right length for children graduating from the teaching pool. 33m is too long. We have a boom in place during all our sessions to reduce the length of the pool. This concern will also apply to school swimming and less good children and adult swimmers.

2. Our older (performance swimmers) compete at standard distances of 25m and 50m. They need to train at these distances. Our strong preference would be for a 50m pool but will settle for 25m.

3. 8 lanes rather than 6 will increase the utility of any pool. Our club does not get in till 7.00pm any evening, crazy when most children at Primary School age, some as young as 3. At this point the pool is closed to Leisure users. 8 lanes would allow use to be split, for example 4 lanes for leisure users and 4 for Club or teaching, giving all users greater opportunity and flexibility.

4. The current pool is not fit for purpose. It is too shallow for older teenagers and adults to tumble turn. Large groups of potential users that the Club competes with for pool time at the Queen Mother Leisure Centre, eg Otters masters (and swimming is the fastest growing adult participation sport in London) do not use Kensington. Though we use Kensington for our social and fitness "Club Squad" we do not use it for our Performance Squad.

This is creating a real drop out of better Kensington swimmers, especially the less well off, at 11 and 12 as they find it difficult to get to our other more suitable pools for before and after school training.

5. Swimmers from the Club swim visit a number of pools each year for external galas. We see a number of well designed modern pools with impressive heat conversion systems etc. There is no point in re-inventing any wheels. Pinning any design to Sport England standards means adequate deck space not just for training and competitions, but also for disability access. Similarly modern pools have the potential to be curtained off, thus allowing women only sessions (this is something that appeals to quite a lot of older or larger women - not just Muslims.) It also means that we are guaranteed a quality and tested product.

6. Scope for competition use is also important, and can be a good revenue earner. Many galas take place at off-peak times for example the main Arena League runs Saturday evenings. (CWSC is about to be promoted to London Division 1 where we will be competing against the big Clubs like Ealing, Hatfield, Camden and Hillingdon.) It also provides scope for school galas, increasing the chance local children have to engage in aquatics activities.

7. The overall aim must be to have a pool that is well used,
Copy of email Fwd leisure centre meeting 2nd Nov. economically viable, and serves different groups within the local population well. The additional flexibility created by a 8 lane standard length pool will deliver this.

The first man I spoke to was perfectly nice. He saw and respected our perspective and we agreed to differ. The second lady agreed with me, and regretted that she had not heard the reasoning directly from the Council. Though she personally would prefer to have a longer pool for leisure swimming she wanted the pool that would serve the local community best. She tells me she has now torn up the 50 petition signatures she collected as she feels others would agree with her.

I would not say I would be happy to do it. However if a decision is made to go ahead with the Leisure Centre, and you are holding another public meeting I would be willing to give a short talk on why the Swimming Club supports a Sport England compliant pool. I think it might be useful to air constructive reasons for the decision rather than simply say that Sport England demand it or the ASA will veto any proposal for a 25m pool. They might, but for good reasons.

=
PETITION: Retaining the Current Pool at Kensington Leisure Centre

The prayer:
“An upgrade of the current facilities at Kensington Leisure Centre is under consideration. Part of the proposed upgrade is a new 25m pool. This pool will replace the current 33m facility. Please sign below if you are in favour of retaining a 33m pool in the upgraded facility/retaining the current facility.”

The Council acknowledges the concerns that lie behind this petition, and appreciates the efforts of the petition organisers to gather and express opinions on the issue. The Council has given careful consideration over a considerable period of time to the matters raised in the petition, and has reached a view on the best way forward. This response sets out the Council’s reasoning on the issues at stake.

Retaining the current facility

Kensington Leisure Centre (KLC) was constructed in the early 1970s and its structural elements are nearing the end of their life. The Council has considered refurbishing the Centre. We commissioned a study into this option, and our consultants told us the capital cost of refurbishment would be £14 million. However – because the life-span of the structural elements is limited - it is unlikely that refurbishment could extend the life of the facility longer than 15 years at most. After this time the Council would have to rebuild the centre at a cost of approximately £25 million (at current prices) giving a further lifespan of 40 years.

These cost estimates show that the average capital cost per year of life is higher for refurbishment than for new build. We have concluded therefore that refurbishment is not good value for money in this case, and we have opted to rebuild the Centre.
A further reason for preferring new build to refurbishment is that, with new build, we can
design in a much larger gym. This larger gym will help meet the strong demand for this
type of facility. More gym stations will give us the opportunity to increase the income
coming in to the Centre and thus reduce the subsidy that residents currently have to pay
through their Council Tax to keep the Centre open.

Choosing between an 8 lane 25 metre pool, and a 6 lane 33 metre pool

It was common practice between the 1950s and early 1970s to build 33 metre long
swimming pools. These incorporated a 25 metre short course length and an additional 8
metres deep end that could accommodate diving from boards either at 5 metres high or
at the Olympic and World Championship height of 10 metres. However, this type of
design is now obsolete, and diving – where it is still practised – is now normally
accommodated in special diving pits. New, modern pools are built either to 25 metres
(short course) or 50 metres (long course), which are the standard lengths used for
school and club competitions. This is why most surviving 33 metre pools have had
bulkheads built into them to create a 25 metre length. The bulkhead at Kensington is in
place most of the time, and most of our users experience the pool as a 25 metre pool,
not as a 33 metre pool.

From the very outset of the public consultation over the new Leisure Centre, we heard
the views of several current users who enjoy the 33 metre pool length. We knew that
reducing the length to 25 metres would not be welcomed by these users. We did not set
aside their opinions lightly. However we had to take account of a number of other
considerations when deciding the optimum length and breadth of the new pool. These
included the following:

- we wanted the new Leisure Centre to meet the needs of everyone, including
  people and families who are not necessarily interested in distance swimming and
  who simply want to have fun in the water. We wanted therefore to build a leisure
  pool as well as a conventional swimming pool. We hoped by doing so to draw
  local people into the new Leisure Centre who might never have used it before.
  We wanted too to retain a training pool for non-swimmers, ie to have three pools
  in all

- we knew the footprint of the new Leisure Centre was limited by the amount of
  land available; we had to have regard to the overall cost of the new Centre as
  well. We were concerned that if we designed in a 33 metre swimming pool it
  could make it difficult to fit in, or afford, a decent sized leisure pool as well as a
  training pool

- we wanted the pool to be wider than it is now, with two extra lanes, so the
  potential for conflict between different users could be reduced

- the Amateur Swimming Association wrote to us at some length, concluding that
  they ‘would positively oppose any decision to remain with a 33.3 metre length’

- the Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC), which has 400 members,
  wrote to us making several compelling points in favour of a wider pool with a 25
  metre length

- the Council's Public Realm Scrutiny Committee Working Party reported (12
  November 2011) that it had heard evidence from witnesses supporting the
  creation of a 25 metre 8 lane swimming pool together with a leisure pool. (I
  attach a copy of the Working Party's full report.)
The Council weighed up these competing considerations and concluded that an 8 lane 25 metre pool together with a leisure pool and a training pool would provide the optimum mix of water facilities in the new Leisure Centre. This decision had regard to the interests and preferences of those swimmers who had told us they preferred a 33 metre length, but the Council concluded on balance that other considerations should prevail.

We note with regret the petitioners’ unhappiness with the Council’s decision. However we remain convinced that the new Leisure Centre will offer a much better overall experience for the local community than the current one, and we are convinced too that new build will be more cost-effective than refurbishment.

Yours sincerely

Lyn Carpenter
Executive Director
Environment, Leisure and Residents’ Services

Enc
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) Design Exhibition

We at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea are interested to hear your views about the proposals that have been put forward for the KALC project.

This is your chance to see the proposals, speak to the architects and give us your views. Your comments will help to shape the final design.

Please place your name and contact details below, if you would like to be informed on progress with KALC programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tell us what you thought of the overall designs? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All need more concrete direction from Council. Where will the cars go to park?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Leisure Centre, Which bits did you like and which did you dislike?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Academy? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike? |

Please return your comments sheet to the suggestions box.
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) Design Exhibition

We at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea are interested to hear your views about the proposals that have been put forward for the KALC project.

This is your chance to see the proposals, speak to the architects and give us your views. Your comments will help to shape the final design.

Please place your name and contact details below, if you would like to be informed on progress with KALC programme.

Name:  
Email Address:  
Address:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Please tell us what you thought of the overall designs? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike? | Askudio  
  I liked the layout and consideration for local residents  
  liked the open space and feeling of space between buildings |
| Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Leisure Centre, Which bits did you like and which did you dislike? | Askudio  
  I liked the Askudio design best |
| Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Academy? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike? | Askudio |

Please return your comments sheet to the suggestions box.
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) Design Exhibition

We at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea are interested to hear your views about the proposals that have been put forward for the KALC project.

This is your chance to see the proposals, speak to the architects and give us your views. Your comments will help to shape the final design.

Please place your name and contact details below, if you would like to be informed on progress with KALC programme.

**Name:** [Redacted]  
**Email Address:** [Redacted]  
**Address:** [Redacted]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tell us what you thought of the overall designs? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike?</th>
<th>The exhibition was a force as without prior input from residents none of the schemes address the issues. The brief given by RBKC to the architects was clearly mis-leading it very different from what has been promised to residents at various times. The good point from the exhibition is that all of the designs propose that it is the wrong site, and the site is too small.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Leisure Centre, Which bits did you like and which did you dislike?</td>
<td>The designs all reduce facilities when there is desperate need for increased facilities. Some designs propose reduced facilities oponed the green and further. All lost the opportunity to increase facilities. All build lack of continuity. The school impacts far too much on the residents. If it were to happen the school must open only after school time and be boarded up to prevent pupils infiltrating the other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us what you thought of the designs for the Academy? Which bits did you like and which did you dislike?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return your comments sheet to the suggestions box.
GO AHEAD FOR NORTH KENSINGTON ACADEMY AND LEISURE CENTRE

Ambitious plans for a new school and leisure centre in North Kensington were given the go ahead last night (Monday 12 December) by the Cabinet of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

After carefully considering a number of design and cost options, the Cabinet committed to funding a new academy and a brand new leisure centre. This decision amounts to a massive £57.8m investment in the Notting Barns ward - one of the most deprived parts of the Royal Borough.

Demand for school places in the north of the borough is high, and a new school will help to address this shortage. The Government has already pledged £17.6m towards building the new academy and the Council has committed an additional £10.4m to ensure the school is built to the same high standard as Chelsea Academy. Co-sponsored by the Council, the lead sponsor of the academy is the Aldridge Foundation. The academy will seek to embed entrepreneurship and expressive arts at the heart of the curriculum.

The Council has also decided to commit £24.7m towards building a new leisure centre. The current leisure centre was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its useful life. An option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14m, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. The brand new centre should last up to 50 years.

Councillor Sir Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, said:

“This decision is very good news for North Kensington and represents part of the Council’s ongoing commitment to the redevelopment and regeneration of the area.

“We are prepared to invest the cash necessary to really tackle the disparity between the north and south of the borough. This initiative will not only help to address the shortage of school places but give the community brand new leisure facilities to enjoy for decades to come.
“However, before we submit a planning application we have a lot more work ahead of us and promise that we will continue to involve and listen to people every step of the way.”

Following the Cabinet’s decision, Chairman of the Aldridge Foundation, Rod Aldridge, said:

“The additional funding will enable us to provide an incredible Academy school for the young people of North Kensington and parents will be proud of the high standards we are aiming for. It will also be a valuable community asset, from which the local residents will benefit.”

The preferred option also includes the provision of some new housing along Bomore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element of the project will be undertaken in the coming months.

The Council’s plans for an academy and leisure centre will then form a planning application that the Council aims to submit in June 2012. A decision by the Council’s Planning Application Committee is then expected in the summer of 2012.

For more information on the project please visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc

-ENDS-

Notes to Editors

Notes to Editors

• The proposed new leisure centre will have three pools and an eight-court sports hall.

• The Council is committing a total of £40.2m, which will come either from its reserves or from part of the receipt from the sale of land to the south of Holland Park School. The breakdown is as follows:

  a) Academy - £10.4 million
  b) Leisure Centre - £24.7 million
  c) Public realm improvements and other works - £5.1 million

• The Government has pledged £17.6m towards building the new academy.

• This amounts to a total investment in North Kensington of £57.8 million.

• Cabinet has also instructed officers to explore the potential for local people to secure some of the jobs that arise from the redevelopment.
The Royal Borough will be hosting two drop-in sessions so that the local community can learn more about the next steps on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre which were agreed by the Council's Cabinet in December. Drop-in sessions will take place at the Kensington Leisure Centre.
This will be an opportunity to see how the plans have progressed since the Cabinet decision. The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions you may have. There will also be four 15 minute presentations from the architects during these sessions to explain the emerging designs.

The sessions will take place in the crèche of Kensington Leisure Centre, Walmer Road, W11 4PQ on:

- **Thursday 26 January**
  from **4pm to 8pm**
  (Architect presentations will take place at 5pm and 7pm)

- **Saturday 28 January**
  from **10am to 2pm**
  (Architect presentations will take place at 11am and 1pm)

If you are unable to attend then please let us know what you think by sending back the attached Business Reply comment card. You can also email us your comments at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk
On 12 December the Cabinet agreed to take the proposals for a new academy and leisure centre forward and committed to providing further funding that will see a total of £57.8m provided for the project.

During the meeting the Cabinet reviewed a range of options for the development and agreed on one which includes an additional investment of £10.4m towards the new academy from the Council. The Cabinet also committed to providing £24.7m for a new leisure centre and £5.1m for public realm improvements and other enabling works. This is on top of £17.6m of funding already confirmed by the Government for the academy.

The additional funding for the academy will ensure that the design and construction of the building can deliver the first class curriculum to support the high standards of education that both sponsors aspire to in all their schools.

In addition, the Council’s Cabinet also discussed carefully the different options available for the leisure centre. The current leisure centre was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its useful life. The option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14m, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. A brand new leisure centre should last much longer.

The £24.7m allocated to a new leisure centre demonstrates the Council’s commitment to improving the health of residents in North Kensington by providing improved, modern facilities to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay well.

The preferred option also includes the provision of some new housing along Bomore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element of the project will be undertaken in the coming months.

The Council’s commitment of £40.2m to the academy and leisure centre alongside the Government funding for the academy is a very significant investment in North Kensington.
Many thanks for your interest in developing the design of the new academy and leisure centre.

We would welcome any comments on the proposal to inform the emerging designs.

For your convenience this is a Business Reply Form so once you have filled out comments you can simply post it back to us for free.

To find out more, including our Frequently Asked Questions, please visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc
**Next steps**

We are now looking forward to sharing the emerging designs for the academy and leisure centre with local communities and getting their views. Following these drop-in sessions we will continue to keep the community informed and further consultation events will be organised in the coming months.

The aim of these events is to tell people how the plans are progressing and listen to feedback before the plans are finalised. A planning application is then expected to be submitted in the spring and a decision by the Council’s Planning Application Committee will be made in the summer.

**Contacts**

You can continue to email us with your comments, concerns and support at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC)
Att: Shelley Gittens
Room B153
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and at www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

Information from this leaflet can be made available in different languages. For more information please contact 020 7361 3008.
hosting two drop-in community can learn on the Kensington centre which were agreed in December.

See how the plans have decision. The Council, (Architects of the academy), Studio members of the project team questions you may have.
to the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre drop-in sessions. The council are holding these drop-in sessions so that the local community can ask questions about the plans for a new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre. There will also be four 15 minute presentations from the architects during these events to explain the emerging designs:

- **Project presentations will take place at 5pm and 7pm on Thursday 26 July**
- **Project presentations will take place at 11am and 1pm on Saturday 28 July**

The council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the Academy), Studio E (architects) and other members of the project team are on hand to answer any questions you may have.
In December 2011 the Council’s Cabinet agreed to take the proposals for the new academy and leisure centre forward and committed to providing funding that would total £24.7million for the project.

The Cabinet reviewed a range of design and cost options for the development and agreed to proceed with the one which includes:

- Extra £10.4million to fund public realm improvements and other enabling works.
- A new bypass along Bomore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element will be undertaken in the coming months.

The Cabinet also carefully discussed the different options available for the leisure centre and decided to commit £24.7million for a new leisure centre.

The existing leisure centre was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its life. An option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects confirmed that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14million, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years.

The Council’s commitment of £40.2million to the academy and leisure centre alongside the Government funding for the academy is a very significant investment in the future of the area.
Let us know what you think of the plans so far by filling out a comment card at the event. You can post it back to us for free. You can also email us your comments at inquiries@rbkc.gov.uk

During these drop-in sessions we will continue to keep the community informed and further consultation events will be organised in the coming months.

The aim of these events is to tell people how the plans are progressing and listen to feedback before the plans are finalised.

- A planning application is then expected to be submitted in the spring and a decision by the Council’s Planning Application Committee is likely to be made in the summer.

To find out more, including our Frequently Asked Questions, please visit our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and at www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk.
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KENSINGTON ACADEMY AND LEISURE CENTRE: INVITATION TO DROP-IN SESSIONS

The Royal Borough will be hosting two drop-in sessions so that the local community can learn more about the next steps on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre which were agreed by the Council's Cabinet in December. Drop-in sessions will take place at the Kensington Leisure Centre.

This will be an opportunity to see how the plans have progressed since the Cabinet decision. The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions you may have. There will also be four 15 minute presentations from the architects during these sessions to explain the emerging designs.

The sessions will take place in the crèche of Kensington Leisure Centre, Walmer Road, W11 4PQ on:
Thursday 26 January from 4pm to 8pm (Architect presentations will take place at 5pm and 7pm)
Saturday 28 January from 10am to 2pm (Architect presentations will take place at 11am and 1pm)

If you are unable to attend then please let us know what you think by emailing us your comments at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk

For more information please visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc or www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk
Press Cutting

20 January 2012
Kensington & Chelsea Chronicle

Academy’s next steps

NORTH KENSINGTON: Two drop-in sessions for residents to learn about the next steps in the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre project will be held later this month.

The council, lead sponsors the Aldridge Foundation, architects Studio E and others involved in the project will be on hand to answer any questions after four 15 minute presentations to explain the designs.

Sessions will take place in the creche of Kensington Leisure Centre, in Walmer Road, on Thursday, January 26 from 4pm to 8pm, then on Saturday, January 28 between 10am and 2pm.
Background

We know that our young people can do well when they get a place in a Royal Borough secondary school and have a good chance of going on to A-level study, college and university. But places in our schools are in short supply, especially in North Kensington, and the indications are, that unless something is done, that shortage will continue to grow.

At the same time, the Council is committed to improving the health of residents in North Kensington and wants to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay healthy. For these reasons the Council’s flagship ambitions for North Kensington are to build a new secondary school and a new leisure centre, more tailored to the needs of local residents.

Kensington Leisure Centre was built in the 1970s and its sprawling layout does not make the most efficient use of its site. It is expensive to run and it is hard to see it continuing to provide adequate sports and leisure facilities in its current form beyond 2025. We would like to see it replaced by a modern, energy efficient building that offers sports and leisure facilities that meet the needs of the community and which can be enjoyed by residents of all ages.
Consultation so far

There have already been a number of academy and leisure centre-related consultations. The site for a new academy was identified as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) process back in 2008, and this process offered many opportunities for local people to have their say. Consultation to date includes:

- during May and June 2010, architects John McAslan and Partners, carried out a site feasibility study to see how the proposals could integrate into the local area. Several workshops were held to enable local people to influence the study
- in September 2010 there was a public meeting organised by local ward councillors
- in late 2010/early 2011 the Council’s planning department held a number of consultation events on the planning brief for the site
- in May 2011 the Aldridge Foundation (the lead sponsor of the academy) also held a public meeting to discuss the new academy and to enable local people to air their general concerns
- the formal academy consultation period ran from 16 May 2011 to 26 June 2011. The academy project team met with local resident and community groups as well as local parents
- in September 2011 there was an exhibition and opportunity to comment on the designs of the six shortlisted architects for the academy and leisure centre
- since September 2011 a residents’ forum has met monthly and will continue to meet as the plans progress
- a Sponsor Partnership Group has also been formed for advocators of the academy
- in November 2011 a leisure centre users group was formed and will continue to meet on a regular basis as the plans progress.

Leisure Centre

The proposed new centre will have three pools, a 120 station gym and an eight-court sports hall.

Concerns have been raised over the size of the proposed main pool, which we propose changing from 33m to 25m. Whilst we appreciate that some leisure users prefer the larger pool the Council is proposing to build an eight lane 25m pool as it meets Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) standards. It will also give us the capacity to offer much more opportunity for general and lanes swimming, as well as a wide variety of club pursuits, lessons and school sessions.

How the plans have progressed

We have made significant progress developing the plans for a new academy and leisure centre. In addition to agreeing an increased funding package for the overall development we have:

- achieved formal approval from the Government for £17.6m of funding as a contribution towards the cost of constructing the new academy
- instructed LA architects, who in conjunction with Studio E, are working towards designing a bespoke leisure centre
- appointed Studio E architects, who are working with the Council and local community to shape the designs
- set up forums so that the local community and those interested in the plans have an opportunity to have their say.
On 12 December Cabinet agreed to take the proposals for a new academy and leisure centre forward and committed to providing further funding that will see a total of £57.8m provided for the project.

During the meeting Cabinet reviewed a range of options for the development and agreed on one which includes an additional investment of £10.4m towards the new academy from the Council. The Cabinet also committed to providing £24.7m for a new leisure centre and £5.1m for public realm improvements and other enabling works. This is on top of £17.6m of funding already confirmed by the Government for the academy.

The additional funding for the academy will ensure that the design and construction of the building can support the high level of education and first class curriculum that the Council aspires to in all its schools.

In addition, the Council’s Cabinet also carefully discussed the different options available for the leisure centre. The current leisure centre was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its useful life. The option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14m, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. A brand new leisure centre should last much longer.

The £24.7m allocated to a new leisure centre demonstrates the Council’s commitment to improving the health of residents in North Kensington by providing improved, modern facilities to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay well.

The preferred option also includes the provision of some new housing along Bomore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element of the project will be undertaken in the coming months.

The Council’s commitment of £40.2m to the academy and leisure centre alongside the Government funding for the academy is a very significant investment in North Kensington. We are now looking forward to sharing the emerging designs with local communities and getting their views.

Councillor Sir Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, said: “This decision is very good news for North Kensington and represents part of the Council’s ongoing commitment to the redevelopment and regeneration of the area.

“We are prepared to invest the cash necessary to really tackle the disparity between the north and south of the borough. This initiative will not only help to address the shortage of school places but give the community brand new leisure facilities to enjoy for decades to come.

“However, before we submit a planning application we have a lot more work ahead of us and promise that we will continue to involve and listen to people every step of the way.”

Following Cabinet’s decision, Chairman of the Aldridge Foundation, Rod Aldridge, said:

“The additional funding will enable us to provide an incredible Academy school for the young people of North Kensington and parents will be proud of the high standards we are aiming for. It will also be a valuable community asset, from which the local residents will benefit.”
Next steps

Now that Cabinet has met and selected a preferred option for the development plans we would like to continue engaging with the local community and will be organising several consultation events in the new year.

The aim of these events is to tell people about the preferred option we’d like to develop, listen to feedback and then finalise the plans before a planning application is submitted in the late spring or early summer of 2012.

We will be hosting a drop-in session on Thursday 26 January from 4 to 8pm and Saturday 28 January from 10 to 2pm at the Kensington Leisure Centre to discuss what was decided at Cabinet in more detail. The Council, architects and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions you may have. Details on the event will also be advertised on the Royal Borough’s website and in the local press in the coming weeks.

Following this we will be holding further consultation with local people and the Department of Education on the designs as part of the legal requirements of seeking planning permission in the borough. An application is expected to be submitted in the spring or early summer and a decision by the Council’s Planning Application Committee will be made in the summer.

Contacts

You can continue to email us with your concerns, support and comments at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC)
Att: Shelley Gittens
Room B153 Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc

And at www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

Information from this leaflet can be made available in different languages.
For more information please contact 020 7361 3008.
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre

Drop-in sessions 26 & 28 January

Comment cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 January comments
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We appreciate that the current leisure centre does not best use the space and support any new development, but please keep a 35m pool. It is wrong to say that 25meters is fine. It is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A room available to and external door to accomidaate wheel barrows, garden tooles, fertilizers and bags of peat and compost etc. For students to work on their own plots of land. Utilising the open spaces for a different purpose than kicking a ball, hitting a ball or throwing a ball. the gardening hapanese live longer with this kind og exercise. Also interest and when supervised a traning for life. Also group authority, creates intrest guidance and helping each other (no bullying).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>please let me know when the new leisure centre will be operational - A. Langlois, 64 Ladbroke Grove, W11 2PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>We need a gym! My daughter attend the gymnastics programme at the Kensington Centre three times a week. It's a great program and one of the best around. I hope some of the money will be put towards keeping and improving the gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I would be in Hammersmith. None of the surrounding residential roads (Aldready over trafficked) has the capability of dealing with the new volume of traffic this development will create.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1. Welcome commitment from architect on 28/1/12 that swimming lanes in main pool will be as wide as in current pool. 2. Please ensure that woman-only swimming sessions are possible in designing main pool and changing area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The pool would be retained at its current length or if a change is required it should be made longer to 50m to enable proper traning at olympic standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Please ensure that the new leisure is fully wheelchair adapted and that there is a proper changing room and shower facilities with hoist etc for wheelchair users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>one can hardly comment on this next because the initial proposal was questioned by this writer and continues in the same way. Even if a majority questioned this proposal it would seem local democracy failed in practice. Let what follows prove the truth of those who dissented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I would like a sauna, steam room, state of the art gym and swimming pool, pluss a juice bar in the leisure centre as I live around the corner I would be using it in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Noise pollution, thus the need for soundproofing has been one of many issues against the Academy, however the architect has done the perfect job of cheating a natural amphitheatre, no that all the noise from 1600+ children will be diverted at Crenfell Tower and being a performance arts Academy, this wont just happen during the dat, but these are bound to be every evening performances too. How I pity the people in Grenfell Tower if this goes ahead. It remains a nonsense to place an Academy in such a tiny space in such an already overcrowded area. What can be done to make the council see sense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I currently use the Leisure Centre everyday at Lunchtime. This is the most convenient gym for me in the tight time restrictions I have at lunchtime. Are there provisions in place to keep the old leisure centre fully operational until the new one has been built? It would be a shame for the leisure centre to loose all its existing customers to rival leisure centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The decision to make the existing 33 meter pool smaller is a disgrace. It is the only 33m pool in the borough, and this is a disservice to all the serious swimmers who swim competatively. The nearest large pool is in Action. Why are you taking facilities away from taxpayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>loss of car park space - already at a premium borough loss of privacy for residents of Grenfell Tower facing the Academy. Noise and dust pollution from the build should be kept to a minimum - secondary glazing for those affected flats should be mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Why scrap the present 33m to a 25m pool? It doesn't make sense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As I have no children of school age and do no use sports centre I would like to know if the council have any provision for the tenants that have to put up with noise, dust, mice, and anything else that crops along the way - will we be getting rebates on out rents etc. Also can we have it in writing that you will not be knocking down out homes to make for something a lot of us don’t want. P.S most of the people using the sports centre do not even live around this area.

As the swimming pool is so valuable for residents and schools. I would suggest to demolish one part of the building (gymnastic, basketball any gym halls) and at a later stage to just refurbish the wet side pool area.

Thank you for the presentation. My concern is where all the residents and new ones in tenancy housing are going to park their cars, what about the visitors to the area and people need to visit people in their homes (medics, repair) to therefore carry out their work there is already a shortage of car park spaces. people will refuse to come to the area as their time will be spent more looking for a parking space than working.

Over 400 comments on the SPD - only comments about trees have been heard no link North/South open station walk to all no new homes, more parking spaces.

Please consider funding for dust screens on all exterior windows as there will obviously be an increase in air born dirt due to large building site on out doorstep. Noise issues are going to be present too but I don’t realistically know how you can deal with that issue??!!

Can you consider giving something back to this community (live) for the ensuing disruptions like new bathrooms and showers and/or kitchen as our are decrepit and over 35 years old!!

Great idea, hop all goes well and great. See you again soon. P.S I am 9 years old.

Would be nice if the propose free space opposite the new entrance to the Leisure centre had table and chairs so that people can eat and talk there, using it as a public square.

I am very concerned that the pedestrian access from Silchester Road to latimer road tube may be cut under this scheme: please keep one footpath open. Why are you considering making life more difficult for pedestrians by removing this while encouraging at the same time) motor Vehicles by commuting a road through the site.

I am very concerned that there may be a road (vehicular) running North/South through the site which could form up with Lancaster Road and create a rat run. I do not think this would enhance the area (I am a local resident) and do not see the point of encouraging people to drive through this route. Surely you do not want a road through a school site?

The proposal does not take into account the current facilities activities that are used by clubs. It appears to be more about revenue for the Centre. Take consideration for clubs that use the facilities. Extremely displeased!

Academy day lighting well considered. Light wells, 4m concourse leisure centre could benefit from a wave machine in leisure pool with sloping entry. Treadmills and cross traininers on mezzanine overlooking atria, etc would make a change from TV's

The designs look alright but the schemes on general is a disaster - too much is being crammed into too small a space.

Very happy about this development.

The Academy 

1. As I have no children of school age and do not use the sports centre, I would like to know if the council has any provision for the tenants who have to put up with noise, dust, mice, and anything else that crops up along the way. Will we be getting rebates on our rents? Also, can we have a written guarantee that you will not knock down our homes to make room for something we don't want? P.S. Most of the people using the sports centre do not even live around this area.

2. As the swimming pool is so valuable for residents and schools, I suggest removing one part of the building (gymnastics, basketball, any gym halls) and later refurbishing the wet side pool area.

3. Thank you for the presentation. My concern is where all the residents and new tenants in tenancy housing will park their cars. What about visitors to the area and those needing to visit people in their homes (medics, repair)? People will refuse to come to the area if they have to spend more time looking for parking than working.

4. Over 400 comments on the SPD only comments about trees have been heard. No link North/South open station walk to all new homes, more parking spaces.

5. Please consider funding for dust screens on all exterior windows, as there will be an increase in air-borne dirt due to the building site on our doorstep. Noise issues will also be present.

6. Can you consider giving something back to the community (live) for the ensuing disruptions, like new bathrooms and showers in our decrepit, over 35-year-old homes?

7. Great idea, hope all goes well and great. See you again soon. P.S. I am 9 years old.

8. Would it be nice if the proposed free space opposite the new entrance to the Leisure Centre had tables and chairs so that people can eat and talk there, using it as a public square?

9. I am very concerned that the pedestrian access from Silchester Road to Latimer Road tube may be cut under this scheme. Please keep one footpath open. Why are you making life more difficult for pedestrians by removing this while encouraging motor vehicles to commute a road through the site?

10. I am very concerned that there may be a road (vehicular) running North/South through the site which could form a rat run with Lancaster Road. This would not enhance the area (I am a local resident) and does not make sense. Surely you do not want a road through a school site?

11. The proposal does not take into account the current facilities activities used by clubs. It appears to be more about revenue for the Centre. Take consideration for clubs that use the facilities. Extremely displeased!

12. Academy day lighting was considered. Light wells, 4m concourse leisure centre could benefit from a wave machine in the leisure pool with sloping entry. Treadmills and cross traininers on mezzanine overlooking atria, etc, would make a change from TV's.

13. The designs look alright, but the schemes in general are a disaster - too much is being crammed into too small a space.

14. Very happy about this development.
KALC Drop-in sessions - 26 & 28 January 2012
49 comment cards received

Main comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card no.</th>
<th>Temporary leisure facilities (incl. pool)</th>
<th>Traffic concerns</th>
<th>Keep Station walk access (for pedestrians)</th>
<th>North - south link (for pedestrians only)</th>
<th>Noise from academy</th>
<th>Keep bigger pool size or make 50m</th>
<th>Construction disruption</th>
<th>Site is too small</th>
<th>Parking concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Royal Borough will be hosting a public exhibition on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre proposals on Thursday 19 April from 4.30pm to 8.30pm and Saturday 21 April from 10am to 2pm.

The exhibition will take place in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church on Lancaster Road, W11 4AH – see map overleaf.
This will be an opportunity to see how the plans have progressed following the drop-in sessions in January and comment on the full designs. The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the Academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions you may have.

During each exhibition there will be a 15 minute presentation from the architects to explain the plans in more detail.

- **Thursday 19 April**
  - from **4.30pm to 8.30pm**
  - (The architect’s presentation will take place at 7pm)

- **Saturday 21 April**
  - from **10am to 2pm**
  - (The architect’s presentation will take place at 11.30am)

After the exhibition the architects and project team will be updating the proposals before submitting a planning application at the end of May.

If you are unable to attend please visit our website to read the latest on the project – [www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc)

---

**Leisure centre consultation**

On 28 March Kensington Leisure Centre operators, GLL, consulted with leisure centre users. This was the second event they have organised to speak to members about the proposals for a new centre and the services they are planning to offer.
During the drop-in sessions suggestions were made on improvements that could be made to Grenfell Tower. Estate renewal work is managed by the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) and they have now begun their own consultation on improvements to Grenfell Tower. Updates will be given to the Lancaster West Estate Management Board and the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Residents’ Forum.

**Grenfell Tower**

During the drop-in sessions suggestions were made on improvements that could be made to Grenfell Tower. Estate renewal work is managed by the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) and they have now begun their own consultation on improvements to Grenfell Tower. Updates will be given to the Lancaster West Estate Management Board and the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Residents’ Forum.

**Drop-ins**

Nearly 90 people attended the drop-in sessions hosted by the Council at the end of January 2012. The sessions allowed the local community to see how the plans for the new academy and leisure centre had progressed following the Council’s Cabinet decision in December to take the proposals forward and commit £57.8 million of funding.

The architects presented the emerging designs during each session and members of the project team, including the Aldridge Foundation were present to answer questions.

Those who attended were able to leave comments and suggestions on the designs. These are being reviewed by the architects and project team and are helping to shape the designs.
Next steps

We are now looking forward to sharing the full designs for the academy and leisure centre with local communities and listening to their views. Following this exhibition the architects and project team will review the feedback and update the designs before submitting a planning application at the end of May.

The planning application will then be considered by the Council at a Planning Committee meeting in September. If the application is successful we aim to open the new academy and leisure centre in September 2014.

Contacts

You can continue to email us with your comments, concerns and support at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC)
Att: Shelley Gittens
Room B153
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and at www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

Information from this leaflet can be made available in different languages. For more information please contact 020 7361 3008.
The Royal Borough will be hosting a public exhibition on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre proposals so that the local community can see how the plans have progressed following January’s drop-in sessions and comment on the full designs.

The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions.

The exhibition will take place in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church, Lancaster Road, W11 4AH on:

- **Thursday 19 April** from 4.30pm to 8.30pm
  (The architect’s presentation will take place at 7pm)
- **Saturday 21 April** from 10am to 2pm
  (The architect’s presentation will take place at 11.30am)

For more information please visit [www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc) or [www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk](http://www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk)
KENSINGTON ACADEMY AND LEISURE CENTRE: INVITATION TO PUBLIC EXHIBITION

The Royal Borough will be hosting a public exhibition on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre proposals. This gives the local community an opportunity to see how the plans have progressed following January's drop-in sessions and comment on the full designs.

The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any questions.

The exhibition will take place in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church, Lancaster Road, W11 4AH on:

Thursday 19 April from 4.30pm to 8.30pm
(The architect's presentation will take place at 7pm)

Saturday 21 April from 10am to 2pm
(The architect's presentation will take place at 11.30am)

After the exhibition the architects and project team will be updating the proposals before submitting a planning application at the end of May. The planning application will then be considered by the Council at a Planning Committee meeting in September.

For more information on the project please visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

-ENDS-
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Academy exhibition dates

A PUBLIC exhibition on proposals for the new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre is being held on two days next week.

Residents will have the chance to see how the plans are progressing as well as meeting with members of the council, the Aldridge Foundation, which sponsors the academy, architects Studio E and other members of the project team.

The exhibition will be in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church in Lancaster Road, on Thursday from 4.30pm to 8.30pm, with a presentation at 7pm, and on Saturday, April 21, from 10am to 2pm, with a presentation at 11.30am.

After the exhibition, the proposals will be updated before a planning application is submitted at the end of May, and decided in September.

Visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kale for more information.
Architect’s impression of
Proposals include:

- Academy providing much-needed school places as over 30 per cent of local students currently travel elsewhere to study.
ed in a mainly residential area, the site has a

diverse architectural style. Buildings range from two to
The Kensington Aldridge Academy will deliver:

- A free, non-selective mixed school for all faiths
- School places for 900 11 to 16 year olds and an additional 300 up to 240 students
- A first-class all-round curriculum focussed on developing students’ entrepreneurial qualities and with a strong focus on personal development.
The ground floor will house a sports hall, changing rooms, and a theatre.

The first floor will include the school entrance and office, a special education needs resource centre, dance studio, painting rooms, classrooms for music, performing arts, business and personal studies. There will also be entrepreneurs and members of the community in developing business ideas.

The third floor will house the dining area, including a terrace.
Kensington Leisure Centre

Our proposals for a fully accessible centre include:

- A 25-metre, eight-lane swimming pool for teaching and swimming at all levels
- A 200-seat spectator gallery
- A 25-metre teaching pool with moveable floor
The centre will be spread over three floors:

- **First floor** will include an eight-court sports hall, changing areas and lockers.
- **Second floor** will house the centre reception, café and facilities.
These improvements include creating an enlarged landscaped Lancaster Green.
of the way. For updates and the latest informa-
tion visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and
kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk
Welcome

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, with lead sponsors the Aldridge Foundation, are proposing a new academy and leisure centre for North Kensington.

This brochure sets out the designs for the Kensington Aldridge Academy and for the leisure centre in advance of a planning application being submitted in May.

This brochure sets out:
- the feedback on the proposals to date
- the site’s context
- the masterplan
- the designs, layout and benefits of the academy
- the design, layout and benefits of the leisure centre
- the additional benefits of the proposals
- the stages involved in the project
- how you can comment and the next steps.

All comments will be considered and used to inform these plans.
Your views on the proposals

We have been engaging regularly with local residents, leisure centre users, prospective parents and other key groups over the past two years on the emerging proposals for the new academy and leisure centre.

This began with consultation on the planning brief for the site which set out the Council’s vision. Between November 2010 and March 2011 this included a series of drop-in events, workshops and a presentation ahead of the brief being adopted by the Council in May 2011.

There was also a separate period of consultation on the ethos for the academy that took place in the summer of 2010 that was led by the Council’s Directorate for Family and Children’s Services and the Aldridge Foundation.

The plans have progressed further following approval by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in December 2011 for a further £40.2 million of funding for the project in addition to the £17.6 million provided by the Government. Following this decision, the emerging designs for the academy and leisure centre were shown at drop-in sessions at the leisure centre in January 2012.

During this time we have also kept the local community informed through our newsletters, resident forum, visits to local schools, leisure centre user consultation and the Council and academy websites.

We have listened to and considered comments throughout and have worked hard to respond to feedback on the proposals.
Integrating into the area

The site for the proposed new academy and leisure centre sits next to the Lancaster West Estate facing Silchester Road to the north and Grenfell Tower to the south.

Located in a mainly residential area, the site has a rich mix of architectural styles – buildings range from two to six storeys alongside the 24-storey Grenfell Tower.

The site comprises of a dated leisure centre and a mixed use open space; while it does include attractive green space, as a whole it falls short of making the most of its potential.
The proposals include:

- A new academy providing much needed school places as over 30 per cent of local students currently travel outside the Royal Borough for their secondary education.
- A state-of-the-art leisure centre to replace the current facility.
- Creating more green space by enlarging Lancaster Green.
- Improving access and creating better links to the area.
- New homes to help fund the scheme.
The Kensington Aldridge Academy

The Royal Borough, in partnership with lead sponsor The Aldridge Foundation, is proposing a new academy for North Kensington. The school is an academy because this is the Government’s preferred method for funding schools in the UK and necessary in order to qualify for financial support.

Academies are high-performing schools designed to meet the needs of young people in the 21st century. They are free, publicly funded by the Government and inspected by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted).

The Aldridge Foundation is a charity that helps young people reach their potential through education and contribute to improving their communities. All Aldridge academies focus on the development of students’ entrepreneurial qualities - including passion, determination, risk-taking, problem-solving, teamwork and creativity. This will feed into all lessons, after school activities, the rewards system and work with the community.

The proposed opening date of the academy is September 2014 for the first group of 11 year olds, with a second group starting the following September.

Community benefits

The proposed new academy will play a full part in its community and in the community of schools in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Facilities such as the sports hall, dance studio and theatre will also be available for adults and community groups to use outside of school hours.

Dedicated entrepreneurial areas or “pods” will be available in the academy to assist students and members of the community develop their business ideas. Each pod will come equipped with internet access, phone line and desks. Aldridge Foundation academies also provide support and training to help the development of business and social enterprises in their communities.

Admissions

The academy will be a local school serving the local community and will adopt the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea admissions criteria. An admissions priority area is being proposed as part of the academy plans. This will not exclude parents outside the area but will ensure it is first and foremost a neighbourhood school.

The post codes included within the priority areas are W10, W11, W12, W14 and a small area of W2. There will be no selection by ability, gender or religion.

The academy will deliver:

- a free, non-selective mixed 11–18 school with places for 900 11–16 year olds and a sixth form for up to 240 students
- first-class all-round curriculum focussed on developing students’ entrepreneurial qualities as well as creative and performing arts
- a borough-wide resource centre for autistic students
- dedicated entrepreneurial spaces and support to assist students and members of the community develop their business ideas.
The layout of the academy is as follows:

- The lower ground floor will house a sports hall, changing facilities and a 350-seat theatre.
- The ground floor will include the school entrance and office, special education needs resource centre, dance studio, the sports hall reception, classrooms for music, performing arts, business and vocational studies. There will also be five entrepreneurial spaces for students and local business start-ups.
- The first floor will house the dining area, including a terrace, the school kitchen, and classrooms for English, languages and humanities.
- The second floor will hold a multi-use games area, terrace and science and math classrooms.
- The third floor will feature art, design, technology, IT and business studies classrooms.
- The external area will provide a playground, a students’ garden and bike shelter.
The new leisure centre

The Kensington Leisure Centre, which was built in the 1970s, will be replaced with a modern, energy efficient building that offers sports and leisure facilities that meet the needs of a growing community and can be enjoyed by residents of all ages.

Our proposals for the new centre include:

- 25-metre, eight lane swimming pool for teaching and training at all levels, fitness swimming, competitions and distance swimming at all standards
- a seated spectator gallery for over 200 people
- a 20-metre teaching pool with moveable floor allowing the centre to offer a wider range of times in the main pool for fitness swimming and club use
- a leisure pool with a sloping, shallow water level to help build confidence in the water
- 120-station gym, with the ability to partition for programming for different user groups
- spinning room
- eight court multi-use hall with additional accommodation and seating
- two fitness studios
- two squash courts with moveable wall giving flexibility for a potential third fitness studio
- a spa suite with sauna/steam facilities and treatment rooms
- dedicated male and female swimming changing areas
- family changing areas and two group changing areas
- ‘dry’ activities male/female change areas
- a partial green roof
- a café and meeting area.

The parking spaces currently outside the leisure centre will be re-distributed around the whole site. Coach parking will also be provided.
Temporary provision

We are very aware that the current leisure centre is a well used facility. Discussions are therefore underway with centre operators Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) on how they will be assisting current users with accessing alternative leisure centres whilst the new facility in North Kensington is being built.

GLL has experience in handling leisure centre redevelopments and in keeping disruption to service users to a minimum. They operate in London with thirteen other local authorities including Westminster and Hammersmith and Fulham.

There are also three centres approximately a mile away from Kensington Leisure Centre which centre users can visit.

These include:

- **Phoenix Fitness Centre** and **Janet Adegoke Swimming Pool** – 1.1 miles away to the east
- **Porchester Centre** – 1.1 miles away to the north
- **Jubilee Sports Centre** – 1.2 miles away to the north

Other leisure facilities in the area include the **Westway Sports Centre** and **Portobello Fitness Club** which are both less than a mile away. Discussions are also underway for a community use agreement for the facilities at **Holland Park School** which is only 0.7 miles to the south.

The leisure centre will be spread across three floors:

- **the basement floor** will include an eight-court sports hall, squash courts, changing areas and lockers
- **the ground floor** will house the centre reception, café and meeting area, three pools, changing areas, lockers and a multi-purpose room
- **the first floor** will include a large fitness suite, fitness studios, sauna/steam facilities and treatment rooms within a spa suite, changing areas, spinning studio, staff restrooms and lockers.
As part of these proposals the Council has committed to investing £5.1 million towards improving the public spaces and walkways around the site.

These improvements include:

- increasing the size of Lancaster Green and creating more landscaped green spaces around the estate
- improving access and creating better links to the area
- renewing the estate’s play areas
- substantial landscaping throughout
- improved lighting and security features

Environmental

We expect to achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method) “excellent” rating which would mean a significantly reduced carbon footprint and lower fuel bills.

Green features of the proposals include bicycle docking stations, green roofs and solar panels.

Estate Improvements

The Council is in discussion with the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO), who manage estate renewal work, on possible improvements to Grenfell Tower. The improvements will be subject to a separate EMB/TMO Board and Council Cabinet Decisions.
Safety

This will allow for better lighting, improvements to landscaping and pathways as well as general improvements to estate security. We will also be partnering with Safer Neighbourhoods and Park Police to ensure the area is a safe place for the local community and students.

Transport

The use of public transport, cycling and walking will be encouraged for those travelling to and from the academy and leisure centre.

Access to the north/south link will be restricted with retractable bollards which can be operated when needed.

A full transport assessment will be submitted as part of the planning application and a Green Travel Plan will also be approved. The assessment will look at the impact of the development on several modes of transport and the travel plan will set out a series of practical measures to reduce car use for journeys.

Improved east/west movement will provide a safer and more understandable route through the area to and from nearby destinations such as Latimer Road underground station and Avondale Park.

Housing

The residential proposals will:
- deliver quality new studio, one and two bedroom flats for sale
- provide essential funding for the development of the leisure centre, academy and renewed landscaping.

Timetable for redevelopment

Should the proposal receive planning permission in September, a phased construction programme would begin in the autumn of 2012 with the new academy opening in September 2014.

Construction of the leisure centre will coincide with the academy programme with the aim of the new centre opening at the same time as the academy.

There is a dedicated project manager who will be overseeing the construction of the new academy and leisure centre and will ensure that the building contractor complies with the contractual obligations, keeps to timetable and actively engages with local residents on what’s happening on the development.
Who’s involved?

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea are developing the proposals for a new academy with lead sponsors the Aldridge Foundation, and plans for a new leisure centre.

The project team is made up of representatives from the Aldridge Foundation, the Council and is supported by a design team.

The team is made up of:

Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cabinet Member for Family and Children’s Services

Laura Johnson  
Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) KALC – Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Ullash Karia  
Head of Leisure and Parks Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Andrzej Kuszell,  
Director Studio E Architects

Cllr Paget-Brown  
Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Leisure

Shelley Gittens  
Programme Manager KALC – Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Alan Brooks  
Head of External Affairs The Aldridge Foundation

LA Architects (Leisure Centre)

Cllr Coleridge  
Cabinet Member for Property & Housing

Peter Wright  
Project Manager Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Family and Children Services  
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Churchman Landscape Architects

Next steps

A planning application for both the academy and leisure centre will be submitted to the Council at the end of May. This pre-planning application exhibition is to provide you with the opportunity to comment on the proposals before they are submitted to Council.

We will share the final designs once they have been submitted and make them available to view on our website.

As part of the normal planning process you will have a further opportunity to comment on the plans once the application has been submitted. The Council’s Major Projects Planning Committee is expected to make a decision on the project in September.

If the proposal is approved, additional information about the construction of the new school and leisure centre will be sent to all local residents in the autumn of 2012.

Have your say

We want to hear your views on the proposals. Have your say by completing a comments card today or post your freepost comment card to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC) Att: Shelley Gittens  
Room B153  
Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London W8 7NX

Or e-mail your comments to kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc

And at www.kensingtonaldrigeacademy.co.uk

We will also keep you regularly informed throughout this process with the newsletters.

For more information please contact 020 7361 3008.

Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cabinet Member for Family and Children’s Services

Cllr Paget-Brown  
Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Leisure

Shelley Gittens  
Programme Manager KALC – Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Cllr Coleridge  
Cabinet Member for Property & Housing

Peter Wright  
Project Manager Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Family and Children Services  
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Churchman Landscape Architects
Many thanks for your interest in developing the design of the new academy and leisure centre.

We would welcome any comments on the proposal to inform the emerging designs.

Name ___________________________________________________
Address _________________________________________________
Telephone _______________________________________________
Email ___________________________________________________

For your convenience this is a Business Reply Form so once you have filled out comments you can simply post it back to us for free.

To find out more, including our Frequently Asked Questions, please visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have already sent an email, to which you replied, about the design of the swimming facilities. One thing I forgot to mention was the inclusion of the temperatures on the showers. 1) air and water temperatures available so heat from showers needs to be too. 2) cold shower setting to refresh should be an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) cupboards needed in changing rooms. 2) vouchers to be close to gym access. 3) is it possible to provide temporary gym?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited the public exhibition on Saturday 21/4/12. Looked at the designs, very impressive BUT I still believe that the proposed site, around Lancaster West Estate, is not suitable. The area is too small. Hope the Council finds a different site where the new Academy can become a beacon of learning - to maye us all very proud where it will shine as it preserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The leisure centre façade is rather bland - allow the batons to be coloured. Commentary in looks too corporate. I think the residential component is great but what is needed are 3+ bedroom flats not more 1 and 2 beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plans for the Academy and Leisure Centre look splendid. My concern is that there should be lattee access from the west of the XXXX by mobile transport. I suggest that TFL should already be approached about providing a less service. The 452 could be XXXX to take in Lancaster, Silchester, Bromley, St. Helen's, St. Lukes Road XXXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is very good idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about construction, traffic affecting our wall and foundations on Lancaster Road. Suggest north/south through road is closed from 6am to 10am so no rat run to Holland Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am totally in favour of the plans and development. Lancaster Gardens as presently existing is not a place I would go as my perception is it's crime-ridden and garish. I look forward to seeing this new provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leisure centre suggestions: 1 - Areas for bikes and Boris bikes docking station as the amount of parking spaces is very reduced. 2 - outdoor table tennis tables (as shown) 3 - Outdoor chess / backgammon tables 4 - Please label all surrounding streets on future maps/proposals so we can orient ourselves 5 - What will the price for local residents for joining the new leisure centre - not astronomical I hope! Special offer to encourage us to join. We will have been without a facility for 20 months, had building work and XXXXX 6 - Why not have a slide or wave machine - 'wet n' wild' sessions are popular - can be 2 - 4pm on a Saturdaypm since these would be popular and revenue making and you have the technology if you are having a moveable floor. Re academy: I do hope evening classes will be here which will encourage everyone to feel included not just parents of teenagers - can be a book club, art classes or something else. I write as someone who did between 92 - 2000 - 3 extra A levels at evening class venues within Kensington, 1 was Holland Park school and other Hammersmith &amp; West XXX College gaining A's in all of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lastly, I think outdoor heaters or heat extracted from the pool so when its summer and people using outdoor table tennis/chess/bar/cafe its not too cold. Thanks for all your hard work so far and giving up your Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 cont | I'm generally supportive of the whole scheme (pity the school playground will be in shadow at lunchtime). Would appreciate a new zebra crossing from the Nottingwood House Alley to the proposed new residential development, as the near building will block the sight-lines of a very tricky intersection for pedestrians.
# Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
## Residents’ Forum

**EMB Meeting Room - 28th September 2011**

## Minutes

### Attendance:

- Laura Johnson, Head of Housing (minutes)
- Councillor Coleridge
- Councillor Campbell
- Councillor Mason
- Councillor Dent-Coad
- Lucas Brahdel – Studio E Architects
- Andrzej Kuszell - Director Studio E Architects
- Ullash Karia - Leisure Services RBKC
- James Masini – Planning RBKC
- Sally Lawson-Ritchie – Aldridge Foundation
- Teresa Miles
- Olivia Dix
- Peter Martindale
- Edward Daffarn – Grenfell Tower Action Group
- Phil Owen
- Karen Baring
- Rob Regan - Estate Caretaker & Resident

## 1. Introduction by attendees

### Declaration of interests:

- None

### Apologies:

- Cllr Blakeman
- Anna Gardiner
- William and Wilma Anderson
- Shelley Gittens

## 2. Terms of reference

### Peter Martindale (PM): concerned about wording on decision making by residents.

### Cllr Coleridge (Cllr C): Councillors are there to listen to views, not decision making body on design. They are there to hear collective views and resident opinions.

### Cllr Mason (Cllr M): How will Scrutiny and public realm be involved in consultation and hear resident views.

### Agreed that residents’ views reported in committee reports relating to KALC.

### Laura Johnson (LJ): agreed separate group to discuss separate housing issue with RBKC Housing, TMO and Cllr Blakeman; e.g. windows, heating.
Report back to Residents forum.

- **Ullash Karia (UK):**  
  - Leisure User Group to be set up and run by GLL to discuss design and facilities. Will report back to Residents Forum.  
  - Residents and tenants group are welcome to attend

- **Eddie Daffarn (ED):** circulated list of issues from Lancaster West Stakeholders– to be appended to minutes.

### 3. Introduction to Architects

- **Andrzej Kuszell (AK) (Studio E):**  
  Introduced concept for KALC, presented how they approach a problem and find solutions, complicated site working on principles of:  
  - Keep as many trees as possible  
  - Protect Lancaster West Green.  
  - Try to improve routes through the sites from East to West.  
  - Massing and height considered keeping in proportion to local buildings.  
  - Ribbon development along road that can be adapted to changing needs of Academy.

- **EO:** Emphasised right to:  
  - A peaceful tenancy.  
  - Residents are not permitted to meet architects prior to design being put together.  
  - Issues about noise pollution are still to be addressed.

- **Olivia Dix (OD):** Will the facilities be used outside of school hours, needs to be taken into consideration.

**Agreed:** residents want forum to note that they have concerns about noise from school and playground.

- **PM:** To note Lancaster Green is broader than identified on plans, doesn’t agree with ideas about opening up the area to increased activity.

- **Cllr Coleridge:** Still up for debate issue about road through the site. Seeking view from the Forum about pedestrian and car use.

- **Rob Regan (RR):** Described access to Verity Close.  
  - Currently noise from leisure centre due to poor sounds proofing, would like to see this addressed.  
  - Would like to explore options for shared access of the road through use of barriers.  
  - Problem with existing access to services adjoined to EM offices.

- **Teresa Miles (TM):** Against opening up road, should only for be for emergency vehicles.

**Debate about location of café**

- **TM:** Concerned about increased number of facilities onsite which is already overcrowded.  
  - Concerned about noise nuisance from building of facilities and rodents / pests.
• **AK:** Can’t address this at present, will have to address with contractors and RBKC.

• **Cllr Coleridge:** Summarised view
  - Concerned about noise.
  - Road through middle.
  - Would like park not route-way.
  - Don’t want road with free access, should be quiet and controlled.
  - Concerned about over development of site.

• **ED:** Raised issue about location of school and leisure centre – could they be swapped around?

• **Cllr Coleridge:** No location of school and Leisure Facilities are fixed in SPD.

### 4. Education

• **Sally Lawson-Ritchie**
  Consultation with residents, families and children:
  - Meeting feeder primary schools.
  - Year 4 children will be able to go to new Academy (now).
  - Explaining to children about new school.
  - Parents challenging Academy about what the offer will be at school.
  - Met with Wesley Square residents concerned about influx of children.
  - Set up sponsor reference group partnership board, have Heads, community providers, sponsorship providers, firemen, etc.
  - Invite ideas, consultative forum.
  - Provided example of how Darwin Academy works.
  - Will provide feedback from sponsorship group and make papers available.

• **TM:** - Concerned about noise and suggested times

• **PM:** How will pupils be prevented from flooding through estate?
  - Parking for coaches, leisure centre users people using the school.

• **Cllr E Campbell:** From experience at Chelsea Academy, developed travel plan which has worked very successfully

• **AK:** - Academy has staggered hours which means children will come at different times. Parking will be designed into scheme, travel plan developed for leisure centre.

• **Sally L-R:** - work with new Principal to develop approach. Darwin Academy 8:30am start time, can come for breakfast from 8am.

### 5. Items for More Detailed Discussion

• Leisure – November.
• Architect – October.

### 6. Consultation

• Newsletter to local residents in October.
• Timetable to be distributed with date when decisions are being taken.
• 26th of October for next meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. AOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PM:** - Local residents do not agree that this is the right location for the Academy, would like this noted.  
**TM:** - Not against Academy, just the site of the Academy at Lancaster West |
APPENDIX 1

Lancaster West Stakeholders Agenda:

Re-provision for loss of our green space.

Noise Pollution (Grenfell Tower and immediate environs, in particular).

Replacement of our children’s playground

Security of our Estate and buildings (who will be responsible for students who encroach onto our estate buildings, who will pay for security patrols, security cameras, etc?...)

Community gain

Replacement of windows and heating system in Grenfell Tower and elsewhere on Lancaster West Estate

Community Heating Plant and the future of heating on Lancaster West.

Concerns of older people who reside in sheltered accommodation (opp is Silchester Road).

Need to improve road from planning brief.

Replacement sports pitches.

Funding issues for Academt and Leisure Centre projects

Funding issues for works on Lancaster West Estate

Disruption to residents during construction.

Lift access for disabled students from Latimer Road Undergrouns Station.

Car parking provision

Ongoing cost to estate of location of facilities on Lancaster Estate
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
Resident Forum Meeting Minutes

Grenfell EMB Meeting Room - 26th October 2011

Attendance:
- Councillor Timothy Coleridge (Chair)
- Shelley Gittens (RBKC)
- John Wilson,
- Councillor Judith Blakeman,
- Rob Regan,
- Peter Bradbury (RBKC)
- Councillor Todd Forman
- Elizabeth Ricardo Binding (London Communications Agency)
- Christopher Carr (Aldridge Foundation)
- Andrzej Kuszell (Studio E)

1. Introduction by attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declaration of interests:</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor E. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Streather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Daffarn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa K Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Minutes and Matters Arising

- There have been a number of requests from interested parties to be a part of the resident forums. These have been reviewed and the decision has been made to invite these people to future meetings.

- Councillor Blakeman raised concerns that some residents have expressed the view that new Academy would be a ‘second rate’ Academy. PB assured that these concerns will be taken back to the next Education Project Steering Group, to discuss ways to address these views and explain what Entrepreneurship means in terms of the Academy. The Academy is focused on academic standards to the highest degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Architects – Progress so far on designs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB to follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio E confirmed that meeting are progressing in looking at the different permutations of the KALC site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are 3 major aspects to the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Public realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) – Public Realm

- This already exists in the form of a walk; however Public Realm is being reviewed within the KALC site, as this is seen as very important and is reflected in the original design.
- The road that has been identified within the core strategy is being developed as a pedestrian route with restricted vehicular access. Minimum traffic for emergency vehicles and some provision for disabled drop off and collection, as well as coach access provision for both the Academy and Leisure Centre is being looked at.
- The issue of how access will be controlled is being explored.
- Details of the design brief are still being interrogated and the further details of this will be included in December’s cabinet paper. Further elements of the design brief are still being explored due to new findings from site surveys.

C) – Leisure Centre

- Surveys have discovered that there is a sewage network/drain under the proposed site for the new Leisure Centre which will influence what can be done with the proposed design. Alternative designs were discussed within the meeting, which navigate around the sewage network. Studio E took meeting attendees through 3 different design variations of the Leisure facility that avoid the sewage network. These options included a variation that placed the leisure facility further north of original design with a walkway to the South of the facility, allowing the residential element of the scheme to remain to the South of the site.
- Rob Regan – TMO have recovered from the Borough archives site plans held at the HUB, Kensal Road that can assist the architects when reviewing the sewage network for the site to see if there are any further networks that have not been identified as yet.
- Rob Regan raised concerns that if the leisure facility was pushed further north, loss of light would need to be considered. The request was made for this to be considered in any design revision. It was also raised that any leisure facility will need to consider noise pollution. Studio E confirmed that any new leisure facility will have sound-proofing.
- Discussions took place regarding Grenfell service road and access to it within the wider programme. These will be looked at in the wider context of the KALC programme and will be discussed with colleagues from TMO and the Housing department.
- Rob Regan asked if a traffic management system could be considered for the road to management traffic flow. Cllr Coleridge said that this will be looked into.
- Cllr Blakeman asked if the North-South walkway will be retained. Studio E stated that it will be and has been within all design options.

B - Academy

- The plans for the Academy are quite developed. The broad principles for the Academy are as follows:
  - A ground floor entrance that is away from Silchester Road
  - A Special Educational Needs unit will be located close to entrance
  - A Sports Hall will be provided within the Academy to the back of the Academy and will be sunken into the ground, which will deal with any noise pollution from there. There is potential for there to be community access to this facility to the South of the Site
- A dance studio will be located on the ground floor.
- Entrepreneurship offices will be located near to the front of the site, to encourage students to put into practice skills developed in class.
- Dining facilities for the Academy will be located on the first floor of the building.

- John Wilson asked whether there would be a boundary wall around the Academy site and his concerns about noise pollution. Studio E responded by taking the group through the plans to evidence that whilst there was not a physical boundary wall, the design of the Academy addresses noise pollution and concerns around loss of light through the design.

### Site

- An Arboreal Cultural Specialist has been commissioned to look at the site and produce a report regarding the trees and landscape. The report states there is an emphasis on retaining the trees within the area.
- Station walk may be lost when the Academy is in opened, due to the width of the path that will be left and concerns around safety if left operational. Concerns about the potential closure were raised by Rob Regan, John Wilson and Cllr Blakeman as they stated that the path is very well utilised during the day. Studio E to review plans and discuss with planning colleagues.
- It was agreed that community space should be retained and a way of blending the established site and the new buildings needs to be considered.
- Rob Regan suggested that a survey can be drawn up and be distributed to all EMB residents and those in the surrounding areas to ask what they would like to see in the area surrounding Grenfell Tower.
- Discussions took place about the possibility for a lift to be provided within the programme, as access to the tower and levels above are only accessible through stairs. This would open up and make the other walkways more accessible to residents.
- A meeting on the 1st November with Housing colleagues has been called to look at the wider community issues that may be addressed alongside the KALC programme.

### 4. Communication

- All within the meeting confirmed that they had received the latest newsletter. A request was made that the newsletter be sent to those on the resident forum electronically also. This will be circulated in future.
- The first Leisure User Forum will take place on the 2nd November. All are welcome to attend. The meeting will take place from 18.30 to 20.30 at Kensington Leisure Centre.
- The London Communications Agency will be putting on an exhibition for all interested of the proposed KALC design in the New Year, after December’s cabinet meeting has agreed the scope and level of funding for the KALC programme.

### Education Update

- The Education Sponsor Partnership group met for the first time and are looking is about academic standards. This will be reinforced.
- A range of meetings have taken place this year with year 4 parents (who will potentially be using the Academy). These meetings have...
been very successful.
- Education and the Aldridge Foundation will work with the communications team to better explain what Entrepreneurship means, as Cllr Blakeman raised concerns that this is not fully understood by all and that it is substituting academic standards. CC stated that the Aldridge Foundation believes that entrepreneurship is an enhancement to, as opposed to a substitute for academic standards. Further work will be done with education partners to allay any concerns that may around regarding this and better explain what entrepreneurship means for the Academy and its students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Visit to Chelsea Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Due to low attendance, the visit to Chelsea Academy was postponed and another date for the visit is being arranged for late November. All those that are interested are to contact Peter Bradbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. AOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Cllr Blakeman asked why specific education issues cannot be discussed within the KALC forum, as she is unable to attend the sponsor partnership due to her not being able to be impartial, due to the forums TOR? It was discussed and agreed that certain education items will be brought to the forum for information and as issues arise later on in the programme. At this stage, discussions are only taking place about the design aspect and aspirations for the Academy. The curriculum and more detailed information will be discussed later on down the programmed residents' forum timetable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cllr Blakeman asked for a timescale regarding the completion of the project and when/how long the work will take? This will be available after December cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rob Regan requested that Security of the site is placed onto the forum agenda at a later stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It was agreed that a forward plan will be produced to identify what will be discussed at future meetings. This forward plan will take into consideration wider items such as those mentioned within the meeting today and any wider issues that may impact on the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG to produce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting Wednesday 30th November 2011, Grenfell EMB Hall, 6:30-8:30
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
Residents’ Forum

EMB Meeting Room – Wednesday 30th November 2011
Minutes

Attendance:
- Laura Johnson, Head of Housing
- Shelley Gittens (Minutes)
- Councillor Coleridge
- Councillor Campbell
- Councillor Blakeman
- Sally Lawson-Ritchie – Aldridge Foundation
- Ullash Karia - Leisure Services RBKC
- Ian Hegg - Education
- LA Architect
- Teresa Miles
- Edward Daffarn – Grenfell Tower Action Group
- Phil Owen
- Simon Blanchflower
- Mary Harris
- Rob Regan - Estate Caretaker & Resident

1. Introduction by attendees

Declaration of interests:
- None

Apologies:
- Anna Gardiner
- William and Wilma Anderson

2. Minutes and Matters Arising

- Teresa Miles raised a concern that Studio E are part of the councils Architect Appraisal Panel and that they should have declared an interest to the project prior to being appointed. Councillor Coleridge and LJ said that many of the firms that are represented on the panel also submitted a tender and that the panel is about information sharing.

- The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.

3. Leisure Offer

- LA Architects and the Head of Leisure took the meeting attendees through the options that have been considered for the leisure centre. A presentation of the latest proposal was discussed, as the design for the facility has changed due to a number of unforeseen issues such as a large sewage network pipe.

- Options 1 and 2 were based on the original design that was submitted for their tender submission

- Option 3 introduced a route along the North of the site. To avoid the sewage pipe. However, this was not seen as favourable due to the
proximity to Verity Close.

- Options 4, 5 and 6 address the sewer issue and the walk way to the south of the building.
- The new facility will see an increase in area from 6000 sq ft to 8000 sq ft. However the footprint is reduced and the public realm area is increased.
- The proposed facility mix will see the new leisure centre with 3 pools (1 leisure pool, 1 teaching pool and an 8 lane 25m swimming pool) instead of 2, an 8 court sports hall, instead of 6 and increased gym floor space to allow for more equipment. 2 studios for classes and a SPIN studio.
- A retail unit is also featured within the latest design, to be housed on the south east corner of the site, however concern was raised around children’s safety when crossing the road to get to the unit, as the road is often used as a ‘rat-run’. Concerns have been noted and a transport consultant is part of the architect schemes, so this will be raised for discussion.
- TM/ED – There are currently 3 units of temporary accommodation for young people leaving care on the leisure centre site. What will happen to these 3 units? Why can’t these 3 units be re-provided within the new residential area?
- LJ – At the present time it was not the intention to re-provided the units on the new site, as there are other more suitable units available in other parts of the borough. However there will be a Planning requirement to replace lost residential accommodation so further discussion on this and with Family and Children’s services on what they want needs to take place.
- Concerns were raised about the noise levels that the academy and the Leisure centre will generate. An Acoustician is part of the architect team and will be assessing the noise levels as part of the project. Modern buildings tend to be better sealed and therefore less noise is heard.
- TM raised concerns that the new pools will not be available for those with disabilities. Disability access has been considered and the new leisure is fully compliant with accessibility for those with a disability.
- ED asked how much it would cost not to build a new Leisure Facility and for it to be refurbished. UK pointed Mr Daffarn to the Q&A’s that are available online on the KALC web page and was also distributed within the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Education Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Have been working with the architects about what is wanted for the outline design for the Academy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Still have not been able to organise the meeting with the 3 ward councillors, the Education Advisor from the Aldridge Academy and Marie Gethridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting with education partners about the expressive arts specialism. To look as the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When visiting primary schools, literature will be provided to explain what the entrepreneurship specialism means. This specialism endorses high standards, along with social justice and community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The recruitment for the Principal of the Academy is starting early, to be appointed by the end of 2012. As soon as this person is in place, they will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be tasked with consulting with the local community in preparation for the Academy opening.

- The ICT provider for the Academy will be appointed early 2012.
- Cllr E Campbell stated that it is very important for young people to learn skills as well as attain academic achievement in relation to the specialism’s and how this will be embedded within the Academy’s ethos.
- TM: Will staff be striking should they not be happy, as has been the case this year and will there be provision for the Children should they be affected by strike action? PB stated that when a new school is set up, the standards are set from the outset and these things will be looked at in conjunction with the new Principal and staff.
- The visit to Chelsea Academy will be re-scheduled for early 2012, as it was cancelled due to very low numbers and conflicting availability.
- In relation to the Autistic Spectrum Disorder Unit, Mrs Harris raised that Education should consult/take advice from ‘Full of Life’ who are a specialist provider that works with people with learning disabilities. Ian Heggs noted that the organisation is a beacon of good practice.

### 5. Communications

**Cabinet Meeting**

- Cabinet Meeting regarding the decision to be made about the scope of KALC (whether the Leisure Centre will go ahead) and the amount of money the council are willing to commit to the programme will take place on Monday 12th December at Kensington Town Hall. It was requested that information regarding this is to be placed within the notice boards within the estate. RR and SG to coordinate this.

**Newsletter**

- The latest newsletter will be available shortly and will be posted within letter boxes and on the KALC web page. This will inform people of the cabinet Meeting and progress to date.
- A walk around the site is being organised with Studio E before Christmas, dates will be circulated and those interested, please email SG.

**Design Exhibition**

- A design exhibition will take place after Cabinet to take people through the decisions that were made and also through the designs to date. The dates for these will be published shortly.

### 6. AOB

- January’s meeting will be re-scheduled due to diaries and a new date will be circulated. The date is likely to be Wednesday 25th January 2012.

### 7. Future Agenda Items

- January – Arboriculture Architect
- February – Combined Heat and Power Plant
- March – Planning application
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
Residents’ Forum

EMB Meeting Room – Wednesday 25th January 2012
Minutes

Attendance:
- Councillor Coleridge (Chair)
- Laura Johnson, Head of Housing
- Shelley Gittens (Minutes)
- Councillor E Campbell
- Councillor Blakeman
- Christopher Carr
- Ullash Karia - Leisure Services RBKC
- Teresa Miles
- Edward Daffarn – Grenfell Tower Action Group
- Phil Owen
- Simon Blanchflower
- Mary Harris
- Joe Wilson
- Chris Churchman (Landscape architect)
- Barrie Maclaurin (RBKC Parks)
- Andrzej Kuszell (Studio E)

1. Introduction by attendees

Declaration of interests:

- None

Apologies:

- Anna Gardiner
- William and Wilma Anderson
- Olivia Dix
- Robert Bryans

2. Minutes and Matters Arising

- Simon Blanchflower contacted the ASA in relation to the 25m pool issue and the ASA have come back to him in support of the 25m pool.
- The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.

3. Public Realm

- ED stated that he is unhappy with the plans of public realm and he does not feel consulted up till this date.
- Cllr Coleridge explained that based upon the decision made from Cabinet, particular areas within the programme were being discussed at different Forum meetings. Today’s meeting was to discuss the Public Realm and would form part of the consultation, along with the other events that have been put on, as well as the drop-in sessions that would take place on Thursday and Saturday.

The landscape architect explained the following points:
• The North-South, East-West links are important however due to the changes to the original design this is being looked at again in relation to the latest designs.
• Retention of Lancaster Green is important. The zones either side of Grenfell Tower should be retained in some form.
• TM raised concerns around the road/link. It will be discussed with planning colleagues and a proposal agreed.
• Officers are reviewing again the sewer pipe and whether this can be diverted.
• New plans have been discussed for a different shape Leisure Centre to take into account the feedback given from the AAP meeting. This could have a vista that connects to Avondale road.
• TM - The issue of electronic bollards in relation to the link. TM does not feel that the estate managers are not best placed to manage this. Ideas around this are being further explored. A robust protocol will need to be drawn up once an way forward regarding this has been found.
• MH asked, where will the new housing be placed? This is still yet to be finalised, however the view is that the housing will be placed towards the South of the Leisure Centre to act as a natural barrier to those living on Walmer Road.

**Playground**
• The existing playground will be re-provided in the same location
• There is still opportunity to look at Lancaster green and the playground and influence the plans for these. This is public realm and as such this is an opportunity for the residents of Lancaster Green estate to inform these designs. The attendees of the meeting were asked whether there are any new people they know that could help to inform the final designs for the public realm.
• ED: Is against the design.
• It was also felt that the playground is boring for older children.
• For older residents, there is a wish to have somewhere to read and sit during the day. A quiet corner to have for the old and for this place to be as far away from the Academy, possibly near the KLC café.
• The crèche will need a playground near them for the under 5’s.
• Only 1 playground can really be made as there is limited space on Lancaster Green.
• It was agreed that Lancaster Green should be in principle left as an open space and improved.

**Options:** Natural play equipment and to make it more into a garden

• TM request that the dead tree be retained for the Mistle Thrush
• There is potential for there to be a larger public realm area and it opens up a lot of opportunity.
• JB: asked about station walk and how this will be dealt with. Revised comments/plans will need to be brought back to a further meeting.

4. Education Update

• Working with the council at design stage and looking at classroom structure
• Looking at ASD centre and how this is integrated as much as possible into the main Academy
• A questionnaire has been developed and is currently seeking feedback from staff and students at Chelsea and other Aldridge Academies on their use of their academies to assist in the design of Kensington Aldridge Academy
• Visits to local schools are ongoing to explain the standards and specialisms of the Academy. These will be supported by publicity pamphlets. A briefing
with local ward councillors is also due to take place on 25th January.
- The ICT supplier tender evaluation process is underway with the ICT service provider due to be appointed by March 2012.
- The Aldridge Foundation is to host one event for all local Primary school heads and another for Secondary schools and Sixth form colleges.
- The next Academy’s ‘Sponsor Partnership Group’ meeting (with representatives from local community, sports, business and education groups as well as Officers and residents) takes place on the 8th of February
- MH asked, are there any families with children with special needs being currently consulted with? PB to check and respond back to next meeting
- The Visit to Chelsea Academy will take place on 7th February 6:30pm.
- TM wants to meet with the residents around Chelsea Academy to seek their views and experiences of the Academy.
- PB will be contacting the people from the last residents form Chelsea and will provide details if permission is granted would like to see a Studio E academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Communications</th>
<th>Peter Bradbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drop-in Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There will be drop-in sessions organised for interested residents and leisure centre users to come and see the latest designs and talk to the architects. These will take place on Thursday 26th January and Saturday 28th January at Kensington Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Update**

The Architect Appraisal Panel met and raised the following points about the programme:
- They highlighted the important roles that the public realm has to play in shaping the proposals and stitching the development into its surrounding urban fabric.
- The scheme needs to work harder to optimise the contributions of the public realm, especially regarding the north-south link.
- A shared surface that permitted vehicle use would encourage night-time pedestrian use, improving safety, and main public entrances.
- The panel supported the ‘ribbon’ form of the Academy, which sits comfortably of the site and responds well to the adjacent public realm.
- The panel felt that the designs for the leisure centre were underdeveloped and uneasy on the site. The shift of the buildings footprint northwards and its entrances southward in response to the presence of a sewer has compromised the quality of its urban design. The panel suggested that it could front onto and reinforce both the new north-south route and Walmer Road as important urban places.
- It was requested that a future meeting be conducted to explore the building works and where things will be stored. There are concerns about heavy vehicular traffic and concerns around the build and the effect of it.
- It was asked whether the building contractors can come to the meeting in March to discuss this. LJ to speak to PW

**Grenfell Tower Update**
- The Council has commissioned the TMO to do some costs in relation to how much it would cost to do some works to the tower, such as cladding, double glazing windows and heating. Feedback regarding the outcome of this will be fed back to this meeting, once the information has been received.
- This news was welcomed. ED stated that the Edward Woodwards estate and how it has been regenerated is a model of preference in terms of ideas for Grenfell Tower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. AOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Future Meeting Dates:
- Wednesday 28\(^{th}\) March 2012
- Wednesday 25\(^{th}\) April 2012

SG
### Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
#### Residents’ Forum
- **EMB Hall**
- **28th March 2012**

#### Minutes

**Attendance:**
- Laura Johnson, Head of Housing (minutes)
- Councillor Coleridge
- Councillor Blakeman
- Teresa Miles, Grenfell Tower Action Group
- Peter Martindale
- Edward Daffarn
- Rob Regan, Estate Caretaker
- John Wilson
- Mary Harris
- Mark Anderson – TMO
- Andrzej Kuszell – Studio E
- Simon Blanchflower

#### 1. Introduction by attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Declaration of interests:**

- None

**Apologies:**

- Alan Brooks - Aldridge Foundation
- Anne Gardiner
- William and Wilma Anderson
- Shelley Gittens
- Peter Bradbury
- Cllr Will

#### 2. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- LJ to contact Aldridge Foundation, have they got any more dates to meet ward Councillors? – Follow up with Cllr Blakeman.

#### 3. Introduction to Architects

- Pre-application meeting with Planning **29/03/2012**
- **ED:** concerns were raised about input of community into design process.
- **AK:** Number of engagement events held.
- **Cllr C:** Supported point made by AK.
- **TM:** Felt style of consultation didn’t meet local residents’ expectations.
- **AK:** Plans have changed to reflect local views with particular reference to the leisure centre.
- **AK:** Further explained scheme:
  - Lancaster Green maintained and extended to front of new leisure centre.
  - Walkway to Avondale PK.
  - Definition of north-south route.
  - Temporary closure of station walk whilst plans further development for
- ‘arches’ and routeway.
- Re-planning play area, brand new facility.
- Lancaster Green linked to new green with leisure facilities that need input from local residents.
- Roadway; controlled route with x2 sets of retractable blockades.

- **RR:** Suggested that control needs to be provided for security looking to drop blockades if required to allow access for fire engines, ambulances, etc.
- **AK:** What provision is there for special needs within the school?
- **MH:** Is there space within the school to accommodate larger areas.
- **RR:** Note needs to be taken of access to services @ base of Grenfell Tower.
- **RR:** Explained sewer diversion; currently through site, will go around the exterior of the leisure centre making the site more developable.
- **RR:** Access to leisure centre from Lancaster Green café can be accessed without going to leisure centre.
- **RR:** eight court sports held – sunk by 4m, three pools. Lower levels accessed from two lifts and a spiral staircase. Two squash courts, tanks for pools, once changing area on the ground floor and on the upper level a changing room and gym.
- **SB:** Asked about provision of underground carparking.
- **SK:** Parking planned to be on the surface rather than underground.
- **RR:** Walk and small communal gardens are they to be retained?
- **AK:** Yes.
- **RR:** Parking is a problem on Dalford Street when coaches park dropping off and waiting for people going to the leisure centre.
- **Clr C:** Fedback issues on parking to design team.
- **AK:** Leisure centre drops to one story toward Verity Close.
- **RR:** Asked how close will leisure centre come to Verity Close?
- **AK:** Will come back on exact measurements.
- **AK:** Alleyway alongside of Verity will be closed to through route, gated on each end.
- **JW:** Asked how close school will be to Lancaster Road and Whitchurch Street.
- **AK:** Academy will be 6m back from road with a 6m zone in front of entrance to academy.
- **Clr B:** Asked if Mr Oliver could contact Studio E about re-design of plaza in front of Methodist Church.
- **AK:** Agreed happy to talk to him if approached.
- **AK:** Presented further elevations and possible colour schemes for cladding of building.
- **TM:** Explained that she did not feel consulted.

### 4. Construction Contractors Update

- Four shortlisted contractors. Winning contractor to be announced week of 2/04/2012 – A request for them to come to next residents’ forum will be made.

### 5. Education update

- Aldridge Foundation liaising with local schools sponsor partnership group x2.

### 6. Communication

- 2 exhibitions are taking place on the 19th and 20th of April and a newsletter before publication event

### 9. AOB

**Grenfell Tower**
- Mark Anderson presents options for regeneration of Grenfell Tower. Initial work with Studio E.
- Issues:
  - External fenestration
  - Windows
  - Void areas on lower level of tower.
  - Rationalising office space.
  - Heating.
- Initial Survey of residents of Grenfell Tower, further discussions to be held with EMB
- ED: Questioned why Studio E chosen to do initial work.
- Clir C: Very difficult to have different contractors on site when x2 different projects going on. Synergises across projects design need between school, leisure centre, public realm and Grenfell Tower.

**RR: Security**
- Problem with gangs on Lancaster West, particularly Verity Close; motorcycles both stolen and vandalised by local youths.

**RR: Windows**
- Worn out on Verity Close and outer ridge of the close, need to provide security for local residents and sound proofing. What is the cost?
- MA: Looking at cost of replacement, RR needs to talk to Siobhan about safe neighbourhoods.
- Due for renewal in 3 years as part of capital programme.
- Clir B: Residents need to tackle staircase up onto Grenfell walk, blind corners, access, circulation space and connectivity.
- Report back on windows at Verity Close and Security.
- Noise acousticians to meet with Studio E, LJ to email ED to find out dates.
- TM: requested minutes posted to her in hard copy.

**Arches**
- LJ: Housing Department starting project looking at re-development of arches to enable opening up of station work.
- Early days, will come back with further information.
- PM: Questioned where businesses will go if Arches are re-developed.

**Date of Next Meeting:** Wednesday 25th April 2012
Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre
Residents’ Forum
Kensington Leisure Centre
25th April 2012

Minutes

Attendance:
- Councillor T. Coleridge
- Councillor J. Blakeman
- Laura Johnson, Head of Housing
- Shelley Gittens (minutes)
- Colin Chiles (Leadbitter)
- Henry Yates
- Geraldine Streather
- Edward Daffarn
- Rob Regan, Estate Caretaker
- Chris Churchman

1. Introduction by attendees

Declaration of interests:

- None

Apologies:

- Mary Harris,
- Ullash Karia,
- Aldridge Foundation,
- Elizabeth Ricardo Birding (LCA),
- John Wilson
- Simon Blanchflower

2. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- □ to contact Aldridge Foundation, have they got any more dates to meet ward Councillors? – Follow up with Cllr Blakeman.

3. Introduction to Contractors - Leadbitter

- Colin Chiles introduced himself.
- Project Director of Leadbitter. Traditional Building contractor. Family run and the companies focus as a business is Local Authority and social housing work.
- He was worked 30 years in the business and his role within the project is to control everything that goes on. Colin will be site-based permanently throughout the build.
- A depot off-site (TBC) will be provided, where workers will park and will be transported onto site
- Primary noises are the trucks coming and going.
- Concreting will generate noise, however where possible, self-compacting concrete will be used, which will reduce the noise.
- Piling will be the quietest it can be, should take about 4 weeks
- ED asked has anything been done around how the noise will impact upon the local community? An Environmental Impact Assessment had been promised
by Planning. □ to check whether this had been promised and if it was necessary.

- A community liaison officer will be on-site who will ensure the community know what work will be done when.
- Monthly newsletters and a weekly email of what will take place in the following weeks will be distributed to the local community and feedback can be received.
- Approximately 6 months of noisy work will be done over the duration of the project.
- Cllr Blakeman – Will there be jobs for local people? Local employment? Apprenticeships?
- CC – contractors for the project will be sourced within a 25 mile radius of the site, an average of 5% will be used within 4 miles of the site.
- Open days will be put on to advertise what will happen and any potential opportunities for local residents.
- A requirement that each sub-contractor has to have at least 1 apprenticeship within their company will be included.
- Collages will be approached as well as local students to see if there is any interest in doing a short-term placement (Proper apprenticeships cannot be given proper as official apprenticeships are deemed to be 2yrs or above, which is longer than the contractors will be on site).
- ED expressed that he is unhappy about the whole proposal put forward for KALC.
- GS stated that this project is a good opportunity and that people will have better lives and children gain a better education from this project.
- A community engagement plan will be drafted and this will be brought back to the forum in a couple of months.
- Sustainability – things being resourced properly to help the environment, noise and air quality. This will ensure that the carbon footprint is as small as possible.
- Cllr Blakeman – with heavy lorries going around the area, will the roads not dilapidate?
- CC - Surveys are done before hand around the area. Around 2 months before construction starts.
- HY – will there be defined access routes?
- CC - Yes two, one for the Academy and one for the leisure centre.
- A pedestrian access will be designated throughout the site details to come back to June Forum.
- RR - When can we expect to see hording going up?
- CC - By October at the latest.
- RR - Location of the office sites – where will they be? Will there be a reception for residents to be able to come and drop-in?
- RR – is there likelihood for there to be road closures during the hoarding stage or building?
- CC - No plans to do road closures, yes there will be an office on site and there will be opportunities for residents to discuss the building works with the contractor.
- Colin Chiles to meet with the EMB.

4. Education Update

- LJ presented a draft Community Use statement that will be adopted in draft by the Aldridge Academy until such time as the Board of Govenors meet and agree the details of the policy on the community's use of the Academy. Any comments please let Shelley know via e-mail.

5. Leisure update

- Council Officers & GLL hosted second Leisure user consultation event on Wednesday 28 March at KLC all feedback will be considered and put forward.
to the design team where applicable
- Leisure Officers, LA Architects and GLL had productive meeting with key swimming groups on 22nd March @ KLC as part of further consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Communications Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The public exhibitions that took place on Thursday 19th and Saturday 21st April went very well, with approx 84 people attending. Feedback was received and helped influence the designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A post planning application submission exhibition will be held in June to allow the public to see the final design that was submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. AOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Realm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chris Churchman explained that he welcomes feedback from residents about what they want to see within the public realm area. The Programme has invested a significant amount of funding into the public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chris explains the current proposal for the public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HY - Road – is there precedent around whether a road like this has been set?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HY – stated that he is opposed to the proposed road and he will petition if necessary. He is concerned with regards to safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chris - Retractable bollards have been placed into the designs an agreement will need to be reached regarding how this will be managed and when these will need to be opened, this will be planning condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HY proposed that an alternative option for the “road” should be put forward which will be to not have a road only emergency access on the proposed route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 or 4 iterations about proposed public realm designs will be placed into the summer autumn newsletter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Aldridge Foundation to meet Ward Councillors. Another date to be forwarded by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Honor Wilson Fletcher’s details to be forwarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clr Blakeman – concerns around the residential site being sold off and then the developer placing an alternative Planning application in for more units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RR – A pest control contractor is also based within the depot. What will happen to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LJ - A temporary site is likely to be used based on Council property near Silchester Road. A permanent site is being sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Another newsletter will be circulated in May/June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of Next Meeting**: Date to be confirmed pending availability of chairs. However the scheduled date of 16th May will be retained, unless otherwise notified.
Community Use Plan
Kensington Aldridge Academy

1. Introduction
Making schools accessible to the local community helps raise pupils' motivation, improves security for the school site, and fosters a sense of ownership in the wider community. The School Standards and Framework Act 1998 explicitly calls for school governors to make their school premises, where possible, available for community use.

2. Why community use?
The Academy will provide the local community with a range of sports and other facilities. Using the local school as a centre for adult learning, childcare facilities and other meetings helps regenerate and strengthen communities. Schools can also support community learning and improve local health and well-being.

Developing strong links with the community creates a greater opportunity to promote the value of parent engagement in securing better outcomes for their children, provides a context for ensuring strong links between education and the world of work and reinforces the value of education for the wider community.

The Kensington Aldridge Academy represents a huge investment in social capital within the North Kensington area. The Academy’s sponsors are keen that the facilities are made available to the local community and wish to develop partnership with local community groups to support their local activities.

The design of the building recognises the vision of both sponsors to enable community use.

3. Community Use Plan
The Academy building, off Silchester Road, will open in September 2014, and will provide a range of facilities, which will be available beyond the main Academy day.

The following areas will be made available, when possible, for Community Use. This will almost certainly be included within Planning Permission conditions:

- A business area with entrepreneurship pods, supported by a dedicated team.
- A Sports Hall and sports facilities including a Multi Use Games Area, a dance studio and changing facilities
- A Theatre and performing arts area
- A TV and sound studio

All of these areas are located on the lower ground and ground floors with easy, secure access to both entrances of the academy.

The dining area will also be available for community use. This will be located on the first floor.

Priority for use of the facilities will be made as follows:
1. Academy use for students and Academy events
2. Academy use for the Extended Schools programme
Community Use Plan
Kensington Aldridge Academy

3. Statutory Users
4. Community Users i.e. Non-profit making registered charities and organisations wishing to hire facilities for the benefit of local residents
5. Other registered charities/group users
6. Private individuals/company users

Note – Academy use for students will always take priority unless the Academy agrees to waive this right. Priority for other users only applies when a facility, or particular time of availability of a facility, has not been booked or where an existing booking is scheduled for review.

Appendix 1
1. Consultation and Community Involvement
2. Hours of availability
3. Charging
4. Variations
5. Lettings Documentation
6. Scale of Charges
7. Discounts
8. Minimum charges and deposits
9. Cancellations
10. Payment methods
11. Extension of Credit
12. Security
13. Conditions of Hire
14. Public Safety
15. First Aid.
16. Non-Smoking
17. Cleaning Costs
18. Sports Equipment
19. Academy MUGA Pitches:
20. Parking
21. Litter
22. Storage
23. Behaviour
24. Review of the Community Use Plan
Community Use Plan
Kensington Aldridge Academy

Appendix 1

Consultation and Community Involvement
The Academy will consult with and involve the local community and interested groups in developing the Academy’s Extended Schools and Community Use Plan.

The Consultation Group will operate within an agreed set of terms of terms of reference which will be reviewed by the Full Governing Body.

The Consultation Group will be accountable to the Board of Governors.

The Consultation Group will aim to reflect the local demography, as well as the demography of the school population and will include existing community groups, businesses, residents associations, parents groups and youth groups.

The Academy will publish annually details of the consultation that has taken place. A Community Lettings Panel will be set up to offer feedback on any new or possibly contentious use of the building.

Hours of availability
The Academy buildings will be available for community use/hire between the hours of 8.00 am – 10.00 pm, subject to the hire being compatible with the effective running of the academy. Lighting of the MUGA areas is, however, available only between the hours of 9am – 9pm (the hours of use likely to be set by planning).

The academy building will not be available for use on bank holidays. Use of the building on Sundays will only be available in exceptional circumstances. Consideration will be given to other significant activities in the area.

Charging
Governors will agree a charging policy which will be reviewed on an annual basis.

Variations
No member of staff is allowed to vary the terms and conditions on which the Academy premises are hired to either individuals or organisations nor to deviate from the governor’s published charging policy without the agreement of the Principal/ Director of Finance & Operations.

Lettings Documentation
All formal hiring of the Academy premises, including those for which no charge is made shall be properly documented. All hirers must complete a Lettings of Hire Agreement (Booking form), and are to receive a copy of the Terms & Conditions of Hire. The Hire Agreement is a contract that the governors may enforce in law.

Scale of Charges
In arriving at their scale of charges the governors will follow the following principles:-
a) that Statutory Users will be charged an amount commensurate with cost recovery;
b) that Community Use users will be charged no more than cost;
c) that other users will be charged on a commercial basis;
d) that there will be parity of treatment for similar users;
e) that overall the cost of letting Academy facilities will be recovered from users.

For the purpose of charging the Principal and Director of Finance & Operations are empowered to determine to which category any particular individual or organisation belongs. The basis of charging will be determined by the purpose for which a letting is arranged.

**Discounts**
These form part of the scale of charges and are the only permitted variations to the standard charges.

**Minimum charges and deposits**
The minimum hire period will normally be two (2) hours.

The governors reserve the right to require a deposit over and above the hiring charge as a surety against damage to the premises (including any equipment) or the premises being left in an unacceptable condition, necessitating their incurring additional cost for cleaning, caretaking or other expenses.

**Cancellations**
Governors will seek to recover any cost incurred by the Academy which are unavoidable and result directly from the cancellation of a letting.

**Payment methods**
The governors are mindful of their responsibilities in safeguarding the academy from bad debt. Therefore payment at the time of booking is the norm. In all cases where cash or cheques are paid over then an official receipt must be issued.

**Extension of Credit**
The governors will allow the extension of credit to bone fide local organisations and individuals where they are satisfied that they are credit worthy. In all the cases the governors reserve the right to withdraw credit facilities where prompt payment is not received. In all cases where credit is extended, an official invoice will be issued. The governors will not normally extend credit for lettings where the invoice value is less than fifty pounds (£50). The governors have chosen to delegate the approval of credit facilities to the Academy’s **Director of Finance & Operations** who is to maintain a list for the guidance of administrative staff. In all cases where credit is advanced, the invoice is to be raised at the time of booking.

**Security**
The governors insist upon continuous caretaking presence to ensure that the hiring does not leave the school vulnerable to theft or damage.
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Conditions of Hire
The use of premises has to be restricted to the use and accommodation specified in the hire permit. The hirer should take all precautions to prevent any damage. Some footwear in particular can cause damage to floors and persons wearing such footwear will not be permitted to enter the premises. The hirer is required to pay for any breakages, losses or damage to property arising out of the letting.

Nominated Representatives of the Academy governors must be given free access to the hired premises for the purpose of inspection. The Academy governors also reserve the right to cancel any letting in which case a proportion of the charges will become refundable.

The Hirer shall effect Third Party (Public Liability) insurance within a minimum indemnity limit of five million pounds for any one occurrence to cover its legal liabilities for accidents resulting in injuries to persons, including participants in the hiring activity, and/or loss of or damage to property including the hired premises, arising out of the hiring of educational premises.

The Academy will not be responsible for any injury to persons or damage to property arising out of the hiring of the premises unless such injury or damage results from the negligence or breach of statutory duty on the part of the Academy.

The sub-letting or sharing of the premises is prohibited.

Any hire during school hours i.e. 8am to 6pm, Monday to Friday, during term time, places an obligation on the hirer regarding appropriate Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checks. Any person wanting unsupervised access to the Academy’s building must be able to provide a current CRB check. Anyone connected to the hirer without a current CRB check must be supervised at all times. The Governors reserve the right to demand to see CRB checks at any time.

Public Safety
- The Hirer shall be responsible for the prevention of overcrowding such as would endanger public safety and for keeping clear all gangways, passages and fire exits.
- The Hirer shall be responsible for providing adequate supervision to maintain order and good conduct.

The charge for accommodation includes the use of furniture only within the room. In the event of the hirer requiring additional furniture a separate charge will be made according to circumstances. On the days when the Academy is in session, articles such as pianos, tables, flowers, etc., may not be delivered to the Academy before 4.30 pm on the day of use, unless arrangements for early delivery are made with the Site Manager. The Hirer should remove all chairs or other furniture, decorations and any other materials introduced into the premises, within an agreed reasonable time after the period of hire. If this is not done, the Academy Governors will be entitled to remove and dispose of such items and the Hirer will pay the cost of removal (less the proceeds of disposal where relevant) on demand.
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Special preparations, such as those required for the purpose of dancing, must not be applied to the floors without specific approval. The Site Manager can advise.

Licences are generally required for:
- Performing plays
- ‘Public dancing, music or other public entertainment of a like kind’ under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982
- Games of bingo.

Hirers should ascertain whether or not a licence is required for these uses, or for any other use to which premises are to be put, and, if so, to obtain and ensure full compliance with the necessary licence. The premises are not already licensed.

Intoxicating liquor is not permitted to be sold to the public or supplied on educational premises without the express consent of the Academy governors, which the governors will not be obliged to give or give reasons for refusal. Details of the license for the sale to the public of intoxicating liquor will need to be available for inspection.

The premises are not licenced under the Cinematography Acts and no inflammable films or materials of any inflammable nature should be used.

When commercial sound recordings (gramophone records, tape recordings or CDs) are publicly used, an application for a licence to use such recordings must be submitted to Phonographic Performance Limited, Evelyn House, 62 Oxford Street, London W1N 0AN. Application forms may be obtained from them on request.

Under the conditions of the Performing Rights Society, hirers of educational establishments are required to furnish details direct to the Society of ‘all musical works, whether published or in the manuscript, performed at the premises locally, instrumentally or mechanically, at entertainments for which a charge is made’. A form can be provided that should be completed and forwarded direct to the Performing Rights Society Limited immediately after the letting has taken place.

**First Aid**
The governors take no responsibility for First Aid provision. Hirers are required to provide details of their own First Aid cover at events.

**Non-Smoking**
The Academy adheres to new government legislation and is a non-smoking environment. Hirers using the Academy premises must adhere to these regulations and are not allowed to smoke within the Academy building or its surrounding grounds.

PLEASE NOTE: Individuals or organisations that breach these regulations will be subject to a fixed penalty fine of £50 or up to £200 on summary conviction.

**Cleaning Costs**
Any additional cleaning cost must be met by the hirer.
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Sports Equipment
The Academy does not provide sports equipment.

Academy MUGA Pitches:
The hirer must ensure that the use of the MUGA pitches will not prejudice its use for normal purposes. Full supervision by a responsible adult must be undertaken whilst being used.

Parking
No parking facilities are available at the Academy.

Litter
The hirer is responsible for leaving the academy facilities litter free and fit for the main purpose of teaching and learning. Failure to adhere to this will result in any future lettings being cancelled. All cleaning costs must be met by the hirer.

Storage
The Academy does not provide any storage facilities.

Behaviour
Hirers of all facilities are responsible for the behaviour of those present and full supervision by a responsible adult is imperative. No adults/juniors should be allowed access to any other areas of the Academy building/premises other than those specified in the Hire Agreement/Letting form.

1. Review of the Community Use Plan
This plan will be reviewed with the Consultation Group annually.
Background

We know that our young people can do well when they get a place in a Royal Borough secondary school and have a good chance of going on to A-level study, college and university. But places in our schools are in short supply, especially in North Kensington, and the indications are, that unless something is done, that shortage will continue to grow.

At the same time, the Council is committed to improving the health of residents in North Kensington and wants to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay well.

For these reasons the Council’s flagship ambitions for North Kensington are to build a new secondary school and a new leisure centre, more tailored to the needs of local residents.

Kensington Leisure Centre was built in the 1970s and its sprawling layout does not make the most efficient use of its site. It is expensive to run and it is hard to see it continuing to provide adequate sports and leisure facilities in its current form beyond 2025. We would like to see it replaced by a modern, energy efficient building that offers sports and leisure facilities that meet the needs of the community and which can be enjoyed by residents of all ages, especially those whose health is not so good.

The Council believes that this project will enhance the area by providing a much needed new school, a leisure centre that is less sprawling and makes better use of its site and a reconfigured and more attractive Lancaster Green.

Continued on page 2…
Consultation so far

There have already been a number of academy and leisure centre-related consultations. The site for a new academy was identified as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) process, back in 2008. The LDF process offered many opportunities for local people to have their say.

Then, during May and June 2010, architects John McAslan and Partners, carried out a site feasibility study. Their brief was to come up with options that would integrate into the local area, link well with local transport, improve the current street pattern and allow for two high quality buildings and some housing. A number of workshops were held in the local area to enable local people to influence that study.

In September 2010 there was a very well attended public meeting organised by local ward councillors.

Over the winter, the Council’s planning department held a number of consultation events on the planning brief for the site. The brief set out what the academy and leisure centre development will have to deliver in order to be granted planning permission.

And in May 2011, the Aldridge Foundation (the lead sponsor of the academy) also held a very well attended public meeting to discuss the character and ethos of the new academy and to enable local people to air their general concerns about the development. All these meetings have enabled the Council and the Aldridge Foundation to hear from many different people and develop a clear picture of their issues and concerns.

The formal academy consultation period ran from 16 May 2011 to 26 June 2011. The academy project team met with local resident and community groups as well as local primary schools and parents of year 3 and below, to share with them the vision for the academy, its admissions policy and its educational plans, and though the formal consultation period is now over the team will continue to do so.
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At the start of 2010, the Council’s academy plans received Government backing in the shape of £17.6 million of public funds. Our academy project was one of few such schemes to receive funding at a time when others missed out due to cutbacks in public spending. We expect this backing to be formalised when the funding agreement is signed in July. This money is for the construction costs of building the academy.

The Council is determined that the Kensington Aldridge Academy will be a good school, in a good building. That is our priority. But we are also committed to retaining a leisure centre on the site. We are ready to use some of our reserves to achieve our ambitions for North Kensington but the full financial picture will only become clear when more work is completed on all the possible options.

Finding a site

It is the Council’s view that the best location for the academy is the existing Kensington Leisure Centre site. Other sites have been considered including:

- **Barlby Primary School**
- **Kensal Gasworks**
- **Middle Row/St Mary’s primary school sites**
- **Princess Louise Hospital**
- **Silchester Garages site**
- **Virgin Active site on Lancaster Road.**

All were carefully examined but ruled out, for reasons such as size and availability. A study has shown that the Kensington Leisure Centre site is big enough to accommodate a modern secondary school and a leisure centre. It is already owned by the Council and, given the tight construction timetable for academies this is a critical advantage.
Most of these questions can’t really be further addressed until we have done some further design and costing work. That work is getting underway now, in fact you may soon see some small-scale boring taking place on the site in order to discover whether there might be major cables and pipes underground or some other issues with the subsoil.

During August we will be appointing architects to come up with designs for both the academy building and the leisure centre. They will be organising a separate series of consultation meetings in the autumn which will give local people an opportunity to influence the designs.

We hope that by the end of 2011 we will have come up with a range of costed design options ready to be scrutinised and considered by the Council, the Department for Education and, of course, by local people.

We promise that there will be opportunities for you to have your say about those options. These opportunities will be publicised through leaflets, and, as with previous meetings and workshops, in the Council newspaper, in the local press, the local library, local schools, in the leisure centre and through local residents’ associations. They will also be on our website, where you can register to receive email notification about meeting dates.

Before any plans for the new academy and leisure centre can become a reality they will have to receive planning permission. The planning process has its own statutory consultation and provides further opportunity for people to seek clarification or raise concerns about the project.

There is no doubt that the Council will soon face some major decisions. Its policies for North Kensington were conceived before the recession, at a time when Government allocations to new school building projects were larger and the Council’s own financial position was stronger. But the case for a new school and improved leisure facilities remains strong.
Contacts

You can continue to email us with your concerns, support and comments at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC) Room 230/3
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc

And at www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk

In the meantime get involved

The Council and the Aldridge Foundation will be meeting and talking to as many local stakeholders as they can to explain their ideas and ambitions for the Kensington Aldridge Academy.

To facilitate this, the Council is setting up a residents’ consultation panel so local people can regularly meet and give representatives from the Council and the Aldridge Foundation their views on the project. If you are interested in joining the panel, please send across your contact details to the email or postal address at the bottom of this page.
The new leisure centre would significantly improve the facilities currently available for North Kensington residents. Over the next few months we will be focussing on developing costed designs to understand exactly what needs to be – and can be – delivered on the site.

Two important milestones have now been reached in the Council’s plans to build a new academy and leisure centre on the existing Kensington Leisure Centre site:

- the Government has formally confirmed it will contribute £17.6 million towards the building of the academy
- and architects have been appointed to design the new school and leisure centre

We have big ambitions for this academy, which would also play a key role in the redevelopment and regeneration plans for the Latimer area. The academy will be co-sponsored by the Council and the Aldridge Foundation and will offer a first class curriculum, specialising in entrepreneurship and expressive arts.

Background

We know that our young people can do well when they get a place in a Royal Borough secondary school and have a good chance of going on to A level study, college and university. But places in our schools are in short supply, especially in North Kensington, and the indications are, that unless something is done, that shortage will continue to grow.

At the same time, the Council is committed to improving the health of residents in North Kensington and wants to make it easier for local people to keep active and stay well. For these reasons the Council’s flagship ambitions for North Kensington are to build a new secondary school and a new leisure centre, more tailored to the needs of local residents.

Continued on page 2...
There have already been a number of academy and leisure centre-related consultations. The site for a new academy was identified as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) process, back in 2008. The LDF process offered many opportunities for local people to have their say.

During May and June 2010, architects John McAslan and Partners, carried out a site feasibility study to see how the proposals could integrate into the local area, link well with local transport, improve the current street pattern, allow for two high quality buildings and some housing. A number of workshops were held in the local area to enable local people to influence that study.

In September 2010 there was a very well attended public meeting organised by local ward councillors.

In late 2010/early 2011 the Council’s planning department held a number of consultation events on the planning brief for the site. The brief set out what the academy and leisure centre development will have to deliver in order to be granted planning permission.

In May 2011, the Aldridge Foundation (the lead sponsor of the academy) also held a very well attended public meeting to discuss the character and ethos of the new academy and to enable local people to air their general concerns about the development.

The formal academy consultation period ran from 16 May 2011 to 26 June 2011. The academy project team met with local resident and community groups, as well as local primary schools and parents of year three and below, to share with them the vision for the academy, its admissions policy and its educational plans.

And, in September 2011, there was an exhibition and opportunity to comment on the designs of the six shortlisted architects for the academy and leisure centre.
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Kensington Leisure Centre was built in the 1970s and its sprawling layout does not make the most efficient use of its site. It is expensive to run and it is hard to see it continuing to provide adequate sports and leisure facilities in its current form beyond the next eight to ten years. We would like to see it replaced by a modern, energy efficient building that offers sports and leisure facilities that meet the needs of the community and which can be enjoyed by residents of all ages.

The Council believes this project will enhance the area by providing a much needed new school, a leisure centre that makes better use of its site and a reconfigured and more attractive Lancaster Green.

Architects appointed

The competition to design a new academy and leisure centre for North Kensington has been won by a Studio E-led team that includes sports and leisure specialists LA Architects, as well as building engineers Max Fordham and Curtin and Churchman landscape architects. During the summer the Council held a design competition with more than 40 firms entering. Six shortlisted architects presented to a panel of councillors and a representative of the lead sponsor and an exhibition was held in early September so that local residents would have the opportunity to see and comment on the shortlisted designs.

Studio E are experienced school and leisure centre designers, having worked on the City Academy Hackney, the Ark Academy Wembley, the Burgess Park sports centre and the Watford Central leisure centre. The architects are familiar with our borough having redesigned Emslie Horniman Pleasance, the classroom of the future at St Francis of Assisi primary and they completed the sports and IT extension to St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College.

“The designs showed some real energy and ingenuity,” said Chairman of the selection panel, Cllr Nick Paget-Brown, “We drew great encouragement from them that we will be able to deliver a fine new school and leisure centre for the people of North Kensington.”
Funding secured

The new academy took an important leap forward in September with formal confirmation from the Government that it would contribute £17.6 million towards the cost of the construction of the new school.

The lead sponsor, the Aldridge Foundation, and co-sponsor, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, have jointly signed an agreement with Schools Minister, Lord Hill. The signing of the ‘funding agreement’ is a key milestone in the process of creating the academy for September 2014.

Speaking for the Aldridge Foundation, its Chairman, Rod Aldridge said: “Confirmation of the way forward is wonderful news for the prospective pupils, parents and the community. It will provide a fantastic environment within which learning and high quality teaching can flourish and a wide variety of choices, both academic and vocational, will be offered. The new buildings will also be an asset for the community and an inspiring example of what can be achieved.”

Cllr Sir Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Royal Borough, commented: “Our young people badly need a new school in North Kensington and we are going to do all we can to provide them with one. This Government contribution is a massive and very welcome vote of confidence in the scheme we are developing with the Aldridge Foundation.

“But we still have a long way to go. We have to make sure the finances stack up, we have to do a lot more consultation and, of course, we need to submit a credible planning application. We have a lot of work ahead of us.”

Take a look at our designs

You can view the preliminary designs and find out more about the proposals for Kensington Aldridge Academy and Kensington Leisure Centre by visiting www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalco and www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk
Contacts
You can continue to email us with your concerns, support and comments at kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to:

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC)
Att: Shelley Gittens
Basement
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

You can read more about the project on our website at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc
And at www.kensingtonaldriggeacademy.co.uk

Information from this leaflet can be made available in different languages.
For more information please contact 020 7361 3008.
Cautious support for six designs

But many residents still prefer new Kensington Academy to be built elsewhere

by Emma Haselting
emmas@kensingtonchronicle.co.uk

SIX dramatic designs for the new Kensington Academy went on display this week near where the school will be built.

Kensington and Chelsea Council is working with internationally renowned architects Dyer & Smith to create a new academy and leisure centre on the site of the former Kensington Leisure Centre in Walworth Road.

Residents were invited to see the six designs and give their feedback. Many were unhappy that the first choice had been the project in June.

One resident said: "They're very over and over what the reason was for choosing to put the new academy in this area. It's a bit of a concern that the consultation has been done in a consultation missed the point."

"These designs are fine - they're not what we expected at all. But most people just don't want an academy here."

After viewing the designs, residents were asked to share their opinions on which of the designs they liked. Most of those who spoke to the Chronicle had no firm preference, and remained opposed to the development.

"This is a huge issue," said one resident. "I don't want to see any of the designs at all. I'm just completely against it."
Studio E Architects has been named as the winner in the contest to design a new academy and leisure centre in North Kensington.

The victorious team led by Hammersmith-based Studio E also includes leisure specialists LA Architects, engineers Max Fordham and landscape architects, Curtis and Churchman. The practice saw off competition finalists Aedas, DNMM, RIBA studio and Hawkins/Brown.

Studio E has already designed several school schemes for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, including the classroom of the future at St Francis of Assisi primary school (2005) and the sports and performing arts extension to St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College (2010).

The design team will now develop a number of design options for the new academy and leisure centre for review by local residents this autumn and the Council's Cabinet in December. Provided approval is received the planning application is set to be submitted in April 2012. Work is expected to begin next summer.
North Kensington academy and leisure centre given go ahead

Tuesday, 13th December 2011

The Cabinet of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea have given the go ahead to funding a new academy and leisure centre in North Kensington. After careful consideration it was decided on the 12th of December that the cabinet would invest a massive £57.8m in the Notting Barns ward-one of the most deprived parts of the Royal Borough.

Demand for school places in the north of the borough is high and growing, a new school will help to address this shortage. The Government has already pledged £17.5m towards building the new academy and the Council has committed an additional £30.4m to ensure the school is built to the same high standard as Chelsea Academy. Co-sponsored by the Council, the lead sponsor of the academy is the Aldridge Foundation. The academy will seek to embed entrepreneurial and expressive arts at the heart of the curriculum.

The Council also committed to £5.7m towards building a new leisure centre. The current leisure centre was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its useful life. An option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14m, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. The brand new centre should last up to 50 years.

Councillor Sir Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, said:

“This decision is very good news for North Kensington and represents part of the Council's ongoing commitment to the redevelopment and regeneration of the area.

“We are prepared to invest the cash necessary to really tackle the disparity between the north and south of the borough. This initiative will not only help to address the shortage of school places but give the community brand new leisure facilities to enjoy for decades to come.

“However, before we submit a planning application we have a lot more work ahead of us and promise that we will continue to involve and listen to people every step of the way.”

Following the Cabinet’s decision, Chairman of the Aldridge Foundation, Rod Aldridge, said:

“The additional funding will enable us to provide an incredible Academy school for the young people of North Kensington and parents will be proud of the high standards we are aiming for. It will also be a valuable community asset, from which the local residents will benefit.”

The preferred option also includes the provision of some new housing along Bannore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element of the project will be undertaken in the coming months.

The Council’s plans for an academy and leisure centre will then form a planning application that the Council aims to submit in June 2012. A decision by the Council’s Planning Application Committee is then expected in the summer of 2012.
New Academy gets the green light

Posted by Emma Heseltine on Dec 16, 11 03:15 PM in News

Controversial plans for a new school and leisure centre in North Kensington have been given the go-ahead by Kensington and Chelsea Council.

The cost and design of the buildings was agreed upon by the cabinet last week, and the scheme will cost a massive £37.6m in what the council describes as "one of the most deprived parts of the Royal Borough."

Neighbours of the site, where the current Kensington Leisure Centre is, have criticised the council for not consulting them properly on the plans, but officers have more recently been working closely with residents on the scheme.

Council leader Sir Merrick Cockell said: "This decision is very good news for North Kensington and represents part of the council's ongoing commitment to the redevelopment and regeneration of the area.

"We are prepared to invest the cash necessary to really tackle the disparity between the north and south of the borough. This initiative will not only help to address the shortage of school places, but give the community brand new leisure facilities to enjoy for decades to come."

"However, before we submit a planning application, we have a lot more work ahead of us and promise that we will continue to involve and listen to people every step of the way."

The government has already pledged £17.6m towards building the new academy and the council has committed a further £10.4m.

The council will also contribute £24.7m towards the new leisure centre, replacing the current 1970s building with one that should last up to 50 years.

Educational charity the Aldridge Foundation will be co-sponsoring the secondary school and including expressive arts and entrepreneurship in the curriculum.

Rod Aldridge, chairman of the foundation, said: "The additional funding will enable us to provide an incredible academy school for the young people of North Kensington and parents will be proud of the high standards we are aiming for. It will also be a valuable community asset."

There is also likely to be new housing in Romore Road, but this will be finalised before the planning application is submitted next summer.

For more information on the project, visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/aac.
Council’s academy plan at critical level

CONTROVERSIAL plans to build a new academy and leisure centre in North Kensington will reach a critical phase this month when several design and cost options are presented to the council.

Kensington and Chelsea Council’s cabinet will look at the options for the Kensington Leisure Centre site when they meet on Monday, December 12 at Kensington Town Hall.

Papers outlining the different possibilities will be on the council website from Monday, December 5 and can be viewed online at www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc.

If a decision is made to proceed with one scheme, it will then form a planning application which the council aims to submit in April 2012. A planning decision is expected to be made in the summer.

Comments and concerns can be sent to kalkenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk or by writing to Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (KALC), 1st Shelley Gittens, Room B133, Town Hall, Hornton Street, London W8 7NX.
New beginning for children's services in west London

Saturday, 7th January 2012

A unique department created to deliver children's services across three west London boroughs received its first annual mandate from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, on the council it serves on Thursday 5th of January 2012.

The mandate sets out the ambitions and expectations the 'Tri-borough' partners - Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith & Fulham - have for the new department, and for children, young people and their families.

These include protecting service quality against a background of sharply falling government grants, extending choice and respecting the different priorities of the three partner councils.

Set out in the mandate are targets that 75 per cent of students in the three boroughs should achieve five GCSEs A* - C grades, including English and mathematics, in 2012 and that 90 per cent of schools should be judged good or outstanding by Ofsted.

Last year the average result for students in London achieving 5 plus A* - C, including English and mathematics, was 61 per cent. The figures for the Tri-borough partners were Kensington and Chelsea 73 per cent, Hammersmith & Fulham 71 per cent and Westminster 68 per cent. The Tri-borough average was 67 per cent.

Other education targets include an increase in children getting places in local secondary schools and more pupils with special educational needs being taught locally.

There are also ambitions to create more good school places. In Kensington and Chelsea for example, the Council will submit a planning application in 2012 to build a new academy in North Kensington.

The mandate also sets demanding standards for services to vulnerable children and young people. For example, the Tri-borough partners intend for children's services overall to be consistently judged as outstanding and for every children's home to be judged as good or outstanding by Inspectors.

One element of the new departments strategy for achieving the overall outstanding rating is for the adoption and fostering team to expand its own pool of local carers. The move will reduce the councils' reliance on agency fostering placements whose carers are typically more expensive and tend to live outside London, which in turn means that children cannot easily maintain contact with their friends and birth families.

The new Fostering and Adoption team will be in place by April 2012 and is expected to deliver £800,000 in salary savings across the three councils in its first year. In addition, the reduction in the use of external agencies for fostering placements is estimated to result in projected savings of £600,000 in its first year of operation.

"Families and Children's Services in the Royal Borough have been consistently rated as excellent and we want to keep them that way," said Royal Borough Leader, Cllr Sir Merrick Cockell. "But grants are shrinking and money is tight. However, by sharing service management we can reduce our costs, get the best value for our money and maintain the high standards of services for families in the borough."

The new combined Family and Children's department is a key part of the three councils' strategy for responding to dramatic changes in local government finance created by the national financial crisis. All three councils face reductions in government grants of approximately 26 per cent between 2011 and 2015. By combining services, the boroughs have been able to focus spending reductions on management and back office costs and thereby ensure relative protection for frontline services. Similar combined departments are also being created in other areas such as libraries and adult social care with a view to delivering a minimum saving of £1.6 million per council per year by 2014/15.
Academy's next steps

NORTH KENSINGTON: Two drop-in sessions for residents to learn about the next steps in the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre project will be held later this month.

The council, lead sponsors the Aldridge Foundation, architects Studio E and others involved in the project will be on hand to answer any questions after four 15 minute presentations to explain the designs.

Sessions will take place in the crèche of Kensington Leisure Centre, in Walmer Road, on Thursday, January 26 from 4pm to 8pm, then on Saturday, January 28 between 10am and 2pm.
New funding agreed

Extra funding will take the cash committed to a new academy and leisure centre in the Royal Borough to a total of £237.8m.

The Council’s Cabinet agreed an additional investment of £10.4m towards the academy as part of a series of decisions that took forward proposals for the ambitious new development. This is in addition to the £17.6m of academy funding already agreed by the Government.

Cabinet also agreed to provide £24.7m for a new leisure centre and £3.1m for public realm improvements and other works.

The new academy has been designed to help meet the demand for school places in the north of the borough and will be co-sponsored by the Council alongside lead sponsor the Aldridge Foundation. The curriculum will have a focus on entrepreneurship and expressive arts.

Cabinet also discussed the different options available for the leisure centre and rejected the idea of re-opening the current centre which was built in the 1970s and is coming to the end of its useful life. Architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14m and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years.

The new leisure centre will have a larger 20m teaching pool (currently 15m), a shallow teaching pool, a 20-station gym (currently 12), 25 station, eight badminton courts, a multi use hall, two squash courts, two indoor sports, spa facilities and a café.

The existing 25m main pool will be replaced by a 25m, eight-lane pool, which will be better for schools and swimmers training for competitions and will offer more opportunity for general and lane swimming.

Councillor Sir Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, said the decision was “very good news for North Kensington and represents part of the Council’s ongoing commitment to the redevelopment and regeneration of the area.”

He went on: “We are prepared to invest the cash necessary to really tackle the disparity between the north and south of the borough. This initiative will not only help to address the shortage of school places but give the community brand new leisure facilities to enjoy for decades to come.”

Aldridge Foundation Chairman Sir Paul Atteridge said: “The additional funding will enable us to provide an incredible academy for the young people of North Kensington and parents will be proud of the high standards we are aiming for.”

The preferred option also includes new housing along Islington Road that will be subject to more detailed appraisal in the coming months. A planning application is expected to be submitted this spring.

In April a public exhibition will be held so that members of the community can view the full designs and comment on them before a formal planning application is submitted.

For dates and more information visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kale.
Academy exhibition dates

A PUBLIC exhibition on proposals for the new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre is being held on two days next week.

Residents will have the chance to see how the plans are progressing as well as meeting with members of the council, the Aldridge Foundation, which sponsors the academy, architects Studio E and other members of the project team.

The exhibition will be in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church in Lancaster Road, on Thursday from 4.30pm to 8.30pm, with a presentation at 7pm, and on Saturday, April 21, from 10am to 2pm, with a presentation at 11.30am.

After the exhibition, the proposals will be updated before a planning application is submitted at the end of May, and decided in September.

Visit www.rbhk.gov.uk/kale for more information.
Academy plans exhibition
Posted by Emma Heseltine on Apr 4, 12:29 PM in News in brief

A public exhibition on proposals for the new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre is being held on two days next week.

Residents will have the chance to see how the plans are progressing as well as meeting with members of the council, the Aldridge Foundation, which sponsors the academy, architects Studio E and other members of the project team.

The exhibition will be in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church in Lancaster Road, on Thursday (19) from 4.30-8.30pm, with a presentation at 7pm, and on Saturday (21) from 10am to 2pm, and the presentation at 11.30am.

After the exhibition, the proposals will be updated before a planning application is submitted at the end of May, and decided in September. Visit www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc.
16 April 2012
Kensington & Chelsea Chronicle, Online

Kensington Academy to open to the public this week
Monday, 16th April 2012

Kensington Academy public exhibition The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea is organising a public exhibition on the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre proposals in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church on Lancaster Road on two separate days.

The exhibition, which will include drawings and models, will be open on Thursday 19th April from 4.30 to 8.30 pm and on Saturday 21st April from 10 am to 2 pm.

The exhibition will offer visitors an opportunity to see the latest version of the plans for the new school and leisure centre. You’ll have the chance to talk to representatives from the Council, the Aldridge Foundation (the lead sponsors of the academy) and Studio E (the lead architects).

After the exhibition the architects and project team will be updating the proposals before submitting a planning application to the Council at the end of May. The Council will consider the application in September. If the application is successful, current plans mean the new academy and leisure centre will open in September 2014.

The exhibition is at the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church, 240 Lancaster Road, W11 4AH. Click here for a map.

See more information about the Council’s proposals here.

Visit the Kensington Aldridge Academy website.
Anti-school campaigners beat a path to the courts

Neighbours try to get route through estate made an official right of way

By Emma Haselkine
...has changed the landscape.

CAMPAIGNERS fighting plans for a new academy in North Kensington have mounted a legal bid to try to stop the development.

Residents on the Lancaster West Estate say their neighborhood is not the right place for a 1,200-seat academy and leisure center, despite Kensington and Chelsea Council deeming it from a list of sites around the borough.

They have applied to have a pathway which runs through the middle of the estate between Silkstone Road and Brackley Road, designated as an official right of way. The plan would mean around the estate which would be new under the plans is also being formally considered as a valuable green.

Campaniers hope the move will stop the academists in their tracks, protesting against the way it is already overdeveloped.

Eddie Dafis, from Goddess Adams Group, said: "We always knew we would have to fight for a right of way to keep stopping this development.

"We would never want to do anything to harm the education and education of residents in this area, that's not what we are trying to do.

"We always knew we would have to find a point of law to help us stop this development."

"It's just that this is not the best place for a new secondary school." Mr Dafis, who is local people, makes plans properly considered, and have had their views ignored.

He said: "We got some legal advice and we hope to get a protected right of way."

"We demand that all of the criteria for us to do so the path has been used by the community for more than 20 years, without asking permission, and without being aware.

And for the path uses at the foot of Grenfell Tower, which we would lose in the development, we hope we can have it designated a village green, and therefore protected.

Kensington and Chelsea Council chose Lancaster West Estate in 2016 as the best site for a new academy, as many local children were forced to travel schools elsewhere in London. It will also provide a new leisure centre for the area, to replace the current community centre in Westway Road.

A planning application is due to be submitted this month, with a view to the school opening in September 2019.

A council spokeswoman said: "Any matters relating to right of way at village green status will be properly considered under the relevant legislation."
Tower set for £7m facelift

Residents hopeful of greater investment in run-down estates

By Emma Heseltine

Residents on a run-down estate will benefit from £6m worth of improvement from Kensington and Chelsea Council.

But residents on the Lancaster West Estate in North Kensington say the investment, although appreciated, does not go far enough, particularly as the site has been earmarked for a controversial new academy and residential tower.

At a cabinet meeting on Wednesday last week, it was decided that proceeds from the sale of 23 new flats created from basements in Elms Park Gardens, Chelsea, would provide the funding.

The council has said it will build a Grenfell Tower, which is on the Lancaster West Estate in North Kensington, by installing double glazing and new sun-bathing terraces, as well as external cladding to improve the energy efficiency and appearance of the building.

Unused space on the lower floors of the tower will also be converted to make up for the affordable housing.

Housing and property chief councillor Tim Colclough said: "We have created 23 new homes out of dead space and the proceeds of that will now form badly needed work elsewhere.

"So the Elms Park Gardens project really has been something of a triumph - the challenge now is to see if we can dispose of the basement buildings elsewhere."

But residents on the estate in the north of the borough say that the contentious pledge does not go far enough.

Eddie O'Sullivan, from the Grenfell Action Group, which is fighting the plans for the new academy, said: "I think it's great that they are providing double glazing to help stop the noise, especially if they go ahead with development here."

But they need to improve the rest of the area.

"It is not just Grenfell Tower which needs work, but the whole of the Lancaster West Estate. We need more investment."

"And the new academy is leaving crime here. We will continue to fight that as long as we can. This area is overdeveloped already."

The group is currently looking into protecting parts of the estate with right of way and village green status, to try and stop the controversial academy plans from going ahead.
KENSINGTON ACADEMY AND LEISURE CENTRE
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS
AS OF APRIL 2012
1. Why are we having this public exhibition?
   a. The aim of this exhibition is to update the local community and leisure centre users on the latest proposals for the Kensington academy and leisure centre. The exhibition will include the most up to date designs and a model with members of the project team, including the architects, on hand to answer questions. The architects will also give a presentation on the designs.
   b. This will also be an opportunity for the public to comment on the detailed designs and give their feedback on the proposals.

2. What has changed since the January drop-in sessions?
   a. The designs have developed further following the drop-in sessions
   b. The context and format of the buildings and public realm have been set and the architects have been working towards finalising the designs. Where possible they have incorporated suggestions made by the public.

3. What are the next steps?
   a. Following this exhibition a planning application will be submitted at the end of May.
   b. The Council will share the final designs with the public and people will be able to comment during the Council's statutory consultation period once the application has been registered.
   c. The Council’s Major Projects Planning Committee is expected to make a decision on the project in September.

WHAT YOU’VE SAID AND WE’VE DONE TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you said</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough money is being invested in this project</td>
<td>£40.2 million of funding was agreed by the Council’s Cabinet in December 2011 in addition to the £17.6 million provided by the Government. This shows a significant investment in a challenging economic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements should be made to the estate and Grenfell Tower</td>
<td>This was raised as a priority by residents following comments made at the KALC resident forum. The Council is in discussion with the TMO on possible improvements and they will be subject to a separate EMB/TMO Board and Council Cabinet decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regular communication on the project</td>
<td>We set up resident and leisure forums that meet on a regular basis as well as a sponsor partnership group and regularly communicate through the project newsletters, leaflets and websites. We have also held drop-in sessions to update residents on the plans following the Cabinet decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about public spaces</td>
<td>Significant improvements to the public realm are being proposed including the enlargement of Lancaster Green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will our play areas and football pitches</td>
<td>The playing pitches will be re-provided at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be lost? the Westway Sports Centre, just five minutes from the site and the current play areas will be renewed along with other improvements to the green spaces within the local area.

Leisure centre changing facilities need improvement

There will be different changing areas in the new leisure centre including dedicated male and female swimming changing areas, family changing areas, two group changing areas and ‘Dry’ activities male / female change areas.

Make the proposals as green as possible

We expect to achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method) “excellent” rating which would mean a significantly reduced carbon footprint and lower fuel bills.

Green features will include bicycle docking stations, green roofs and solar panels.

A. ACADEMY

Need

1. Why does the Royal Borough need a new school?
   - As a local authority the Council has a responsibility to provide sufficient school places for residents in the Royal Borough.
   - Over 30 per cent of local students currently travel outside the Royal Borough for their secondary education.
   - Demand for secondary school places is especially pressing in North Kensington and this situation is only set to increase with the growing population.
   - We need to address this issue to ensure that children have access to sufficient high quality education within the Royal Borough now and in the future.

2. Will every child be guaranteed a place in this academy?
   - Children would have to apply for a place in the academy, in the same way that they do for any other state school. Admissions are fair, and must be in accordance with the School Admissions Code.

About academies

3. What is an academy?
   - Academies are publicly funded independent local schools that provide a first class free education. They are all-ability schools established by sponsors from business, faith or voluntary groups working with partners from the local community.
   - Academies provide a teaching and learning environment that is in line with the best in the maintained sector and offer a broad and balanced curriculum to pupils of all abilities, focusing especially on one or more specialism.

About the Kensington Aldridge Academy

4. Have architects been appointed to design the new academy?
The competition to design a new academy and leisure centre for North Kensington has been won by a Studio E-led team. During the summer the Council held a design competition with more than 40 firms entering.

Studio E are experienced school and leisure centre designers, having worked on the City Academy Hackney, the Ark Academy Wembley, the Burgess Park sports centre and the Watford Central leisure centre.

The architects are familiar with our borough having redesigned Emslie Horniman Pleasance, the classroom of the future at St Francis of Assisi primary and they completed the sports and IT extension to St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College.

5. Why is this an academy and not just a regular school?
- Establishing academies is the Government’s preferred method for funding schools in the UK. To qualify for financial support from the Government for this school we needed to ensure that it was an academy.
- Academies were introduced in 2000 to bring a distinctive approach to school leadership by drawing on the skills of their sponsors and supporters. They are an integral aspect of the Government’s strategy to raise education standards in disadvantaged and challenging areas.
- Academy status also gives the school greater freedom to promote enterprise and innovation while offering students the opportunity to specialise.

6. Will you have to pay to send a child to this academy?
- No.
- Academies are state schools and they are completely free of charge.

7. How big would the school be in terms of size?
- We are currently looking at Studio E’s designs and the final size of the school needs to be agreed. However, the Department for Education (DfE) and Partnership for Schools have funded a new academy with a gross internal area of 8,850m², including internal sports facilities. The architects are also presenting a costed option to the Cabinet Members of an academy in line with the DfE’s original area for an academy at 10,700m².

8. Who are the sponsors of the academy?
- The lead sponsor of the academy is the Aldridge Foundation with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea as co-sponsor.
- Both sponsors have a proven track record in delivering high performing schools.
- The Aldridge Foundation already sponsors Academies in Darwen in Lancashire, Brighton and Portslade, in East Sussex, which opened in September 2011. Darwen has achieved excellent GCSE results and Brighton, which started from a challenging base as an underperforming school, has now been transformed. The Aldridge Foundation is also sponsoring the Isle of Portland Academy which will open later this year.
- All academies the Aldridge Academy sponsor are non-selective, non-denominational, community schools for local students and their families.
- The Royal Borough is the co-sponsor of the Chelsea Science Academy which opened on time and to budget in September 2009. The recent Ofsted inspection indicated that the borough’s schools achieve high standards at all key stages and that it provides excellent support. The Council will ensure that the proposed academy plays a key role as a leader of teaching and learning.

9. Will the sponsors benefit financially from the academy?
- No. The Aldridge Foundation is a not-for-profit charitable organisation which has already delivered two highly successful Academies in Brighton and Darwen, with a third opened in Portslade in September 2011.

10. What will the curriculum be like?
- The main focus of education would be on core subjects and achieving the highest levels of literacy, numeracy and science.
Alongside this the academy would specialise in entrepreneurism and expressive arts.

11. What will the academy specialise in?
- The academy's specialisms would be entrepreneurship and expressive arts.
- Entrepreneurship is an integral part of teaching and learning across the whole curriculum, helping raise attainment and aspirations.
- In keeping with the sponsors’ commitment to developing a curriculum that makes learning relevant and provides skills for life, a second specialism is planned to be the expressive arts. This part of the borough is rich in its vibrancy and enthusiasm for the expressive arts and the academy would contribute significantly to the cultural life of the community through this specialism.
- The value of such specialist creative activity in schools is reflected in Ofsted’s latest report “Learning: creative approaches that raise standards” which recognises that creative learning practices in schools are improving standards and students’ personal development. Of the 44 schools visited by Ofsted for the report almost all were using creative approaches.

12. How will the academy be able to deliver a full sports curriculum and would it have access to other sports facilities?
- The detailed provision of sports facilities will be looked at more closely when the plans for the academy are developed.
- As with all other schools, the academy would deliver a sports curriculum, whether on-site or using nearby facilities as many other boroughs and inner London schools already do.
- For instance, students from Chelsea Academy routinely use off-site sports facilities, as do the pupils from the Cardinal Vaughan School.

13. When would the academy open?
- Our intention is to have the school open by September 2014. This is, of course, subject to getting planning permission and on the Partnership for Schools who will be working with the Aldridge Foundation and the Royal Borough to deliver the project.

14. Are the transport links sufficient in the area to support an academy?
- The studies we have carried out so far have shown that a school on this site could be supported by the existing transport links.
- Further studies will be carried out as the plans develop including a traffic and parking assessment as part of the planning application process. The study will assess the impact of the increased intake of the academy on parking, traffic, public transport and the local road network. Further details will be included within the application for detailed planning permission.

15. What would the new academy look like?
- The final design of the new academy still needs to be decided; however, Studio E’s initial design proposals can be viewed by visiting the RBKC or academy websites www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and www.kensingtonaldrigeacademy.co.uk

16. How will admissions be arranged? Is this based on proximity to the academy?
- The academy will be a local school serving the local community and will adopt the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea admissions criteria.
- An admissions priority area is being proposed as part of the academy plans. This will not exclude parents outside the area but will ensure it is first and foremost a neighbourhood school.
- The post codes included within the priority areas are W10, W11, W12, W14 and a small area of W2. There will be no selection by ability, gender or religion.

17. Would there be provision for special needs educations?
- Yes.
It is still early days so we would look in more detail at how many special needs education places are provided although the school will be fully Disability Discrimination Act compliant.

We are committed to ensuring that children of all abilities can benefit from this new school.

18. What would the age range be at the academy?
- The new academy would be co-educational and accommodate 900 11 to 16 year olds and a sixth form of up to 240.

19. How would parents be involved in the academy?
- As much as possible; we will establish a partnership with all parents as this is crucial to the success of the academy.

20. Would the academy offer community uses?
- As with any such project we would seek to deliver additional benefits for local communities. The planning brief for the area also includes a mechanism for delivering additional social and community uses on site either as part of the academy or elsewhere.
- The details on this still need to be worked out but this could include weekend and out of hours community uses.

Safety

Are any improvements being proposed to improve lighting and security in the areas around the estate as part of these plans?
- Yes, a significant part of this project includes improvements to public realm, with £5.1 million allocated by the Council at the December Cabinet. This will allow for better lighting, improvements to landscaping and pathways as well as general improvements to estate security. We will also be partnering with Safer Neighbourhoods to ensure the area is a safe place for students and the local community.

Cost

21. How much will the new academy cost and how will it be funded?
- A total of £57.8 million has been agreed towards the building of the new academy and leisure centre.
- The Council will provide £10.4 million for the academy in addition to the £17.6 million already provided for the academy by the DfE. This extra funding will ensure that the academy is built to the same high standards as Chelsea academy.

22. Will this school cost as much as Chelsea Academy?
- The costs associated with academy projects need to be considered on an individual basis.
- There were specific site conditions at Chelsea Academy which meant that some £4-5 million pounds of additional funding was required and the Programme was procured at the peak of the market. Building costs alone have decreased by some 9% since.
- Additionally, Chelsea Academy received £36.2 million of funding from central government whereas Kensington Academy was granted £17.6 million. This is a reflection of the changed economic situation that we are now in.
- With this additional funding in place, better conditions on site and efficiencies from improved procurement method, the Council is confident that a state-of-the-art academy, meeting the same high standards as Chelsea Academy can be delivered.

23. Is the Council using its reserves to fund the school?
- Yes, the Royal Borough is funding £10.4 million towards the academy out of its reserves with the remaining £17.6 million coming from the Government’s contribution.
24. Are you still on track to deliver the academy by 2014?
- Yes.
- The procurement option chosen will see the academy building ready for fit-out by July 2014 at the latest – in time for the 2014/15 school year.

25. Would you need to consider temporary accommodation?
- This is not currently the intention but we are keeping our options open at this stage.
- We have previously used temporary accommodation at the Chelsea Academy and at Holland Park School and it has worked well in both cases.

27. Will the Aldridge Foundation be contributing any money towards the build of the academy?
- The remit of the Aldridge Foundation as lead sponsor has never been to contribute financially to capital cost of building the academy.
- The Aldridge Foundation will provide the ethos and educational direction for the school in perpetuity and deliver the high standard curriculum that we aspire to in the Royal Borough.

B. LEISURE CENTRE

28. How old is the leisure centre?
- The leisure centre was originally built in the mid-1970s as a swimming pool.
- It was further developed in 1986 to include dry-side facilities including full size and smaller sports halls and squash courts. In 2001 Kensington Leisure Centre was reopened after a £3m redevelopment and upgrading which resulted in an improved swimming pool, sports hall, new café bar/reception and better facilities for disabled people.

29. Wasn’t the leisure centre recently refurbished?
- The latest significant redevelopment took place more than a decade ago, in 2001. Since then no major improvement works have taken place and the facilities and the building itself have aged significantly.

30. Why does the leisure centre have to be rebuilt?
- There is a strong case for replacing the building because of how the centre was originally built; as it does not currently make the best use of the space, nor is it an environmentally sustainable building.
- The centre underwent a redevelopment in 2001 however since then no major refurbishment works have taken place and facilities are in need of renewal.
- Additionally as part of an initial consultation exercise undertaken last year users of the centre have also told us they would prefer a new leisure centre for this part of the borough.

31. Has the Council considered alternative sites for the leisure centre?
- The Council has considered other sites that might be suitable for the construction of a new leisure centre and found no other sites in North Kensington that are currently available for development and that could realistically be used to house a new leisure centre to the minimum specification.
- Also we know that local people treasure having this facility there and we want to make sure that local communities can enjoy this for many years to come. Rebuilding it is the most effective way of ensuring that this is achieved.

32. Will the same or additional facilities be included in the new leisure centre?
- The new leisure centre would be at least as big as the current facility and would contain a swimming pool.
- The exact mix of other facilities will depend on the size and layout of the new leisure centre as well as demand from the local community.
- The Council and architects will work with users and the local community to establish exactly what facilities will be included in the new leisure centre.
Rationale

33. What is wrong with the present premises?
- The current centre was built in the 1970s and just isn’t tailored to the health needs and pastimes of local people. The internal layout is sprawling and as a result makes poor use of the space. The layout also makes the building hard to maintain and oversee and therefore expensive to run. We believe by rebuilding rather than refurbishing we will significantly reduce running costs.
- Environmentally speaking, the current centre is a poor building and a refurbishment is unlikely to successfully address this failing. A new building would certainly be low carbon, in fact we would expect it to achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method) “excellent” rating which would mean a significantly reduced carbon footprint and lower fuel bills.
- Architecturally the current centre has little or no merit. With award winning architects on board, we believe we can do better. We want to design new and much improved facilities that meet local needs and aspirations and which help people become healthier.
- But perhaps most importantly of all, the current centre is coming to the end of its useful life. Leisure centres built in the 70s typically have a lifespan of between 30 and 50 years. So the current centre’s time is up. As a result repair and maintenance costs are starting to mount. We think a really good refurbishment would only keep the centre in business for another decade or so and still leave fundamental shortcomings unaddressed.

Cost

34. How much would it cost to put the current leisure centre right, compared with the cost of a rebuild?
- The architects estimate that a full refurbishment would cost in the region of £14 million, and would last around ten years, versus around £20 million lasting 50 years for a new centre. We also need to take into account that the running costs for the original building are also set to get more expensive as the building ages, so by rebuilding it now we can save money in the long-term.
- Refurbishment on the scale of providing a like-for-like facility would still involve closing the leisure centre for up to a year. New builds therefore provide a more cost effective construction option. Finally, because we are intending to build a new academy at the same time, we may be able to achieve economies of scale on the cost of a new centre. That means there may never be a better time than now to try for a brand new, state-of-the-art centre for the people of North Kensington.

35. Is the funding of the academy linked with the funding of leisure centre?
- No, £17.6 million has already been provided by the DfE for the academy which clearly shows Government commitment to the school and is a significant investment in the challenging economic climate.
- During the Cabinet meeting in December it was agreed that an additional investment of £10.4 million would go towards the new academy from the Council.
- The Cabinet committed to providing £24.7 million for a new leisure centre and £5.1 million for public realm improvements and other enabling works. Funding for the leisure centre is coming from the Council’s own capital reserves and is not dependent on grants.

Consultation

36. Why didn’t the Council start with a consultation of users before formulating its first plan many years ago?
- We have consulted on the plans widely over the last eighteen months. There have been a number of consultation events on the academy and leisure centre and these have happened on the following dates: 20.11.10, 2.2.11, 9.02.11, 22.02.11, 16.05.11, 21.06.11,
29.06.11, 19.07.11, 28.09.11. The meeting on the 2 November was the first Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) User Forum meeting where only current users of the centre received an invitation. Previously, consultation events held at the centre and other local buildings and were open to all interested people including local residents, current centre users and representatives of local groups. At all these meetings the future of the leisure centre was an agenda item and discussed.

- A consultation event was held by GLL at the leisure centre on 28 March 2012 to update users on how the project has progressed following the January 2012 drop-in sessions on the designs.
- A Public Realm Scrutiny Committee Working Group on Leisure Facilities, comprising Cllr Joanna Gardner, Cllr Barbara Campbell and Cllr Pat Mason, conducted consultation with a range of current users and non-users of the leisure centre, and their report included a list of suggestions for a new centre based on this consultation, which has been passed to the architects. The full report is available on the RBKC website.

37. What was decided at the December Cabinet?
- After carefully considering a number of design and cost options, the Council’s Cabinet committed to funding both the new academy and brand new leisure centre.
- During the meeting the Cabinet reviewed a range of options for the development and agreed on one which includes an additional investment of £10.4 million towards the new academy from the Royal Borough. The Cabinet also committed to providing £24.7 million for a new leisure centre and £5.1 million for public realm improvements and other enabling works. This is on top of £17.6 million of funding already confirmed by the Government for the academy.

- The Council’s Cabinet carefully discussed the different options available for the leisure centre. The option to refurbish the existing leisure centre was rejected after architects estimated that full refurbishment would cost in region of £14 million, and would only extend the centre’s life by ten years. A brand new leisure centre should last much longer.

38. If leisure users do not support the plans will you listen and change the development proposed?
- We have many different users of the centre and quite often the use of the facilities conflict with each other and the operator tries to strike the right balance between competing demands. Decisions will be based on a range of opinions from leisure users, industry experts, architects and politicians. As well as consulting and satisfying existing users, we have an obligation to provide a facility that attracts new users, not just today but into the future. The present building whilst enjoyed and loved by sections of the community is neither attractive nor flexible enough to increase its usage. The architects chosen for the redesign will continue to talk to users and non-users as the facilities are designed.

39. Have people with learning disabilities been consulted yet?
- Yes. We have consulted with current and potential users of a new leisure centre. For example, one of the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee’s Working Group key recommendations is that the borough’s leisure facilities “meet the needs of people with restricted mobility and other disabilities, throughout the centre not just parts of it.” They spoke at length with user groups including those representing local disabled people and also disabled people. Also, the Kensington and Chelsea Community and Physical Activity Network (CSPAN) have a dedicated sub-group for disabled people and disability issues. Again the new leisure centre has been a key agenda item at its meetings. Local organisations such as Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea have been invited to our public consultations events. We are proud to support local clubs such as Emperors Swimming Club, who teach swimming to disabled people regardless of age or disability and the work they do.
40. Why has the Council gone back on its previous assurances (e.g. about the length of the pool)?

- It was common practice between the 1950s and early 1970s to build 33 metre long swimming pools. These incorporated a 25 metre short course length and an additional 8 metres deep end that could accommodate diving from boards either at 5 metres high or at the Olympic and World Championship height of 10 metres. However this type of design is now obsolete, and diving – where it is still practised – is now normally accommodated in special diving pits. New, modern pools are built either to 25 metres (short course) or 50 metres (long course), which are the standard lengths used for school and club competitions. This is why most surviving 33 metre pools have had bulkheads built into them to create a 25 metre length.

- From the very outset of the public consultation over the new leisure centre, we heard the views of several current users who enjoy the 33 metre pool length. We knew that reducing the length to 25 metres would not be welcomed by these users. We did not set aside their opinions lightly. However, we had to take account a number of other considerations when deciding the optimum length and breadth of the new pool. These included the following:
  
  - we wanted the new leisure centre to meet the needs of everyone, including people and families who are not necessarily interested in distance swimming and who simply want to have fun in the water. We wanted therefore to build a leisure pool as well as a conventional swimming pool. We hoped by doing so to draw local people into the new leisure centre who might never have used it before. We also wanted to retain a training pool for non-swimmers, ie to have three pools in total.
  - we knew the footprint of the new leisure centre was limited by the amount of land available; we had to have regard to the overall cost of the new centre as well. We were concerned that if we designed in a 33 metre swimming pool it could make it difficult to fit in, or afford, a decent sized leisure pool as well as a training pool
  - we wanted the pool to be wider than it is now, with two extra lanes, so the potential for conflict between different users could be reduced. Eight lanes would give us the capacity to offer much more opportunity for general and lanes swimming, as well as a wide variety of club pursuits, lessons and school sessions.
  - we wanted a pool which meets Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) standards. The Amateur Swimming Association also wrote to us at some length, concluding that they ‘would positively oppose any decision to remain with a 33.3 metre length’
  - the Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC), which has 400 members, wrote to us making several compelling points in favour of a wider pool with a 25 metre length

- The Council weighed up these competing considerations and concluded that an eight lane 25 metre pool with a leisure pool and a training pool would provide the optimum mix of water facilities in the new leisure centre. It would mean a pool that can provide for teaching at all levels, for fitness swimming, fitness training such as aqua aerobics, distance swimming at all standards and competitive.

- The proposed teaching pool would add further flexibility; we are currently investigating the provision of a 20m x 10m tank with a movable floor. This would provide excellent swim teaching space, allowing fewer lessons in the main pool and therefore a wider range of times in the main pool for fitness swimming and club use. At the very peak time of fitness swimming (e.g.: 7.30am – 8.30am), this pool could provide extra lane capacity with the weaker swimmers in the teaching pool at a constant depth of 1.2m freeing up more lane space in the main pool for stronger swimmers.

- This decision had regard to the interests and preferences of those swimmers who had told us they preferred a 33 metre length, but the Council concluded on balance that other considerations should prevail.

41. What would adding a third pool provide that the current two pools cannot?
With a sloping, shallow water level the leisure pool will be the ideal place for all the family to enjoy. In addition, it will help adults and their young children gain confidence in the water, before taking swimming lessons in the other pools. It would enable younger people to have fun and develop a sense of comfort and security in the water. This is currently not provided.

Academy

42. How much would current access to the facilities be curtailed by the school's use?
- The detailed provision of sports facilities will be looked at more closely when the plans for the academy are fully developed. As with all other schools, the academy would deliver a sports curriculum, either on-site or using nearby facilities as many other boroughs and inner London schools already do. For instance, students from Chelsea Academy routinely use off-site sports facilities, as do the pupils from the Cardinal Vaughan School. The academy would become another customer of the leisure centre but would not have any exclusive deals on the use of the new facilities.

43. Does a sports hall in the school mean the leisure centre will not have one, and can non-school users access the school's hall?
- The proposed new centre will have a 120 station gym and an eight-court sports hall. This would enable us to offer more flexible programming for casual use and for local clubs and organisations. The academy would have its own dedicated four badminton court-size sport hall which would be accessible to the community outside of curriculum time.

Process

44. If the leisure centre is rebuilt what alternative provision is being organised for users while it is closed?
- Discussions are already under way with our centre operator GLL on how they can assist current users. GLL operate in London with thirteen other local authorities including Westminster and Hammersmith and Fulham.
- Three centres are approximately a mile away from Kensington Leisure Centre. These include Phoenix Fitness Centre and Janet Adegoke Swimming Pool which is 1 mile away to the east, Porchester Centre is 1.1 miles away to the north, and the Jubilee Sports Centre which is 1.2 miles away the north). Additionally the new Holland Park School facilities are only 0.7 miles to the south.
- GLL has experience in handling leisure centre redevelopments and in keeping disruption to service users to a minimum. Chelsea Sports Centre will remain open during any refurbishment or rebuilding of Kensington Leisure centre. GLL will also be considering how to facilitate travel to proposed alternative centres.
- We will also talk to our local schools and other local providers such the Westway Development Trust, particularly to see if they can accommodate clubs and sports hall users. We are also looking for other flexible spaces close to the leisure centre that may be able to accommodate a fitness room and studio in the short term.

45. How long would it take before the new building is open?
- We want to see minimum disruption to the service and to local residents' lives. Therefore, we will seek strong assurances from the appointed building contractor about the centre reopening as soon as possible. Depending on the final design of the centre and how the building programme dovetails with the academy building, the earliest we would see the centre opening is eighteen months after first closing. An extensive refurbishment may see the centre closed for up to 12 months.

46. Can temporary facilities be set up so that some provision remains whilst work is taking place?
- This could be an option as part of a package of losing a valued service whilst a new centre is built. We are looking at whether this could be incorporated when building the new centre. However, there is difficulty in finding adequate space within a ten minute walk of
the existing facility. The lack of space is one of the main reasons why the new academy is proposed to be sited on the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and Silchester Car Park.

47. Can the work be phased, starting with the academy, so that the leisure centre isn’t closed for so long?
   • Phasing the work would not shorten the length of time the leisure centre is closed, to rebuild the leisure centre would take around 18 months whether or not it is done at the same time as building the academy. In addition, building in two phases would be considerably more expensive.

48. The quality of life for local people will be impacted when there are two sets of building work going on at once.
   • The quality of life for local people would be impacted, even if the leisure centre was only being refurbished. If we did nothing now we will still have to revisit this issue in five to eight years time and deal with the potential disruption then. It makes sense to combine these two projects into one short building programme which will reduce the length of time disruption takes place. We will ensure that we continue to work with the local community to keep any impact on the quality of life to an absolute minimum.

C. OTHER ISSUES

49. Will improvements such as new windows and cladding be made to the estate including Grenfell Tower?
   • Estate renewal work is managed by the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation. The Royal Borough are in discussion with the TMO in order to determine whether there is finance available to enable improvements to the adjacent estate. Updates will be provided to the Lancaster West Estate Management Board and the KALC Residents Forum. The improvements will be subject to a separate EMB/TMO Board and Council Cabinet decisions.

50. What assurances are there regarding transport to and from the new academy and leisure centre as well as within the site itself?
   • The use of public transport, cycling and walking will be encouraged for those travelling to and from the school and leisure centre. Access to the north/south link will be restricted with retractable bollards which can be operated when needed.
   • A full transport assessment will be submitted as part of the planning application and a Green Travel Plan will also be approved. The assessment will look at the impact of the development on several modes of transport and the travel plan will set out a series of practical measures to reduce car use for journeys.
   • Improved east/west movement will provide a safer and more understandable route through the area to and from nearby destinations such as Latimer Road underground station and Avondale Park.

The Planning Brief

51. What is the Planning Brief?
   • The Planning Brief – known also as a ‘Supplementary Planning Document’ (SPD) – takes the policies set out in the borough-wide planning policy document, called the Core Strategy, and provides more detail on the planning requirements for the development of the site. It also sets an indicative masterplan as to how the Council envisages the development of the site.
   • The Planning Brief was informed by a feasibility study carried out in July 2010 and consulted on between January and May 2011. Following the consultation, amends were made to the brief and this was adopted in May 2011.

51. When did the consultation on the Planning Brief take place and what did it involve?
Consultation has included a number of elements:
- A 'snap and say' day on 20 November 2010 attended by 50 residents – a drop in event where small groups of residents walked the sites and, using photographs, identified the things they liked and didn’t like about the area. A survey was also available to gather facts about the use of open space and how people move through the area.
- A workshop on 2 December 2010 attended by 40 residents.
- A presentation on 6 December 2010 to the EMB of the Lancaster West Estate.
- Three events on the draft SPD brief as part of the formal consultation period – a drop-in event on 2 February 2011 attended by 20 residents, an evening event on 8 February attended by 30 residents and a final event on the evening on 22 February 2011 at the leisure centre attended by 80 residents.

When the draft Planning Brief was made available for public comment, an organisation called Planning Aid was appointed by the main residents’ groups to make sure that they had an effective voice in commenting on the draft brief.

52. Where was the consultation publicised?
- The consultation was publicised in leaflets and letters sent out across the local area and was advertised in the local newspaper as well as on the Council's website. Posters were also put up across the estate.
- In addition to the initial survey in late 2010, the formal Planning Brief consultation period ran for six weeks from 25 January to 8 March 2011. 57 people responded to this and there were over 400 specific comments.

53. Has the Planning Brief changed as a result of the consultation?
- The Planning Brief has been amended in a number of areas following comments from local residents and key stakeholders.
- However, the significance of this project stretches beyond the immediate area and has the potential to benefit hundreds of residents who will be able to send their children to a school in their own borough and enjoy the new leisure centre facilities.
- It is important, therefore, to consider the priorities of communities in North Kensington along with those near to the site.

54. Have Councillors now approved the Planning Brief?
- Yes. The Royal Borough’s Cabinet approved the Planning Brief in April 2011. It was subsequently adopted on 16 May 2011.

55. Wasn’t there a request for the Planning Brief to be ‘called-in’ by councillors?
- There was a request from a local resident to Cllr Gardner, Chair of the Royal Borough’s Scrutiny Committee to call in the Council Cabinet's Key Decision on the Planning Brief on grounds that it breached Council and national planning policies specifically intended to protect open space and residential amenity from development.
- Cllr Gardner declined this request noting that the Planning Brief had been prepared in accordance with the relevant legislation and is in conformity with the Core Strategy.

56. Can the Planning Brief be challenged?
- The Planning Brief has been adopted following approval from the Royal Borough’s Cabinet.
- There was a three month period where the Planning Brief could be challenged and a Judicial Review requested but this has now expired.

Next steps and getting involved

57. I want to have my say in the emerging proposals – how can I do this?
- In order to move the project forward, Studio E architects are further developing the design of the academy and leisure centre following the Cabinet decision in December 2011.
We want people to get involved so we have set up a residents’ forum which meets on a monthly basis. If you are interested in joining the forum or becoming involved then please contact kalcenquiries@rbkc.gov.uk

We are also interested in all those who make use of the centre facilities and what we can do to improve and extend the borough’s leisure centre provision. A leisure group has been formed which includes regular users of the leisure centre so they can input into the emerging proposals. If you would like to be involved please contact the manager of Kensington Leisure Centre on 020 7727 9747 or email kensington.enquiries@gll.org

We held two drop-in sessions on 26 and 28 January 2012 to share how the designs are progressing following the Council’s Cabinet decision in December. Feedback from those sessions is being reviewed and considered where possible.

We will be holding a public exhibition on the full designs on Thursday 19 April from 4.30pm to 8.30pm and Saturday 21 April from 10am to 2pm. This will be an opportunity to see how the plans have progressed following the drop-in sessions in January and comment on the full designs. The Council, Aldridge Foundation (lead sponsors of the Academy), Studio E (lead architects) and other members of the project team will be on hand to answer any. The exhibition will be held in the Lower Hall of Notting Hill Methodist Church on Lancaster Road, and we will be advertising the event locally and on the Royal Borough’s website, in the coming weeks.

Key responses from the Planning Brief

58. Cost – how does the cost of Kensington Academy compare with the Chelsea Academy or Holland Park and does this project have the same priority?

• Delivering a high quality school for the north of the borough is a key priority for the Council.
• That is exactly why it has teamed up with the Aldridge Foundation – a highly reputable co-sponsor with a strong track record in delivering high quality schools across the country.
• It also needs to be noted that the costs associated with each project need to be considered on an individual basis. A portion of the cost for the Chelsea Academy, for instance, was due to additional works that needed to be done to prepare the site, so we will not know the final cost for this project until more detailed plans are developed.

59. Site selection – were other sites considered for the academy?

• It is never easy in a densely populated borough, near the centre of London, to find a big enough site to build a new school.
• We carried out a site selection process for the school in 2009 and looked at five sites – Barlby Primary School, Kensal Gasworks Site, Princess Louise Hospital, Middle Row/St Mary’s and the Kensington Leisure Centre Site.
• However, none of these were suitable for a school, predominantly because they had poor accessibility, were too small, or were not in Council ownership.

60. Alternative sites – what about the other two sites the public suggested – the Virgin Active Gym and Silchester Garages?

• The Virgin Active/ St Thomas Primary School site is not available. The freehold for the site is owned by Stenham Property who lease the property to Virgin Active. Virgin has confirmed that this is a well used facility and the Council has been informed by the operators that they do not wish to sell.
• In addition, while the Virgin building is an old school, it does not offer accommodation regarded as appropriate for a new school. Demolition would therefore be required, further adding to project costs.
• There is also the additional complication of having to offer continuous provision of accommodation, either on or off site, for St Thomas Jones Primary School during the redevelopment. Even if the site were available, these complications would not allow for the school to qualify for Government funding as it needs to be open by 2014. The Silchester Garages site would not be available for the construction of the school by 2014 as the 14 properties on Shalfleet Drive and their communal garden could not be
assumed to be available by that date. When they are taken out of the site, the area is simply not big enough to accommodate a school. Furthermore, in this scenario the school would be accommodated on two separate sites which is not ideal.

61. Open space – will building the school on the selected site result in the loss of open space?
   - The details of the scheme are yet to be worked out but some loss of open space would be inevitable. However, the portion of the open space that would be reprovided would be significantly improved.
   - It is worth noting that currently one third of the site is taken up by a car park, which does not add greatly to the local amenity.
   - A lot of the open space on the site is also made up of the playing pitches, which would be reprovided at the Westway Sports Centre, just five minutes from the site.
   - In addition, the current play area would be retained or replaced and further improved.

62. Parking – would car parking still be provided on site?
   - In areas like this, where there are adequate alternatives to car use and there would remain significant parking capacity in the area, the Council does not resist the loss of car parking.
   - It should also be noted that many of the spaces in the existing car park are used by commuters. The reduction of car parking at this site will help minimise car use in the local area.

63. The road – is the new road still proposed and won’t this encourage ‘rat running’ and add more traffic to the area?
   - The plans for the site do include the provision of a road.
   - As part of the process going forward, we would need to determine how this road is best managed to serve the academy and the new leisure centre whilst considering the impact on local residents.
   - Our early thinking suggests, however, that this new connection would be used primarily by pedestrians and cyclists and would therefore not have a great impact on the traffic in the area.
   - Currently there is no convenient and clear way of getting to the leisure centre – you need to know where it is to find it. The new road could help address this and make it a more accessible facility for visitors.

64. Noise – won’t the noise from the school be disruptive to local residents?
   - Naturally there would be some noise impact however our experience from other schools is that this can be mitigated very effectively through staggered school hours.
   - As part of the planning application for the school, the Council will expect a full list of mitigation measures that the school will intend to use and where necessary impose planning conditions to control and minimise noise and disruption for residents living in the area.

65. Housing - will there be any housing as part of this development?
   - The preferred option chosen by Cabinet in December includes the provision of some new housing along Bomore Road. A more detailed appraisal of this element of the project will be undertaken in the coming months.

66. Trees – would any trees be lost as a result of the construction work?
   - There would be some loss of trees but none of these would be protected trees.
   - Replanting would also take place to make sure that any trees lost were replaced.

67. Other uses – would there be retail/ a library provided on site?
   - The Planning Brief does not include every possible use on the site. It sets out what you ‘have to’ do on site as opposed to what you ‘could do’.
   - The Planning Brief sets out the options in a realistic way recognising that it would be a challenge to provide more uses on an already constrained site.

The Process
68. What consultation has taken place on the academy to date?

- The consultation on the ethos and vision for the academy is the latest of several processes that previously the Council, and now the academy sponsors, have undertaken for this significant project.

1. It started with consultation by the Council on the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework (LDF) during 2008 and 2009; This looked at opportunities for the wider Latimer area, for this specific site, as well as borough-wide planning policies such as those relating to open space.

2. The next stage was looking at the more detailed planning requirements for the academy and leisure centre site by preparing a Planning Brief. The Planning Brief – known also as a ‘Supplementary Planning Document’ (SPD) – takes the policies set out in the borough-wide planning policy document, called the Core Strategy, and provides more detail on the planning requirements for the development of the site. This was consulted on between January and May 2011 and adopted in May 2011.

3. The adoption of the SPD allowed the academy sponsors to consult with the local residents on the early vision and the ethos for the academy itself, and this consultation took place in the summer of 2011.

- This will be followed by further consultations on the design of the proposed school and on separate plans for the leisure centre.

- Following an architect’s exhibition held in September 2011, Studio E architects were chosen as the designers for the project. They are now developing designs and a residents’ forum and leisure group have been formed in order to ensure ideas from both groups are fed back to the architects. Now that a preferred option has been confirmed by the Council’s Cabinet the view is to submit a planning application for the site in May 2012.

69. What are the next steps?

- Now that the architects have been appointed, we are looking to invest £1.5 million in procuring a design team for the academy to develop more detailed plans.

- Further consultation with residents by the sponsors and the Council’s Leisure Department will continue to take place through 2012.

- Two drop-in sessions were held at the leisure centre on 26 and 28 January to share how the designs have progressed now that the Cabinet has chosen a preferred option.

- A public exhibition will be held on Thursday 19 April and Saturday 21 2012 at Notting Hill Methodist Church on the full designs for the academy and leisure centre. Further details on the event will be advertised on the Royal Borough’s website, the next project newsletter and in the local press in the coming weeks.

- We aim to submit the planning application in May 2012 for determination in the summer/autumn of 2012.

70. What systems have been put in place to ensure that people are informed and consulted as the Programme progresses?

- Any public consultation activities going forward will be publicised in the local media and in key community areas across the borough.

- We will also be writing directly to stakeholders and local groups to keep them up-to-speed on the process.

- In addition, we are making plans to host regular residents’ meetings which will be another opportunity to keep up to speed with the project and discuss any issues.

**The architects**

71. What was the process for choosing an architect?

- During the summer the Council held a design competition with more than 40 firms entering.

- An exhibition was held in early September 2011 so that local residents would have the opportunity to see and comment on the shortlisted designs.
The six shortlisted architects presented to a panel of Councillors and a representative of the lead sponsor before a decision was made.

72. Who are the architects?
- The competition to design the new academy and leisure centre was won by Studio E architects.
- Studio E are experienced with school and leisure centre projects, having worked on the City Academy Hackney, the Ark Academy Wembley, the Burgess Park sports centre and the Watford Central leisure centre. They are familiar with the borough having redesigned Emslie Horniman Pleasance, the classroom of the future at St Francis of Assisi primary and they completed the sports and IT extension to St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College.

73. Will design options be available to view and comment on?
- Yes.
- You can view the preliminary designs and find out more about the proposals for Kensington Aldridge Academy and Kensington Leisure Centre by visiting www.rbkc.gov.uk/kalc and http://www.kensingtonaldridgeacademy.co.uk/
- A community panel made up of local residents and groups will review these options as the project develops.
- A separate leisure group which will include regular users has also been formed so that they can input into the proposals.

74. When will the final design option be presented and voted on?
- The architects are now further developing their designs following the Cabinet decision.
- During this process and up to the submission of the planning application we are working with local residents' groups and user groups to ensure they are involved in the process and that our plans and thinking are shared every step of the way.

---

\(^{1}\) Letter attached to Cabinet report dated 12 December 2011